

INCONTRI LINGUISTICI

42

A Yearly International Peer-Reviewed Journal

The eContent is Archived with *Clockss* and *Portico*.
The Journal is Indexed and Abstracted in Scopus (Elsevier). ANVUR: A.

*

Rivista fondata da Roberto Gusmani e pubblicata in collaborazione tra

UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI TRIESTE

SEZIONE DI STUDI IN LINGUE MODERNE
PER INTERPRETI E TRADUTTORI

e

UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI UDINE

DIPARTIMENTO DI STUDI UMANISTICI
E DEL PATRIMONIO CULTURALE

*

Direzione:

RAFFAELLA BOMBI (Università di Udine)
raffaella.bombi@uniud.it

FRANCO CREVATIN (Università di Trieste)
fcrevatin@units.it

VINCENZO ORIOLES (Università di Udine)
vincenzo.orioles@uniud.it

Comitato scientifico:

IGNASI-XAVIER ADIEGO LAJARA (Institut del Pròxim Orient Antic, Universitat de Barcelona) · RAFFAELLA BOMBI (Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici e del Patrimonio Culturale, Università di Udine) · FRANCO CREVATIN (Sezione di Studi in Lingue Moderne per Interpreti e Traduttori, Università di Trieste) · RENÉ LEBRUN (Faculté de Philosophie, Arts et Lettres, Université Catholique de Louvain) · MARCO MANCINI (Dipartimento di Lettere e Culture Moderne, Università di Roma "La Sapienza") · H. CRAIG MELCHERT (Department of Linguistics, UCLA) · VINCENZO ORIOLES (Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici e del Patrimonio Culturale, Università di Udine) · PAOLO POCETTI (Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici, Università di Roma Tor Vergata) · DOMENICO SILVESTRI (Dipartimento di Studi Letterari, Linguistici e Comparati, Università degli Studi di Napoli "L'Orientale")

Comitato di redazione:

FRANCESCO COSTANTINI · TIZIANA QUADRIO

Recapito della redazione:

Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici e del Patrimonio Culturale
Università · 33100 Udine

*

Con un contributo finanziario di:

Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici e del Patrimonio Culturale
Università di Udine

UNIVERSITÀ
DI TRIESTE

UNIVERSITÀ
DI UDINE

INCONTRI LINGUISTICI

42

(2019)

© Copyright by Fabrizio Serra editore, Pisa · Roma.



PISA · ROMA
FABRIZIO SERRA EDITORE

MMXIX

I prezzi ufficiali di abbonamento cartaceo e/o Online sono consultabili presso il sito Internet della casa editrice www.libraweb.net

Print and/or Online official subscription rates are available at Publisher's web-site www.libraweb.net.

FABRIZIO SERRA EDITORE

Casella postale n. 1, Succursale n. 8, I 56123 Pisa,
tel. 050 542332, fax 050 574888

Uffici di Pisa:

Via Santa Bibbiana 28, I 56127 Pisa, fse@libraweb.net

Uffici di Roma:

Via Carlo Emanuele I 48, I 00185 Roma, fse.roma@libraweb.net

I pagamenti possono essere effettuati sul c.c.p. 17154550 indirizzato a *Fabrizio Serra editore*, oppure tramite carta di credito (*American Express, Eurocard, Mastercard, Visa*).

*

Proprietà riservata · All rights reserved

Copyright 2019 by *Fabrizio Serra editore*, Pisa · Roma.

Fabrizio Serra editore incorporates the imprints *Accademia editoriale*, *Edizioni dell'Ateneo*, *Fabrizio Serra editore*, *Giardini editori e stampatori in Pisa*, *Gruppo editoriale internazionale* and *Istituti editoriali e poligrafici internazionali*.

www.libraweb.net

A norma del codice civile italiano, è vietata la riproduzione, totale o parziale (compresi estratti, ecc.), di questa pubblicazione in qualsiasi forma e versione (comprese bozze, ecc.), originale o derivata, e con qualsiasi mezzo a stampa o internet (compresi siti web personali e istituzionali, academia.edu, ecc.), elettronico, digitale, meccanico, per mezzo di fotocopie, pdf, microfilm, film, scanner o altro, senza il permesso scritto della casa editrice.

Under Italian civil law this publication cannot be reproduced, wholly or in part (included offprints, etc.), in any form (included proofs, etc.), original or derived, or by any means: print, internet (included personal and institutional web sites, academia.edu, etc.), electronic, digital, mechanical, including photocopy, pdf, microfilm, film, scanner or any other medium, without permission in writing from the publisher.

*

ISSN PRINT 0390-2412

E-ISSN 1724-1669

*

Direttore responsabile: Fabrizio Serra

Autorizzazione del Tribunale di Pisa n. 10 del 19.4.1984

SOMMARIO

SAGGI

STORIA DEL PENSIERO LINGUISTICO

- TIZIANA QUADRIO, *Sul costruito di Elementarverwandschaft. Genesi, statuto e ricezione* 11

INDOEUROPEISTICA

- ALAIN BLANC, *Les adjectifs simples dérivés de substantifs en *-es- et la structure du composé grec ἀμενηνός* 47
- RICCARDO GINEVRA, *Vedic bhiṣáj - 'healer' (*b^hh₂s h₂éǵ - 'the one who leads to the light'), the Indo-European poetics of [LIGHT] as [LIFE] and the mythology of the Ásvins* 67

LINGUISTICA ANATOLICA

- STELLA MERLIN, VALERIO PISANIELLO, *Linguistic Strategies in Filiation Formulas: Data from Lycian-Greek Bilingual Texts* 89

LINGUISTICA GRECA

- LUZ CONTI, *De la duda a la certeza: sobre el uso de ἴσως en el teatro griego* 111
- LAURA MASSETTI, *The phraseological story of Gk. πολισσόε (Homeric Hymn 8.2)* 137

MORFOLOGIA

- PAOLO RAMAT, *The Limits of Transcategorization* 155

DIVERSITÀ LINGUISTICA

- CARLO CONSANI, *Le lingue di minoranza come terreno di verifica delle relazioni tra fattori 'interni' ed 'esterni' al linguaggio* 173

RASSEGNA CRITICA

- ALAIN BLANC, *Les adjectifs sigmatiques du grec ancien. Un cas de métamorphisme dérivationnel* (Francesco Dedè) 213

<i>Observing Eurolects. Corpus analysis of linguistic variation in EU law</i> , ed. by Laura Mori (Margherita Di Salvo)	218
SARA CHIARINI, <i>The So-called Nonsense Inscriptions on Ancient Greek Vases. Between Paideia and Paidía</i> (Giovanna Rocca)	227
<i>Etnografia della scrittura</i> , a cura di Marco Mancini, Barbara Tur- chetta (Glauco Sanga)	231

SCHEDE BIBLIOGRAFICHE

<i>Language and Prehistory of the Indo-European Peoples. A Cross-Disci- plinary Perspective</i> , edited by Adam Hyllested, Benedicte Nielsen Whitehead, Thomas Olander, Birgit Anette Olsen (Gabriele Costa)	239
ROBERT DREWS, <i>Militarism and the Indo-Europeanizing of Europe</i> (Ga- briele Costa)	242
SERGIO NERI, <i>Elementi di morfologia flessiva nominale indoeuropea</i> (Francesco Dedè)	248
MARIA LUISA PORZIO GERNIA, LARISSA BONFANTE, <i>Giuliano Bonfante and Historical Linguistics, 1930-2000</i> (Mario Enrietti)	249
“ <i>Ce qui nous est donné, ce sont les langues</i> ”. <i>Studi linguistici in onore di Maria Pia Marchese</i> , a cura di Monica Ballerini, Francesca Mura- no, Letizia Vezzosi (Renato Gendre)	252
FRANCESCA MURANO, <i>Saussure, Bally e la linguistica greca. I corsi gine- vrini del 1893-1903</i> (Renato Gendre)	253
VINCENZO BELLELLI, ENRICO BENELLI, <i>Gli Etruschi. La scrittura, la lingua, la società</i> (Riccardo Massarelli)	255
<i>Der Rinderraub. Táin Bó Cúailnge in Auszügen. Restaurierter altiri- scher Text, mit Einleitung, Übersetzung, Kommentar und Glos- sar, herausgegeben von Wolfgang Meid; Der Rinderraub. Táin Bó Cúailnge in Auszügen. Editio minor. Einleitung, Text und Glos- sar, herausgegeben von Wolfgang Meid</i> (Andrea Nuti)	258
CAMILLA AMFT, <i>Das präteritale Konzept im Frühneuhochdeutschen</i> (Ralf Plate)	260
<i>Recapito dei collaboratori</i>	263

