Contacts of Languages and Peoples in the Hittite and Post-Hittite World

Ancient Languages and Civilizations

Editor-in-Chief
Chen Zhi (*Research Centre for History and Culture, Beijing Normal University & uic, China*)

Associate Editors
Carlotta Viti (*University of Lorraine, Nancy, France*)
Wang Xiang (Shawn Wang) (*Research Centre for History and Culture, Beijing Normal University & uic, Zhuhai, China*)

Editorial Board
Luz Conti (*Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Spain*) – Paola Cotticelli (*University of Verona, Italy*) – Trevor Evans (*Macquarie University, Australia*) – Yegor Grebnev (*Research Centre for History and Culture, Beijing Normal University & uic, China*) – Geoffrey Khan (*University of Cambridge, UK*) – Laura Loporcaro (*Ghent University, Belgium*) – Marco Mancini (*University "La Sapienza", Italy*) – Daniel Petit (*École Pratique des Hautes Études, France*) – Yuri Pines (*Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel*) – S.A.S. Sarma (*Ecole Française d'Extrême Orient, Pondichery, India*) – Adam Craig Schwartz (*Hong Kong Baptist University, Hong Kong, China*) – Zhang Wei (*Fudan University, China*) – Zhou Yiqun (*Stanford University, USA*)

Advisory Board
Giuliano Boccali (*State University of Milan, Italy*) – Chen Zhan (*Research Centre for History and Culture, Beijing Normal University & uic, China*) – Julien Cooper (*Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia*) – Ekkehard König (*Free University of Berlin, Germany*) – Maria Kozianka (*Friedrich Schiller University Jena, Germany*) – Frédéric Lambert (*Bordeaux Montaigne University, France*) – Glenn W. Most (*University of Chicago, USA*) – Anna Orlandini (*University of Toulouse-Jean Jaurès, France*) – Thomas Schneider (*University of British Columbia, Canada*) – Edward L. Shaughnessy (*University of Chicago, USA*) – Hans van Ess (*Ludwig Maximilian University of Munich, Germany*)

VOLUME 11

The titles published in this series are listed at *brill.com/alac*

Contacts of Languages and Peoples in the Hittite and Post-Hittite World

VOLUME 2

The 1st Millennium and the Eastern Mediterranean Interface

Edited by

Federico Giusfredi
Alvise Matessi
Stella Merlin
Valerio Pisaniello



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

This is an open access title distributed under the terms of the CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 license, which permits any non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided no alterations are made and the original author(s) and source are credited. Further information and the complete license text can be found at https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/

The terms of the CC license apply only to the original material. The use of material from other sources (indicated by a reference) such as diagrams, illustrations, photos and text samples may require further permission from the respective copyright holder.

The publication of this monograph was financed by the project PALaC, that has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement n° 757299).



Cover illustration: Karatepe inscription, courtesy of Dr Carolina Ferrandi

The Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data is available online at https://catalog.loc.gov
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2025012986

Typeface for the Latin, Greek, and Cyrillic scripts: "Brill". See and download: brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 2667-3770
ISBN 978-90-04-72969-8 (hardback)
ISBN 978-90-04-72970-4 (e-book)
DOI 10.1163/9789004729704

Copyright 2025 by Federico Giusfredi, Alvise Matessi, Stella Merlin, Valerio Pisaniello. Published by Koninklijke Brill BV, Plantijnstraat 2, 2321 JC Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill BV incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Nijhoff, Brill Schöningh, Brill Fink, Brill mentis, Brill Wageningen Academic, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Böhlau and V&R unipress.
Koninklijke Brill BV reserves the right to protect this publication against unauthorized use.
For more information: info@brill.com.

This book is printed on acid-free paper and produced in a sustainable manner.

Contents

List of Figures xi
Abbreviations xii

1 Introduction to Volume 2 1
F. Giusfredi, A. Matessi, S. Merlin and V. Pisaniello
1 What is This Volume? 1
2 The Structure of the Book 1
3 Multi-authored Chapters 4
4 Chronologies: Addendum 4
5 Philological Conventions: Addendum 5

PART 1
The Ancient Near-Eastern Interface During the First Millennium

2 The Dark Age 9
Federico Giusfredi and Alvise Matessi
1 Toward the Iron Age in Anatolia and Syria: An Introduction 9
2 The Political Reorganization of the Ancient Near East during the Dark Age 12
3 The Fall of Hatti and Its Aftermath in Central Anatolia 20
4 Luwian Syro-Anatolia 30
5 The Linguistic Map of the Ancient Near East after the End of the Bronze Age 49

3 The Iron Age 54
Alvise Matessi and Federico Giusfredi
1 Introduction 54
2 The Syro-Anatolian Area from the 10th Century until the Assyrian Conquest 58
3 The Phrygian Area 78
4 Western Anatolia from the 10th Century to the Achaemenids 87
5 Concluding Remarks 91

4 Cilicia in the Iron Age 93
H. Craig Melchert
1 Defining the topic 93
2 The land 104
3 Languages and speakers 105
4 History 106

5 Iron Age Luwian in Its Anatolian and Syro-Mesopotamian Contexts 109
Federico Giusfredi and Valerio Pisaniello
1 Introduction 109
2 Lexical Interference 113
3 Grammatical Interference 120
4 Onomastics 131
5 Concluding Remarks 139

6 Lycian and the Achaemenid Empire 141
Valerio Pisaniello
1 Lycia under Persian Domination 141
2 The Lycian Language 144
3 Sources for the Study of Lycian–Iranian Language Contact 144
4 Iranian Influence on Lycian 146
5 Lycian Influence on Aramaic 150
6 Lycians in the Achaemenid Sources 155
7 Concluding Remarks 156

7 Lydian and the Languages of the Achaemenid Empire 157
Elena Martínez-Rodríguez
1 Introduction 157
2 Onomastics and Phonetic Interference 159
3 Lexical Interference 167
4 Grammatical Interference 168
5 Concluding Remarks 171

8 Linguistic Contact in the Anatolian Iron Age: The Phrygian Data 173
Bartomeu Obrador-Cursach
1 Introduction: Phrygian, the Balkan Language in Central Anatolia 173
2 Lexical Borrowings Concerning Phrygian 174
3 Phonetic Influences Concerning Phrygian 182
4 Morphological Influences? 185
5 Syntactical Influences on Phrygian 187

6 Phrygian Bilinguals in the Iron Age 190
7 Textual Convergence Concerning Phrygian 191
8 Concluding Remarks 196

9 On the Fringes: Kartvelian, Armenian, Etruscan, and Lemnian 198
Zsolt Simon
1 Introduction 198
2 The Northeastern Periphery: The Kartvelian Languages 198
3 The Northeastern Periphery: Armenian 200
4 The Northwestern Periphery: Etruscan and Lemnian 206

PART 2
The Eastern Mediterranean and Aegean Interface

10 The Aegean–Anatolian Interface: Overview of the Late Bronze and Iron Age Evidence (ca. 1400–700 BCE) 213
Alvise Matessi
1 Introduction 213
2 The *Ahhiyawa Question* and the Historical Interactions between Hittites and Mycenaeans 214
3 Wiluša 220
4 Sea Peoples and Philistines: An Aegean Migration? 223
5 Philistines in the North? 232
6 Greeks in Cilicia? The Problem of Hiyawa 236
7 Concluding Remarks 244

11 The Mediterranean Interface: Anatolia and the Aegean in the Bronze Age 246
Stella Merlin and Valerio Pisaniello
1 Introduction 246
2 The Challenge of Pre-Greek: Issues, Boundaries, and Limits. 247
3 The Greeks and the Ancient Near East 260
4 Narrowing the Focus: Greece and Bronze Age Anatolia 263
5 The Problem of Mycenaean–Anatolian Contacts 264
6 Concluding Remarks 270

12 Homer and Anatolian 272
Filip De Decker and Stella Merlin
1 Introduction 272
2 Homeric Greek and Anatolian 272
3 Concluding Remarks 297

13 The Problem of the Scholarly and Late Evidence: Anatolian Glosses in Greek 299
Stella Merlin
1 Introduction 299
2 Types of Sources and Types of Evidence 299
3 Theoretical and Methodological Issues 306
4 Long-Memory Echoes of Anatolian Languages in Greek 309
5 Concluding Remarks 314

14 The Problem of Lexical Borrowings from Anatolian Languages into Greek 315
Stella Merlin and Bartomeu Obrador-Cursach
1 Theoretical Premises 315
2 Linguistic Analysis of the Relevant Lexicon 320
3 Summary and General Discussion 333
4 Concluding Remarks 336

15 Greek and the Anatolian languages of the First Millennium: Lycian, Lydian, and Carian 338
Elena Martínez-Rodríguez and Stella Merlin
1 Introduction 338
2 Phonetic and Morphological Interference 341
3 Grammatical Interference 352
4 Concluding Remarks 359

16 Late Languages of Marginal Attestation: Pamphylian, Sidetic, and Pisidian 360
Stella Merlin and Valerio Pisaniello
1 Introduction 360
2 Pamphylian 360
3 Sidetic 373
4 Pisidian 377
5 Concluding Remarks 380

17 Conclusions to Volume 2 381
F. Giusfredi, A. Matessi, S. Merlin and V. Pisaniello

Appendices: Addenda to Volume 1

Appendix 1: A Note on the Language of Kalašma 387
Elisabeth Rieken and Ilya Yakubovich
Appendix 2: The Language of KBo 19.164+ 389
David Sasseville

References 391
Index of Quoted Texts and Passages 469
Index of Divine Names 479
Index of Names of Places and Peoples 480
Index of Personal Names 485
Subject Index 491

