



ERLAC

Fonctionnements
linguistiques

Genres
épigraphiques
et langues
d'attestation
fragmentaire
dans l'espace
méditerranéen

sous la direction
d'Emmanuel DUPRAZ
et de Wojciech SOWA

 PURH

Genres épigraphiques et langues d'attestation fragmentaire dans l'espace méditerranéen

Sous la direction d'Emmanuel Dupraz et de Wojciech Sowa

Introduction

L'étude des langues d'attestation fragmentaire documentées dans le bassin méditerranéen au 1^{er} millénaire avant notre ère a souvent été faite dans le passé selon les méthodes de l'analyse étymologique et de la grammaire comparée. Ces procédures ont permis le déchiffrement et l'analyse de ces textes difficiles, puisque renvoyant à des langues mal attestées. Dans le cadre de ces recherches, la comparaison se faisait principalement à l'échelle proprement linguistique, d'une part, et à celle des formes et non des textes, d'autre part : il s'agissait de prouver des parentés originelles entre langues – démontrer par exemple que l'étrusque appartenait, ou en l'occurrence n'appartenait pas, à la famille des langues indo-européennes – et, par ailleurs, de rechercher des parallèles pour telle ou telle forme ou lexème attestés dans une inscription issue d'une langue d'attestation fragmentaire. Il n'est pas question de minimiser les résultats obtenus par ces méthodes : ce sont eux qui permettent l'accès aux textes des langues fragmentaires du bassin méditerranéen.

Pour autant, une autre voie d'analyse est possible, celle de l'étude sociolinguistique. À la vérité, cette voie n'est pas neuve elle non plus, et les recherches sur la diffusion de l'écriture, par exemple, ont toujours fait intervenir les questions sociolinguistiques – quel milieu social, dans quel contexte économique, politique ou culturel, a fait tel usage de l'écriture, à quelles fins ? Mais la recherche sociolinguistique permet une étude à une échelle qui n'a pas été souvent envisagée dans la recherche passée, l'échelle des genres de texte.

En effet, les langues d'attestation fragmentaire sont documentées non seulement par un petit nombre de textes, mais aussi par un petit nombre de genres épigraphiques qui possèdent chacun ses caractéristiques précises, en termes de support, de contexte archéologique, de visée communicative et de contenu sémantico-référentiel. Ainsi, telle langue d'attestation fragmentaire a livré surtout des épitaphes – c'est par exemple le cas de l'étrusque – telle autre au contraire, sauf cas particulier, a livré surtout des commémorations de travaux publics ou de dédicaces – ainsi notamment l'osque.

L'étude de ces caractéristiques n'est pas moins instructive que celle des formes attestées ou des apparentements linguistiques. Elle permet, en coopération avec l'archéologie des supports et des contextes, une détermination des milieux sociaux concernés par l'écriture et de leurs attentes. Même si ce point n'est pas directement pertinent pour la reconstruction étymologique, l'histoire sociale et culturelle a beaucoup à attendre d'une telle détermination. L'étude de la diffusion des genres épigraphiques d'une langue à une autre donne aussi accès aux modalités de contact entre celles-ci – il est possible, par exemple, que telle société apprenne l'écriture au contact de telle autre, mais, et c'est capital pour évaluer les relations de l'une à l'autre, fasse de l'écriture des usages inconnus dans la société d'origine, soit neufs, soit inspirés d'un autre modèle encore. La diffusion des

genres épigraphiques renvoie donc potentiellement à une autre histoire des contacts entre populations que celle de l'écriture elle-même, qui reste largement à écrire. Par ailleurs, une analyse en termes de genres épigraphiques se voit confrontée aux conventions qui caractérisent ceux-ci tant au niveau du support matériel et de l'*ordinatio* qu'à celui des formules et des contenus. Ces conventions affectent l'analyse proprement linguistique elle-même : l'étude de ces conventions peut permettre une meilleure compréhension de la langue, mais elle peut aussi indiquer que tel trait présent dans les textes est purement conventionnel et ne saurait être représentatif du diasystème linguistique de la société considérée, c'est-à-dire de l'ensemble des usages écrits et oraux de la ou des langues employées par celle-ci et de leur distribution sociale, géographique et diachronique.

Les études réunies dans le présent volume sont issues des travaux d'un colloque tenu à l'université de Rouen les 25, 26 et 27 juin 2012. C'est à dessein que nous les avons regroupées par thème et non pas par aire : il nous a semblé important de confronter, à propos des mêmes thèmes, les données des différentes régions du bassin méditerranéen et les approches des chercheurs qui travaillent sur chacune de ces régions, même si un semblable classement par thèmes est souvent difficile et arbitraire.

Une première série d'études porte sur les questions d'alphabet et de graphie. L'article d'Ignasi-Xavier Adiego porte sur la normalisation d'une variété d'alphabet lycien par le pouvoir politique à des fins de centralisation. Même le choix d'une forme pour tel graphème peut être un enjeu sociolinguistique significatif. Celui de Marie-Laurence Haack s'attache à un genre précis, celui des inscriptions alphabétiques étrusques, et montre que le choix de graver l'alphabet, attesté à plusieurs périodes, avait des finalités différentes selon l'époque. Marta Muscariello aborde les débuts de l'usage de l'écriture dans le Latium : les premières inscriptions, coupées de toute finalité pratique, servent de vecteur d'auto-représentation des élites. Giulia Sarullo, quant à elle, aborde le genre des textes en *boustrophedon* dans l'Italie archaïque : ce mode de gravure a été privilégié pour des textes officiels, contrairement à ce qui a lieu dans les aires helléniques dont ce type de gravure provient ; il y a donc là un choix fait par les populations d'Italie et non la simple reprise d'une pratique grecque.

Même si les langues d'attestation fragmentaire sont pour l'essentiel documentées par des sources épigraphiques, les textes littéraires des langues classiques fournissent aussi des informations à leur sujet, y compris pour une analyse en termes de genres de textes. Manuela Anelli étudie un cas rare, celui d'une forme attestée à la fois par une inscription osque et par des glossateurs latins, et propose des hypothèses sur le statut social auquel renverrait cette forme. Barbora Machajdíkova aborde pour sa part une glose latine qui pourrait renvoyer à un lexème sabellique ; son analyse montre la difficulté d'analyser de telles sources, mais aussi leur intérêt pour des champs lexicaux aussi importants que celui du rituel, en complément des textes épigraphiques eux-mêmes.