LINGUISTIC STRATEGIES IN FILIATION FORMULAS: DATA FROM LYCIAN-GREEK BILINGUAL TEXTS*

STELLA MERLIN · VALERIO PISANIELLO

ABSTRACT · Among nearly 200 Lycian inscriptions, a small corpus of Lycian-Greek bilinguals can be singled out that provides several clues on the Lycian cultural environment during the 1st millennium BC. The issue of the relationships between Lycians and Greeks has received the attention of many scholars, both from a historical and from a linguistic perspective. In this paper, we will study the Lycian-Greek filiation formulas in order to evaluate the extent of specific language contact phenomena. For this purpose, we will analyse the linguistic strategies adopted by the two languages to express the genealogy of an individual, by looking into the structures of each language and, at the same time, by comparing the different patterns within the corpus of bilingual texts. More specifically, our study will be focused on three major points: the morphological encoding of the father's name in Greek within the bilingual texts, the use of the word for 'son' or 'daughter', and, finally, the presence or lack of Greek definite articles. Such an analysis aims to offer a contribution to the discussion about contact-induced language variation.

KEYWORDS: filiation formulas, Lycian, Greek, language contact.

1. INTRODUCTION

THE Lycian corpus consists of nearly 200 inscriptions written in an epichoric alphabet, most of which are funerary inscriptions record-

stella.merlin@univr.it, University of Verona.

valerio.pisaniello@univr.it, University of Verona.

* This paper is part of the project PALaC, which has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement n° 757299). Although the content of the paper has been entirely discussed and shared by the authors, V. Pisaniello is responsible for §§ 2.1, 2.3, 3.2, 3.3 and S. Merlin for §§ 1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.4. Both authors are responsible for the § 4. We are indebted to Federico Giusfredi (PI. of the project), Paola Cotticelli and Alfredo Rizza, whose valuable feedback and suggestions greatly enhanced the manuscript. We would also like to thank the two anonymous reviewers for their helpful suggestions. Any remaining mistakes are, of course, our own.

ing the name of the builder of the monument, his genealogy, the people for whom the monument was built (usually the wife and the children of the builder), often without their personal names, and sometimes also a curse formula against whoever will damage it or a burial clause mentioning the people who should or should not be buried in the tomb.¹ Some of these Lycian texts occur with a Greek inscription on the same monument. However, only a small number of these inscriptions are really bilingual, namely texts containing more or less the same information. In some cases, the Lycian and the Greek texts are even not related to each other, although they are on the same monument.²

This paper aims to analyse the filiation formulas found both in Lycian and Greek inscriptions from Lycia, bilingual and monolingual, in order to identify possible phenomena of interference between the two languages.

2. FILIATION FORMULAS IN LYCIAN AND GREEK

2. 1. *Filiation formulas in Lycian*

To begin with, it may be useful to observe how Lycian and Greek usually express the genealogy of an individual. The Lycian pattern is quite homogeneous: the father's name is in genitive case, usually followed by the word *tideimi* 'son, child' (a participle literally meaning 'suckled'):³

¹ For a list of sources and further discussion, see CHRISTIANSEN (2009).

² See BRIKHE (2007), MOLINA VALERO (2007), ADIEGO (2014), and DARDANO (2015) for a general presentation of the corpus involving Lycian language and multilingual inscriptions and for related sources and references. The entire corpus of Lycian texts is available via the digital resource by MELCHERT (2001), which includes the inscriptions previously edited by KALINKA (1901) and NEUMANN (1979). An updated version of the corpus can be found in RÉVEILHAC (2018: 559-624). Lycian inscriptions published by Kalinka in 1901 are indicated by the sigla TL (= *Tituli Lyciae*), while those published after 1901 are marked by N (= *nova*). The reference dictionaries are MELCHERT (2004) and NEUMANN (2007).

³ As can be seen from the following examples, Lycian filiation formulas generally follow the name to which they refer, although they are not necessarily placed immediately after it: when there is an initial subject in focus, we find the structure Subj.+*ti* Verb Filiation formula (e.g. *ikuwe=ti: prñnawate: ipresidah: tideimi:* in TL 29, 1; see also TL 62, TL 95, TL 98, TL 99, TL 116, and TL 127), whereas in TL 27, 1-4 the filiation formula follows the benefactive dative referred to the subject (*mexisttēn(e)=ē: ep[i] tuwete: atli: ehbi: sxxulijah: tideimi:*), and we find an analogous structure in the Greek version of TL 72 (τὸδε τ[ὸ] μν[ῆ] μα Κυδαλιη[ς]: ξ[στ]ησ[ε] ἔστυτωι: Μορωζα υἱός, vs. Lyc. *ebēñnē: tezi: m=ene: ñte: tuwetē: xudali[j]ē: murāzah[:] tideimi:*). Two inscriptions seem to show a filiation formula preceding the name to which it refers: TL 28 (see ex. (7) below) and N 351 (SEYER-TEKOĞLU 2009), where we read *apñxuxah: tideimi ştamaha=ti: prñnawate:*, although *apñxuxah: tideimi* is written in the first line and centred, beginning more or less above the verb, so that we may think of a secondary addition.

- (1) TL 1, 2-3 (Telmessos):
xudali *zuhrijah* *tideimi*
 PN.NOM PN.GEN. child.NOM.SG.
 ‘Xudali, son of Zuhrija’

If a woman is involved, the word can be either *tideimi* or *kbatra* ‘daughter’:

- (2) TL 27, 5-7 (Düwer):
merimawaj[e] *petēnēneh* *tideimi*
 PN.DAT. PN.GEN. child.DAT.SG.
 ‘to Merimawa, daughter of Petēnēne’
- (3) TL 25a, 5-6 (Tlos):
tikeukēprē ... *urtaqijahñ* *kbatru*
 PN.acc. PN.GenAdj.ACC.SG. daughter.ACC.SG.
 ‘Tikeukēpre, daughter of Urtaqija’

In few cases (20 times), only the genitive of the father’s name occurs:

- (4) TL 105, 2 (Limyra):
esete: *muleseh*
 PN.NOM. PN.GEN.
 ‘Esete, (son) of Mulse’

Conversely, kinship terms other than *tideimi* or *kbatra* cannot be omitted:

- (5) TL 113, 1-2 (Limyra):
pttar[a]zi *urssm̃ [mah]¹* ... *ddawahāmah* *tuhes*
 PN.NOM. PN.GEN. PN.GEN. nephew.NOM.SG.
 ‘Pttar[a]zi, (son) of Urssm̃[ma], ... nephew of Ddawahāma’

If the son’s name is in accusative case, the genitival adjective is usually found, a form of derived adjective built on the genitive of the father’s name (see also *urtaqijahñ* in (3) above):²

¹ This name is written as *urssm̃e*[.] (cf. the hand copy of the inscription provided by KALINKA 1901: 79), emended by ARKWRIGHT (1891: 191) in *urssmm[a]*. Since in the break there seems to be space for only one sign (we acknowledge the anonymous reviewer for this precious hint), possibly followed by a word divider, and the name could be either *urssm̃ma*- or *urssm̃me*- (cf. RÉVEILHAC 2018: 130, fn. 65), a more plausible restoration of the text could be *urssm̃<m>e[h:]*. However, none of these alternatives will change the syntactic function of the name, still in genitive case, expressing the patronymic.