Figures

2.1 Key sites and inscriptions in the Levantine coast during the Dark Age. 13
2.2 Key sites and inscriptions in Anatolia and Syria during the Dark Age. 17
2.3 The Syro-Anatolian region during the Iron Age, with key sites and main regional entities. 43
3.1 Distribution of Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions by date. 56
3.2 Distribution of Iron Age inscriptions by languages. 57
3.3 Languages of Asia Minor during the late first millennium BCE. 88
8.1 Distribution of Old, Middle and New Phrygian inscriptions. 174
10.1 West Anatolia and the Aegean during the Hittite period. 215
10.2 The East Mediterranean during the migrations of the Sea Peoples. 225

Abbreviations

ACLT2	Yakubovich, Ilya, Annotated Corpus of Luwian Texts, 2nd version (https://luwian.web-corpora.net/)
AfO 17	Weidner, Ernst. Review of Poebel, Arno. *The Second Dynasty of Isin according to a New King-List Tablet* (Assyriological Studies 15). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1955. *Archiv für Orientforschung* 17 (1954–1956), pp. 383–385.
AhT	Beckman, Gary M., Bryce, Trevor R., and Cline, Eric H. *The Ahhiyawa Texts* (Writings from the Ancient World 28). Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.
ARM	*Archives Royales de Mari*. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.
AuOrS 1	Arnaud, Daniel. *Textes syriens de l'âge du Bronze Récent* (Aula Orientalis. Supplement 1). Barcelona: Editorial AUSA, 1991.
CAD	*The Assyrian Dictionary of the University of Chicago*. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1956–2010.
CGL	*The Cambridge Greek Lexicon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021.
CHD	*The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1980 ff.
Chicago Homer	*The Chicago Homer*, ed. by A. Kahane and M. Mueller, available at (https://homer.library.northwestern.edu/).
CHLI I	Hawkins, John David. *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions, Volume 1. Inscriptions of the Iron Age* (Studies in Indo-European Language and Culture 8.1). Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 2000.
CHLI II	Çambel, Halet. *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions. Volume 2. Karatepe-Aslantaş* (Studies in Indo-European Language & Culture 8.2). Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 1999.
CHLI III	Hawkins, John David. *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions, Volume 3. Inscriptions of Hittite Empire and New Inscriptions of the Iron Age* (Studies in Indo-European Language and Culture 8.3). Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 2024.
CIG	*Corpus inscriptionum graecarum*. (4 vols). Berlin, 1828–1877.
CIPPh	Brixhe, Claude, and Lejeune, Michel. *Corpus des inscriptions paléophrygiennes. I Texte, II Planches*. Paris: Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 1984.
CTH	Laroche, Emmanuel, Catalogue des textes hittites, Paris: Klincksieck, 1971; premier supplément, Revue Hittite et Asianique 30 (1972), pp. 94–133; Online edition: Košak, Silvin et al., https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/CTH/.

CTU Salvini, Mirjo. *Corpus dei testi urartei*. (4 vols). Roma: CNR—Istituto di Studi sulle Civiltà dell'Egeo e del Vicino Oriente, 2008–2012.

DELG Chantraine, Pierre. *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Grecque. Histoire des mots*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1999.

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

DMic. Aura Jorro, Francisco. *Diccionario Micénico*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1985.

DMic. II Aura Jorro, Francisco. *Diccionario Micénico*. Volumen II. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1993.

EA Knudtzon, Jörgen A., *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln* (Vorderasiatische Bibliothek II), Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1915.

EDAIL Martirosyan, Hrach K. *Etymological Dictionary of the Armenian Inherited Lexicon*. (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 8). Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2010.

EDG Beekes, Robert S.P., with the assistance of Lucien van Beek. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek* (2 vols) (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 10). Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2010.

EDHIL Kloekhorst, Alwin. *Etymological dictionary of the Hittite inherited lexicon*. (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 5). Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2008.

eDiAna Digital Philological-Etymological Dictionary of the Minor Ancient Anatolian Corpus Languages (https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/index.php).

FdX VI Metzger, Henri, Laroche, Emmanuel, Dupont-Sommer, André, and Mayrhofer, Manfred, eds *Fouilles de Xanthos VI: La stèle trilingue du Létôon*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1979.

FGrH Jacoby, Felix. *Die Fragmente Der Griechischen Historiker Part I–III*. Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill, 1926–.

GEW Frisk, Hjalmar. *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1960–1972.

GI Montanari, Franco, ed, *Dizionario Greco-Italiano*. Torino: Loescher, 1995.

Godley, Loeb 1920 Herodotus, *The Persian Wars*, Volume I: Books 1–2. Translated by A.D. Godley (Loeb Classical Library 117), Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1920.

Godley, Loeb 1922 Herodotus, *The Persian Wars*, Volume III: Books 5–7. Translated by A.D. Godley (Loeb Classical Library 119), Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1922.

HED Puhvel, Jaan. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*. Berlin/New York: Mouton, 1984–.

HEG Tischler, Johann. *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 1977–2016.

HKM Alp, Sedat, Masat-Höyük'te bulunan civi yazili Hitit tabletleri/Hittite Cuneiform Tablets from Masat-Höyük (Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları vi/34), Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basimevi, 1991.

HW^2 Friedrich, Johannes et al., eds *Hethitisches Wörterbuch. Zweite, völlig neubearbeitete Auflage auf der Grundlage der edierten hethitischen Texte*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1975–.

Jones, Loeb 1929 Strabo, Geography, Volume VI: Books 13–14. Translated by Horace Leonard Jones. Loeb Classical Library 223. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929.

KAI Donner, Herbert, and Röllig, Wolfgang. *Kanaanäische und Aramäische Inschriften*. (3 vols). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1960–1964.

KBo Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi, vols. 1–6 Leipzig: Hinrichs; vols. 7–70 Berlin: Mann; vol. 71: Mainz: Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, 1916 ff.

KH Peker, Hasan. *Texts from Karkemish I. Luwian Hieroglyphic Inscriptions from the 2011–2015 Excavations* (OrientLab. Series Maior 1). Bologna: Ante Quem, 2016.

KN Melena, José L. and Firth, Richard J. The Knossos Tablets. 6th edition. Philadelphia: INSTAP Academic Press, 2019.f

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

KPN Zgusta, Ladislav. *Kleinasiatische Personennamen*. Prague: Verlag der Tschechoslowakischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1964.

KUB *Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi*, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1921–1990.

LGPN V.A Corsten, Thomas, ed, *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names. Volume v. A. Coastal Asia Minor: Pontos to Ionia*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2010.

LGPN V.B Balzat, Jéan-Sebastien, Catling, Richard W.V., Chiricat, Édouard, and Marchand, Fabienne eds *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names. Volume v. B. Coastal Asia Minor: Caria to Cilicia*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2013.

LGPN V.C Fraser, Peter, and Matthews, Elaine, eds *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names. V.C. Inland Asia Minor*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2018.

LiDo Lehmann, Christian. *An online multilingual linguistic terminology database* (http://linguistik.uni-regensburg.de:8080/lido/Lido).

LIV^2 Rix, Helmut. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2001.

LSJ Liddell, Henry George and Scott, Robert. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Revised and augmented throughout by Sir Henry Stuart Jones with the assistance of Roderick McKenzie. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940.

LW Gusmani, Roberto. *Lydisches Wörterbuch. Mit grammatischer Skizze und Inschriftensammlung*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1964.

LW/N New Lydian inscriptions published after Gusmani, Roberto. *Lydisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1964.

NH Laroche, Emmanuel. *Le noms des Hittites*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1966.

MAMA Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua, Manchester: Manchester University Press.

MAMA IV Buckler, William Hepburn, Calder, William Moir, and Guthrie, William Keith Chambers. *Monuments and Documents from Eastern Asia and Western Galatia* (Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua 4). Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1933.

MAMA V Cox, Christopher William Machell and Cameron, Archibald. *Monuments from Dorylaeum et Nacolea* (Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua 5). Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1937.

Murray, Loeb 1924 Homer. *Iliad, Volume I: Books 1–12*. Translated by A.T. Murray. Revised by William F. Wyatt (Loeb Classical Library 170). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1924.

OIP 2 Luckenbill, Daniel David. *The Annals of Sennacherib* (Oriental Institute Publications 2), Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1924.

Packhum *Searchable Greek Inscriptions* (https://epigraphy.packhum.org/).

PBS *Publications of the Babylonian Section*. Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Museum, 1911–.

PF Elamite texts of the Persepolis Fortification, numbered after Hallock, Richard T. Persepolis Fortification Tablets (Oriental Institute Publications 92). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1969.

PRU Schaeffer, Claude F.-A., ed, *Le Palais Royal d'Ugarit* 1–6. Paris: Klincksieck, 1955–1970.

RIMA 2 Grayson, Albert K. *Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millennium BC*, Volume 1 (1114–859 BC). Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991.

RIMA 3 Grayson, Albert K. *Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millennium BC*, Volume 2 (858–745 BC). Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996.

RINAP 1 Tadmor, Hayim, and Yamada, Shiego. *The Royal Inscriptions of Tiglath-pileser III (744–727 BC) and Shalmaneser V (726–722 BC)*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011.

RINAP 2 Frame, Grant. *The Royal Inscriptions of Sargon II, King of Assyria (721–705 BC)*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2021.

RINAP 5 Novotny, Jamie, and Jeffers, Joshua. *The Royal Inscriptions of Ashurbanipal (668–631 BC), Aššur-etel-ilāni (630–627 BC) and Sîn-šarra-iškun (626–612 BC), Kings of Assyria. Parts 1 & 2*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2018–2023.

RS Texts from Ras Shamra.

RSL Texts from Ras Shamra (Louvre Museum).

SEG *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*. Vols. 1–11, ed Jacob E. Hondius,

Leiden 1923–1954. Vols. 12–25, ed Arthur G. Woodhead. Leiden 1955–1971. Vols. 26–41, eds Henry W. Pleket and Ronald S. Stroud. Amsterdam 1979–1994. Vols. 42–44, eds Henry W. Pleket, Ronald S. Stroud and Johan H.M. Strubbe. Amsterdam 1995–1997. Vols. 45–49, eds Henry W. Pleket, Ronald S. Stroud, Angelos Chaniotis and Johan H.M. Strubbe. Amsterdam 1998–2002. Vols. 50--, eds Angelos Chaniotis, Ronald S. Stroud and Johan H.M. Strubbe. Amsterdam 2003–.