L'étude linguistique et la grammaire comparée peuvent bien entendu être associées à l'analyse des sources épigraphiques en termes de genres et de contexte social. José Luis García Ramón tente par exemple, à partir d'inscriptions lyciennes et des données de la comparaison, de reconstituer une terminologie des institutions sociales et sa préhistoire. Gerhard Meiser propose une étude syntaxique des Tables Eugubines : il montre comment, dans le cadre d'un genre très précis, celui de la description de rituels, les prêtres ombriens pouvaient introduire des variations correspondant à leurs préférences

ou à l'évolution de la langue. Craig Melchert, dans l'étude d'une famille étymologique lycienne, montre combien une analyse rigoureuse du système de la langue, en synchronie et en diachronie, est indispensable pour tirer des sources épigraphiques les conclusions d'histoire sociale qu'elles peuvent livrer. L'article de Matilde Serangeli est consacré à une problématique voisine, toujours à propos du lycien qui se révèle un domaine en pleine évolution et pour lequel l'apport de la comparaison est capital. Wojciech Sowa, quant à lui, examine une langue géographiquement voisine, le phrygien, et montre la difficulté d'analyser des formulaires attestés dans des textes peu nombreux, quoique standardisés et appartenant au même genre, celui des malédictions ou bénédictions en contexte funéraire. Enfin, Sabine Ziegler, au-delà du cadre temporel de l'ouvrage, mais de manière exemplaire pour la problématique de celui-ci, étudie une inscription dans une langue inconnue retrouvée en Libye et datée de la période impériale romaine : la connaissance du contexte historique combinée avec des principes typologiques relatifs à la structure des langues permet des hypothèses précises sur la nature de la langue employée dans ce texte.

Une question centrale dans l'étude des genres de texte documentés dans les langues d'attestation fragmentaire est celle de la visée communicative que se proposaient les auteurs et du public auquel était destiné le texte. Il s'agit là d'enjeux spécifiques à chaque langue, qui nécessitent une analyse précise du contexte social exact de la culture correspondante, et qui pour cette raison sont à la fois centraux et difficiles à généraliser. Francisco Beltrán Lloris examine ainsi comment les populations de la péninsule ibérique, qui ont appris l'écriture d'abord sur la côte orientale, ont pu reprendre ou au contraire moduler les usages monumentaux de celle-ci. Dominique Briquel, pour sa part, examine la relation entre une marque étrusque d'appartenance au mobilier funéraire et le support, céramique ou métal, sur lequel ce message était inscrit. Les variations entre les habitus épigraphiques des différentes cités étrusques apparaissent nettement. Emmanuel Dupraz examine l'épigraphie attestée chez les Marse, un peuple sabellique, dans les deux siècles qui ont suivi la mise en place de la domination romaine, et conclut que le choix du latin, bien documenté, relève d'un genre épigraphique unique de textes d'apparat, probablement peu significatif de l'ensemble du diasystème linguistique local. Sophie Minon aborde le cas de plusieurs dialectes grecs : nombre de ceux-ci peuvent être considérés comme des langues d'attestation fragmentaire, secondairement en contact avec la koinè, donc soumis à une dialectique de normalisation et d'écart par rapport à la norme qui dépend du genre épigraphique et des milieux sociaux. Giovanna Rocca, enfin, publie et commente une défixion sicilienne en grec et aborde la combinaison de traits formulaires privés et publics que ce genre peut recéler.

Pour finir, l'étude des genres de textes dans les langues d'attestation fragmentaire entraîne bien entendu souvent l'examen des contacts entre langues, soit avec d'autres langues d'attestation fragmentaire, soit avec des langues mieux documentées. Maria José Estarán Tolosa propose, pour tout l'occident méditerranéen, une étude des différents types d'inscriptions bilingues documentées, qui varient selon le type de contact avec les grandes langues véhiculaires. Joaquín Gorrochategui et José Vallejo, à partir d'exemples ibériques et aquitains, montrent que l'étude des aires onomastiques, définies par la diffusion concordante de formes onomastiques nombreuses, permet des conclusions pour la diffusion des langues elles-mêmes, lorsque celle-ci n'est pas directement documentée

par l'épigraphie. Katherine McDonald examine le corpus des inscriptions osques en caractères grecs et s'attache à montrer que les choix graphiques effectués peuvent varier selon le genre du texte et la visée communicative qui lui est attachée. Paolo Poccetti propose une synthèse sur le genre bien attesté des défixions dans la Grande-Grèce. Les populations oscophones ont emprunté ce genre aux Grecs et ont su moduler dans leurs inscriptions les traits linguistiques et formulaires présents dans la langue originelle. Coline Ruiz Darasse achève le volume par une communication consacrée à la diglossie dans le monde ibérique nord-oriental, examinant si les différents genres de textes attestés permettent de déterminer quelle population faisait usage de l'écriture et dans quel but.

Le choix a été fait pour le présent volume de laisser chaque contributeur libre de la langue de son article. Nous avons ainsi voulu à la fois faire dialoguer les traditions scientifiques liées à la langue allemande, anglaise, espagnole, française et italienne, et, d'autre part, refléter l'autonomie de chacune de ces traditions et les méthodes différentes de la recherche dans les aires germanophone, anglophone, hispanophone, francophone et italophone.

Le lecteur pourra constater que les méthodes suivies à propos de chacune des aires méditerranéennes varient, au-delà même de l'école nationale du contributeur. Les recherches sur les langues de la péninsule ibérique, par exemple, s'attachent bien plus aux questions de contacts entre langues et de visée communicative que celles qui portent sur les langues de l'Anatolie, pour lesquelles l'étude socio-linguistique est plus liée à la reconstruction étymologique. Le cas des aires italiennes est intermédiaire. C'est précisément cette diversité d'approches – qui s'explique en partie, bien entendu, par le caractère nettement indo-européen des langues de l'Anatolie au I^{er} millénaire avant notre ère et par les progrès récents de la reconstruction dans ce domaine, ainsi que, de l'autre côté, par les avancées de l'archéologie ibérique – que nous avons voulu respecter et reproduire. Nous espérons ainsi montrer que les recherches présentes en appellent d'autres, futures.