² In order to describe such a form of derived adjective with relational function, the metalinguistic tradition also applies the label of *accusativus genitivi*, since the inherited genitive is secondarily inflected in the accusative case, or in other terms the ending of accusa-

- (6) N 320, 10-11 (Xanthos):
eseimiju *qñturahahñ* *tideimi*
 PN.ACC. PN.GenAdj.ACC.SG. child.ACC.SG.
 ‘Eseimija, son of Qñturaha’

However, this does not seem to be mandatory, at least when the personal name of the son/daughter follows the filiation formula, if the reconstruction of the following text is correct:¹

- (7) TL 28, 2-3 (Tlos):
prijabuhāmah *kbatru* ... *mlttaimi*
 PN.GEN. daughter.ACC.SG. PN.ACC.
 ‘the daughter of Prijabuhāma, [...] Mlttaimi’

2. 2. Filiation formulas in Greek

In Greek, as is well known, several strategies are attested.² First, the father’s name can be found in genitive case, with or without the expression of the word for ‘son’, as υἱός or παῖς, or even θυγάτηρ ‘daughter’; in fact, in epigraphic inscriptions, the word for ‘son/daughter’ is very often lacking.

- (8) *Il.* II 819-820:
 παῖς Ἀγχίσαο | Αἰνεΐας
 child.NOM.SG. PN.GEN. PN.NOM.
 ‘The son of Anchises, Aeneas’
- (9) *Il.* XVII 79:
 Μενέλαος ἀρῆϊος Ἄτρεος υἱός
 PN.NOM. warlike.ADJ.NOM.SG. PN.GEN. SON.NOM.SG.
 ‘The warlike Menelaus, son of Atreus’

tive is added to a noun in genitive case which has thus become an adjective. However, this problematic issue certainly deserves an in-depth further discussion.

¹ See TEKOĞLU (2017). Note that the alleged personal name Mlttaimi (uncertain, cf. MELCHERT 2004: 99) is regularly followed by *mrbbanada[hñ] ladu uwitahñ xahb[u]*, ‘wife of Mrbbanada (*GenAdj*.acc.sg.), granddaughter of Uwita (*GenAdj*.acc.sg.)’ (cf. ex. (6) above). However, two newly discovered inscriptions from Tlos published by TEKOĞLU (2017) show the very same structure (genitive + *kbatru* ... *GenAdj*.acc.sg. + *ladu*, *GenAdj*.acc.sg. + *xahbu*), but without mentioning the personal name of the daughter.

² On Greek patronymics see, among others, ANGERMANN (1868), AITCHISON (1964), MASSON (1965), KEARNS (1994), KEURENTJES (1997), DARDANO (2011), and SMITHERMAN (2014). Note that some foreign names in Greek (e.g. Μορωζα) do not bear any graphic accent whenever attested only in epigraphic sources and the Greek tradition does not allow us to restore it.

- (10) IG I² 1082, 1 (Attica):
 Ἀμεινόκλεια Ἄνδρομέους θυγάτηρ
 PN.NOM.(FEM.) PN.GEN. daughter.NOM.SG.
 ‘Ameinokleia, daughter of Andromenos’
- (11) TAM II 232, 1-2 (Sidyma):
 Χρύσιππος Ζωσίμου
 PN.NOM. PN.GEN.
 ‘Chrysippus, (son) of Zosimos’

Another very common way, especially in poetry, to express the patronymic relation in Greek is through the derivational morphology, namely using a derived patronymic adjective in *-ιος*, *-(ι)δαξ*, or *-ίων*.¹ One example for all is the following taken from the huge number attested in Homer.

- (12) *Il.* xxiii 349
 Νέστωρ Νηλήϊος
 PN.NOM. PN.ADJ.NOM.SG.
 ‘Nestor, the son of Neleos (lit. the *Neleius* Nestor)’

2. 3. Filiation formulas in Lycian-Greek bilingual texts

This paragraph presents all the filiation formulas collected within the bilingual inscriptions from Lycia, in order to show the parallel structures belonging to the Lycian and Greek texts:

- (13) TL 6, Lyc. 1-2; Gr. 4-5 (Karmyleessos):
- | | | |
|------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Lyc. | <i>pulenjda</i> | <i>mullijeseh</i> |
| | PN.NOM. | PN.GEN. |
| Gr. | Ἀπολλωνίδης | Μολλίσιος |
| | PN.NOM. | PN.GEN. |
| Lyc. | <i>dapara</i> | <i>pulenjdah</i> |
| | PN.NOM. | PN.GEN. |

¹ Ancient grammarians were also perfectly conscious of such morphological possibilities in expressing the filiation. The *Tekhne Grammatiké* (GG I, 1: 25-26) reports that: “The patronymic is, properly, a form derived from [the name of] the father and by extension from [that of] the ancestors, such as *Pelides* or *Aeacides* said of Achilles. There are three types of masculine patronymics: the type ending in *-δης*, that in *-ών*, and the type proper to the Aeolians, in *-αδιος*, as respectively *Atreides*, *Atreion*, and *Hyrradios*. Pittacus was, in fact, the son of Hyrra. Similarly, there are three types of feminine forms: the type in *-ις*, that in *-αξ*, and that in *-νη*, as *Priamis*, *Pelias*, and *Adrestine*. Homer does not derive the patronymic from [the name of] the mother, but the new poets do”. [Translation by S. Merlin].

Gr.	Λαπάρας	Ἀπολλ[ω]νίδου	
	PN.NOM.	PN.GEN.	
Lyc.	<i>purihimetehe</i>	<i>pr[ñ]n[e]zijehe</i>	
	PN.GEN.	household member.GenAdj.NOM.PL.	
Gr.	Πυριμάτιος ¹	οἰκεῖοι	
	PN.GEN.	household member.NOM.PL.	
(14)	TL 25a, Lyc. 2-7; Gr. 8-14 (Tlos):		
Lyc.	<i>xssbezē:</i>	<i>krup[ssēh]</i>	<i>tideimi:</i>
	PN.NOM.	PN.GEN.	child.NOM.SG.
Gr.	Πόρπαξ ²	Θρύψιος	
	PN.NOM.	PN.GEN.	
Lyc.	<i>purihime[teh]</i>	<i>tuhes:</i>	
	PN.GEN.	nephew.NOM.SG.	
Gr.	Πυριβάτους ³	ἀδελφιδούς	
	PN.GEN.	nephew.NOM.SG.	
Lyc.	<i>tikeukēprē</i>	... <i>urtaqjahñ:</i>	<i>kbatru</i>
	PN.ACC.	PN.GenAdj.ACC.SG.	daughter.ACC.SG.
Gr.	Τισευσέμβραν	... Ὀρτακία	θυγατέρ<α>
	PN.ACC.	PN.GEN.	daughter.ACC.SG.
Lyc.	<i>prijenubehñ:</i>	<i>tuhesñ</i>	
	PN.GenAdj.ACC.SG.	niece.ACC.SG.	
Gr.	Πριανόβα	ἀδελφιδῆν	
	PN.GEN.	niece.ACC.SG.	
(15)	TL 45 A, Lyc. 1-2; Gr. 1 (Xanthos):		
Lyc.	<i>pixe[s]ere</i>	<i>kat[amla]h</i>	
	PN.NOM.	PN.GEN.	