SGDI II Collitz, Hermann, ed, *Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften, II. Epirus, Akarnanien, Altolien, Aenianen, Phthiotis, Lokris, Phokis, Dodona, Achaia und seine Colonien, Delphi*. Göttingen: Hermann Collitz, 1899.

Smith, Loeb 1919 Thucydides. *History of the Peloponnesian War, Volume I: Books 1–2*. Translated by C.F. Smith (Loeb Classical Library 108), Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1919.

TAD B Porten, Bezalel, and Yardeni, Ada. *Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt*. Volume 2. Jerusalem: Eisenbrauns, 1989.

TAM Tituli Asiae Minoris, Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.

TAM II Kalinka, Ernst. *Tituli Lyciae linguis Graeca et Latina conscripti* (Tituli Asiae Minoris II). Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1920–1944.

TAM V Herrmann, Peter. *Tituli Lydiae linguis Graeca et Latina conscripti* (Tituli Asiae Minoris V). Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, vol. 1: 1981 ; vol. 2: 1989.

TCS Texts from Cuneiform Sources, Locust Valley: J.J. Augustin.

TCS 5 Grayson, A. Kirk. *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles* (Texts from Cuneiform Sources 5). Locust Valley: J.J. Augustin, 1975.

Th.LG *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae ab Henrico Stephano constructus*. Ed. by Charles B. Hase, Wilhelm Dindorf and Ludwig A. Dindorf, Paris, 1831–1865.

TL Kalinka, Ernst. *Tituli Lyciae lingua Lycia conscripti* (Tituli Asiae Minoris 1). Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1901.

TLG *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/).

Ug. V Nougayrol, Jean, Laroche, Emmanuel, Virolleaud, Charles and Schaeffer, Claude F.A. (1968). *Ugaritica* V. Nouveaux *textes accadiens*, *hourrites* et *ugaritiques* des archives et *bibliothèques privées d'Ugarit*, *commentaires* des *textes historiques* (première *partie*). Paris: Imprimerie Nationale/Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner.

Wb Erman, Adolf and Grapow, Hermann, eds, *Wörterbuch der Ägyptischen Sprache*, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1926–1961.

Linguistic and Paleographic Abbreviations

acc.	accusative
act.	active
Akkad.	Akkadian
Anat.	Anatolian
Aram.	Aramaic
Arm.	Armenian
Bab.	Babylonian
Car.	Carian
CLuw.	Cuneiform Luwian
Cypr.	Cyprian
dat.	dative
Dor.	Doric
Elam.	Elamite
fem.	feminine
gen.	genitive
gen.adj.	genitival adjective
Gr.	Greek
Hitt.	Hittite
HLuw.	Hieroglyphic Luwian
Hurr.	Hurrian
imp.	imperative
Ion.-Att.	Ionian-Attic
Lat.	Latin
loc.	locative
LNS	Late New Script
Luw.	Luwian
Lyc.	Lycian
Lyd.	Lydian
masc.	masculine
MAss.	Middle-Assyrian
Med.	Median
Mil.	Milyan
MP	modal particle
Myc.	Mycenaean
n.	neuter gender
NAss.	Neo-Assyrian
NH	New Hittite
nom.	nominative

NS	New Script
obv.	obverse
OIran.	Old Iranian
OPers.	Old Persian
PA	Proto-Anatolian
Pamph.	Pamphylian
PG	Pre-Greek
Phoen.	Phoenician
Phryg.	Phrygian
PIE	Proto-Indo-European
Pis.	Pisidian
pl.	plural
PN	personal name
pres.	present
pret.	preterit
rev.	reverse
sg.	singular
Sid.	Sidetic
SOV	subject-object-verb
Sum.	Sumerian
SVO	subject-verb-object
Ugar.	Ugaritic
VSO	verb-subject-object

Historical Periods and Other Abbreviations

IA	Iron Age
LH	Late Helladic
SACC	Syro-Anatolian Cultural Complex
YHSS	Yassıhöyük Stratigraphic Sequence

3 Multi-authored Chapters

As for chapters written by more than one author, please acknowledge the following attributions. In Chapter 2, sections 3 and 4 (with subsections) are by A. Matessi, sections 1 by A. Matessi and F. Giusfredi and section 5 by F. Giusfredi. In Chapter 3, sections 2.1, with its subsections, and 3, with its subsections, are by A. Matessi; section 2.2.3 is by F. Giusfredi and A. Matessi; all other sections are by F. Giusfredi. In Chapter 5; section 3, with all its subsections, is by F. Giusfredi; section 5 is by F. Giusfredi and V. Pisaniello; all other sections are by V. Pisaniello. In Chapter 11, sections 4, 5, 5.1 and 5.2 are by V. Pisaniello, all other sections are by S. Merlin except section 6, which is by both authors. In Chapter 12, sections 1 and 2.1 with all its subsections are by F. De Decker; sections 2.2 to 2.6 is by S. Merlin and section 3 was written by both authors. In Chapter 14, section 2, with all its subsections, is by B. Obrador-Cursach; all other sections are by S. Merlin. In Chapter 15, section 3, with all its subsections, is by S. Merlin; section 4 is by E. Martínez-Rodríguez and S. Merlin; all other sections are by E. Martínez-Rodríguez. In Chapter 16, section 2, with all its subsections, is by S. Merlin; sections 1 and 5 are by S. Merlin and V. Pisaniello; all other sections are by V. Pisaniello. Chapter 17 was written jointly by the four volume editors. Finally, the Appendix has been authored by Elisabeth Rieken and Ilya Yakubovich (section 1) and David Sasseville (section 2).

4 Chronologies: Addendum

In the introduction to Giusfredi, Matessi, and Pisaniello (2023) we provided a very general and simple tabular chronology which, for sake of simplicity, we also reproduce here.

Dates	Phase (Ancient Near East)	Phase (Aegean)
3rd millennium BCE	Early Bronze Age	Early Helladic
2000–1600 BCE ca.	Middle Bronze Age	Middle to Late Helladic
1600–1200 BCE ca.	Late Bronze Age	Late Helladic / Mycenaean
1200–1000 BCE ca.	Syro-Anatolian Dark Age	Late Mycenaean / Greek Dark Age
1000–539 BCE ca.	Iron Age	Greek Dark Age to Archaic Greece
539–330 BCE ca.	Achaemenid Period	Classical Greece
330 BCE onwards	Hellenistic / Late Period	Hellenistic / Late Period

CHAPTER 16

Late Languages of Marginal Attestation: Pamphylian, Sidetic, and Pisidian

Stella Merlin and Valerio Pisaniello

1 Introduction

In this section, we introduce three languages attested in a circumscribed geographical area located roughly in the central part of southern Anatolia: Pamphylian, Sidetic, and Pisidian, which are presented in order of relevance to the study of language contact. These languages pose a number of problems in terms of documentation, interpretation of texts, and genealogical filiation. However, they also provide some interesting data for the study of language contact.

Pamphylian is a Greek dialect, but, unlike other Greek dialects, its documentation includes only epigraphic evidence (and plausibly some glosses in scholarly tradition); no literary texts have come down to us. Sidetic and Pisidian are Anatolian languages and probably belong to the Luwic branch. They are also attested only by epigraphs, which mostly include personal names.

Their chronology is not entirely consistent: whereas Pamphylian and Sidetic display coeval documentation and plausibly were in contact with each other, Pisidian documentation is significantly later.

2 Pamphylian

Pamphylian is a little-known language attested in around 300 inscriptions written in an epichoric Greek alphabet and in coin legends, coming mostly from the city of Aspendos, and to a lesser extent from the sites of Syllion, Perge, and Selge in Pamphylia, the ancient name of a region that lay between Lycia and Cilicia, on the south coast of Asia Minor, under Pisidia.

2.1 *Pamphylian People and Language*

That Pamphylian is included in a chapter about minor Anatolian languages may be surprising. As a matter of fact, from a genealogical point of view, it has been proved, since Brixhe (1976a), that Pamphylian is a marginal dialect

© STELLA MERLIN AND VALERIO PISANIELLO, 2025 | DOI:10.1163/9789004729704_017
This is an open access chapter distributed under the terms of the CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 license.

of Greek, which had many chances to strongly interfere with Anatolian local languages attested in the same period. The languages that were in contact with Pamphylian were Lycian and Sidetic, the latter a language that is transmitted by fewer than a dozen of inscriptions from the city of Side, which in fact was located in the very region of Pamphylia.

The people of Pamphylia are not mentioned by the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* and start appearing in literary Greek sources in two sporadic occurrences in the Archaic and early periods: the elegiac poet Tyrtaeus (7th century BCE) and the great tragedian Aeschylus (6th–5th centuries BCE).[1] Later, Herodotus quoted them a few times in different parts of his *Histories*,[2] often including their name among others that indicate more or less neighboring populations, or eastern ones in general, such as Carians, Lycians, and Cilicians, but also Paphlagonians or even Egyptians.

Pamphylians are also mentioned in the *Bibliotheca*[3] by the historian Diodorus of Sicily (first century BCE), and by Arrian of Nicomedia in his work *Periplus of the Euxine Sea*[4] (second century CE), as well as by other ancient historical, geographical, and scholarly sources.

2.1.1 Strabo's Pamphylia

The region of Pamphylia and its inhabitants are frequently mentioned in Strabo's *Geography*: in the second book, devoted to a general overview of territories and their geographical boundaries, Pamphylia appears in the description of the Anatolian Peninsula, which is named *Asia*, as the continent (*Geogr*. 2.5.24), and Pamphylians figure as the last population living beyond the Taurus mountains (*Geogr*. 2.5.32; see also 11.12.2). In *Geogr*. 13.3.27, commenting on Homer's geography, Strabo listed a number of names that are not found in the Homeric poems. Among these, Pamphylians appear, along with Milyans, Pisid-

1 Tyrtaeus (fragm. 19) mentions Pamphylians as one of the Dorian tribes together with Hylleis and Dymanes. In Aeschylus (*Suppl*. 548–555) the chorus briefly introduces the land of Asia, mentioning the regions of Phrygia, Mysia, Lydia, Cilicia, and Pamphylia.

