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1. Introduction

Reading, word-formation and etymology of the Lycian personal name Trbbẽnime/i- are still unclear. Besides Eichner’s interpretation as ‘Re°natus’ from *Trbh(i)°(a)nimi, which is based on his reconstruction of a possible original reading Trbbãnimi, no further proposal has been advanced.¹

The goal of this paper is twofold. First, I will present and discuss the problems concerning the reading of this name and the identification of its bearer(s) in the Lycian documentation (§2). Second, I will suggest a new interpretation for this name based on the more diffused reading Trbbẽnimi, which was no doubt the name of a ruler living in ca. 430 BC for which no variant Trbbãnimi is attested, and which must be separated from a later figure bearing the same name that shows a variant Trbbãnimi. In my view, this new etymology fits better the military class to which both Lycian individuals belong, and, more importantly, it allows us to identify cognates for both elements of the compound in Lycian as well as in other Anatolian languages (§3.1–2). Last but not least, the combination of the elements of the compound finds parallels in both composition and phraseology outside Anatolian (§3.3). All this would suggest that Trbbẽnimi may be an Anatolian creation based on a well-known Indo-European compositional structure and a diffused semantic pattern. Future studies on the topic may offer further parallels from other Indo-European branches (§4).

2. Lycian Trbbẽnimi and Trbbãnimi

The earliest attestations of the personal name Trbbẽnimi date back to the Xanthos Stele (TL 44a.44, 44b.111): a ruler of Limyra bearing this name is mentioned in the context of the 430/429

¹ The personal name Trbbẽnime/i- and its variant Trbbãnime/i- will be written Trbbẽnimi and Trbbãnimi unless the indication of the i-mutation will be relevant to explain the hypothesis advanced in this paper. All translations are mine unless otherwise noted. I follow the standard abbreviations: PN for personal name, DN for divine name, GN for geographical name.
BC military campaign led by the *strategos* Melesandros against the anti-Athenian coalition in Lycia, in which the Athenians were defeated (Thuc. 2.69). The name *Trbbẽnimi* also occurs in the epitaphs of Xuwata (TL 135.1) and, in its variant *Trbbẽnimi*, of Krustti (TL 128.1) from Limyra, in which the grave owners are defined as ‘*tideri* of *T*’, i.e., they are related to a certain *Trbbẽnimi* by a relationship of some kind. In the same period, i.e. the first quarter of the 4th c. BC, a ruler named *Trbbẽnimi* issued several coins in Limyra (*T. zēmuho<9> / zēm ‘Zemuri (= Limyra)’). This *Trbbẽnimi* may be the predecessor of Perikle<5> or even contemporaneous with him and may be the same mentioned in the two epitaphs.<6>

Besides *Trbbẽnimi/Trbbẽnemī*, which always occur either with the sign ✶ <ã> or its variant ✷ attested only on coins, there is evidence for a third form, *Trbbẽnimi*, which has been suggested for ten coins so far and which is written with the signs ✶ and ✷, i.e. variants of <ã>.-<7> Both signs for <ã> are known from inscriptions that are contemporaneous with the coins issued by the mint of *Trbbẽnimi*, and they occur interchangeably in the first decade of the 4th c. BC in the same inscription (N 325) or later even in the same word (N 320, 337 BC).<8> The variant ✶ disappeared shortly

---

2 Whether he participated in this campaign on the Lycian or rather Greek side remains unclear. The question rests basically on the interpretation of *Trbbẽnimi* as a nominative or accusative singular, and of the word *terā* as an accusative singular meaning ‘army’ (Deecke 1889, 186–187) or ‘field’ (Pedersen 1945, 49–50), or rather as a temporal conjunction ‘when’ as proposed by D. Sasseville elsewhere in this volume. As a consequence, the standard view sees *Trbbẽnimi* as responsible for the Athenian defeat, while according to Sasseville’s interpretation *Trbbẽnimi* would rather be an ally of the Athenian *strategos* Melesandros. Should the latter interpretation prove correct, it would profoundly change *Trbbẽnimi*’s role in that campaign and Limyra’s role in the Peloponnesian War overall: *xbane : ese : trbbẽnimi : tebete : terā se milasāṭtrā : pddên(e) eke : xbânije : izredi ehbijedi : hātahe “Als er Trbbẽnimi und Melesandros in Kyaneai auf dem kyaneischen Flachland mit eigenen Händen in Ehre des Kriegsgottes besiegte” TL 44a.44–46 (transl. D. Sasseville).

3 The word *tideri/-i* most likely means ‘*collacteus* from *tide*’ and **‘are/-i’ (with Neumann 1993, 37–38). However, this does not mean automatically that we are dealing with foster-brothers *(vel sim.*) or more in general with individuals who have been fed by the same woman. One should bear in mind that it is not uncommon, nowadays just like in antiquity, to use kinship terminology to define social groups of different kinds; see, e.g., English *confraternity* that for sure does not indicate any sort of kinship relationship. Thus, the expression ‘*collacteus of T*’ does not speak automatically for kinship ties nor does it offer a chronological frame for the life period of the *Trbbẽnimi* mentioned in these two inscriptions.

4 Coins: *Trbbẽnemī* M 143, *Trbbẽnemī* (apocopated), *Trbbẽn / trb* (shortened) in M 142 b, M 144 a; as ruler of Limyra (with *zēmuho<9> or zēm ‘Zemuri’) M 142a–b, M 144a. As for the reading of the name *Trbbẽnemī* as *Trbbẽnimi* in M 141 a–j see the discussion below in this paper.

5 Rix 2015, 77.

6 The kind of relationship between the two is unclear. For a kinship relationship see Landskron 2015, 353, 376 with previous literature. In fact, it seems conceivable that they were chronologically closer than previously thought. First, they likely shared the same mint: three planchets have been re-struck on coins from Cyprus, and have been used to strike coins for both *Trbbẽnemī* and *Perikle*. Second, a single die seems to have struck in the same period coins of both *Trbbẽnemī* and *Perikle*, thus without having been used with a precise chronological succession. This suggests that they might have been contemporaneous to each other although the implications of such a possibility are not clear (Vismara 2018, esp. 30, who adds two specimens from the antiquities market that were likely struck by the same pair of dies of the Podalia Hoard identified by Olçay – Mørkholm 1971, d9–p17 nos. 192–219).