C'est pour nous un devoir agréable de remercier ceux et celles qui ont permis l'ouvrage collectif que nous publions ici, tout d'abord les contributeurs pour leur venue à Rouen et les débats auxquels le colloque a donné lieu, ensuite les directeurs successifs de l'Équipe de recherche interdisciplinaire sur les aires culturelles de l'université de Rouen, Laurence Villard et Miguel Olmos, qui ont activement encouragé nos travaux, enfin le conseil scientifique de l'université de Rouen et le conseil régional de Haute-Normandie, qui ont bien voulu soutenir notre recherche.

Emmanuel Dupraz et Wojciech Sowa

Lycian *alaha-* and *alada/ehali-*¹

H. Craig Melchert

INTRODUCTION

The overwhelming majority of epichoric texts from Lycia are sepulchral inscriptions, but they are atypical in their content. Commemoration of the dead is often an important motivation in the first or early use of writing by a culture, and those of the Anatolian and Aegean region of the first millennium B.C. are mostly unexceptionable in this regard.

Hieroglyphic Luvian funerary inscriptions of Tabal (8th Century B.C.) celebrate the life of the deceased and are explicitly dedicated by surviving kin: e.g. KULULU 2, 3, 4 (see Hawkins 2000: 488-91, 445-6). Similarly in contemporary Syria: MEHARDE/SHEIZAR (Hawkins 2000: 416-7). The same is likely true of the much more laconic Carian tomb inscriptions of Caria, Egypt, and Greece, based on the probable meaning of the words referring to the object bearing the inscriptions: e.g. *C.Tr 1&2* (Adiego 2007: 130-1; see remarks on *s(i)ði* ibid. 412), *E.Me 17* etc. (Adiego 2007: 48-9; see remarks on *upe* ibid. 429-30), and *C.Eu 1* and *G1* (Adiego 2007: 132 & 164; see ibid. 414-5 on *ś(j)as* = σῆμα and Melchert 2010: 181-2 after Meier-Brügger 2006). Finally, we may probably infer the same for Lydian tomb inscriptions, despite some first-person formulations. For example, text 10 (Gusmani 1964: 254) is explicitly dedicated by a father to his son, and texts 2, 4-9 and others (ibid. 251-3) are also likely posthumous dedications. One may contrast the exceptional text 3 (ibid. 251) with its phrase *alarmś fadol wśtasś* “he himself dedicated, *living*”.

The Lycian tombs in contrast were built *in advance* by the eventual occupant. The inscriptions typically do name the builder/occupant, but the focus is on designating with precision who is and is not authorized to be buried in the tomb. Curse formulas likewise are aimed primarily at those who misuse the tomb for burial of unauthorized

1. I am indebted to Diether Schürr and Birgit Christiansen for helpful comments and criticism, including clarification of their own analyses, but the standard disclaimer applies with particular force in this case, since Schürr’s views on the problem complex remain those of his published article of 2008, while those of Christiansen will appear in the proceedings of the Warsaw congress. The interpretation presented here is entirely my responsibility.

persons. It is noteworthy that the word “harm” occurs only three times in the entire corpus of native Lycian tomb inscriptions.

Lycian sepulchral inscriptions are thus primarily legal statements of property rights, not commemoration of dead forebears. See the apt characterization of Arkwright (1923: 19): “...almost all the later Greek epitaphs consist of what is practically a will, regulating with varying degrees of severity under a penalty the uses to which the tomb might be put.” He says the same for the Lycian epitaphs (ibid. 20), and subsequent research has confirmed this view.

The unusual nature of the Lycian tomb inscriptions has presented problems for their understanding, since interpretation of their phraseology cannot entirely depend on standard expectations of what a funerary text is likely to say. I explore in what follows one particularly notorious and recalcitrant example, the verb *alaha-* and associated noun *alada/ehali-*. My new attempt at an analysis was inspired by recent work by Schürr (2008) and Christiansen (2011), who have presented arguments against the prevailing interpretation that include use of evidence from later Greek-language tomb inscriptions of Lycia. Analysis of Lycian texts in the nineteenth and first half of the twentieth century was performed largely based on such evidence, but the definitive identification of Lycian as an Anatolian Indo-European language related to Hittite and more closely to Luvian has in the last half century tended to privilege (sometimes excessively) inner-Anatolian comparisons in analyzing Lycian (a notable exception is Schweyer 2002). A holistic approach to interpreting Lycian texts using all relevant evidence obviously is called for.

THE PROBLEM: ALAHA- (VERB) AND ALADA/EHALI- (NOUN)

The Lycian verb *alaha-* is used mostly of an illicit action to be prohibited or punished, but there are some important exceptions to this generalization. The noun appears in several variants of a formula that is generally taken to refer to a payment made to the *mindis*, a body supposedly charged with supervising and guarding the necropoleis (but see below). According to a widespread view these terms refer to the act of burial: “arrange, lay out (for burial)”, as argued by Bryce (1976: 178-82). This interpretation is accepted by Schweyer (2002: 45-6) “arranger, preparer” and by Melchert (2004: 3). Similarly, Eichner (1993: 239) takes the verb as “beisetzen” and the noun as “Bestatter, Totengräber, Leichenbesorger, Grabaufseher”.

This interpretation has recently been challenged by Schürr (2008) and Christiansen (2011), who persuasively argue that the proposed sense is incompatible with the fact that the finite verb is attested (with a single exception) only in prohibitions and protases of curse formulas, but *never* in the positive prescriptions for burial (which use rather *hrppi ta-* “place upon” and *ñtepi ta-* “place within”). Further, the notion that the fees associated with *aladahali-* are paid for burial by the *mindis* is contradicted by the fact that the actual prescriptions for burial are never accompanied by fees (see Schürr 2008: 154).

Christiansen (2011) tentatively suggests “authorize” for the verb, comparing the use of $\sigma\upsilon\lambda\chi\omega\rho\eta\sigma\alpha\iota$ in a similar context in Greek-language tomb inscriptions of the Hellenistic period (see already Arkwright 1923: 21). Schürr (2008: 155) also endorses this interpretation for the prohibited action expressed by present third singular *alahadi*, but proposes (2008: 163) “stets beziehen” = “bring in, consult” (the *mindis*) for the plural

form *alahhāti* in just one text (TL 11 given as example (1) below)². He does not explain how the same verb can have such widely divergent meanings. He characterizes the noun *aladahali* as “eine förmliche Zusage in Bezug auf *alahha-*.” Finally, he assumes (2008: 163) still a third meaning “überwachen” for the infinitive *aladehxxāne*, which belongs to a stem **alahxxa-* that is manifestly derived from *alaha-* (thus with Eichner 1993: 239). Once again, we are not told how a derivative of “authorize; bring in” could come to mean “watch over, protect”. One does not expect the derived stem **alahxxa-* to have a meaning identical to that of *alaha-* (as noted already by Hajnal 1995: 117, note 130, the object of *aladehxxāne* is part of a tomb, not an occupant, as with *alahadi*), but the meaning of the derivative should be at least related to that of the base. Many verbs in many languages certainly do have different senses according to context, but these are always explainable starting from some common core meaning. To assign quite divergent interpretations to the different instances of *alaha-* and related forms is unacceptable. Any solution to the problem must show how the uses in different contexts are compatible with a *single* fundamental sense.