2 Herodotus 1.29.1 (people under Croesus's control); 3.90.2 (Pamphylians together with Ionians, Magnetans of Asia, Aeolians, Carians, Lycians, and Milyans formed the first administrative provinces or satrapies created by Darius, to whom they owed 400 silver talents); 5.68.13 (Pamphylian as the original name of one of the three Dorian tribes, cf. Tyrtaeus); 7.91.7, 9 (Pamphylians are said to provide the Persians with 30 ships and carry Greek weapons; moreover, they are defined as the descendants of those Trojans who were wrecked with Amphilocus and Calchas); 8.68.32 (in the speech directed to Mardonius pronounced by Artemisia, the commander of the Carian navy allied with the Achaemenid Empire against the Greeks, Pamphylians are said to be *bad servants* together with Aegyptians, Cyprians, and Cilicians).

3 *Bibliotheca Historica* 2.2.3.3–4; 11.2.1.8; 18.3.1.9 *passim*.

4 *Periplus Ponti Euxini*, 27.16.

ians, Mariandynians, and Cappadocians. Strabo will return to this issue at the end of Book 14 (see below).

Pamphylians are then present in a different passage of Book 14, which continues and closes the description of the Asia Minor started in Book 13. In a passage concerning the Lycian city of Daedale (*Geogr.* 14.3.2.) it is said that the Pamphylians, along with the Cilicians, used to practicing piracy; that the Cilicians auctioned off prisoners, pretending they were free men, in their own shipyards located in the Pamphylian city of Side; finally, that Pamphylians by their dishonest conduct had extended their control even as far as Italy. In contrast, the Lycians, who could have followed the example of their neighbors, always played by the rules. Then, the account of Herodotus (7.91) is reported, according to whom the Pamphylians were the descendants of that *miscellaneous throng* (λαῶν μιγάδων τινῶν, Strabo 14.3; translation Jones, Loeb 1929) who accompanied Amphilocus and Calchas from Troy. Then, guided by Mopsus, all these peoples crossed the Taurus, some remained in Pamphylia, while some others moved to Cilicia, Syria, and even Phoenicia.

For our purposes, the detail concerning this possible *mixedness* of the Pamphylians should be emphasized in order to check how much the etymology of the people's name (πάμ-φυλος 'of every race') may have prompted the choice of the word μιγάδες 'mixed.' In fact, etymologically, the name of the people is quite similar to the adjective πάμφυλος found in Plato (*Pol.* 291a), Aristophanes (*Av.* 1063), and the Bible (*Macc.* 2.8.9) with the meaning of 'of mingled tribes or races,' LSJ, s.v. πάμ-φυλος, ον, (φυλή, φῦλον). However, it would appear that this etymological connection is not accepted by Strabo, according to whom the Pamphylians were not a mixed people and also because, in his view, a people could be either Greek or barbarian, but not a mix of the two (see below, on Strabo 16.5.25).[5]

Regarding the etymology, Stephanus of Byzantium (s.v. Παμφυλία, *Ethn.* 16.9) reports that the Pamphylians took their name from Pamphylē, a daughter of Rhacius and the seer Mantio (and a sister of Mopsus). By contrast, a scholium in Dionysius Periegetes (850.5) describes Mopsus as having defeated Calchas

5 TH.LG, vol. 6a s.v., reports two separate entries. The first is Pamphylia as *omnes genus populorum* in a testimony of Simmachus Ebionite (second century CE) in reference to *Gen.* 14.1. The second, much more extensive entry, describes Pamphylia as a region of Asia Minor collecting its main sources. The structure of the lexicon, in two separate entries, suggests a homonymy that does not in fact provide for an etymological connection between the region of Pamphylia and the idea that it is composed of all peoples. However, as noted by Brixhe (1976:145) according to an oracle of Suedra (Cilicia Trachea), it is not impossible that Pamphylians themselves referred to this kind of connection.

and having reached Cilicia, where he married Pamphylē, daughter of Cabderus, and became king of the region. He then named it Pamphylia after his wife.[6]

Finally, it is worth giving attention to a long passage toward the end of the book (*Geogr*. 14.5.22–29), in which Strabo claims to add some further remarks about the peoples of Asia Minor. In particular, the ancient geographer criticizes the false claim of Apollodorus of Athens in his work on the *Catalog of Ships* that the Anatolian Peninsula was in the shape of a triangle, nullifying the considerable distance between Sinope (or Amissos, according to other authors, Strabo points out) and Issos, which constitute the ends of the isthmus (§ 22). In § 23, Strabo quotes Ephorus of Cyme, who counts 16 peoples (to which Apollodorus then added the Galatians) in the Anatolian Peninsula, except the mixed ones, including three (unspecified) Greeks and 13 barbarians: these include the Pamphylians.

> But though Ephorus said that this peninsula was inhabited by sixteen tribes, of which three were Hellenic and the rest barbarian, except those that were mixed, adding that the Cilicians, Pamphylians, Lycians, Bithynians, Paphlagonians, Mariandynians, Trojans, and Carians lived on the sea, but the Pisidians, Mysians, Chalybians, Phrygians, and Milyans in the interior, […].[7] (Strabo, *Geogr*. 14.5.23, 1–8)

Strabo first wonders which were the mixed peoples (οἱ μιγάδες, § 25) and then which were the Greek peoples (§ 26). In the two passages, it is interesting to observe a series of comments related to cultural and linguistic aspects: Strabo states that, in fact, mixed peoples do not exist, but rather that a people either is Greek or ceases to be Greek, becoming a barbarian people—or the opposite can happen, in the sense that, in case of mixing, the preponderant part makes a people either Greek or barbarian. Regarding the Greek peoples, Strabo finds it difficult to divide them into three tribes, because he counts either two, if Athenians and Ionians (on one side) are paired with Dorians and Aeolians (on the other side), or four, if they are kept separate (cf. 8.1.2)

---

6 The passage in Strabo 14.5.7 mentions part of the military expeditions of (Publius Servilius Vatia) Isauricus, proconsul of Cilicia, who after conquering the cities of Pamphylia proceeded beyond the Taurus, conquering the capital of the Isaurians and thus winning the *agnomen* of Isauricus.

7 Φήσαντος δὲ τοῦ Ἐφόρου διότι τὴν χερρόνησον κατοικεῖ ταύτην ἑκκαίδεκα γένη, τρία μὲν Ἑλληνικὰ τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ βάρβαρα χωρὶς τῶν μιγάδων, ἐπὶ θαλάττῃ μὲν Κίλικες καὶ Πάμφυλοι καὶ Λύκιοι καὶ Βιθυνοὶ καὶ Παφλαγόνες καὶ Μαριανδυνοὶ καὶ Τρῶες καὶ Κᾶρες, Πισίδαι δὲ καὶ Μυσοὶ καὶ Χάλυβες καὶ Φρύγες καὶ Μιλύαι ἐν τῇ μεσογαίᾳ […].

Then, returning to questions of Homeric exegesis (§ 27), Strabo again reports Apollodorus's view that the peoples that Homer does not mention either were not yet settled in Anatolia at the time of the Trojan War or were under the rule of others (cf. above). Finally (§ 28), Strabo points out that Homer mentions some peoples who are completely unknown in his time, such as Cauconias, Solymi, Ceteians, and Leleges. Obviously, this kind of ancient reading implicitly assumes that the Homeric text represents the historical era coeval with the Trojan War.

2.1.2 Ancient Sources on the Pamphylian Language

Beside commenting on the Pamphylian people, the ancient sources also discuss the Pamphylian language. The *Etymologicum Magnum* (EM 391.16–21) reports an interesting phonetic-phonological observation: Argives, Lacones (Spartans), Pamphylians, Eretres (in Euboea), and Oropians (between Attica and Boeotia) do not pronounce the intervocalic /s/, but instead replace it with an aspiration so that, for example, μουσικά [muzi'ka] becomes μωΐκά [mōhi'ka].[8] This latter form may indeed correspond to a gloss, but we cannot be certain. Surely it is an example of the phenomenon described. This ancient observation cannot be corroborated by any known features of Pamphylian, but it may be worth noting that other cases of consonantal weakening are instead attested, such as the weakening and deletion of the voiced velar /g/, e.g., Μιάλης < Μεγάλης; Μιάλιτους < Μεγάλιτους (see, e.g., Panayotou 2015:429).

Eustathius of Thessalonika, commenting on Homer, provided another characteristic feature of the Pamphylian language: it would be the insertion of a beta in the pronunciation of some words, and the shift in accent, e.g., φάος → φάβος, ἀέλιος → βάβελιος, ὀρούω → ὀρουβῶ (Bezzenberger *apud* Ramsay and Sayce 1880, also quoted by Brixhe 1976a:142). However, we must guess that for Eustathius, who lived in the 12th century CE, the use of beta was a graphic device to mark something else and likely an approximant [w], being evidence of the phenomenon known as *betacism*. This is confirmed by the etymology: βάβελιος, perhaps to be corrected in ἀβέλιος and thus compared with the Hesychian gloss ἀβελιακόν (α 104), which is derived from the PIE stem *$*seh_2u$-el-*

8 Cassio (2016:19) confirms this feature for Laconic, Argolic, Elean, and Cypriot, affirming that "il mutamento si è realizzato indipendentemente nei vari dialetti e ad epoche diverse (a Sparta è antico, a Creta e Cipro recente), e dato che era in genere percepito come un tratto 'provinciale' le iscrizioni oscillano molto tra forme con Σ e forme con ⟨H⟩ = [h]" [the mutation occurred independently in the different dialects in different ages (earlier in Sparta, later in Crete and Cyprus], and since it was generally perceived as a 'provincial' feature forms with Σ and forms with H alternate largely in the inscriptions].