7 So far, ✷ has been attested only on six coins of different provenience, while ✶ is attested on four coins from private collections; see Babelon 1910, 323 (No. 475) for the former, and single examples from private collections for both the former and the latter group (Anelli 2019, 55–56 with fig. 5 and 6). Possibly, a group of third staters from the Podalia Hoard issued by Trbbẽnemi himself should be added to the group with ✷ <ã>, for which initially a reading ✷ <ã> was suggested. The different letter used for the expected <ã>, in this group was already noted by Olçay – Mørkholm 1971, 9 nos. 157–253 (= M 141a–j), but later omitted in Markholm – Neumann 1978, 32 and n. 141c. This explains why no Lycian dictionary nowadays mentions it. The question has been revived by Eichner 1983, 50 n. 10 who first suggested a reading <ã> with a phonetic value for it, most recently followed by Anelli 2019, 62. His reading has been also taken in consideration by Vismara 2018, esp. 30, who adds two specimens from the antiquities market that were likely struck by the same pair of dies of the Podalia Hoard identified by Olçay – Markholm 1971, d9–p17 nos. 192–219.

8 Adiego 2012, 94.
after, with \( \Psi \) becoming in the second part of the 4\(^{\text{th}}\) c. BC the only sign for <ã>. Thus, it seems difficult to deny that a form \( \text{Trbbãnimi} \) besides \( \text{Trbbēnimi} \) did exist.\(^9\) It follows that both \( \text{Trbbēnimi} \) and \( \text{Trbbãnimi} \) were attested at the beginning of the 4\(^{\text{th}}\) c. BC, although \( \text{Trbbēnimi} \) only on coins and in alternation with the more diffused \( \text{Trbbēnimi} \).

Two main issues remain open: whether the ruler mentioned in the Xanthos Stele is the same individual as the ruler of Limyra that issued coins at the beginning of the 4\(^{\text{th}}\) c. BC, and whether we are dealing with a phonetic variant of the same personal name.

As for the first issue, the ruler mentioned in the Xanthos Stele and the one attested on coins are most likely two different individuals: the Greco-Lycian campaign (430/429 BC) and the coins’ issue (ca. 400-375 BC) are quite distant in time from each other. In that case, only the second \( \text{Trbbēnimi} \) issued coins, since its production is typologically and technically so uniform that it does not suggest two different issuing authorities.\(^11\) However, this consideration is surely valid for those coins for which it can be established whether they have been struck by the same mint. Instead, our poor knowledge of other coins bearing this name does not allow us to establish that.

A thorough numismatic analysis of the whole group of coins of \( \text{Trbbēnimi}/\text{Trbbãnimi} \) remains therefore a desideratum. This is an extremely important point, in my view, because this could shed a different light on the distribution of \( \text{Trbbēnimi} \) and \( \text{Trbbãnimi} \) on coins issued by the same person. This leads us to the second issue, which is trickier. Different from the variants \( \text{Trbbēnimi}/\text{Trbbãnemi} \), which may be explained easily by vowel assimilation, to my knowledge \( \text{Trbbãnimi} \) cannot be explained from \( \text{Trbbēnimi} \) by any Lycian phonetic rule.\(^12\) In order to explain these data at least three scenarios are possible.

First, since \( \Upsilon <\varepsilon > \) and \( \Psi <\alpha > \) have an extremely similar shape and also indicate similar sounds (nasalised vowels), the two signs may have been confused and, at some point, used interchangeably. Later, for this reason, this name might have been occasionally written with the variant \( \varsigma \), which most likely shares its origin with \( \Upsilon \), both developing from \( \Psi \).\(^13\) I consider this a conceivable possibility, but I am not aware of any parallel in Lycian that may validate such a confusion: most of \( <\alpha >/ <\varepsilon > \) alternations may be explained in terms of umlaut. However, some of them have instead no clear explanation, for which see the discussion below.\(^14\)

This leads us to the second scenario. If the alternation is to be explained in terms of umlaut, then \( \text{Trbbãnimi} \) would be the original form. \( \text{Trbbēnimi} \) would reflect an umlauted form with shift from \( /\alpha _n\_i/ \) to \( /\varepsilon _n\_i/ \) as cautiously suggested by Eichner.\(^15\) Most recently, Anelli remarked this possibility,\(^16\) after her identification of new coins with both <ã> variants (see above in this paragraph and n. 7). Eichner advanced the hypothesis that \( \text{Trbbēnimi} \) may be a compound consisting of a preverb or preposition \( \text{trbb}^{(\ell)} \) ‘against, re-’ as its first element and \( \text{ênime/i} \) from \( \text{ânime/i} \), i.e. a participle of a postulated Lycian verb \( ^*\text{ani}j\text{-}a \), as its second element. As cognates to Lyc. \( ^*\text{ani}j\text{-}a \)- he mentions Hitt. \( \text{an}^{(\ell)}\text{-}\text{ma} \) ‘to work; to carry out, to produce’ and Luw. \( \text{an}^{(\ell)}\text{i}^{(\ell)}\text{a} \)- ‘id.’.\(^17\) Based on this analysis,