The sole basis for the proposed sense “bring in” (Schürr 2008: 155 and 161) is the following unique example:

(1) TL 11 (Pinarā)

1 *ebēññē prñnawā: m=ē=ti=prñnawatē: ddapssm̄ma: padr̄m̄mah tid[eimi]*
 this tomb conj.=it=refl. built Ddapssmma of P. son

2 *hrppi prñnezi: ehbi: urebillaha: tr̄m̄misñ: xñtewete ter[i]*
 for p. his Urebillaha Lycia ruled when

3 *arttum̄para: s=ē=t=alahhāti: miñti: adai: O-*
 Artumbara and=it=part. they a. *mindis ada* 10½

“Ddapssmma, son of Padrmma built this tomb for his household member Urebillaha when Artumbara ruled Lycia, and...”

Schürr (2008: 148) argues that since *adai* is dative singular, *miñti* cannot be dative singular, as usual in the *ada-* formulas. Since he correctly concludes (2008:155) that *miñti* is not the subject with a plural verb, he interprets the accusative singular clitic pronoun *-ē* as proleptic and *miñti* as the accusative direct object, hence “bring/call in”. This is certainly syntactically possible, but the pronoun may just as easily refer back in normal anaphoric fashion to the tomb, and *miñti* be a dative: “they shall a. it to the *mindis* for 10½ adas”. This example thus does not establish a meaning “bring in”, for which there is no other evidence.

Some attestations of the verb as a prohibited action are hardly interpretable as “authorize, assent”, as suggested by Arkwright, Christiansen, and Schürr:

(2) TL 102 (Limyra)

1 *ebēññē: xupā: m=ē=ti prñnawatē: sxxutrazi m=ēne: ñtepi tāti: sxxutrazi: se ladu: ehbi*
 2 *se tideimis: ehbi: ti=ñte: hri: alahadi: tike: tibe=ñte=ti: hrppi tadi: tike: me ttle-*

2. Schürr (2008: 155) takes the geminate *-hh-* of *alahhāti* as reflecting reduplication and thus an iterative sense. In view of the new example of the infinitive *aladahhāna* cited below equivalent to the dative noun *aladehali*, I find it doubtful that the geminate spelling of the *-hh-* has any functional value.

3 *iti puwa: aitāta: aṁmāma: qebelija: ēni: qlahi: ebij[e]hi p̄treñni: se=we: tubidi: pd- 4 ēxba*
 “Sxxutrazi built this tomb for himself. They shall place him inside, Sxxutrazi and his wife and his children. Whoever **alaha’s** in someone **above** or whoever puts someone in on top, they shall pay eight(?) *qebelija* goats(?) to the mother of the local sanctuary of P̄tre(?), and Pdēxba shall strike (him).”

A sense “authorize” is incompatible with the specification of physical position by the adverbs *ñte* and *hri*. The latter suggest rather a physical action. As we would predict, no such local specification ever appears with Greek *συνχωρήσαι* “assent, authorize” in the Hellenistic tomb inscriptions. That the Greek verb is based on the noun *χώρα* “space, place” is entirely irrelevant. The derived verb *χωρήσαι* and compounded *συνχωρήσαι* clearly come to mean “assent, authorize” via “give up one’s position to, give way, yield”. Nowhere does either mean “give a place to (someone else)”. A phrase “authorize/assent in/above” would be as strange in Greek or Lycian as in English.

Schürr (email of August 19, 2012) cites as evidence for the equation of *alaha-* and *συνχωρήσαι* a supposed parallel between the Lycian text TL 131 and the Greek tomb inscription TAM II 247: *se=ije=ti: eseri=tadi: tike xupa: ebehi: tibe=te: alahadi: [t]ike* “whoever deposits anyone in this tomb or *alaha’s* anyone” and ἄλλω δὲ οὐδενὶ ἔξεσται ἐν τῷ ἡρώω ταφῆναι οὔτε συνχωρήσαι τινὶ κατ’ οὐδένα τρόπον “it is not permitted to anyone else to bury in the heroon nor to authorize anyone else in any way”. However, I reject the parallel as inexact. First of all, while Lycian *alahadi* is used only of a prohibited action, the use of *συνχωρήσαι* in the cited text is actually very atypical. The term *συνχωρήσαι* and the corresponding noun are regularly used of the authorization made by the tomb builder or persons designated by the tomb builder (see the representative texts in Schwyer 2002: 220ff.). Furthermore, we would expect a verb meaning “assent, authorize” to occur at least once with a dependent infinitive describing the action authorized (see *συν[χ]ωρήσαι ἔτέρ[ω] ταφῆναι* “to authorize another to bury” in “Cyaneai 42”, Schwyer 2002: 242)³. Note finally the use of the local particle *-te* with *alahadi* in TL 131, another indicator that the action described by the verb is a physical one. The same applies to the following example:

(3) TL101 (Limyra)

1 *ebēñnē: xupā: m=e=ti: pr̄ñnawatē: za[h]ama: ddawāpartah*

2 *tideimi: me ñtepi tāti: za[h]āmā: se: ladā: se: tideimis: ehbi[s]*

3 *kbi: tike: ti ñtepi tadi: a[t]la[h]i: tibe: kbijehi*

4 *tibe=te: ala[h]adi ti: m=ene: mā[h]āi: tubeiti*

5 *wed[rēñ]ni*

“Zahama, son of Ddawāparta, built this tomb for himself. They shall put inside Zahama and (his) wife and his children. Whoever puts inside, or whoever **alaha’s**, someone else, his own or of someone else, the *w.* gods shall strike him.”