'sun.' As Brixhe (1976:47) points out, with many examples, that the outcome of Proto-Greek */w/ was always maintained in Pamphylian ("Sans préjuger de son articulation [...] nous devons constater que l'héritier du */w/ protogrec constitue un phonème vivant en pamphylien jusqu'à la disparition du dialecte"). As for the accent, this may be related with the hypothesis that Pamphylian developed an intensive accent (see Brixhe 1976a:146).

It is sometimes claimed that the ancients considered Pamphylian a barbarian language from this passage from Arrian (*Anab.* 1.26.4) according to which the language spoken in Side is a βαρβαρικὰ φωνῇ, 'a foreign language.' However, the comment concerns Sidetic rather than Pamphylian. It is also true that Side is located in Pamphylia and that Hesychius reports possible glosses in reference not only to Pamphylia in general but also to individual cities, such as words used by Περγαῖοι, that is, the inhabitants of Perge (e.g., αἰβετός, α 1676; ἄκρυμα, α 7290; βουρικυπάρισσος, β 963; κόρκορα, κ 3636). Nevertheless, in the case of Arrian's commentary, as Rizza (2018) explains, it seems correct to assume that the φωνή of Side is precisely Sidetic, the Anatolian language known to us (see Section 3 below).

In general, apart from the few observations above and some sporadic glosses by Hesychius (see below), we have no explicit information from the ancient scholars on the classification of the language spoken by the Pamphylians, even though different positions were taken regarding their geographical and historical origins, which may certainly have contributed to the lack of definite knowledge.

2.1.3 Pamphylian as a Marginal Greek Dialect

Turning now to modern scholarship, although researchers often treat Pamphylian as not fully classified (i.e., not traceable to a Greek dialect subgroup; e.g., Colvin 2010:203), all emphasize that it is a Greek variety, that, due to historical and sociolinguistic events, came to assume a marginal position among the Greek dialects.

Previously it was considered as part of the Achaean group, together with Arcadian and Cypriot. Filos (2014 s.v. Pamphylian) stated that "it may be more accurate though, to describe Pamphylian as the language of the Greek colonies of Pamphylia, particularly Aspendos, Perge, Syllion and Side. In fact, Pamphylian was a rather idiosyncratic, non-standard linguistic variety of Greek spoken for the largest part of the first millennium BCE in the central southern coastal area of Pamphylia in Asia Minor [...]."

Since 1976a, Brixhe emphasized the specificity of Pamphylian as a marginal Greek variety that, on the one hand, was influenced by the surrounding Anatolian languages but, on the other hand, was capable of innovating indepen-

dently from the other Greek dialects, in some cases introducing phenomena that would later be typical of the *koiné*, such as the reduction of /ĭŏ/ > /ī/, the neutralization of the opposition /nd/ : /nt/, or the spirantization of intervocalic plosives. In general, in line with Brixhe (1976a:150), we will not attempt a clear-cut dialectal classification of Pamphylian, because this does not appear necessary in order to provide a description of its main linguistic feature and of the available corpus.

2.2 *Sources and Studies*

2.2.1 Inscriptions and Coin Legends

The corpus of inscriptions has been edited over the years by Brixhe, beginning with his doctoral thesis, published in 1976a, often referred to as DGP (*Dialecte grec de Pamphylie*). This first work was followed by six supplements that appeared in journals, either authored by Brixhe alone or produced in collaboration with other scholars, bringing the current total of inscriptions to 289, all dating between the 5th century BCE and the second century CE.[9]

The epichoric writing system is a Greek alphabet with some peculiarities: the lack of graphemes indicating long vowels, the sign ⟨Y⟩ marking [u] instead of [y] (a feature also present in the Ionic and Attic systems), two special graphemes, namely ⟨Ψ⟩ for /ts/, later /ss/ or /s/; and ⟨И⟩ (Pamphylian digamma, also found in Carian) for the semivowel /w/, which is also marked by the usual Greek digamma ϝ, from the 3rd–2nd centuries BCE ⟨B⟩ and ⟨Φ⟩.[10]

2.2.2 Pamphylian Glosses

Besides coins and epigraphs, some putative Pamphylian materials mentioned in the ancient scholarly tradition come from lexicographic sources. Schmidt (1868) collected nine Pamphylian words within the Hesychian text, considering only the cases in which Παμφύλιοι or Παμφύλια were explicitly mentioned. Sayce, in the final section of Ramsay and Sayce (1880), quotes the more extensive collection of glosses made by Bezzenberger (1880), which also includes Hesychian references to single cities (as Side, Perge, Aspendos) together with some of the EM's occurrences and a testimony from Eustathius. This list of

9 The supplements are the following: Brixhe (1976b, 1988a, 1991, 1996); Brixhe and Tekoğlu (2000); and Brixhe et al. (2007). See also Brixhe (2012). The full corpus of inscriptions, based on DGP (Brixhe 1976a) and supplements but nonetheless very useful for a comprehensive overview, is collected in Appendix 5 of Bianconi (2019). We thank Michele Bianconi for sharing his unpublished writings. Since then, Tekoğlu and Kose (2022) has also appeared.

10 For more on the alphabet, see Filos (2014, with references).

about 30 words, completed by the glosses detected by Metri (1954), is presented in Brixhe (1976a:141–143). The glosses, in addition to reporting lexemes peculiar to the Pamphylian dialect that are not usual in other dialects, especially in the Attic-Ionic "standard," adds phonetic information, such as ἀδρί for ἀνδρί (Hesychius α 1200) or the already mentioned ἀβελιακόν (Hesychius α 104).

2.2.3 Research and Studies

As for Pamphylian as a Greek dialect, Ramsay and Sayce (1880) and Meillet (1908) were among the first scholars to attempt a description of this language. Overall grammatical sketches are also found in general volumes devoted to Greek.[11] The common denominator of these descriptions is the definition of Pamphylian as a peculiar, sometimes aberrant, isolated, idiosyncratic dialect of Greek, perhaps (in accordance with part of the ancient tradition) imported in Asia Minor by some Doric tribes, or in successive waves by different dialect-speaking communities, in order to justify the combination of different features.

Brixhe's many years of research (1976a with all following supplements) have provided unsurpassed reference works for the detailed description of the corpus as a whole, the overall perspective on the available materials and open problems, and the depth of analysis.[12] His writings have proven to be extremely important not only for knowledge of the Pamphylian corpus in its textual component, but also for possible links with surrounding languages. Therefore, in this chapter we shall be leaving aside the isoglosses shared by Pamphylian and other Greek dialects (all can be found in the aforementioned references) to focus on aspects of possible linguistic contact with Anatolian languages. In the case of Pamphylian, we will need to take into consideration, on the one hand, a possible Lycian interference, and on the other hand the possible adstrate influence primarily exerted by Sidetic.

In fact, some works are devoted to single aspects of possible interferences (e.g., Dardano 2006 on the Pamphylian vocalism, describing possible connection with Lycian, and Dardano 2007 on the peculiarity of this dialect of using the vowel /a/ as a connecting element in compounds found in onomastics, which is explained as a case of interference of the Luwic substrate). Such investigations, although focused on particular aspects, offer materials that contribute to the overall analysis of language interference in the Aegean–Anatolian area.

---

11 Some of the reference work include Buck 1955; Colvin 2007; Filos 2014; Panayotou 2014; and Cassio 2016, all provided with further bibliography.

12 See Neumann (1980). Cf. Doria (1979), who emphasized some points of detail in terms of phonology.

More recently, Skelton (2017) addressed an overview structured according to different levels of linguistic descriptions. In particular, typological approaches and models of language contact are applied to the studies of ancient languages, together with tentative comparisons with today's linguistic contexts (for Pamphylian the tentative comparison with Singlish, the variety of English spoken in Singapore).

2.3 *Anatolian Influences in Pamphylian*

2.3.1 Phonological Data

As first pointed out by Brixhe (1976a:146), some linguistic features of the Pamphylian Greek dialect can be traced back to an Anatolian influence. These features essentially belong to the phonological level and are summarized in the following traits: hints of intensive accent, frequency of aphaeresis and metathesis, persistence of glide after /u/ and /i/ (both long and short) in hiatus, neutralization of final /ŏ/ : /ŭ/, weakening of final nasal (with possible emerging of nasalized vowels), conditioned weakening of voiced initial and intervocalic /g/, and the rhotacism of /d/.

Building on these observations and selecting some of the traits identified by Brixhe, Skelton (2017) firmly asserts the influence of Anatolian—in fact, Lycian—on Pamphylian, going so far as to claim that:

> structural influence from Anatolian on the phonology of Pamphylian was so extensive that the consonant inventory of Pamphylian appears less Greek than Anatolian, with the loss of distinctions in voicing and aspiration, the development of voiceless and voiced fricatives, and the retention of /w/ and the introduction of /j/ as a phonemic glide. There is also influence on the vowel system, with the introduction of syllabic consonants and nasalized vowels, and possibly the reduction of the number of instances of /o/ and heterosyllabic sequences of vowels." (Skelton 2017:114)

Independently, Bianconi (2019:335–363), after listing the traits identified by Brixhe (1976a), reorganizes the topics, selecting five case studies, namely: a) lowering of the open-mid front unrounded vowel, b) aphaeresis, c) rhotacism, d) weakening of voiced velar, and e) linking vowels in compounds. The literature on the topic is examined for each of these traits, describing linguistic facts and potential theoretical explanations.