---

9 Rix 2015, 85.
10 With Anelli 2019.
11 Vismara 2018, 30 n. 17.
12 Lyc. DN \( \text{Trbbámara} \) is the only other case in which \( \text{trbbē}^\circ \) becomes \( \text{trbba}^\circ \), but this is due to assimilation to the following /a/.
13 From \( \varsigma \), for which see Rix 2015, 85, 93. Moreover, both variants of <ã> apparently developed in those decades, thus maybe incrementing the confusion.
14 A purely graphic variant would require that <ã> and <ε> alternate in Lycian in the same word both reflecting the same phonetic value.
15 Eichner 1983, 50.
16 Anelli 2019, esp. 62.
17 See Kloekhorst 2008, 179–181 for an overview of the unclear aspects of the reconstruction of these forms like the origin of the double nasal (contra the explanation by means of Cop’s Law in Melchert 1993, 17) and the colour of the laryngeal \( ^*\text{h}_j/\text{h} \_j \) in case it is cognate with Lat. \( \text{onus} \) ‘load’ and Skr. \( \text{á} \text{n} \quad \text{ā} \text{s} \)- ‘cart’. For
Eichner interprets Trbbēnimi as ‘the reborn one’, comparing Lat. Re°natus. Tentatively, the Lycian GN Trebenna could be added to this group: it would reflect the same structure as Trbbēnimi and it could mean ‘the re-built (scil. place)’,18 but see below for further considerations on this name.

Although Eichner’s interpretation is attractive, a Lycian verb *anije- remains unattested. Furthermore, neither do the corresponding Luwian and Hittite forms mean ‘to give birth’ nor does any Anatolian language show any parallel for the meaning ‘re-nasci’.19 That being said, we may turn to other directions.

We might consider the possibility that the alternance Trbbēnimi/Trbbãnimi may not be due to umlaut /a_i/ > /e_i/. Different from other types of umlaut attested in Lycian, this one does not show any consistent pattern, as it does not appear in several nominal and verbal forms where we would expect it. This difference is usually explained as a strategy to maintain the morphological intelligibility of a given paradigm, as is the case with the genitival adjective nom. sg. Malijahi (TL44c.5) and not *Malijehi from the divine name Malija ‘Athena’. However, this may also be the result of a restitution process, as was already briefly suggested by Hajnal.20 Either way, both features have been put in connection with its later appearance in Lycian if compared with other more established Lycian umlaut types.21 In my view, these factors open the discussion for further considerations: if this umlaut was not consistent, and e/i-forms could in some cases have been changed back to a/i-forms, one could doubt whether all Lycian a/i- and e/i-pairs should be defined as real umlauted forms. Only a study of the oscillation between the signs <a>/<ã> and <e>/<ẽ> and their phonetic correspondences on inscriptions and coins (together with the identification of the mint for all coins), as well as a thorough study of the Lycian umlaut types could shed some light on this topic. On this occasion, I will limit myself to mention those aspects that, in my view, should be treated more accurately before assuming that the oscillation Trbbēnimi/Trbbãnimi must be the result of e/i-umlaut.

As suggested above, it is not unthinkable that the signs for <ẽ> and <ã> were confused, as the two nasal sounds may overlap in pronunciation. This is possibly reflected, too, in Greek renderings of this name, which show both <ẽ> and <η> for Lyc. <ẽ> and <ã>,22 whereas Lyc. <a> mostly corresponds to Gk. <α> (and in some cases <ο>). However, Lycian <a> is also rendered with <η>, especially in those cases in which Lyc. /a/ originates from *-eh1 and, therefore, most likely reflects [æ] (see, e.g., 3.sg. tadi from the verb ta- ‘to put’ from PIE *dêh₁-). Furthermore, hypercorrected forms cannot be excluded either, since a restitution process for the e/i-forms is conceivable – although far from being assured. Following this possibility, cases like the name Trbbãmara from Trbbeõmara (with ‘mara from mere- ‘law’) might have influenced the restitution of <ã>- in Trbbã*nimi. Last but not least, if this is commonly accepted as a more recent umlaut, it seems to me difficult to explain the possible relationship between Trbbēnimi/Trbbãnimi and the place name Trebenna. Following Eichner’s hypothesis on Trbbãnimi, the only possible reconstruction for Trebenna seems to me the following: The first element of the compound would show a vocalisation treb(i)ₐ (instead of Trbb(i)ᵣ), which most likely speaks for a different accentuation that in turn may also explain the second element of the compound by means of a double syncope. Then,

---

18 Heiner Eichner, pers. comm.
19 Compare the occurrences in HED 1, 66–71 and the semantic analysis in Kloekhorst 2008, 179. A meaning ‘to plant (a seed)’ does occur with vegetables (HED 1, 66).
20 Hajnal 1995, 89.
21 Hajnal 1995, 81–89.
22 See Greek (Lycia) Τρέβημις, Τρἐβεμις, Τρἐβημις, Τερβῆμις (KPN §1600-4, 5, 7, 8) (~ Pisid. Terbemi Abydos, Egypt), Τρεβῆς (KPN §1600-10). It is of some interest that precisely the Greek name Μελήσανδρος (see above §2) is rendered in Lycian as Milasãñtra, that is with <a>; however, note that this is a Greek and not a Lycian name.
the assimilation of the two nasals would have occurred. This means that the second element of the compound, if related with Trbbēnimi, should be reconstructed as follows: *°anma < *°anima < *°anijaama. The main problem, besides the double syncope, is that we should assume that the e/i-umlaut has occurred quite early in order to justify the syncope. Unfortunately, this is exactly the opposite of what one would expect from a late umlaut like this one.\(^{23}\) Instead, if we think of Trebenna as having a first element trebe\(^{8}\) without any umlaut, the reconstruction seems more consistent with our knowledge of this specific umlaut.

That being said, too many aspects are still uncertain to assume that the existence of a variant Trbbēnimi excludes that Trbbēnimi is the original form of this name. In the next paragraph, I will suggest this possible alternative scenario, i.e. that Trbbēnimi is the original form. I will put forward a new interpretation for it as ‘(the one) who sends (troops) against (the enemy)’ or ‘(the one) who turns himself against (the enemy/toward the battle)’. This etymological interpretation seems preferable: not only are the elements of the compound independently attested in Lycian but the collocation that may be reflected in Trbbēnimi is well attested in the Hittite phraseology; moreover, the semantic pattern on which this personal name is built occurs outside the Anatolian branch, as shown by synonymous roots and parallel compositional structures.