¹ The Lycian genitive *purihimetehe* is regularly adapted as Πυριμάτιος in Greek; cf. also Ποριματις in H II 5 and Πορασιματις (with preserved -s-) in JHS 15: 108, 18.

² In this inscription, unlike the most of the cases in which the personal name is transposed and/or formally adapted in the other language (e.g. from Lycian to Greek *tikeukēprē* > Τισευσέμβραν, *xudara* > Κοδάρας, etc.; from Greek to Lycian Παρμένοντος > *pa[r]mnaḥ*, Δειμοκλ[ει]δής > *ñtemuxlida*, etc.), there is no formal correspondence between the Lycian *xssbezē* and the Greek Πόρπαξ. The latter means ‘handle of a shield’ and, as a personal name, is a *hapax* so far. However, it occurs as a dog name in Xen. *Cyn.* VII,5. Possibly, the Greek name could represent a translation of Lyc. *xssbezē*, although we do not positively know the meaning of this word in Lycian (cf. COLVIN 2004: 66). See however HAJNAL (1995: 35-36, n. 28) for a tentative etymology of the Lycian name, traced back to the PIE root **sah₂(i)-* ‘to bind’ (for the root see LIV²: 544 s.v. **sh₂ei-*). Greek adaptations of this Lycian name could be Οσσυβας and Οξυβας (compare the genitive *xzχubezeh* in TL 13, 3).

³ The Lycian genitive *purihime[teh]* is rendered as Πυριβάτους (instead of Πυριμάτιος as in TL 6, 5) which probably reflects a partial Hellenization, as observed by COLVIN (2004: 66-67) and MELCHERT (2014: 68).

- Gr. Πιζώδαρος Έκατόμ[νου ...]
PN.NOM. PN.GEN.
- (16) TL 56, Lyc. 2; Gr. 5 (Antiphellos):
Lyc. *ixtta:* *hlah:* *tideimi:*
PN.NOM. PN.GEN. child.NOM.SG.
Gr. Ίκτας Λᾶ
PN.NOM. PN.GEN.
- (17) TL 72 Lyc. 1; Gr. 3 (Kyana):
Lyc. *xudali[j]ē:* *murāzah[:]* *tideimi:*
PN.NOM. PN.GEN. child.NOM.SG.
Gr. Κυδαλιη[ς] ... Μορωζα υἱός
PN.NOM. PN.GEN. SON.NOM.SG.
- (18) TL 117, Lyc. 2-3; Gr. 6-7 (Limyra):
Lyc. *siderija:* *pa[r]mnaḥ:* *tideimi*
PN.NOM. PN.GEN. child.NOM.SG.
Gr. Σιδάριος Παρμένοντος υἱός
PN.NOM. PN.GEN. SON.NOM.SG.
- (19) TL 143 Gr. 1; Lyc. 2 (Limyra):
Gr. Κοδαρας Οσαίμιος
PN.NOM. PN.GEN.
Lyc. *xudara:*
PN.NOM.
- (20) N 302, Gr. 1; Lyc. 2 (Korydalla):
Gr. Σαπια Μαναπιμ[ι]ος [...]
PN.NOM. PN.GEN.
Lyc. *ssepīje:* *mahanepi[jemihe:* *tideimi(?)*
PN.NOM. PN.GEN. child.NOM.SG.
- (21) N 312, Gr. 1; Lyc. 4 (Xanthos):
Gr. Δεμοκλ[ει]δης Θε[ρ]βειος
PN.NOM. PN.GEN.
Lyc. *ñtemuxlida* *krbbe[s]eh*
PN.NOM. PN.GEN.
- (22) N 320, Lyc. 1-2, 10-11; Gr. 1-2, 8-9 (Xanthos):
Lyc. *pigesere:* *katamlah:* *tideimi:*
PN.NOM. PN.GEN. child.NOM.SG.
Gr. Πιζώδαρος Έκατόμνω υἱός
PN.NOM. PN.GEN. SON.NOM.SG.
Lyc. *eseimiju:* *qñturahahñ:* *tideimi:*
PN.ACC. PN.GenAdj.ACC.SG. child.ACC.SG.
Gr. Σιμίαν Κονδορασιος υἱόν
PN.ACC. PN.GEN. SON.ACC.SG.

3. THE LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS BETWEEN OLD ASSUMPTIONS
AND NEW PERSPECTIVES

3. 1. *Greek patterns in bilingual texts: genitives vs. possessive adjectives
and the case of the “Doric” genitives*

As can be seen, the Greek inscriptions show only one pattern: the father’s name is expressed by a genitive, sometimes followed by *υἰός*. This means that in a Greek text belonging to some multilingual larger text, the use of a derivational suffix in order to express the patronymic relation is not attested. This could certainly depend on a lack of documents, but in fact it is worth giving different and quite satisfactory reasons: first of all, as far as we ascertained in a spot-check, the derivational strategy is never selected in inscriptions, namely in epigraphic genre, nor in bilingual text. Thus, it could be more properly on account of a reduction of linguistic patterns according to both genre (here also writing support) and content.

Some cases could seem ambiguous, e.g. *Μολλίσιος* in TL 6, 4 or *Θρύψιος* in TL 25a, 8, since they could be morphologically considered as patronymic adjectives in *-ιος*; however, forms like *Πυριμάτιος οικεῖοι* in TL 6, 5 and *Κονδορασιος ὑόν* in N 320, 9 show that we are instead dealing with *i*-stems genitives, since the phrases do not show the grammatical agreement required if the *-ιος* ending form was an adjective.

Some forms are noteworthy: *Ὀρτακία* and *Πριανόβα* in TL 25a, 13-14, *Λᾱ̃* in TL 56, 5, and *Μορωζα* in TL 72. In these cases, we have genitives in *-ᾱ*, characteristic of the Doric dialect (**-αο > -ᾱ*).¹ Their use is probably due to linguistic adaptation strategies: they possibly represent the simple, mechanical, transposition of the corresponding Lycian names – see especially *ixtta hlāh tideimi = Ἰκτας Λᾱ̃²* –, which does not compromise the Greek system, because it knows such a form (note that this kind of Doric genitive is often used with foreign proper names in *-a*, cf. *Ἀννίβᾱ*, *Ἀμίλκᾱ*, *Ἀσδροῦβᾱ*, *Κατιλίνᾱ*, *Γάλβᾱ*, etc.).³ In Greek monolingual inscriptions from Lycia we find several other examples of genitives in *-ᾱ* involving Anatolian names: *Ερμενδαδης Τεδικτα* in H II 25 (Limyra, III BC?), *Ε[ρμ]απια θυγάτηρ* in H II 28 (Limyra), *Σελλιος τοῦ Ποναμοα* in

¹ *Contra* MOLINA VALERO (2009: 783), who regards *Ὀρτακία* and *Πριανόβα* in TL 25a as adjectives built on the two Lycian proper names. On the explanation of these forms as genitives, see now also RÉVEILHAC (2018: 533 with fn. 56).

² In Cilicia and Pamphylia, the gen. *Λατος* is also found.

³ An analogous explanation is now provided by RÉVEILHAC (2018: 533-535).

H II 33 (Limyra, IV BC?), Κενδαξ Ασσα υἱ[ός] in H II 34 (Limyra, IV/III BC), etc.¹

3. 2. Is the Greek pattern GEN + υἱός triggered by Lycian GEN + *tideimi*?

As suggested by Rutherford (2002: 210-212), there seems to be mutual interference among Lycian and Greek as far as patronymics are concerned, which appears in the expression of the word for ‘son’. Indeed, on the one hand, the occurrence of the noun υἱός after the genitive of the father’s name in the Greek version of some bilingual texts is assumed to be a calque of the Lycian formula GEN + *tideimi*; on the other hand, the Lycian formula without *tideimi* occurring in other bilinguals could be modelled on the Greek common pattern without υἱός.