As for the first point, the research of Dardano (2006, 2007) is considered, according to which a correspondence is found, on one hand, between Lycian ⟨e⟩ and Greek ⟨α⟩ (e.g., Lycian *Purihimetehe* : Greek Πυριματιος (bilingual

TL 6:1–2); Lycian *Pubieleje* : Greek Πυβιαλῃι (bilingual TL 117:4–5)) and, on the other hand, between Lycian ⟨a⟩ and various Greek vowels, namely Greek ⟨α⟩, ⟨ε⟩, ⟨η⟩, in the Lycian transcriptions of Greek names (e.g., Lycian *Xelijaãnaxssah* (TL 116:2) : Greek Καλλιάναξ; Lycian *Alaxssa*[*ñ*]*tra* (TL 29:9) : Greek Ἀλέξανδρος; Lycian *Milasãñtra* (TL 44a:45) : Greek Μελήσανδρος). Bianconi (2019:339), although considering Dardano's arguments in favor of a Lycian influence entirely plausible, advances the hypothesis of a possible influence by a late form of Luwian.

The aphaeresis, basically of the initial ⟨α⟩ shown by Pamphylian proper names in comparison with their correspondents in the rest of Greek dialect, has been identified as a characteristic trait of Pamphylian on the basis of a majority criterion, given the fluctuation (even in the same inscription, e.g., Φορδίσις Ἀφροδισίυ, no. 20)[13] of forms with and without this phenomenon, the latter being in any case a minority. The conclusions reached by Bianconi (2019:342), in the wake of Brixhe and Dardano, are those of a trait that is indeed the result of linguistic contact. The inconsistency of the evidence, whereby the phenomenon is limited to some nouns (and not in all their occurrences), may suggest a situation of bilingualism that results in the presence of proper names in both *standard* Greek and *interfered epichoric* forms.

The issue of the rhotacism of /d/ in intervocalic contexts is more complex: as in the previous case, Pamphylian inscriptions show both rhotacism (e.g., Φιραραυ < *Φηράδαυ, no. 99, 113; Ἐπιτιμιραυ < *Ἐπιτιμίδαυ, no. 125), and the retention of intervocalic /d/ (e.g., Λεωνιδας, no. 25; Θαναδωρυς, no. 26). Again, this may be a contact phenomenon because it is also found in other Anatolian languages—although, in fact, it is not attested in Lycian, the language generally regarded in terms of substrate.[14] The category of *flap* has been invoked (Rieken and Yakubovich 2010) assuming that such a rhotacism should instead be understood as a change into an alveolar flap [ɾ]. Sasseville (2021), reconsidering the phenomenon in the Anatolian languages, finds it also in Lydian and proposes that it may be an areal trait typical of the first millennium BCE. The idea that the same phenomenon may have affected Pamphylian as well, advanced by Bianconi (2019:352), appears convincing both from a linguistic perspective and in the terms of a geo-historical identification of the area of convergence.

13 This inscription is doubly interesting because the first form is affected by both apheresis and metathesis, which may suggest the presence of liquid syllabic (or sonorant) consonants, as in Lycian (but also projectable in Proto-Indo-European). On the problem of syllabic liquid in Greek and on Pamphylian data, see now the discussion by Van Beek (2021:137–139).

14 In Merlin and Pisaniello (2020), the correspondence between Lyc. *Pinale* and Gr. Πίναρα is discussed, showing possible answers to this unexpected equivalence.

Regarding the weakening of the intervocalic voiced velar, Brixhe (1976a:88) states that this is a common phenomenon that does not require an explanation by language contact. Bianconi (2019:358), on the other hand, observes that the two aspects are not mutually exclusive: language contact (as in the case of the definite article; see below) may trigger or counter internal linguistic change, accelerating or conversely blocking its development. The idea that the weakening of Pamphylian velars was induced by the influence of Anatolian languages has been discussed since the 1960s, with a pioneering study by Szemerényi (1968) and a series of objections by Wallace (1983), which Bianconi (2019) duly discusses. Although Bianconi's work much better characterized the contexts conditioning the weakening in the different languages that exhibit it, the one issue left unresolved appears to be the chronology of the change. As already discussed in Volume 1 (Chapter 15, Section 3), the loss of these stops in Luwian is conditioned by phonemic voice, which, in turn, was certainly annihilated by the time Pamphylian Greeks would have entered into contact with Luwic speakers (Federico Giusfredi, *personal communication*). Therefore, there is no reason to assume that a change occurring more than one thousand years before would have affected the phonotactics of languages at a synchronic level. If anything, we may expect initial /g/ to be devoiced, but not dropped. Thus, this hypothesis appears to be weaker than the others.

The last phenomenon that is usually attributed to contact with the Anatolian languages is the presence of a linking vowel ⟨α⟩ instead of ⟨ο⟩ in compound proper names, as the final vowel of the first component. A list of examples is offered by Bianconi (2019:359–363), whose analysis generally—if with due caution—tends to confirm the conclusions by Dardano (2007), who successfully compared forms like Πελαδώρου for Ἀπολλόδωρος (no. 59, with several related forms), or Ἐλλαφίλου for Ἑλλόφιλος (no. 134), to names attested in the cuneiform Hittite corpus such as Mizra-muwa or Mitanna-muwa, which also exhibit an /a/ vowel that replaces the theme of the first part of the name. All in all, in this case, Dardano's hypothesis, cautiously but successfully supported by the follow-up analysis by Bianconi, appears linguistically and areally convincing.

2.3.2 Morphology and Syntax

Turning to the morphological and syntactic levels, first of all, it is easy to observe that very little can be said about the morpho-syntax of Pamphylian because the texts available to us are very short (a couple of lines) and, because they are funerary inscriptions, often limited to a list of names. Only two texts are of a significant length, but these are damaged and difficult to interpret.

It can be said that nominal and verbal inflection are mostly in line with that of other Greek dialects; however, according to Skelton (2017:115–116), there are two notable exceptions. The first is the ending -τι instead of -σι, which is not only common to West Greek but should also be connected with Lycian.[15] The second is the third-person imperative active -δυ, seemingly corresponding to the Lycian *-tu* and -(˜)*tu*.

As far as syntax is concerned, Skelton (2017:115–117) highlights three traits that, from her perspective, fall within the phenomena of interference: 1) the lack of the article (except for ὑ βōλέμενυς, nos. 3 and 13, considered as a loan of legal formula); 2) the use of the dative instead of the genitive after prepositions with an *ablative* value; and 3) the construction και νι with the imperative with the meaning of negative imperative. These examples would find confirmation in situations of language contact nowadays, in terms of substrate lending grammar to the superstrate, which means that the Pamphylians should, in this case, be Anatolian-speakers who have imperfectly learned Greek. Because we dare not speculate as to the composition of a population based on indirect sociolinguistic hints, we will limit ourselves to examining the three hypotheses from a linguistic point of view.

If the aberrant use of dative and the phrase και νι with the imperative appear at least possible, the case of the alleged lack of the definite article warrants some caution. First, the absence of the definite article may simply depend on the geographical marginality of Pamphylian: because we do not know for sure how old the dialect was, it is impossible to exclude the possibility that it separated from Greek before the full grammaticalization of demonstratives into articles (consider, as a comparandum, the very different typology of articulation in peripheral languages like Romanian and Sardinian, which postpone clitic definite articles, as opposed to all other languages derived from Latin, which prepose them). The idea that the quasi-absence of articles was, indeed, an archaism, is defended also by Brixhe (2000). If, however, these typological considerations appear too speculative, it is the very epigraphic corpus that presents a major problem. Indeed, in the funerary inscriptions of virtually all regions of Greece, there is a strong tendency to omit the definite article (cf. Chapter 15, Section 3, for discussion and references).

2.3.1 Onomastic Data

Finally, as regards the lexical level, it is important to emphasize that most of the material is given by onomastics, whose analysis follows rules different from

15 However, this feature could also be described as an archaism in Greek.

those employed for common vocabulary. As shown above, onomastic material can be studied with reference to the phonological and morphological aspects. The phono-morphological level can be analyzed by comparing it with other forms, both in terms of model and replication, assuming the possibility of interference (if the pattern is Anatolian, what is the replicated form in Pamphylian?) and in terms of variation from other dialects (how does the same form occur in the other Greek dialects?).

A more classical approach, however, consists in the mere classification of onomastic material according to the language of origin. Dedicated studies that examined the corpus of personal names from Pamphylia in this perspective are Brixhe (1976a:146–147), Dardano (2012), and Skelton (2017:110).[16] Although the forms considered are not all those that have been attested, the general tendency indicates a majority of Greek names, a large minority of Anatolian ones, and only a few that go back to different origins (including Semitic). Now, although there is certainly some value to this approach, one should always remember that the language of origin of the name a person bears is often unrelated to the cultural and linguistic profile of that person. The only thing that we can safely assess, based on this picture, is the general profile of the Pamphylian onomastic culture, which is mixed and has two unsurprising main components: Greek and Anatolian.

2.3.2 Theoretical Discussion

In the previous section, dedicated to data analysis, some theoretical and methodological observations found in the studies or proposed in this brief overview have been already made. Such comments will be collected once again here, in an attempt to provide a more general picture.

First of all, the importance of Pamphylian for the study of linguistic contact in ancient societies could hardly be overstated. It is a Greek dialect, but it has remained isolated from the motherland and, at the same time, it was in contact with Anatolian languages that we know.

When dealing with specific contact-induced features, three potential scenarios appear to emerge:

1) A given feature is an inherited one, common to both Anatolian and Greek dialects, which has been preserved in Pamphylian as an archaism, based on the isolation and the separation of Pamphylian in the early stages of

16 Dardano (2012) is by far the most extensive and detailed work, which collects the largest corpus of onomastic materials as well as a sound theoretical discussion.

inner-Greek development or language change, which involves, by contrast, other Greek dialects. This may be a way to read the near absence of the definite article, assuming the possibility that language contact *prevents* the process of grammaticalization (demonstrative > article) in such a dialect.

2) A feature has a diachronic areal diffusion. This could explain Pamphylian rhotacism and other substrate phenomena.

3) A given feature has a contact-based synchronic explanation: Pamphylian converges in some features with surrounding Anatolian languages in the same span of time, as in the case of adstrate phenomena (e.g., the verbal endings discussed above).