3. A new etymology

Lyc. Trbbēnime/i- might be analysed as Trbbēnime/i-, a compound with the preverb/preposition Lyc. trbbi/trbbē ‘against’ as its first element and an *-Vime/i-participle as its second element. The second element *nime/i could be the syncopated form of an unattested Lycian participle *nijeme/i. For a parallel syncope see *nime/i from pipe- ‘to give’, frequently employed in the Anatolian onomastics.\(^{24}\) Furthermore, on the one hand Lyc. *nijeme/i intuitively recalls Lyc. B nēnijeti, which may be the 3\(^{rd}\) sg. of a verb nēnijē-, i.e. likely the corresponding reduplicated form of the unattested base verb of *nijeme/i. On the other hand, Lyc. B nēnijē- may be a cognate of Hitt. nanna-/nanni-bbi ‘to drive’ and tentatively also of CLuw. nanna- (meaning unclear), and nana- ‘to lead’;\(^{25}\) which may, in turn, represent the reduplicated form of Hitt. nē/ni- ‘to send, to turn (someone/something), to turn oneself’ from PIE *neiH- ‘to lead’.\(^{26}\) Based on these data, two scenarios will be presented in §3.1–2: first, Trbbēnimi may originate from ‘who sends/turns X against Y’ (transitive), whence a possible interpretation as ‘(the one) who sends/turns X (e.g. the army/people) against Y (e.g. the enemy)’; second, it might hide a meaning ‘(the one) who turns (himself) against (scil. someone else)’ (intransitive), hence ‘who turns (himself) against (e.g., the enemy)’. As often mentioned above in this paper, both the Trbbēnimi of the Xanthos Stele and the one who issued coins a few decades later were rulers. This means that both belong to a sort of military aristocracy, for which such a name seems conceivable to me.

As a general remark, note that: (a) a preposition or a preverb as the first element of a compound is well-attested in the Lycian onomastics, see Epřišuxa, Hrišiňma, Hrppiśduba; (b) the combination of a preverb with an adjective or a past participle is well-attested in other Anatolian languages as well; see Lyc. Unuwe/i- ‘well regarded’ TL 62.1,\(^{27}\) and possibly also Car. Šaruxul- ‘super-/hyper-blessed’\(^{28}\) and Cib. Ἀρραμίς < *ser-uqammi-2 ‘highly regarded’.\(^{29}\)

\(^{23}\) See the same explanation for similar cases offered by Hajnal 1995, 82–83.

\(^{24}\) On this possibility see briefly already Neumann 2007, 372.


\(^{26}\) LIV\(^{4}\) 450–451.

\(^{27}\) Schürr 2009, 104.

\(^{28}\) For the form see Adiego 2007, 418, 431.

\(^{29}\) Schürr 2009, 100. As regards the Carian PN, a meaning ‘super-/hyper-blessed’ suggested by Melchert 2013, 42 is not supported by textual evidence, for which see Simon 2020. The abbreviation Cib. is used here for Cibyratis.
3.1 First element of the compound: trbbē

Lyc. trbbē “against” (most likely not trbbi in this case)\(^{30}\) is attested in the Lycian DN Trbbamara *1law against X* → ‘prohibition’ (umlaut e_a > a_a), where *mara-* is the result of umlaut from mere-* ‘law’, and probably also in PN Trbbule, for which see the Greek corresponding Τρεβε-λυσις.\(^{31}\)

Formally, both Lyc. trbbi (2×) and trbbẽ (1×, TL 44a.23) may be prepositions reflecting different cases of a root noun *trep-* ‘step’. Lyc. trbbi might reflect loc. sg. *trepi*, for which compare HLuw. tarpi ‘against, aggressively’; Lyc. trbbẽ, possibly an endingless loc. *trep-en-Ø, for which one may compare HLuw. tarpa (1×).\(^{32}\) It is also possible, on a Luwic level, that trbbẽ reflects *trbbe* + en, that is, a compound with *en(i) ‘in’ as second element, as has been recently proposed for the Lycian local adverb pddẽ ‘in front, before’ that is a functional equivalent of Hitt. pēran and Luw. parran(n)i and for ñtewẽ ‘opposite, against’.\(^{33}\) Following this reconstruction trbbe° would represent a dative or a locative in -e, for which compare the s-stem dative in -e of unclear origin (see, e.g., tehluse of unclear meaning).

Help in defining the semantics of Lyc. trbbi is offered by comparing the following two passages. In the first passage trbbi appears together with the accusative atânás ‘Athens’ meaning ‘against Athens’.\(^{34}\)

\[\text{TL 44c.3} \]
\[
\text{trbbi: atânás: zxxâte: terñ} \\
\text{‘when they battled against Athens’}
\]

In the second passage, the verb trbbe-* ‘to oppose, to take up arms against’ appears in a very similar context:\(^{35}\)

\[\text{TL 44a.53–55} \]
\[
\text{‘when he went (*made a step?) against Turaxssi at Mykale in front of Samos to launch the battle and to defeat Amorges hâtahe’}\(^{36}\)

The comparison between these two passages is significant because Lyc. trbbi/trbbẽ is etymologically related to the verb trbbe-. The latter belongs to a group of Lycian verbs that may be traced back to PIE *trep- ‘to step’ or *trep- ‘to turn’, although both formal and semantic aspects are still controversial. In what follows I rely on resource to our purpose:\(^{37}\)

\(^{30}\) A form trbbi ‘id.’ is unlikely here since an umlaut *i_a > e_a is unattested in Lycian (pace Neumann 1979b, 262).

\(^{31}\) KPN §1600-2; Neumann 1979a, 25; 1979b, 262; Melchert 2004, 69.