Starting with the analysis of the Greek pattern with υἱός in the bilingual inscriptions, statistics, albeit based on very small numbers, seem to favour the assumption that it depends on the Lycian model with *tideimi*, since a perfect correspondence in almost all cases can be observed: in three inscriptions, the Lycian version has *tideimi* and the Greek one has υἱός (TL 72, TL 117, N 320 [2x]),² three other texts do not have the word ‘son’ either in Lycian or Greek (TL 6 [2x], TL 45 A, N 312), whereas in two inscriptions the Lycian and the Greek formulas diverge, the first showing *tideimi*, the latter having nothing (TL 25a, TL 56). Lastly, two cases can only be partially assessed: in TL 143 only the Greek inscription has the father’s name, whereas the two versions on N 302 are broken on the right side.³

¹ THREATTE (1996) provides several examples of genitives in -α and -ᾶ, first observing that “Genitives of this types were always normal in Attic inscriptions for masculine personal names in -ας” (p. 5); then, they are “not necessarily Doric forms, for by this time they could be genitive which is identical to the nominative minus -s” (pp. 83-86). See also SCHWYZER (1939: 561).

² We could add to this list TL 44, the Xanthos stele with inscriptions in Lycian, Milyan (or Lycian B), and Greek, which has [Γέργ]ις ὅδε Ἀρπάγου υἱός in the Greek version (TL 44c, 24, restored according to BOUSQUET 1975: 139), matching Lyc. [x]er[iga: ar]ppaxuh: tid[eimi:] (TL 44a, 1-2). However, the two texts are very different, the Greek one being a short epigram of 12 lines. Similarly, the short Lycian inscription N 311 – [erb]bina(j)=ēne ubete xruwata ertēmi [xer]jigah tideimi se(j)=upēneh: ‘[Erb]ina, son of [Xer]jiga and Upēne, offered votive offerings to Artemis’ – occurs with a longer Greek epigram, different in content, starting with Γέργιοις ὄν υἱός τ[οῦ Ἀρπάγου ἐκγεγῶτος (?)], followed in line 4 by the name Ἀρβίνας. Finally, in another Greek inscription we find Ἀρβίν]ας παῖς Γέργ[ι]ος, but the Lycian text, which preceded the Greek one, as we can see from some traces, is now lost (see BOUSQUET 1975: 143-145).

³ Since N 302 is written *stoichedon*, the same number of letters should be restored in every line. TRITSCH’s (1976) restoration of the two lines discussed here, also followed by

Turning for a moment to Greek monolingual texts from Lycia, we can observe that the occurrence of υἱός with the father's name is quite sporadic. It is very interesting that the only case we have found so far is in an inscription from Limyra (H II 34, IV / III c. BC), whose structure fully reproduces that of the Lycian sepulchral inscriptions, with a topicalized object, followed by the verb, the subject and the filiation formula with the father's name in genitive case + the noun 'son' (both personal names are Anatolian), and the indirect object (the builder himself, his wife, and their sons):

(23) H II 34 (Limyra):

Τοῦτο τὸ μνήμα κατεσκευάσατο Κενδας Ασσᾶ υἱ[ός] ἑαυτῶ <τ>ε
καὶ τῆι γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶ[ς] τέκνοις.

'This monument, Kendas son of Assas built (it) for himself, his wife, and (their) children'.

This supports the hypothesis that presence of the word for 'son' in the bilingual texts can be modelled on the Lycian version.¹ However, we must stress that the interference does not operate against the Greek rules or create something new; it rather expands an uncommon epigraphic use already existing in the Greek.

3. 3. *Is the Lycian pattern without tideimi triggered by the same structure in Greek?*

After having shown that the presence of υἱός in the Greek filiation formulas probably depends on the common Lycian use, the question arises whether it is possible to speak of interference in the other way around. In other terms, can we assume, with Rutherford (2002: 212), that the Lycian filiation formulas without *tideimi* depend on the Greek custom? In our view, only N 312 could provide us with a positive answer, because this is the only inscription in our corpus having a full Greek text preceding the Lycian one.² It is useful to present here the full text and the translation:

NEUMANN (1979: 15), runs as follows: (1) Σαπία Μαναπιμ[ι]ος [κατεσκευάζατο] (2) *ssepije*: *mahanepi[jemihe: tideimi]*. If this were correct, the Greek line would not show υἱός.

¹ See also the commentary to this inscription in the edition by WÖRRLE (H II: 423). Furthermore, RUTHERFORD (2002: 212) notes that the only pattern not occurring in these inscriptions is a filiation formula without *tideimi* in Lycian matching a Greek filiation formula with υἱός.

² The Greek version precedes the Lycian one also in TL 143 and N 302, recording, however, only the names of the builder of the monument and his father (but a verb could be possibly restored in N 302, cf. fn. 3 p. 97), followed by a complete Lycian text (curiously, as noted above, the father's name is lacking in the Lycian version of TL 143).

(24) N 312 (Xanthos):

1 Δεμοκλ[εί]δης Θε[ρ]βεισιος

2 Λιμυρεύς ἀγαθῆι τύχηι

3 Ἀρτέμιδι ἀνέθηκεν

4 *ñtemuxlida krbbe[s]eh*

5 *zemuris ertemi*

6 *xruwata*

(Gr.) ‘Demokl[i]des, (son) of The[r]besis, of Limyra, for good luck, dedicated to Artemis’.

(Lyc.) ‘Ntemuxlida, (son) of Krbbe[s]e, of Limyra, votive offerings for Artemis’.

The Greek version seems to be primary, not only for layout reasons, because the Greek text is positioned first and before the Lycian one, but also with respect to the content of the text itself. Indeed, in Greek we find the very common idiomatic expression ἀγαθῆι τύχηι, which is lacking in the Lycian version, and the verb ἀνέθηκεν, replaced by the noun *xruwata* ‘votive offerings’ in Lycian (note that almost all Lycian inscriptions have a verb).¹ Therefore, the use of a filiation formula without *tideimi* could really depend on the Greek model. Such a “dependence” should not be interpreted as a mere translation, but rather it could be an indicator of the socio-linguistic context in which this document was made: in this particular case, we could imagine that the Greek language was the first language, or in any case, the language in which the people concerned (author, customer, speaker, addressee) had the higher competence.²

The case of TL 6 is more difficult to evaluate:

(25) TL 6 (Karmylessos):

1 *ebēññē ñtatā m=ene=prñnawātē pulenjda mullijeseh se=dapara pulenjdah puri-*

2 *himetehe pr[ñ]n[e]z[i]jehi hrppi lada epttehe se=tideime se=ije ti=(e)seri ta-*

3 *di tike ñtat[a] ebehi me=ije [httēm]i punamaθθi aladahali: ada*

‘This burial chamber, Pulejda, (son) of Mullijese, and Dapara, (son) of Pulejda, household members of Purihimete, built it for their wives and chil-

¹ According to DARDANO (2015: 217): “la versione licia sarebbe solo un segno di rispetto per una tradizione ormai obsoleta che stava scomparendo”. On this inscription, see also PAYNE (2008: 479-480).

² As a parallel, we can compare the sociolinguistic explanation on the use of υῖός in the Greek-Latin bilingual inscriptions from Delos, which, according to ADAMS (2004: 670-677), depends on the Latin pattern with *filius*. However, the Lycian-Greek bilingual corpus at our disposal is unfortunately not sufficient to explain to what extent the sociolinguistic aspects could play a role here too.

dren. Who(ever) places anyone in the burial chamber of this (tomb), the anger of the totality (will fall) on him. For the transferral:¹ 5 *adas*'.