3. The real Lycian equivalent of Greek *συνχωρήσαι* is likely rather *mar-*. I had followed others (see the references in Neumann 2007: 194) in rendering this as “order, command” (Melchert 2004: 37), but the contexts of occurrence would be equally or more compatible with “authorizes”, as e.g. in TL 112, 3-4: *[ñ] t[e]=me=i [ala]-hadi: tike: tibe me=i: martti: td[i]ke kbi alade[h]ā[ne...]* “if one *alaha’s* anyone inside or gives authorization to *alaha-* anyone else...”

The same objections to “assent, authorize” apply to the second instance in example (4) below, which also contains the form *aladehxxāne*. Note that here *alahadi* is accompanied by the other local particle *-de* and again the adverb *ñte* “inside”. As suggested by Schürr (pers. comm.), the lack of an expressed object is probably due to the fact that the *alahadi* clause was at first forgotten, then added on after the curse formula, instead of in its proper place following *hrppi=(i)je=me=i: tadi: tike* “if one places someone upon (them)” (“or *alaha*’s (someone) herein”).

(4) TL 57 (Antiphellos)

3 *ebēñnē: xupu: m=e=ti: prñawatē: idamaxza: uherijeh*

4 *tideimi: hrppi ladi ehbi: se tideime: se=i pijētē*

5 *pijatu: miñti: ētri: xupu: sixli: aladehxxāne: se hrzzi*

6 *tupmme: sixla: hrzzi prñawi: me=i: ñtepi tāti*

7 *id[am]axzā: se l[adā ehbi s]e=[ije] n[e hrppi tā]ti tike*

8 *kbi: hrppi=(i)je=me=i: tadi: tike: m=ene: tubeiti: mähāi*

9 *huwedri: se itlehi: trm̄mili: ebi=d=alahadi=ti: ebei: ñte*

“Idamaxza, son of Uherije, built this tomb for his wife and children, and they gave a gift to the *mindis* to have/make the lower tomb *alaha*-ed for a shekel, and the upper one for two shekels. They shall place I. and his wife in the upper chamber, and they shall not place anyone else upon (them). If one places someone upon (them), all the gods shall strike him, and the Lycian *itlehi* - or whoever *alaha*’s herein.”

I must conclude that “authorize, assent” cannot be correct for the verb *alaha-*.

Crucial new evidence has now become available regarding the relationship of the verb and the noun *alada/ehali-*. Schürr (email of September 22, 2011) has kindly informed me that he has learned from Recai Tekoğlu that a new inscription of Patara has the infinitive *aladahhāna* in place of *aladahali* in a formula of the following type (see the other variants given by Schürr 2008: 148):

(5) TL 4: 3-5 (Telmessos)

se=d=i ñta=tadē tēsi miñti: aladehali: adē ||||

and=it=dat. in=put in pledge to *mindis* for *a. ada* 4

“And he has deposited in it for the *mindis* for (its) oath four *ada*’s for the *a.*”

Equation of the infinitive *aladahhāna* with the noun *aladahali* has important implications. First, the noun is an action noun (Neumann 2007: 9 and Schürr 2008: 163), not an agent noun (Hajnal 1995: 106⁸⁸ and 111¹⁰², Eichner 1993: 239, Melchert 2004: 3). Second, the noun must mean effectively the same as the infinitive (hence by the proposal of Arkwright, Christiansen, and Schürr “authorization, assent”). Substitution by the infinitive also clarifies the syntax of the formula: *aladahali* must be a dative-locative expressing the purpose of the fee paid.

This has further consequences: while Schürr (2008: 158-63) has defended the essence of the traditional view that the *mindis* is some kind of collective authority that supervises the necropoleis, Christiansen has expressed serious doubts about its existence. She argues that there is no hard evidence that the term refers to a group of human beings

and suggests “contract”, “bondage”, “legal agreement”, or the like. She finds it odd that such an important putative public institution would have totally disappeared by the Hellenistic period.

As to the latter point, I find it not at all surprising that the significant societal changes of the Achaemenid and then Hellenistic periods could have resulted in the demise of such a traditional institution. I point out that not only are references to the *mindis* almost totally lacking in the Hellenistic-era inscriptions, but also any references at all to the fee associated with the action *aladahali/ aladahhāna*. On the other hand, there is a widespread new kind of stipulation in the Hellenistic inscriptions: repeated reference to a possible reward for the act of “denunciation” (προσανγγέλλις and other terms): see the selection of texts in Schwyer 2002: 220ff. This new kind of provision (for which there is no equivalent in the Lycian texts) suggests that indeed the previous safeguards against violations no longer existed.

As to the place of *miñti*- in the Lycian texts themselves, it is true that in example (4) above (*pijētē pijatu: miñti: ētri: xupu: sixli: aladehxxāne*) one could interpret *miñti* as expressing the purpose of the gift, but that is already indicated by the following infinitive clause, and the absence of any recipient for the gift would be strange. Furthermore, now that we know that *aladahali* in the *ada* formula means “for *alaha*-ing” (= *aladahhāna*), we likewise need a recipient in that formula. And I see no reasonable candidate for that besides *miñti*. I also find implausible that the *marazija miñtaha* invoked as a punishing authority in the curse formula of TL 135, 2-3 (*s=ene teseti: tubeiti: trñmili s[e ma]r[az] i[ja]: miñt[ah]a*) could be merely “stipulations of the contract”. These are rather “the courts/judgments of the *mindis*”. In order to be efficacious, sanctioning authorities must be people (note that the punishing oaths are “of the Lycians”). The two references to the *mindis* in the Hellenistic inscriptions also clearly refer to people (see the discussion by Schürr 2008: 159-60). I therefore retain with Schürr the traditional view of the *mindis* as a collective human institution that supervised and guarded the necropoleis. For their oath to perform these duties they received the stated fees paid in *ada*'s.

In example (4) this relationship is expressed differently: *se=i pijētē pijatu: miñti: ētri: xupu: sixli: aladehxxāne: se hrzzi tupñme: sixla* “and they gave a gift to the *mindis* to have/make the lower tomb *alaha*-ed for a shekel, and the upper one for two shekels”.

Note crucially that only in this instance where the *derived* verb is used is the *mindis* the subject of the action. For that reason I assume that the sense is roughly “to have/make *alaha*-ed”, a meaning fully in order with the likely source of the suffix *-xa-* (see further below).