\(^{32}\) As a possible parallel, see Lyc. A epn ‘behind, afterwards’ and epi ‘above, upon’ that may reflect an endingless locative *h_op-(e)n-Ø and a locative *h_op(i), respectively; cf. HLuw. aan (see adv. POST-na versus POST-ni ‘in future, afterwards’), Hitt. āppan ‘afterwards’ (García Ramón 2012, 66). Tentatively, another cognate may be identified in Lyc. B epe(*) ‘back, backwards’ (1×, TL 55.5), for which see Hitt. āppa, from the instrumental *h_op-oh_.


\(^{34}\) And not a postposition with gen., pace Neumann 2007, 372. Compare also trbbi: trusñ ‘against Trysa’ TL 44b.15, showing the same function (Eichner 1993, 145 n. 131).

\(^{35}\) I tentatively accept the suggestion of Sasseville (in this volume) to interpret terñ ‘when’ as a conjunction. Should the previous interpretation of terñ as ‘field’ be proven correct, my interpretation of trbbe- would work anyway. See above n. 2.

\(^{36}\) Pace Schürr 1998, 154 (trbbe or trbbẽi ‘support’ [with a positive meaning]).

\(^{37}\) For details on the following Lycian verbal formations see Serangeli 2018, 132–133, 185–187. See also the recent verbal classification by Sasseville 2020, 234–235, 377–378.
(a) *trbb- ‘to step, stand (up) (against), destroy’ (root-verb, consonant class): TL 44c.37 laKra: *trbbâi: Xeriga ‘Steinmale’ stürzt Xeriga um’;38 TL 44d.27 muni: *trbbâi: tahstuwdâi: mëmrezi: *trppali ‘and he steps against the *trppali of the mëmrezi’;

(b) tarb(e)i: ‘to take a step (against sb./sth.)’ → *to attack (sb.), to defeat (sb.)’ (eji-class, with lenition),39 see 3sg. pret. tarbide (1×), transitive (acc.sg. tlân ‘Tlos’): TL 44a.46–47 pddê=n=ekte: xebê[n]ije: izrêdi ehibijêdi: håtahe: tîn nele: nele: tarbide ‘and (he) tarbide (defeated?) Tlos at any place with his troops (of the hand-to-hand-fight)’ in front of the eki, the Kyanean håtahe’;40

(c) *trbb(e)i- ‘to step against/to act as an enemy’ → ‘to be hostile (to sb.)’ (intransitive, see the dat.-loc. pl. esbête in the passage below), tentatively a denominative derived from *trbbe ‘enemy’, for which see below in this paragraph.41 This verb is attested only once and in a very obscure passage; any translation is, therefore, provisional. However, trbbeite is clearly recognizable as a verb: se dđewe: sttati m ê urublijê: mei ti: pûweti: azzala: dđeu trbbeite mê: esbête: xêtwatêdi: unabannme ‘and a dđewe stands as a memorial/monument and on it azzala inscribes, how they trbbeite (were hostile to)’ the unabannme riders/heroes together with the king’ (TL 44c.9–10);42


It may be noticed that double verbal formations like Lyc. trbbe, trbbei ‘to step (against someone)’ are very common in Anatolian: see the corresponding Luwian double formations tarpa and tarpanalli ‘to clump, step (on)’ (neutral meaning), and compare as double formation HLuw. tarzi ~ tarzi ‘to turn’.44

As for nominal forms, an adjective trbbeli ‘hostile’ (TL 65.11, N324.12) is also attested; following Diether Schürr see also the collective TL 106.2, 131.5 tawa trbbala hati ‘they shall cast eyes on’.45 In my view, trbbeli- may be a derivative of an estem *trbbei ‘enemy’ of which both trbbi and trbbê might be fossilized case forms (see above §2).

However, it is also possible that all these verbal forms go back to PIE *trep- ‘to turn’ since both semantics and morphology are not decisive to make a distinction between *trep- ‘to step’ and *trep- ‘to turn’. The Lycian verbs mentioned right above would then be explained as follows: Lyc. trbb- *‘one overturns X (i.e., the stones)’ → *‘one destroys X’, tarb(e)i- * ‘one turns to attack’, *‘one turns back → one defeats (the troops), *trbb(e)i- * ‘one turns on someone’ → ‘one becomes hostile’. Compare CLuw. tarpanalli- ‘ritual substitute’ (from *the one that turns away [evil]), but also ‘turncoat’, ‘rebel’.46 In that case, it seems conceivable that HLuw. tarpa ‘to plough’ and

---

38 Eichner 1993, 145.
39 It is maybe a causative/iterative form *trep-ê/e/o- (with a-anaptyxis, Hajnal 1995, 146), type CoC-ê/e/o- → CoC-ê/e/o-.
40 Reading as pddê=n=ekte and interpretation of pddê as ‘in front of’ by Schürr 2010, 152.
41 Type C(o)C-e-jê/o- → C(o)C-ê/e/o-, cf. Olnd. denom. *-a-yâti → *-âyati after the iteratives.
42 It may be noted that only the verbal form trbbeite is in the preterite. Therefore, it may be suggested that the narration of past events written on the stele begins with trbbeite, see TL 44c.9 dđewe sttati mê versus TL 44c.10 dđeu trbbeite mê.
43 This formation remains unclear. Tentatively, a stative Proto-Anat. *trêp-ô-< IE *trêp-or → them. trbb-e-te (Hajnal 1995, 146).
45 Melchert 2004, 69.
46 By either etymology, it should be noted that *r,p becomes *r,b[v] in Lycian. I thank H. Craig Melchert (pers. comm.) for this point and for the fruitful discussion on the two roots *trep-.
47 Morpurgo Davies 1986.
maybe *tarpai ‘to substitute’ (and iter. *tarpasša ‘to substitute’\textsuperscript{48}) continues PIE *trep ‘to turn’ too, for which compare Hitt. *terip\textsuperscript{ṃi} ‘to plough’, OInd TRAP ‘be ashamed’, Gk. τρέπω, Lat. *trepō ‘turn’.