4 τοῦτο τὸ μνήμα ἐργάσαντο Ἀπολλωνίδης Μολλίσιος καὶ Λαπάρας
5 Ἀπολλ[ω]νίδου Πυριμάτιος οἰκεῖοι ἐπὶ ταῖς γυναῖξιν ταῖς ἑαοτῶν
6 κ[α]ὶ τοῖς ἐγγόνιοις· καὶ ἄν τις ἀδικήσῃ τὸ μνήμα τοῦτο
7 ἐξώλεα καὶ πανώλεα εἴη ἀοτῶι πάντων

'This monument, Apollonides, (son) of Mollisis, and Lparas, (son) of Apollonides, household members of Purimatis, made (it) for their wives and descendants. If someone will ruin this monument, destruction and devastation of everything be to him!'

In general, the two texts correspond to each other, especially in the first sentence: we can only note that Lyc. *ñtatā* 'burial chamber' is matched by a generic *μνήμα* in the Greek version. The curse formulas show some differences, both in the protasis and the apodosis: in the protasis, the Lycian text says 'Who(ever) places anyone in the burial chamber of this (tomb)', whereas the Greek one speaks of a damage (*ἀδικήσῃ*); in the apodosis, Lyc. [*httēm*]i *punamaθθi* 'the anger of the totality' does not correspond to Gr. *ἐξώλεα καὶ πανώλεα ... πάντων*, unless we restore something different from [*httēm*]i in the Lycian text.² Finally, only the Lycian version records the amount of *adas* due for the transferral of the deceased. Therefore, all in all, the Greek text seems to be more generic than the Lycian one.

From a more linguistic point of view, the use of *ἐπὶ* in the phrase *ἐπὶ ταῖς γυναῖξιν ταῖς ἑαοτῶν κ[α]ὶ τοῖς ἐγγόνιοις* is generally assumed to be calqued on Lyc. *hrppi*,³ but the opposite scenario, explaining Lycian *hrppi* + dative as a calque from Greek, can be defended as well, as per Daues (2009: 56-59), since *ἐπὶ* sometimes marks the beneficiary in Greek inscriptions from Greece, and the beneficiary clause is often expressed by the simple dative in Lycian inscriptions.⁴ Another possible calque could be Gr. *οἰκεῖοι* matching Lyc. *prñnezijehi*; however, according to Rutherford (2002: 205-206), it is possible that the Lycian word is a calque on the Greek one, since the latter also occurs in other Greek inscriptions from Lycia, or they can be two independent developments.

Finally, the inscription TL 45 A is quite fragmentary and cannot be fully analysed.

¹ Thus with MELCHERT (2015).

² KALINKA (1901: 17) restores [*tu*]be[*it*]i 'strike', semantically more fitting with the Greek formula.

³ Cf. RUTHERFORD (2002: 206) and MELCHERT (2014: 69).

⁴ On the preposition *hrppi* in a perspective of language contact, with particular emphasis on the formula *hrppi atli ehbi* 'for himself', see also RIX (2015: 108-113) with references.

3. 4. *The lack of the definite article in the Greek filiation formulas:
a case of interference?*

Another element sometimes invoked as a contact-induced phenomenon (see e.g. Rutherford 2002: 208-209, Dardano 2015: 221) is the constant lack of the definite article before the father's name in the Greek filiation formulas. Such a syntactic structure, in which the expected determiner before the proper name is lacking, would derive from the lack of the expression of articles as a grammatical category in Anatolian languages, to which the Lycian language belongs.¹ Let us look to some examples in the corpus (already mentioned above), with and without the expression of υἱός 'son':

(26) TL 6, Lyc. 1; Gr. 4-5 (Karmylessos):

Lyc.	<i>pulenjda</i>	<i>mullijeseh</i>
Gr.	Ἀπολλωνίδης	Μολλίσιος

Lyc.	<i>dapara</i>	<i>pulenjdah</i>
Gr.	Λαπάρας	Ἀπολλ[ω]νίδου

(27) TL 117, Lyc. 2-3; Gr. 6-7 (Limyra):

Lyc.	<i>siderija:</i>	<i>pa[r]mna:</i>	<i>tideimi</i>
Gr.	Σιδάριος	Παρμένοντος	υἱός

As pointed out by scholars, the unusual lack of the article in the Greek text may have been induced by the Lycian model; more specifically the lack of articles in the Greek language which does have such a kind of determiners would be influenced by the Anatolian languages, in which the category of articles is not represented.

However, if we consider more generally the corpus of Greek inscriptions, a similar construction is found in several monolingual Greek texts of the same period attested in Asia Minor, as for example in the list of names reported in the following inscription, in which the simple nominative singular, not preceded by the article, is followed by the simple genitive singular, again not preceded by the article:

(28) TAM II 50 (Telmessos):

Καλλιτέλης Καλλιτέλο[υ]
Π[ο]λύκλεια Δημητρίου
Διονύσιος Στράτωνος

¹ See also SCIANCALEPORA (2017), with analogous claims on some Greek inscriptions from Lydia and Caria.

Καλλιστράτα Καλλιτέλου
 Ποσιδώνιος Διογνήτου
 Ἀταλάντη Διονυσίου
 Ἀδλ[α]σις Μανδαλάσιος
 Σιγαδρας Κενδόνιος
 Τελήτω Ἀδλάσιος
 Δημητρίω Σιγάδρου

If we broaden the observation to other monolingual Greek texts of different places, far away from Lycia, we will again find the same construction, as in the following examples from Attica.

- (29) IG I² 909,1 (Attica)
 Χσάνθιππος Ἀρρίφρονος
 ‘Xantippus (son) of Arriphron’
- (30) IG I² 910,1 (Attica):
 Θεμισθοκλῆς Φρεάρριος
 ‘Themisthokles (son) of Phrearris’
- (31) IG I² 1046 (Attica):
 Εὐφραντίδης Μάνδρωνος Ἀστυπαλλαιέος
 ‘Euphrantides, (son) of Mandron of Astypalaia’

In these inscriptions the lack of articles would be, at least in theory, hardly explained on the basis of an Anatolian influence. It seems more probable that there are different reasons, such as the epigraphic support or some specialised use (= technical language) for this kind of script, more than a linguistic influence, namely based on internal language facts, from the Anatolian languages.¹

Furthermore, more interestingly, not all the articles lack in Greek when filiation formulas are involved. If at a first sight the use of the article may seem inconsistent, in fact a rule can be detected. As we have observed (finding then a confirmation in Miller 1916 and other works)² the article appears, not inconsistently, in the sequences with genitives, according to the following schema:

¹ It is also worth remembering that in classical Greek the use of definite article before the proper name and also before the ethnonym (the adjective referring to the geographical origin of the person) is far from mandatory, as in the famous examples: Ἡροδότου Ἁλικαρνησέος ‘Herodotus of Halicarnassus’; Ἑκαταῖος Μιλήσιος, ‘Hecataeus of Miletus’; Θουκυδίδης Ἀθηναῖος, ‘Thucydides of Athens’.

² See also MEISTERHANS (1900: 223-224) and GILDERSLEEVE (1904, II: 266). All these scholars observe that such use is regular in public, official inscriptions, while in private ones the articles are often found. But the issue about the status – private or public/official – of the Lycian funerary inscriptions is a quite complex one and cannot be dealt with in this paper.

PN ₁	± article	PN ₂
NOM / DAT / ACC	–	GEN
GEN	+	GEN

TABLE 1. The presence or absence of the article in Greek filiation formulas.

Here are a couple of examples, among many others:

- (32) TAM I 5 (Telmessos):
 Διογένην Διογένου τοῦ Διογένου τοῦ Σωσικλέου
 PN.ACC. PN.GEN. DEF.GEN.SG. PN.GEN. DEF.GEN.SG. PN.GEN.
 ‘Diogenes (son) of Diogenes, (son) of [the] Diogenes, (son) of [the] Sosikles’.