For each feature, one explanation may be more plausible than another, with the understanding that the nature of the evidence does not allow us to attempt a truly comprehensive analysis of the language system. However, it is important to emphasize that inheritance, inner development, and contact are not mutually exclusive, although a solution combining these phenomena may complicate the picture.

2.4 *A Final Remark*

In sum, although Pamphylia is an extremely important example of a multilingual area from the ancient world, viable avenues toward firm conclusions remain limited. Linguistically, we have a modest knowledge of the Anatolian languages with which it was in contact, and historically speaking, the perception of the non-Greek element as barbarian in the classical sources imposes serious caution when working with the information coming from ancient historians and geographers.

Modern interpretations also tend to diverge. Some authors have argued that Pamphylian is more Anatolian than Greek (Skelton 2017), and others maintain that the language's internal archaisms should be emphasized without resorting to language contact (López Eire and Lillo Alcaraz 1982). Some see it as an anticipatory variety of the *koiné* (Filos 2014), whereas others, perhaps more wisely, balance these positions by considering linguistic features on a case-by-case basis (Bianconi 2019).

3 Sidetic

From the city of Side in Pamphylia comes a small corpus of epigraphs written in a peculiar local alphabetic script that attests a language most probably belonging to the Anatolian branch of the Indo-European family (seemingly close to

Lycian),[17] which has been given the name of *Sidetic* based on the findspot of the inscriptions.

The writing system used for Sidetic inscriptions is unique, different from any other alphabet found in first-millennium Anatolia (whether Greek, epichoric, or Semitic), and it remains a matter of debate between those who argue for a Greek origin and those who posit a Semitic one.[18] Its uniqueness was also probably acknowledged in ancient times, as emerges from the following well-known passage of Arrian (*Anab.* 1.26.4), in which, as shown by Rizza (2018), the φωνή of Side is best explained as referring to the visible language, to the language in its written form:[19]

> Alexander then reached Side. Sidetans are Cumaeans from Cumae in Aeolis; and they tell this account about themselves, that, as the first envoys from Cyme landed in that country and disembarked for the foundation, they soon forgot the Greek language and immediately spoke a barbarian language, not however that of the neighboring barbarians, but a language peculiar to themselves, which had never existed before: since then the Sidetans *barbarized* in a different way from the other neighbours.[20]

The Sidetic script was deciphered by Bossert in 1950 (with later adjustments),[21] but the language is still poorly known due to the limited extent of the corpus. Indeed, direct Sidetic sources include ten inscriptions (mostly very short coin legends) as well as some documents whose Sidetic status is not assured;[22] to

17 See Pérez-Orozco (2007:125).

18 See, e.g., Brixhe 1969 (Semitic origin, perhaps with Greek intermediation), Neumann 1978 (from a cursive Greek script); Carruba 1992; Pérez-Orozco 2005, 2007 (basically an Aramaic-derived alphabet with some Greek influences).

19 See also Brixhe 2018:170–171.

20 Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ ἐπὶ Σίδης ᾔει. εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ Σιδῆται Κυμαῖοι ἐκ Κύμης τῆς Αἰολίδος· καὶ οὗτοι λέγουσιν ὑπὲρ σφῶν τόνδε τὸν λόγον, ὅτι, ὡς κατῆράν τε ἐς τὴν γῆν ἐκείνην οἱ πρῶτοι ἐκ Κύμης σταλέντες καὶ ἐπὶ οἰκισμῷ ἐξέβησαν, αὐτίκα τὴν μὲν Ἑλλάδα γλῶσσαν ἐξελάθοντο, εὐθὺς δὲ βάρβαρον φωνὴν ἵεσαν, οὐδὲ τῶν προσχώρων βαρβάρων, ἀλλὰ ἰδίαν σφῶν οὔπω πρόσθεν οὖσαν τὴν φωνήν· καὶ ἔκτοτε οὐ κατὰ τοὺς ἄλλους προσχώρους Σιδῆται ἐβαρβάριζον.

21 See, e.g., Neumann 1968, 1978; Brixhe 1969; Ševoroškin 1975; Pérez-Orozco 2003; Schürr 2016b; Pérez-Orozco 2020; Zinko and Zinko 2020; and Simon 2021c. An overview of the different transliteration conventions with further references can be found in Rizza 2016.

22 The corpus is collected in Nollé 2001; the coins are included in Atlan 1968. See also Rizza 2005; Pérez-Orozco 2007; Zinko and Zinko 2016, 2020; and Rizza 2021. Alfredo Rizza (*personal communication*) informed us that "from 2020 the Side archaeological mission of the Eskişehir Anadolu University, directed by Prof. Dr. Feriştah Alanyalı, has uncovered some new Sidetic evidence, of particular note a monolingual stele of about twenty lines,

these one could add personal and place names only indirectly attested in Greek and Roman sources. Sidetic inscriptions are dated to the 4th and 3rd centuries BCE; afterwards, only inscriptions in Greek are found.

As far as the issue of language contact is concerned, one should first mention that, among the small Sidetic corpus, a subcorpus of Greek–Sidetic bilingual inscriptions can be found, comprising only three documents, the so-called *Artemon* and *Apollonios inscriptions*, and the bilingual of Seleucia-Lyrbe.[23] Unfortunately, such inscriptions are quite short and consist mostly of personal names, which also are the only clear elements found in these texts.[24]

The *Artemon inscription* is engraved on a small altar. The Greek version,[25] preceding the Sidetic one, lacks the first line, so that one can read only the personal name Ἀρτέμων, a patronymic for which different readings have been suggested, but currently read as Ἀθηνόβιος,[26] and, finally, χαριστήρια 'thank-offerings.' The Sidetic version is less clear, except for the two personal names corresponding to those occurring in the Greek version (*artmon ϑanpijś*). All the rest is quite obscure, and various hypotheses have been suggested concerning the possibility of identifying in the Sidetic text either the name of a deity (or deities) to whom the inscription was dedicated, or something matching Greek χαριστήρια, or perhaps some verbal form.[27]

In the *Apollonios inscription*, the Sidetic text, consisting of only a single incomplete line, precedes the Greek text, which is a full dedication of four lines that also includes the signature of the engraver. The Greek texts says: "Apollonios, (son) of Apollodoros, (son) of Apollonios, set up this image of himself to all the gods. Mnaseas, (son) of Artemon, Sidetan, made (it)."[28] The Sidetic text is less informative: we surely recognize the personal name of the dedicator and the onomastic formula (*polonij pordorś polonijaś*), followed by *masara*, plausibly to be connected with Luw. *māššana/i-* and Lyc. *mahana-* 'god'

---

a long stele with a list of personal names, and a pair of 'election' cards. The Anadolu University team with colleagues from the University of Graz are studying the materials, and the publication of the documents has been entrusted to Michaela and Christian Zinko (Graz), with the collaboration of Alfredo Rizza (Verona). Notwithstanding the substantial untranslatability of the monolingual document, thanks to the recognition of some Greek lexical borrowings we were able to assume that the document carries a decree for the celebration of benefactors of the city."

23 See, e.g., Adiego 2014:244–248.

24 On Sidetic personal names, see also Zinko 2016.

25 Published in Nollé 1993 no. 19.

26 See Rizza 2019 for the history of this reading. Cf. also Rizza 2021:582–584.

27 See Rizza 2019 for an updated edition including all previous suggestions.

28 Ἀπολλώνιος Ἀπολλοδώρου τοῦ Ἀπολλωνίου ἀνέθηκεν [εἰ]κόνα τήνδ' ἑαυτοῦ θεοῖς πᾶσι. [Μ]νασέας Ἀρτέμωνος Σιδήτης ἐπο[ί]ησε.

and thus matching Gr. θεοῖς. The last word in the Sidetic text—unfortunately fragmentary—reads ↑*ue*[..., which has been explained as representing either the Sidetic cognate of Luw. *tūwa-* and Lyc. *tuwe-* 'put, place,' matching Gr. ἀνέθηκεν, or the Sidetic cognate of Lyc. *huwedri-* 'all' (< **suwedri*, cf. Luw. *šuwatar* 'fullness'), thus matching Gr. πᾶσι.[29]

The last bilingual inscription, the bilingual of Seleucia-Lyrbe, poses more difficulties in reading, but has recently received a new interpretation.[30] The Greek text includes only the name of the dedicator (Εὐέμπολος) with his patronymic (Σίδιδος) and an ethnic designation (Τυμεριζεύς, allegedly from *Tymerissos, which would be, according to the editors, a variant of the city of Tyberissos, in Lycia), followed by the verb ἀνέθηκεν. The Sidetic version, if it has been read correctly, includes only the first three elements found in the Greek version, *eumpol sδits timenezas*, without the verb. Given the form of the ethnic in the latter text, one could suggest an identification with the Lycian city of Tymnessos rather than Tyberissos, but the Greek form appears not to fit with such a reading. Unfortunately, because the inscription is currently missing, it is impossible to check it.[31]

As a general remark, in these bilingual inscriptions, the Sidetic versions (although sometimes unclear) appear to be secondary to the Greek versions: in two of the inscriptions, the Greek text precedes the Sidetic text, and when the Greek follows the Sidetic (as in the *Apollonios inscription*), it is longer and more informative than the Sidetic version. However, a comprehensive evaluation of the relationships between the Greek and Sidetic versions is currently hampered by our poor knowledge of the Sidetic language.