This would imply that both Indo-European roots (*trep ‘to step’, *trep ‘to turn’) were attested in the Luwic languages, but that they would be phonetically indistinguishable. Either way, a meaning ‘against’ for Lyc. *trbbi/*trbbē may be taken as certain.\textsuperscript{49}

### 3.2 Second element of the compound: *nimi-

Lyc. *nimii/*nemii is attested a few times in the Lycian onomastics: see PN *Tuti*nimi (TL 122)\textsuperscript{50} with first element *tuti̯i\textsuperscript{c}, cf. HLuw. *Tutaya- (\textit{DEUS}tutaiasa, JISR EL HADID line 2)\textsuperscript{51} as well as *Xluwā*nimi (TL 67.1)\textsuperscript{52} with first element *xluwā\textsuperscript{c}; cf. Hitt. *Halwa\textsuperscript{ziti}\textsuperscript{,}\textsuperscript{53} see *κλαο in ÎΔa*κλαο.\textsuperscript{54} Hence, the second element remains semantically and formally unclear so that it is still not possible to suggest a meaning for these PNs.

As briefly anticipated above (§3), Lyc. *nimi may be the syncopated form of a participle *nijeme/i on the type *nīmū → *pιjēmī from *pιje ‘to give’: see N302.2 Mahanepi\textsuperscript{ji}emi from maha\textsubscript{(na)} and *pιjēmī ‘given by the gods’, and Gk. Lyc. Μανάπιμιος. Should this hypothesis be correct, the following terms are good Luwic candidates for cognates to *nimi/*nijeme/i: (i) Lyc. B nēnijeti (trans.,\textsuperscript{\textit{x}}, asənənələ xumalə-de nēnijeti TL 44d.65), which may correspond to Hitt. nanna-/nanni\textsuperscript{h} ‘to drive, to draw, to ride in an animal-drawn vehicle’, likely a -anna/i-formation to Hitt. nē-\textsuperscript{hor}, nai-/ni-\textsuperscript{b} ‘to lead, to turn’ (PIE *neiH-\textsuperscript{55}) (ii) CLuw. *nana- ‘to lead’\textsuperscript{,56} (iii) the noun *niniyal (n.) ‘cradle’ → *"Gerät, mit dem man (das Kind) hin- und herlenkt\textsuperscript{,}\textsuperscript{57} and (iv) the noun *niniyama-/m- ‘twisted-spired bread’\textsuperscript{,}\textsuperscript{58} As briefly mentioned in the previous paragraph, two questions arise. First, the precise phonetic and morphological details of *nīj(e)- must remain an open question for now. Tentatively, because Lycian -i- may be traced back to -*e- (see Lyc. 3sg. pres. *siyēn/sitēn likely from *kejōr/kejōr) *nimi, as the syncopated form of *nijēme/i-, may easily go back to *nejHommo/i- (see Hitt. 3pl. pres. *nēnzi ‘they lead, guide, send’ from *nēiH-e- to *PIE *nejH-).\textsuperscript{59}

\textsuperscript{48} With Starke 1990, 233–234 and n. 796.

\textsuperscript{49} Given the possibility sketched also for *trep- ‘to turn’, one should probably not exclude a meaning ‘back’ either. This throws us back to Eichner’s hypothesis of comparing *trbbi with Lat. re-.

\textsuperscript{50} KPN §1584-2.

\textsuperscript{51} Hawkins 2000, 379.

\textsuperscript{52} KPN §627.

\textsuperscript{53} Laroche 1966, No. 262.

\textsuperscript{54} KPN §451-6.

\textsuperscript{55} It may be noticed that the geminate in Hitt. nanna-/nanni\textsuperscript{h} cannot find an explanation if we assume for it a reduplicated form. Therefore, an explanation as a durative-iterative stem in -anni/a- seems to me the best explanation so far (with Melchert 1998, 416). However, it is true that the expected anna/i-formation of nē-\textsuperscript{xai}, nai-/ni-\textsuperscript{h} is *ninni/i- and that this form is not attested.

\textsuperscript{56} Melchert 1993, 154 with ref.


\textsuperscript{58} Melchert 1993, 158. Even still disputed, HLuw. CRUS CRUS\textsubscript{(-)}niyasha- (KARKAMIŠ A11b §16) may be added to the dossier, for which a meaning ‘procession’ (as a ‘leading’?) (Starke 1990, 331) and recently ‘relocation’ (Yakubovich, ACLT s.v.) has been advanced. The assumption of a reduplicated form *naniya- as basis of CRUS CRUS\textsubscript{(-)}niyasha- (with double writing of the logogram) cannot be supported by any parallel so far (pace Starke 1990, 331 and n. 1173). Should the meaning ‘procession’ be validated, Luwian would show a known typological parallel to Gk. πέμπω ‘to send, guide’ and the noun πομπή ‘procession’. More complicated is the situation of Lyc. Natri ‘Apollo’, whose interpretation as ‘the leading one’ (possibly from *najatar(i), cf. Ved. netar- ‘leader’) remains just an attractive hypothesis facing serious phonological problems. See an overview of the current state of research in Neumann 2007, 235.

\textsuperscript{59} LIV.450 with ref. However, should Lyc. Bnēnijeti be related to Hitt. nanna-/nanni\textsuperscript{h} and both be recognized as reduplicated forms as Kloekhorst 2008, 600 suggests, the Hittite 3pl. pres. nanniyanzi (OS) (and the derivative penna-/penni\textsuperscript{h}) ‘to drive (there)’, 3pl. pres. penniyanzi may reveal a 3pl. pres. *niyanzi for Hitt. nē-\textsuperscript{a}, nai-/ni-\textsuperscript{h}, which may be useful to explain Lyc. nēnje(i)- and *nīj(e)-. Should *nīj(e)- represent a zero grade, it may be the result of an influence from the plural form with expected zero-grade as shown
While Hitt. *nē,(a)ri, nai-/*ni-ḫḫi (and its derivatives) is widely attested and its semantics assured, it should be noted that the Luwian terms do not reveal any attestation in military context, and a meaning ‘to lead’ is assured in only one CLuwian text (KUB 54.3, 17th); the Lycian terms are attested in only very fragmentary or unclear texts. With this discrepancy between the Hittite and the Luwian material, it may be helpful to look at collocations outside Lycian and Luwian, too. Hitt. *nē,(a)ri, nai-/*ni-ḫḫi (and derivatives) appears together with the preposition p(a)rā ‘toward, forth’ frequently in a military context, which may support the hypothesis that a military connotation is hidden behind the PN Lycian Trbbēnimi and the Lycian B verb nēni(je)-.