But just what action is expressed by *aladahali/ aladahhāna* (and *aladehxxāne*!) that involves a payment of a fee to the *mindis*? The fact that the basic verb *alaha-* most often refers to a prohibited action precludes that the associated noun and infinitives mean “guarding, watching over”. We need a basic meaning that can apply to both an authorized action involving a tomb, as in examples (1), (4), and (5), and an unauthorized action applied to persons in (2), (3), and (4). Use of local particles in both contexts - *te* in (1) and (3) and *-de* in the second instance of (4) - suggests physical action. A contribution is made to the *mindis* for the authorized action in (1), but I stress that the action itself is taken by the tomb owner or his representatives, while in (4) the gift is not given to the *mindis* to take the action on the tomb (*aladahhāna*), but to have the action taken

(*aladehxxāne*). Likewise in another important new variant of the *ada* formula, it is not the *mindis*, but someone else who takes the action:

(6) N334: 10-13 (Tlos; see for the text Tekoğlu 2002-2003:106)
 [s]e=j=aitē aw[a]hāi aladahali ada ||
 and=dat.=they made a.NPl a. ada's 2
 "And for it the *awaha*'s made the *aladahali*. Two *ada*'s."

I follow here the analysis of Schürr (2008: 157), who takes *aladahali* in this case as the accusative direct object of the verb and the *awaha*'s (*awahāi* is animate nominative plural) as agents/representatives of the *mindis*.

Since the *mindis* appears to be the recipient of the action in (1), a sense "transfer" seems appropriate: "they shall transfer it to the *mindis* for 10½ adas". That is, the tomb is transferred to its authority/protection, with a contribution for its services. The noun *alada/ehali* "transfer(ral)" in the frequent formula refers to this standard action: example (5) above thus means "And he has deposited in it for the *mindis* for (its) oath four *ada*'s for the transfer(ral)". Example (6) is then reasonably "And for it (the tomb) the *awaha*'s made the transfer(ral). Two *ada*'s." With Schürr, I take the last phrase as a stand-alone radical abbreviation of the usual formula "for the *mindis* for (its) oath X *ada*'s". Finally, in (4) *se=i pijētē pijatu: miñti: ētri: xupu: sixli: aladehxxāne: se hrzzi tupmme: sixla* "they gave a gift to the *mindis* to have the lower tomb transferred for a shekel and the upper one for two shekels".

I stress that "transfer(ral)" here emphatically does not refer to a change in ownership. The tomb surely remained the property of the tomb builder and designated heirs, who retained the right to decide who could and could not be buried in it, as well as the right to sell it. However, if we accept the traditional view that the *mindis* was some kind of human institution that had responsibility for supervising the necropoleis, then it is reasonable to suppose that upon the first use of a tomb it was in fact transferred to its care (for which it received a nominal fee). The situation would be entirely analogous to that in contemporary cemeteries, where a burial plot belongs to the family that purchased it, but responsibility for maintaining the cemetery and overall policies rests with the institution that manages it (public or private). The surviving family alone decides who may be buried in the plot, but typically the management does impose certain standards (such as minimal requirements regarding embalming or the nature of containers for those cremated, or limitations on the size and style of monuments).

On the other hand, in a legalistic desire to forestall every possibility, not only did the Lycians explicitly prohibit (new) burial of unauthorized persons in a tomb (*ñtepi ta-, hrppi ta-, ñte hrppi ta-*), but also the transfer from another tomb of someone already buried. In (4) the final prohibition is against *ebi=d=alahadi=ti: ebei: ñte* "or whoever transfers (anyone) herein". The variants in (2) and (3) are more and less precise respectively: *ti=ñte: hri: alahadi: tike* "whoever transfers someone in above" and *tibe=te: ala[h]adi ti* "or whoever transfers" (them, i.e. his own or someone else's from the previous clause).

Some readers may find such obsessiveness in precluding every imaginable kind of unauthorized burial hard to believe, but the obsessiveness of the Lycian tomb builders in this regard is there in the attested inscriptions. TL 112 cited in footnote 2 actually prohibits

the act of *alaha*-ing twice, in addition to the authorization to *alaha*-⁴. TL 118 prohibits placing someone on top of the authorized occupants, the act of *alaha*-ing, harm to the tomb, authorizing the act of *alaha*-ing, and later harm to the tomb a second time with a different word (*xtta* the first time, *mētē* the second). This inscription is unfortunately badly damaged, but it is likely that after a single line expressing the building of the tomb for its authorized occupants, the text continues with a full six lines of prohibited actions, the details of which escape us partly because of the damaged text, but partly because of unique vocabulary. This kind of legalistic “overkill” does not surprise anyone familiar with the phraseology of Hittite kings’ vassal treaties, which similarly seek to preclude any conceivable evasion of the terms imposed by numbing repetition and near-repetition of provisions. See for one example among many the even-numbered clauses §§20-38 of the Treaty of Tuthaliya II with Šunaššura of Kizzuwatna (Beckman 1996: 17-18). Anyone living in the United States in the twenty-first century will also recognize such language from real estate agreements or insurance policies. I therefore suggest that *alaha*- could refer in Lycian both to the authorized transfer of tombs to the care of the *mindis* and to the prohibited transfer of already buried persons from one tomb to another.

There is no lack of possible motivations for transferring already interred persons from one tomb to another. While many like to think of the dead as sacrosanct and not subject to being disturbed in their “final resting place”, disinterment and reburial of bodies is in fact commonplace in most western societies. As noted at the outset, Lycian tombs were built in advance by their intended occupants. It would be surprising if at least occasionally surviving members of a family did not have other ideas regarding who should be buried with whom, especially if relationships between members of families changed for the worse, and take action accordingly. We also know that the Lycian tombs varied markedly in their elaborateness and the prominence of their location. If a particular family died out (or moved to another place), there surely would have been temptation to move one’s own dead into superior quarters. I therefore do not find it implausible to suppose that Lycian tomb builders sought to forestall explicitly these very real possibilities, just as they prohibited unauthorized initial burials.

FORMAL ISSUES

As indicated above, the infinitive *aladehxxāne* presupposes a verb **alahxxa*- “have/make transferred”, derived from *alaha*- “transfer”. Eichner (1993: 239) laconically describes the derivation as “hethitisch gesprochen – °*ahh*-Ableitung”. This must be fundamentally correct, but it leaves serious problems of morphology and phonology unaddressed⁵. First of all, Hittite stems in *-ahh*- are factitives and thus denominative, reflecting PIE **-eh₂* (see Oettinger 1979: 455). A direct derivation of a verb **alahxxa*- from the verb *alaha*- is thus problematic. The same objection applies to the account (as stated) of Hajnal (1994: 184) of Lycian *zxxa*- “fight” as **d^zahá-* < **d^zahá-* or **d^zahāiō-* to the base seen in Hittite *zah(h)*- “strike”.