- (33) TAM II 1160 (Olympos)
 Εὐτύχης Ζωσιμᾶ τοῦ Νεοπτολέμου
 PN.NOM. PN.GEN. DEF.GEN.SG. PN.GEN.
 ‘Eutukhes, (son) of Zosimas, (son) of Neoptolemos’.

In this kind of formulas, whose meaning is “X son of Y son of Z”, the article always appears between two genitives in order to separate the two referents. Otherwise, the two genitives, being at the same syntactic level, would have been related to the same referent.

Coming back to the first hypothesis of interference found in literature, one could still imagine that the lack of article in Greek represents a contact-induced phenomenon, that spread in the Greek texts beyond the period of bilingual texts, which indeed can show the interference between Lycian (as a no-articles language) and Greek. However, in accordance to the corpus at our disposal, it seems impossible to describe in general terms the lack of articles in Greek as a contact-induced phenomenon. Of course, many other elements could support the hypothesis of a real comprehensive influence of the Lycian language on the Greek texts: nonetheless, in this specific case involving the use of the definite article in proper name sequences, such an explanation simply appeared much too confident and finally undue.¹

¹ On the other side, in a syntactic construction different from filiation formulas, namely in just one case occurring in the corpus of the bilingual texts (TL 44c), we could reasonably suspect a possible influence of the Lycian language on the Greek one with respect to the lack of article. This quite long text from Xanthos is a bilingual (or trilingual) inscription, written in Lycian, Lycian B or Milyan, and Greek. In the Greek part of the

4. CONCLUSION

To conclude, after having shown the strategies adopted by each of the two languages, we have analysed three aspects of the filiation formulas in the Lycian-Greek bilingual texts: 1) the morphological encoding of the name of the father in Greek; 2) the presence of *υἰός* in the Greek formulas and, conversely, the lack of *tideimi* in the Lycian ones; 3) the absence of the definite article before the genitive of the father's name in Greek.

As to the first point, we have observed that the Greek pattern is quite consistent with the Lycian one: all examples show the father's name in genitive case; no derived patronymic adjective is involved. It could be tempting to explain this reduction of strategies in Greek as a contact-induced phenomenon; however, we must note that even when we find a genitival adjective in Lycian, the Greek version displays a genitive, beside the fact that the use of a simple genitive for the father's name is a common custom throughout the Greek world.

Conversely, the presence of *υἰός* in some of the Greek formulas in our corpus is probably triggered by the Lycian pattern, consistently showing *tideimi*. However, we must stress again that this use remains confined to the bilingual documents and apparently does not spread outside them. The opposite phenomenon – the lack of *tideimi* in Lycian – is more difficult to evaluate: four cases out of twenty are found in bilingual inscriptions, among which the Greek influence is likely at least in N 312, where the Lycian text seems to be secondary.

Finally, broadening the perspective to the Greek monolingual texts from Lycia and elsewhere, an undeniable morpho-syntactical fact emerges: despite some recent claims, the lack of the definite article in the Greek filiation formulas should no longer be considered a contact-

inscription, we read in line 21 *στήλην τοιάνδε* 'this gravestone', and in line 23 *μνήμα τόδε* 'this memorial', instead of the (expected) structure with a definite article before the noun (as in other texts containing a similar construction, preceded by the demonstrative, cf. e.g. TL 6 *τοῦτο τὸ μνήμα* '(lit.) this the memorial' TL 56 *τοῦτ' ἰ τὸ μνήμα* '(lit.) this the memorial here'). We could possibly assume that the lack of articles in TL 44c is counter-balanced (semantically and pragmatically) by the presence of the demonstrative that, as a determiner, assumes the functions of the definite article, with a reversed word order. Although, taking into account the whole inscription, a Lycian influence appears as a fully plausible explanation of the Greek phrase structure, we should not forget that the Greek version is just a short epigram, which patently does not correspond to the longer Lycian text. For these reasons, there is a high chance that the Greek text in TL 44c is secondary and to a certain extent dependent and influenced by the Lycian one, but a further research on this point is needed.

induced phenomenon. First of all, in some particular contexts definite articles are consistently found, being virtually mandatory, i.e. when both the son's and father's names are expressed in genitive case. Furthermore, this distribution of the definite article is really not specific to the bilingual inscriptions nor of the monolingual Greek ones from Lycia; rather, it is the fully regular strategy in constructing filiation formulas, mostly in the epigraphic context, also in the Greek peninsula, for which it would be difficult to suggest a contact-induced explanation.

Therefore, as a very final remark, we suggest that such linguistic phenomena meant to be of a contact-induced kind should be re-evaluated on a case by case basis. The linguistic influence of Anatolian languages in Greek bilingual texts may be less decisive than one might suppose.

REFERENCES

- ADAMS 2004 = J. N. ADAMS, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- ADIEGO 2014 = I.-X. ADIEGO, *Las inscripciones plurilingües en Asia Menor: hacia una clasificación tipológica y un análisis funcional*, in *Öffentlichkeit – Monument – Text. XIV Congressus Internationalis Epigraphiae Graecae et Latinae. 27.-31. Augusti MMXII. Akten*, hrsg. von W. Eck, P. Funke, Berlin-Boston, de Gruyter, pp. 231-269.
- AITCHISON 1964 = J. M. AITCHISON, *Τελαμώνιος Αἴας and other Patronymics*, «Glotta», 42, pp. 132-138.
- ANGERMANN 1868 = C. T. ANGERMANN, *De patronymicorum graecorum formatione*, Lipsiae, Melzer.
- ARKWRIGHT 1891 = W. ARKWRIGHT, *Some Lycian Suffixes*, «The Babylonian & Oriental Record», 5, pp. 185-192.
- BOUSQUET 1975 = J. BOUSQUET, *Arbinas, fils de Gergis, dynaste de Xanthos*, «Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres», 119, 1, pp. 138-150.
- BRIXHE 2007 = C. BRIXHE, *Greek Translations of Lycian*, in *A History of Ancient Greek. From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity*, ed. by A.-F. Christidis, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 924-934.
- CHRISTIANSEN 2009 = B. CHRISTIANSEN, *Typen von Sanktionsformeln in den lykischen Grabinschriften und ihre Funktionen*, in **h₂nr. Festschrift für Heiner Eichner*, hrsg. von R. Nedoma, D. Stifter, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz (= «Die Sprache», 48), pp. 44-54.
- COLVIN 2004 = S. COLVIN, *Names in Hellenistic and Roman Lycia*, in *The Greco-Roman East. Politics, Culture, Society*, ed. by S. Colvin, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press («Yale Classical Studies», 31), pp. 44-84.
- DARDANO 2011 = P. DARDANO, *I patronimici in -ιδᾶς del greco antico tra conservazione e innovazione*, «Res Antiquae», 8, pp. 41-62.