(a) [send someone/troops – to attack]:

HKM 46 rev. 15–17

\[man=kan \, ùTUŠ \, BÈLIYA \, BÈLU \, kuinki \, parā \, naitti \, man=a \, KUR-i \, ùLKûR \, ûL \, dammišjați\]

‘Were you, my lord, to send some commander, the enemy would not wreak havoc in the land.’

HKM 36 obv. 5

\[nu=wa=mu=kan \, ERINMES \, parā \, nai\]

‘Despatch troops to me!’

HKM 36 obv. 13–14

\[n=åst\, k[åš]ma \, aperedani \, KUR-e \, ù[N \, MADGALT]I \, parā \, nehûn\]

‘Look, to that land I have despatched a border commander.’

KBo 5.6 i 32–33 (emended from KUB 31.7 obv. 4)

\[Uräkaninn=ma=kan \, . . . \, INA \, KUR \, ùKûKašula \, GUL-a[ññuñzi \, parā] \, naëstå\]

‘He despatched U. to K. in order to attack.’

(b) [send troops – against people – in battle]:

KUB 14.1 obv. 61 (MH/MS)

\[n[åšt]a \, ùKišnapilin \, ERINMES \, ANŠE.KUR.RA ùLA \, ana \, ùAttariššija \, menañhanda \, zañhija \, parā \, naiš\]

‘He sent K., infantry, (and) chariotry against A. in battle.’

(c) [object-subj – turn toward]

KBo 15.10 ii 5–6

\[nu=åSTUKUL-SU \, parā \, neanza \, èstu\]

‘Let his weapon point straight ahead (i.e., be battle-ready)!’

by the Hittite corresponding reduplicated form. However, the lack of an explanation for the double nasal both in Hittite nanna-/nanni-ḫḫi and (eventually) Lycian nēni(je)- remains an issue for this hypothesis.

60 See Melchert 1993, 154.

61 Serangeli 2018, 221–222.


64 As further attestation, see also HKM 36 rev. 35–36 nu=war=an=kan INA ùRIJšaš parā nehûn ‘I sent it [scil. the army] to I.’
KUB 57.63 ii 4–5

\textit{nu=šmaš para nejantan tarḫušilin} GIŠ\textit{UKUR paiš}

‘He gave them a battle-ready, valiant spear (saying: ‘Let the hostile foreign lands perish by the land of Labarna!’).’

Hitt. \textit{nannije-} also offers a similar meaning, see:

KBo 25.54 i 13–14 + KBo 20.20 obv. 3–4

\textit{nu=šmaš= ...[2 GIŠ mariuš kuttanaza=šmit ki ... nannianzi}

‘They drive two māri-spears ... from their shoulders (to the battle/enemies).’

From these examples it is clear that Hitt. \textit{nē-\text{a}ri , nai-/*ni-ḫḫi and its derivatives are not only attested in a military context, but they also show, among others, a precise collocation, with little variations, i.e. ‘to send or to lead troops to someone for help in battle.’ Example (b) is particularly relevant to this paper, due to the fact that Hitt. \textit{menahḫanda} ‘in front of/against’ perfectly matches the semantics of Luw. \textit{tarpi/tarpa} and Lyc. \textit{trbbi/trbbe} ‘against’, which has no cognate in the Hittite prepositions/preverbs. It seems possible to me that the absence of a military context for Lyc. *\textit{nēnije-} and CLuw. \textit{nana-} may be due to lack of attestations. Therefore, it cannot be excluded \textit{a priori} that this verb was used in military contexts.

Should this hypothesis be correct, \textit{Trbbēnimi} could hide a meaning ‘the one who sends (tentatively: troops?) against (scil. the enemy)’ or the like. This interpretation would imply that the participle *\textit{nimi} has been used transitively here. This is unusual for transitive verbs although well-known cases of this kind are attested in the Luwic languages: see, e.g., HLuw. \textit{EDERE-\text{a}ra/i- ‘having eaten’ and the ant-}participle Hitt. \textit{adant- ‘having eaten’}. However, one could notice that the \textit{ma/i-}participle of this verb is usually attested intransitively in the sense ‘turned (toward)’ (physically and metaphorically). This is also the case of example (c) above, in which the weapon itself is the subject of the clause: the weapon \textit{points forward}, which means that it is battle-ready. Intransitive examples with human beings as subjects are also attested in Hittite, but not in a military context. Thus, they are not mentioned here. Therefore, it cannot be excluded that the participle is here used intransitively; \textit{Trbbēnimi} would then mean ‘the one who turns against/to-ward (tentatively: the enemy/battle)’ or the like. However, this interpretation may be less preferable since apparently there is no attestation of this verb (intransitive) with a preverb which may be a good parallel to the structure and meaning of the Lycian compound.

Either way, the identification of a second element *\textit{nimi} allows us to reconstruct a collocation in Lycian that has a strong parallel in Hittite, and that is missing in the other Anatolian languages, likely due to lack of attestations. In Lycian, it has been adapted to the Lycian vocabulary, using \textit{trbbi} instead of other preposition(s) unknown to Lycian.