4. It is possible, but impossible to prove given the damage to the inscription, that these prohibitions were followed by a provision that “they shall transfer as many as Ahbalawija authorizes”.

5. I am indebted to Ms. Matilde Serangeli for reminding me of these issues after my presentation in Rouen.

Second, the regular Lycian reflex of the factitive suffix $*-eh_2$ is simply $-a-$, as in *prñnawa-* “build” from a virtual $*prñnoweh_2-$ (similarly Hajnal 1994: 149). Factitives in $*-eh_2-$ were originally “*hi*-verbs” (Oettinger 1979: 455, Jasanoff 2003: 139). In Lycian the original *hi*-inflection was replaced by *mi*-inflection of a stem *prñnawa-* plus “unlenited” endings, thus Pres3Sg *prñnawati*, Pret1Sg *prñnawaxā*, Pret3Sg *prñnawate/ē*. The variant $-a-$ instead of expected $*-ax-$ < $*-eh_2-$ arose in the first singular, where $*-eh_2-h_2e$ would have simplified to $*-axa$, analyzed then as stem $-a-$ + ending $-xa$, and in the second persons, where $*-eh_2-t+$ led to $*-a-t+$ ⁶. The paradigmatic alternation of $-a-$ ~ $*-ax-$ was leveled in favor of $-a-$, and the factitives transferred to the *mi*-conjugation (as they also were in Hittite). The point of this discussion is that one cannot derive the $-xxa-$ of $*alahxxa-$ directly from $*-eh_2-$, which could only produce $*-ax-$ or $-a-$.

A clue to the source of $-xa-$ is provided by the case of Milyan (Lycian B) *mrssxa-*, which must, whatever its precise sense in context, be related to Hittite *maršahh-* “desecrate; make deceitful” (thus with Carruba 1980: 291ff. and Shevoroshkin 1968: 483). A direct equation of the Milyan verb with the Hittite is again impossible for the reasons given above. However, there is also a Milyan noun *mrssxa-* “deceit, falsehood” or the like⁷. As established by Hajnal (1994), Lycian animate nouns in $-a-$ are highly productive, and we may in this instance suppose that the verb is derived from the noun, which itself is derived from the Lycian cognate of the Hittite verb: in entirely anachronistic terms $*mr_2seh_2-éh_2-$. Syncope of the medial syllable would lead regularly to *mrssxa-* (in Milyan $*s$ does not lead to *h* as in Lycian). We may likewise posit a similar noun $*zxxa-$ “fight”, derived in the same fashion from the base *zahh-* “strike”, base of the attested verb stem *zxxa-* “fight” (and *zxxaza-* “warrior”, denominative like *maraza-* “judge” < *mere-* “law”).

In Melchert (1989: 38) I derived Lycian *ha-* (Pres3Sg *hadī*) “release, let go” and Luvian *ša-* “idem” from a root $*seh_1-$ (followed by LIV²: 518). However, no other evidence establishes the laryngeal of this root as $*h_1$, and my positing of it was based on the false premise that a sequence $*-éh_2ti$ would not undergo “lenition” in Anatolian. As per footnote 5 above, a preform $*séh_2ti$ would in fact also lead to Lycian *hadī*⁸. We may therefore suppose that parallel to *mrssxa-* < $*mrsax-á-$ there was derived a noun $*alahax-á-$ “transfer(ral)” to the prehistoric verbal stem $*alahax-$ “transfer”. Syncope led regularly to $*alahxxa-$, and from the noun was derived our verbal stem $*alahxxa-$ “have/make transferred”, attested in the infinitive *aladehxxāne*⁹. The basic verbal stem $*alahax-$ “transfer” itself underwent regular further development to *alaha-*.

6. Loss of the laryngeal before stop is assured, contra Jasanoff (2003: 115 with note 59), as shown by the Luvian *mi*-verb *m(a)nāti* “sees” < $*mnéh_2ti$ (thus with Starke 1980: 147, contra Melchert 1994: 236 et passim). However, as the Luvian verb just cited shows, the long vowel resulting from the loss of the laryngeal did regularly “lenite” (or voice) a following dental stop. Unsurprisingly, in the factitive verbs of the *hi*-conjugation the regular unlenited endings with $-t-$ were restored (see Jasanoff 2003: 115 with note 59 on Cuneiform Luvian *tāta* “stood”).

7. TL 44d, 24: *me=te ne mrssxati urtuwāz: mar[āz]* “He shall not desecrate the great laws” (or sim.). TL 44d, 11-12: *me=pe ne tubidi: urtu: mrssxā: trqq[i]z* “Does not/will not the Storm-god strike the great deceit/falsehood?” (or sim.).

8. I repeat that we do not find “lenition” of the third person endings in the factitives in $*-eh_2-$ because they were originally *hi*-verbs.

9. Still to be solved is the problem of the appearance of the element $-de-$ (with umlaut also $-da-$) between the initial *ala-* and the verbal stem just in nominal forms (noun *alade/ahali-* and infinitives). One thinks

The basic sense of *ha-* is “release from the hand”, which seems appropriate for the meaning “transfer, hand over”. The precise semantic contribution of the initial *ala-* and its source are far from clear. The fact that in the nominal forms *-de-* can be inserted between *ala-* and the verbal stem suggests a univerbation of some kind. With considerable reserve I cite as a mere possibility that *ala-* might reflect a (virtual) allative **alyeh₂* “anderswohin/elsewhere, to another place”, which added to *ha-* “let go” would produce “transfer”. For a similar derivation of *ala-*, but false semantics and morphology see already Carruba 1970: 27-36¹⁰. While Lydian *ala-* “other” does assure that PIE **alyo-* survived into Anatolian, for obvious reasons I regard this etymology of Lycian *ala-* in *alaha-* as little more than speculation.