- DARDANO 2015 = P. DARDANO, *Le iscrizioni bilingui licio-greche nel loro contesto socio-storico: tipi e funzioni a confronto*, in *Ancient Languages between Variation and Norm*, a cura di G. Marotta, F. Rovai, Pisa, ETS (= «Studi e Saggi Linguistici», 53/2), pp. 207-226.
- DAUES 2009 = A. DAUES, *Form und Funktion – die Wortstellung in den lykischen Grabinschriften*, in *Pragmatische Kategorien. Form, Funktion und Diachronie. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 24. Bis 26. September 2007 in Marburg*, hrsg. von E. Rieken, P. Widmer, Wiesbaden, Reichert, pp. 53-63.
- GG I, 1 = *Grammatici Graeci recogniti et apparatu critico instructi. Pars I. Vol. 1. Dionysii Thracis Ars Grammatica*, ed. G. Uhlig, Lipsiae, Teubner.
- GILDERSLEEVE 1904 = B. L. GILDERSLEEVE, *Syntax of Classical Greek from Homer to Demosthenes*, New York-Cincinnati-Chicago, American Book Company.
- H II = M. WÖRRLE, *H II. Die griechischen Sepulkralinschriften von Limyra*, in *Limyra. Studien zu Kunst und Epigraphik in den Nekropolen der Antike*, hrsg. von J. Borchhardt, A. Pekridou-Gorecki, Wien, Phoibos, pp. 411-457.
- HAJNAL 1995 = I. HAJNAL, *Der lykische Vokalismus (Methode und Erkenntnisse der vergleichenden anatolischen Sprachwissenschaft, angewandt auf das Vokalsystem einer Kleincorpusprache)*, Habilitationsschrift Zürich, Graz, Leykam.
- IG I² = *Inscriptiones Graecae I. Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis anno (403/2) anteriores*, 2nd edition, ed. F. Hiller von Gaertringen, Berlin, de Gruyter.
- JHS 15 = G. DAVIES, *Greek Inscriptions from Lycia*, «Journal of Hellenic Studies», 15, pp. 100-115.
- KALINKA 1901 = E. KALINKA, *Tituli Lyciae lingua Lycia conscripti*, Wien, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften («Tituli Asiae Minoris», 1).
- KEARNS 1994 = J. M. KEARNS, *A Greek Genitive from Lydia*, «Glotta», 72, pp. 5-14.
- KEURENTJES 1997 = M. B. G. KEURENTJES, *The Greek Patronymics in -(i)δας / -(i)δης*, «Mnemosyne», 50, 4, pp. 385-400.
- LIV² = H. RIX et al., *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen. Zweite, erweiterte und verbesserte Auflage bearbeitet von Martin Kümmel und Helmut Rix*, Wiesbaden, Reichert.
- MASSON 1965 = O. MASSON, *Trois questions de dialectologie grecque*, «Glotta», 43, pp. 217-234.
- MEISTERHANS 1900 = K. MEISTERHANS, *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*, Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.
- MELCHERT 2001 = H. C. MELCHERT, *Lycian Corpus*, <https://linguistics.ucla.edu/people/Melchert/lyciancorpus.pdf>.
- MELCHERT 2004 = H. C. MELCHERT, *A Dictionary of the Lycian Language*, Ann Arbor-New York, Beech Stave Press.
- MELCHERT 2014 = H. C. MELCHERT, *Greek and Lycian*, in *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*, vol. 2, ed. by G. K. Giannakis, Leiden-Boston, Brill, pp. 67-70.
- MELCHERT 2015 = H. C. MELCHERT, *Lycian alaha- and alada/ehali-*, in *Genres épigraphiques et langues d'attestation fragmentaire dans l'espace méditerranéen*, sous

- la direction d'E. Dupraz et W. Sowa, Rouen, Presses universitaires de Rouen et du Havre («Cahiers de l'ERAC», 9), pp. 153-163.
- MILLER 1916 = C. W. E. MILLER, *Note on the Use of the Article before the Genitive of the Father's Name in Greek Papyri*, «The American Journal of Philology», 37, 3, pp. 341-348.
- MOLINA VALERO 2007 = C. MOLINA VALERO, *Contactos griego-licio: las inscripciones bilingües*, in *Las aguas primigenias. El Próximo Oriente Antiguo como fuente de civilización. Actas del IV Congreso Español de Antiguo Oriente Próximo (Zaragoza, 17 a 21 de Octubre de 2006)*, ed. de J. J. Justel, B. E. Solans, J. P. Vita, J. Á. Zamora, Zaragoza, Instituto de Estudios Islámicos y del Oriente Próximo, pp. 127-141.
- MOLINA VALERO 2009 = C. MOLINA VALERO, *Syntaxis comparada de las inscripciones bilingües greco-licias*, «Interlingüística», 18, pp. 779-788.
- NEUMANN 1979 = G. NEUMANN, *Neufunde lykischer Inschriften seit 1901*, Wien, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- NEUMANN 2007 = G. NEUMANN, *Glossar des Lykischen. Überarbeitet und zum Druck gebracht von Johann Tischler*, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz («Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie», 21).
- PAYNE 2008 = A. PAYNE, *Lycia – Crossroads of Hittite and Greek Traditions?*, in *Papers on Ancient Literatures: Greece, Rome and the Near East. Proceedings of the "Advanced Seminar in the Humanities". Venice International University 2004-2005*, a cura di E. Cingano, L. Milano, Padova, S.A.R.G.O.N. («Quaderni del Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Antichità e del Vicino Oriente – Università Ca' Foscari, Venezia», 4), pp. 471-487.
- RÉVEILHAC 2018 = F. RÉVEILHAC, *Contact linguistique et emprunts onomastiques entre grec et lycien: apports à la phonétique et à la morphologie*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Sorbonne Université.
- RIX 2015 = E. RIX, *Tombs and Territories: the Epigraphic Culture of Lycia, c. 450-197 BC*, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Oxford.
- RUTHERFORD 2002 = I. RUTHERFORD, *Interference or Translationese? Some Patterns in Lycian-Greek Bilingualism*, in *Bilingualism in Ancient Society*, ed. by J. N. Adams, M. Janse, S. Swain, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 197-219.
- SCHWYZER 1939 = E. SCHWYZER, *Griechische Grammatik, auf der Grundlage von Karl Brugmanns Griechischer Grammatik. Band 1. Allgemeiner Teil, Lautlehre, Wortbildung, Flexion*, München, Beck («Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft», 2.1.).
- SCIANCELEPORE 2017 = E. SCIANCELEPORE, *La relazione sintattica determinante-determinata in alcune epigrafi greche dell'Iran achemenide*, in *Del Indo al Egeo. Relaciones culturales y lingüísticas en el interior del Imperio aqueménida*, ed. de J. A. Álvarez-Pedrosa, M. C. Benvenuto, F. Pompeo, Madrid, Escolar y Mayo, pp. 223-234.
- SEYER-TEKOĞLU 2009 = M. SEYER, R. TEKOĞLU, *Das Felsgrab des Stamaha in Ostlykien – ein Zeugnis für die Ostpolitik des Perikle von Limyra?*, in *h₂nr. *Festschrift für Heiner Eichner*, hrsg. von R. Nedoma, D. Stifter, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz (= «Die Sprache», 48), pp. 217-226.
- SMITHERMAN 2014 = T. SMITHERMAN, *Patronymics*, in *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek*

Language and Linguistics, vol. 3, ed. by G. K. Giannakis, Leiden-Boston, Brill, pp. 45-46.

TAM = *Tituli Asiae Minoris*, Wien, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1901.

TEKOĞLU 2017 = R. TEKOĞLU, *Old and Newly Discovered Lycian Inscriptions from Tlos*, in *Hittitology Today: Studies on Hittite and Neo-Hittite Anatolia in Honor of Emmanuel Laroche's 100th Birthday / L'hittitologie aujourd'hui: Études sur l'Anatolie Hittite et néo-hittite à l'occasion du centenaire de la naissance d'Emmanuel Laroche. Istanbul 21-22 novembre, 2014*, ed. by A. Mouton, Istanbul, Institut Français d'Études Anatoliennes, pp. 63-68.

THREATTE 1996 = L. THREATTE, *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions. II. Morphology*, Berlin-New York, de Gruyter.

TRITSCH 1976 = F. J. TRITSCH, *The Lycian Bilingual in Stoichedon from Korydalla*, «Kadmos», 15, 2, pp. 158-167.

COMPOSTO IN CARATTERE DANTE MONOTYPE DALLA
ACCADEMIA EDITORIALE, PISA · ROMA.
STAMPATO E RILEGATO NELLA
TIPOGRAFIA DI AGNANO, AGNANO PISANO (PISA).

★

Dicembre 2019

(CZ 2 · FG 3)