\textit{66} Nikolaev 2010.
\textit{67} Lyc. \textit{řtewe} also reflects \textit{menahḫanda} but rather in the sense of ‘in front of’.
\textit{68} Among others, see CHD N, esp. 352.
\textit{69} CHD N, 355, 357.
\textit{70} Hitt. \textit{nē-\text{a}ra, nai-/*ni-ḫḫi} is also attested with \textit{edi or katta} with a meaning ‘to defect, to desert’ from *‘to turn (against someone) / *to turn (from an allegiance)’ (CHD N, 349, 355–356). This may lead to the attractive, but still highly speculative interpretation of \textit{Trbbēnimi} as ‘the rebel, the deserter’ from *‘the one who turns against so.’ which would be particularly fitting in case \textit{Trbbēnimi} will be proved to have participated in the military campaign on the Greek side against the Lycians (see above §2 and n. 2). Of course, in that case one would need to postulate that the military leader would receive this name as a nickname after the campaign. Although both options are formally possible, the collocation of \textit{nē-\text{a}ra, nai-/*ni-ḫḫi with \textit{ma/jra} and especially with \textit{menahḫanda} is, in my view, more compelling to make a comparison with Lyc. \textit{trbbi}.}
3.3. Semantic parallels outside Anatolian

Names carrying a military connotation are very common in Indo-European. I am not aware of a precise correspondence to the structure of Trbbênimi outside Anatolian, but some compounds showing the same semantic patterns illustrated above may be mentioned.

(a) Trbbênimi as ‘who turns/sends (army/people) against (the enemy)’: see the Greek PN Λᾱτροπος ‘who turns/directs the people towards/against X’ (Argos, 3rd c. BC, SEG XVII 152) in which ἄτροπος is corradical of the verb τρέπω ‘to turn, to direct’ that functions as a synonym of Hitt. nē-/*ni- ἄρι, while Λᾱ reflects λαός ‘people/army’, that is, the object that is possibly missing in the Lycian name. The meaning of this collocation is also supported by Greek phraseology, but with the synonymous δήμος ‘people’ and out of a military context: see, e.g., Pind. Pyth. 1.70 δῆμον γεραίρων τράποι σύμφωνον ἐς ἡσυχίαν ‘(the man who is himself the leader…) may bring honour to the people and turn them towards harmonious peace’. 71

(b) Trbbênimi as ‘who turns towards/against (the army/enemy)’: Compare the very similar collocation [RusH - upon/against people] and/or [COME - towards/upon/against people] that may be seen in the Mycenean MN e-ti-ra-wo /Erti°lāwoi (dat.) (PY Cn 655.9, 131.10) from e-ti-ra-wo /Erti°lāwos/ which is reflected (by the inversion of the elements of the compound) in the alphabetic PN Λᾱ°έρτης (Hom.+). The first element Λᾱ° clearly reflects λαός ‘people’, while the second element έρτης might be etymologically related either with the aor. ἔρετοι ‘rushed headlong at’ (Hsch. ἐπιδρόμος ὡρμήθη) or with ἔρχεσθαι ‘to advance’. 72

As an example of a verbal compound with a preverb as its first element, as is the case with Trbbênimi, see Myc. MN e-pi-do-ro-mo (TH, Fq 118, among other occurrences), corresponding to alphabetic Gk. Ἐπίδρομος (Athens, 6th c. BC) ‘who runs over/attacks’. This name derives from ἐπιδρόμος meaning ‘running over’ and, in a poetic context, ‘offensive, aggressive (from *who attacks)’; this is built by a preposition ἐπι over and the agentive δρόμος ‘runner’ (with secondary accent shift as expected in PNs). This meaning is assured by the verb ἐπιδράμειν ‘to attack (by feet)’ (Il. 4.542 and 18.527). The simple form without a preposition is also attested in Greek, see the PN Myc. do-ro-me-u /Dromēus/ (PY An 209.4), corresponding to alphabetic Gk. Δρομεύς (see also Δρομέας, Δρόμων, Δρομᾶς). 73

For the purpose of this paper it is sufficient to have shown that semantic and syntactical parallels to both the compositional structures that have been advanced for Trbbênimi may be found outside Anatolian. The analysis has not been extended to Indo-European branches other than Greek; however, given that the suggested meaning reflects one of the essential features of the culture that has been reconstructed for the Proto-Indo-European speaking peoples, that is, the military aspect, I am confident that further good parallels can be found in other Indo-European branches as well. 74

4. Conclusions

As a result of the present study, a new interpretation may be taken into consideration for Trbbênimi: it may be analysed as Trbbênimi, namely a verbal compound with a preposition Lyc. trbbi/trbbê ‘against’ as first element and °nimii as second element, i.e., the syncopated form of an unattested Lycian participle °nijemii likely related to Lyc. B nêntje- of unclear meaning. This would imply that Trbbênimi is the original form among the variants Trbbênimi, Trbbênimi, and Trbbêneni.
On the strength of the collocations [send troops – against people – in battle] (transitive) and [object/person/subject – turn toward] (intransitive) that are attested for Hittite ne-na, nai-/*ni-bbi ‘to lead, to send, to turn’, which possibly is a cognate of °nimi, two proposals have been advanced for Trbbēnim: ‘who sends (scil. troops, vel sim.) against (scil. the enemy, vel sim.)’ or ‘who turns against (scil. the enemy, vel sim.)’. In my view, at the moment, it is impossible to choose between these two possibilities.

Compounds with a military connotation describing the action of attacking the enemy in battle are well-known with synonymic roots in the Indo-European onomastics. See, e.g., Gk. MN Λᾱτροπος ‘who turns/directs the people toward/against X’ (trans.), and Myc. MN e-pi-do-ro-mo (alphabetic Gk. Ἐπίδρομος) ‘who runs over/attacks’ and e-ti-ra-wo /Erti°lāwos/ ‘who rushes upon/against the people’ or ‘who comes towards/upon/against the people’ (intrans.).

In conclusion, the semantics of Trbbēnimi may reflect the social class from which its bearers stem, i.e. a military aristocracy; this possibility would perfectly work both for the Trbbēnimi who participated in the Greco-Athenian military campaign and for the ruler who issued coins a few decades later.
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