REFERENCES

- LIV²: H. Rix (ed.), *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*, Wiesbaden, 2001².
- ADIEGO 2007: I.-J. Adiego, *The Carian Language*, Leiden-Boston.
- ARKWRIGHT 1923: W. Arkwright, *Lycian Epitaphs*, in W. H. Buckler-W. M. Calder (eds.), *Anatolian Studies Presented to Sir William Mitchell Ramsay*, Manchester, 15-25.
- BECKMAN 1996: G. Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, Atlanta.
- BRYCE 1976: T. Bryce, *Burial Fees in the Lycian Sepulchral Inscriptions*, in *Anatolian Studies* 26, 175-90.
- CARRUBA 1970: O. Carruba, *Contributi al licio*, in *Studi micenei ed egeo-anatolici* 11, 27-42.
- 1980: O. Carruba, *Contributi al licio II*, in *Studi micenei ed egeo-anatolici* 22, 275-95.
- CHRISTIANSEN 2011: B. Christiansen, *Grave matters - Burial issues in Dynastic Lycia*, paper presented at the Eighth International Congress of Hittitology, Warsaw, Poland, 6 September, 2011.
- EICHNER 1993: H. Eichner, *Beiträge zur Interpretation lykischer Inschriften*, in J. Borchhardt - G. Dobesch (eds.), *Akten des II. Internationalen Lykien-Symposiums*. Wien, 6.-12. Mai 1990, Volume 2, Wien, 229-42.
- GUSMANI 1964: R. Gusmani, *Lydisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg.
- HAJNAL 1994: I. Hajnal, *Die lykischen a-Stämme: Zum Werdegang einer Nominalklasse*, in J. E. Rasmussen (ed.), *In honorem Holger Pedersen. Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 26. bis 28. März 1993 in Kopenhagen*, Wiesbaden, 135-71.
- 1995: I. Hajnal, *Der lykische Vokalismus*, Graz.
- HAWKINS 2000: J. D. Hawkins, *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*, Vol. 1, *Inscriptions of the Iron Age*, Berlin - New York.
- JASANOFF 2003: J. Jasanoff, *Hittite and the Indo-European Verb*, Oxford-New York.
- MEIER-BRÜGGER 2006: M. Meier-Brügger, *Zur Bildung von griechisch θεός*, in *Incontri Linguistici* 29, 119-25.

inevitably of the local particle *-de-* that co-occurs with the finite verb, but why it should be inserted into the nominal derivatives remains mysterious. Cf. Schürr (2008: 153).

10. Further comparison with Luvo-Hittite *allallā* (*pāi-*) “to desert; go over to the enemy” (cf. Eichner 1993: 239) is made unlikely by the use of *allallā-* to refer to a concrete place into which one may fall (KBo 13.260 iii 33-37).

- MELCHERT 1989: H. C. Melchert, *New Luvo-Lycian Isoglosses*, in *Historische Sprachforschung* 102, 23-45.
- 1994: H. C. Melchert, *Anatolian Historical Phonology*. Amsterdam-Atlanta.
- 2004: H. C. Melchert, *A Dictionary of the Lycian Language*. Boston-Ann Arbor.
- 2010: H. C. Melchert, *Further Thoughts on Carian Noun Inflection*, in R. van Bremen-J.-M. Carbon (eds.), *Hellenistic Karia. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Hellenistic Karia-Oxford, 29 June-2 July 2006*, Bordeaux, 177-86.
- NEUMANN 2007: G. Neumann, *Glossar des Lykischen. Überarbeitet und zum Druck gebracht von Johann Tischler*, Wiesbaden.
- OETTINGER 1979: N. Oettinger, *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbuns*, Nürnberg.
- SCHÜRR 2008: D. Schürr, *Zur Rolle der lykischen Mindis*, in *Kadmos* 47, 147-70.
- SCHWEYER 2002: A.-V. Schweyer, *Les Lyciens et la mort. Une étude d'histoire sociale*, Paris.
- SHEVOROSHKIN 1968: V. Shevoroshkin, *Zur hethitischen-luwischen Lexik*, in *Orbis* 17, 467-91.
- STARKE 1980: F. Starke, *Keilschriftluwisch manā^{ti} „sehen“, mammanna⁻ⁱ „schauen“*, in *Kadmos* 19, 142-8.
- TEKOĞLU 2002-2003: R. Tekoğlu, *Three New Lycian Inscriptions from Tlos and Asartaş*, in *Die Sprache* 43, 104-14.

GENRES ÉPIGRAPHIQUES
ET LANGUES
D'ATTESTATION FRAGMENTAIRE
DANS L'ESPACE MÉDITERRANÉEN

Sous la direction d'Emmanuel DUPRAZ
et de Wojciech SOWA

Le bassin méditerranéen est au I^{er} millénaire avant notre ère un espace multilingue dans lequel sont documentées de nombreuses traditions épigraphiques différentes. Cependant la pauvreté de la plupart de ces nombreux corpus représente une grave difficulté pour l'étude des langues correspondantes. La perspective choisie dans le présent volume s'attache à une donnée souvent négligée dans l'analyse des langues d'attestation fragmentaire : chaque corpus présente non seulement un nombre réduit de textes, mais aussi un nombre réduit de genres de textes, définis comme l'emploi de supports matériels précis pour l'écriture d'un message structuré d'une manière précise, l'association des deux obéissant à une visée communicative précise auprès d'un public escompté précis. La relative fixité de l'association entre support, texte, lectorat et acte de langage permet des interprétations pluridisciplinaires, qui permettent des conclusions plus riches que la simple analyse d'éléments isolés. Ces recherches peuvent combiner des méthodes étymologiques, onomastiques, archéologiques, épigraphiques. À son tour, l'étude des habitus documentés pour chaque langue est susceptible d'aboutir à des hypothèses significatives sur les transferts entre cultures et sur la typologie des inscriptions à l'échelle de l'ensemble du bassin méditerranéen.

Ont collaboré à l'ouvrage : Ignasi-Xavier Adiego, Manuela Anelli, Francisco Beltrán Lloris, Dominique Briquel, Emmanuel Dupraz, María José Estarán Tolosa, José Luis García Ramón, Joaquín Gorrochategui, Marie-Laurence Haack, Katherine McDonald, Barbora Machajdčíková, Gerhard Meiser, H. Craig Melchert, Sophie Minon, Marta Muscariello, Paolo Poccetti, Giovanna Rocca, Coline Ruiz Darasse, Giulia Sarullo, Matilde Serangeli, Wojciech Sowa, José M. Vallejo et Sabine Ziegler.

PRESSES UNIVERSITAIRES DE ROUEN ET DU HAVRE


ISSN collection : 2117-7880

ISSN série : 2119-9329

ISBN : 979-10-240-0424-2

 UNIVERSITÉ
DE ROUEN

 ÉRIAC

28 € 9  791024 004242