In addition to bilingual inscriptions, some relevant data for language contact are provided by onomastics and a very limited number of loanwords. As stated by Pérez-Orozco (2007:126), Sidetic inscriptions include "una mezcla de nombres griegos y anatolios, casi a partes iguales," which show some quite regular phenomena of adaptation; for example, Sidetic adaptations of original Greek names starting with a vowel consistently undergo aphaeresis, cf. Ἀθηνόβιος > *θanpijś* (gen.adj.); Ἀπολλώνιος > *polonij*; Ἀπολλόδωρος > *pordorś* (gen.adj.). It is possible that some phenomena of adaptation could be explained through Pamphylian intermediation, because Greek names occurring in Sidetic inscriptions somewhat match the form they display in Pamphylian, whereas those occurring in the Greek versions of bilingual inscriptions match the koinè forms.[32]

29 See Nikolaev 2017, with previous references.

30 Magnelli and Petrantoni 2020.

31 See Rizza 2021:577.

32 See Pérez-Orozco 2007:126.

In particular, the aforementioned aphaeresis is a feature shared by the Pamphylian and Sidetic renderings of Greek personal names. However, the Sidetic forms do not perfectly match the Pamphylian ones, which may thereby guarantee their Sidetic status and rule out the possibility that they were instead Pamphylian forms in Sidetic texts. Compare, e.g., Sid. *polonij* vs. Pamph. Πελόνιιυς (= Ἀπολλώνιος) and Sid. *pordor* vs. Pamph. Πελάδωρυς (= Ἀπολλόδωρος). Furthermore, aphaeresis is a rather common phenomenon (for example, it also occurred in Luwian and Lycian adaptations of foreign names), so we cannot be certain that its occurrence in Sidetic adaptations of Greek personal names should be regarded as a Pamphylian interference phenomenon. One should note that it does not occur in the Greek loanword *anaϑemat-* (see below), although the phonetic context is different, and, more generally, Sidetic data are too scarce to substantiate any definitive conclusions.

As far as loanwords are concerned, only two Greek common words are currently attested in Sidetic documentation, always adapted to Sidetic phonology and morphology: *iśtratag* from Gr. στρατᾱγός 'army leader, commander' (and perhaps *iśtratagej-*, possibly from *στρατᾱγεία, variant of στρατηγία, unless *iśtratagejaś* should be rather explained as *iśtratag ejaś*)[33] and *anaϑemat-* 'offerings' from Gr. ἀναθήματα (unless one should instead segment *anaϑemataś* as *anaϑema taś*).[34]

Beyond proper names, two possible Sidetic words are found in Greek sources: ζειγάρη occurs in the lexicon by Hesychius, glossed as ὁ τέττιξ παρὰ Σιδήταις, "the cicada, according to the Sidetans,"[35] while λαέρκινον is given by Galenus (14.72) as the name of the καρπήσιον (*Valeriana Dioscoridis*) at Side in Pamphylia.[36] Of course, the actual Sidetic status of these words is by no means assured.

4 Pisidian

Until quite recently, the Pisidian language was known only from a small corpus of fewer than 50 very short funerary inscriptions in a Greek-derived alphabet from the area of Tymbriada (2nd–3rd centuries CE), near the source of the river Eurymedon.

---

33 See Pérez-Orozco 2007:138.

34 See the discussion in eDiAna, s.v. Sidetic *anaϑemata* (https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=1185).

35 See Brixhe 1976a:84–85 and eDiAna s.v. Sidetic *ζειγάρη* 'cicada' (https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=1252).

36 See eDiAna s.v. Sidetic *λαέρκινον* 'Valeriana dioscoridis' (https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=1027).

A first edition, comprising only 16 inscriptions, was provided by Ramsay (1895), who also first labeled the language *Pisidian* after Strabo (13.4.17). Such a designation was later challenged by Shafer (1950), who pointed out that the inscriptions cluster on the northeastern border of Pisidia, whereas the information given by Strabo on the Pisidian language does not seem to fit that area. Thus, according to Shafer's reconstruction, the language of the *Pisidian* inscriptions may instead be Cilician. The same corpus compiled by Ramsay was also given by Zgusta (1957) and Metri (1958), with some corrections to Ramsay's word division and interpretation. New discoveries have since increased the corpus: one new inscription was added by Borchhardt et al. (1975) and six more by Brixhe and Gibson (1982). Brixhe's 1988b edition included 21 texts (two of the inscriptions published in Brixhe and Gibson 1982 were not included), to which 15 new inscriptions must be added published by Brixhe et al. (1987), four more published by Brixhe and Özsait (2001), and two others coming from the middle Eurymedon valley published by Fuhrmann and Neumann (2005). The corpus compiled by Adiego (2012) comprised 44 inscriptions. Subsequently, two more inscriptions from the middle Eurymedon have been published by Brixhe and Özsait (2013). Currently, the most recent edition by Brixhe (2016) comprises 49 northern inscriptions (N 1–49) and four southern inscriptions (S 1–4). Finally, two unintelligible inscriptions from Pisidia have been published in Bean (1956:151; no. 48, from Osmankalfalar) and Bean (1959:76; no. 19, from Büğdüz = SEG 19:755), but these are not included in the Pisidian corpus.

The linguistic material provided by these inscriptions is quite scant in that they mostly consist of onomastic formulae including only personal names;[37] nevertheless, this has allowed scholars to suggest that the Pisidian language belonged to the Luwic subgroup of the Anatolian branch.[38] Furthermore, some Pisidian personal names and toponyms were also indirectly known from Greek

37 See already Ramsay (1895:356): "Les inscriptions paraissent mentionner essentiellement les noms et la parenté du mort." Very different analyses of the texts, since proven to be wrong (see already Zgusta 1957), were provided by Brandenstein (1933–1934) and Shafer (1950), also later defended by Hemer (1980).

38 See, e.g., Melchert 1994:44–45 (based only on the presence of a genitival adjective). See also an earlier claim by Shafer (1950:258), based on the nominatives ending in -α: "in the present state of our knowledge *Pisidian* is at least as likely to be related to Lycian as to Greek or Latin." Pisidian would be closer to Lycian according to Zgusta (1963:480–481), but closer to Sidetic according to Neumann (1978:874 fn. 6), whereas Starke (1999) regards it as a late form of Iron Age Luwian (see also Lebrun 2012:353 and, far more cautiously, Melchert 2003b:177), which has recently been rejected by Simon (2017d), who suggests that Pisidian was either part of the Carian-Lycian-Milyan dialectal continuum or a late development of Milyan.

sources, but their status as genuine Pisidian names is questionable. The new inscriptions that have been found in the area of Asar Kale, on the middle course of the Eurymedon, include a complete, 13-line inscription (Kesme 2), which is currently the longest Pisidian inscription.[39] However, because these new texts are mostly unintelligible, no significant progress has been made in the understanding of the language, and our knowledge still relies on personal names.

An interesting point is the late date of Pisidian inscriptions, which are generally dated to the 2nd–3rd centuries CE. According to the analysis of Bru (2017:242–244), this could be a "caractérisation linguistique de l'anthroponymie *a posteriori*," as a form of differentiation of cultural identity by means of language, following the model of the Greek language (from which they take the alphabet and the funerary epigraphic tradition), which had successfully imposed itself as the official language of the Roman East.

Given the nature of its corpus, Pisidian currently does not provide any data that would be particularly relevant to the investigation of language contact in ancient Anatolia. As for the writing system, one may note that the southern inscriptions employ both the common digamma (F) and the Pamphylian one (И), whereas no digamma is found in the larger corpus of northern inscriptions. From a linguistic point of view, no bilingual inscription is currently found, but some northern inscriptions (N 31, N 34 and perhaps also N 30, although the latter's place in the Pisidian corpus has recently been challenged[40]) featuring both Pisidian and Greek names show an interesting phenomenon of code-switching: Pisidian names (or names perceived as such) are inflected according to Pisidian grammar, whereas Greek names follow the Greek inflection, even within the same phrase, e.g., Μηνι Τίτου, Τατι Τίτου, Νέμεσις Μηνις, "Meni (Pis.) son of Titos (Gr.), Tati (Pis.) son of Titos (Gr.), Nemesis (Gr.), son of Meni (Pis.)" (N 31).[41]

As for place names, an Anatolian etymology appears most likely for some 40 toponyms attested in the area of ancient Pisidia (besides other place names of different origins, mostly Greek); however, given our very limited knowledge of the Pisidian language—currently reliant solely on personal names—it is impossible to determine whether the Anatolian language (or, perhaps better, one of the Anatolian languages) to which these toponyms belong can be identified with the language we label *Pisidian*.[42]

39 See Brixhe and Özsait 2013; Brixhe 2016 (text S 2); Adiego 2017.

40 See Obrador-Cursach and Adiego (2017), who advocate a purely Greek interpretation.

41 See Brixhe (2016:89–91, 127) and Bru (2017:240–242).

42 For a general overview on Pisidian toponomastics and some examples, see Locatelli (2021).

5 Concluding Remarks

In this chapter, we have dealt with three minor languages of Anatolia: Pamphylian, Sidetic, and Pisidian. The latter two are Anatolian languages, whereas Pamphylian is essentially a Greek dialect for which, however, a number of interference phenomena have been found that have led some scholars to consider it more Anatolian than Greek. The minor-language status of this trio, attested in southern Anatolia, is dictated by the smallness of their respective corpora, being more or less reduced—particularly for Pamphylian, which is marginal even in geographical terms.

We have discussed possible contact phenomena, proposing an interpretative grid that intends to analyze them from epigraphic and philological points of view, seeking solutions that consider both diachronic and synchronic aspects, as well as inheritance, inner development, and contact.

Finally, referring to minor languages, it is worth remembering that some other populations are mentioned in ancient sources, such as Cauconias, Solymi, Ceteians, and Leleges in Strabo 14.5.28. For those languages we have neither testimony, nor inscriptions, nor literary text. These are ethnonyms, which historians and archaeologists may study order to trace their corresponding material cultures. In addition to the ethnonyms (and often related to them), there are the glottonyms—the names of languages—a particular class of which is formed by those glottonyms not corresponding to any *linguistic product*. In other words, we know that a language existed in a certain area, or that some people spoke a given language, but we have no direct attestation of this language—at least, not yet.

This scenario could be further enriched by drawing attention to such evidence—both cultural and linguistic—that, despite a lack of actual correspondence in any documented historical reality, may nonetheless offer interesting insights upon which to broaden ongoing research.