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The Trilingual Inscription of the Létôon

Lycian Version

Lycian Text

1. ėke: trîmisĕ: xssaθrapazate: pigesere: katamlaḥ: tideimi:
2. sē=ñe=nte=pddē=hadē: trîmèle: pddēnehθînis: ījeru: se=natrbbijemī:
   se(j)=arîna: asaxlaẓu: erttimeli:
3a. me=hîti-tubedē: arus:
3b. se(j)=epeweltîmĕi: arînâ: ḥmaitē: kumeziĕ: 00ē: xñtawati: xbidēnī:
   se(j)=arKKazuma: xñtawati:
5. se=de: eseimijaje: xuwaṭi=ṭi:
6. se=i pîjetē: arowâ:
7. ehbijē: esi=ṭi:
8. s=ed(e)=elîn=tâṭe: teteri: se(j)=epeweltîmĕi: ĵrûmada: ttaraha:
9. me=xbaitē: zâ:
10. ese=xesûtedi: qîtati «=ti»: se=pigrēi:
11a. sē=nte=nte=kîmē:
11b. se(j)=êti: 00ē: sttati=teli:
11c. se=tahîtai «x»ñtawatehi: xbidēnēhe: se(j)=arKKazumaḥi:
12. se=i=pibiti: uhazata: ada: H00: êti: tîlaxfīta: arîna:
13. se=sîmati: xddazas:
14. epi=de arowa: hâtî kîmētis:
15. me=i=pibiti: sixlas:
   xbidânnaha: se=rKKazumaḥa:
17. me=ije=sitēni=ṭi: huîmîpijata
18. m=ede=te=we: kumezidi: nuredi: nuredi: arâ: kuṃehedi:
   se=uhazata: uwadi: xñtawati: xbidēnī: se(j)=erKKazuma:
19. me=kumezidi: seimijâ:
20. se=de: seimijaje: xuwaṭi=ṭi:
21. se=ije=hrî(j)=aitē: tasa: mere: ebette: teteri: arînas: se(j)=epeweltîmĕi: arînâi:
22. me=t=epi=tûwêti: mara: ebêjîa:
23. êti: sttali: ppuweti=mē: ebehi:
24. se=we=ne: xttadi: tike: ebî=ne=ñtewē: mahâna: ebette:
   ebî=ne: ñtewē: kumazi: ebehi:
25. xttade=me(j)=ê: tike:
26. me=pddē: mahâna: sîmati: ebette: se(j)=êni: qlahi: ebijehi pîntrênni:
   se=tideime: ehibije: se(j)=eļijâna:
27. pigesereje: me=i(j)=eserî=hhatî:
28. me=hrîqla: asāne: pzziti=ti

Translation

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

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

Notes

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

2. As seen by Laroche (1979: 62&93), the second clause in the Lycian is a subordinate temporal clause coordinated with the first, while the third clause is the apodosis (in contrast to the Greek).
For detailed arguments that in both texts the protasis and apodosis represent sequential and causally linked events (against Briant [1998] 323-4) and that the Greek version is not based on an error (against Blomqvist [1982: 14-15] and Rutherford [2002: 207-8]) see Storme (2014: 125-35).

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

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

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

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

3b. For an analysis of Lycian epewēttimē- see Adiego (1993). The verb ištamaṭe was interpreted by Eichner (1983: 59-60) as ‘built’ and compared with HLuvian *tama- ‘build.’ Given the location of the Lētōon, this remains a good possibility (thus also Storme [2014: 138]), but it is not assured. See Schürr (2014: 21) for a contrary opinion. The context makes clear that ḥēṭē refers to a concrete installation. *Pace* Schürr (2016), the Hieroglyphic Luvian designation of ‘stele’ /tasa-/ and Lydian tasēv, which refers to a dedicatory stele to Athena, are cognate: on the latter see now Payne-Sasseville (2016). However, Sasseville-Yakubovich (forthcoming) have shown that Palaiic taśūra- means ‘pen’ (in context specifically ‘kennel’), not ‘sacrificial table’. Removal of the latter sense eliminates the compelling evidence for an inherently sacralized meaning for this set of cognates (*contra* Melchert 1997: 49-50 *et alibi*). Several of these objects are sacred only because they are dedicated to deities or the dead, a
sense easily derivable from a form of *dheh₁- (Schürr: 2016: 128). That there is no inherent meaning ‘sacralized’ is now confirmed by Palaić tašira-, which represents *a place where one puts (animals)’. Likewise also with Schürr (2016: 126) tahñta- ‘installations’: see below. The adjective kumezije- in the present Lycian context is not redundant, but specifies the thing dedicated (θθẽ) as ‘sacrificial’, thus ‘altar’ (with Schürr 2016: 125).

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

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

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

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

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

11abc. First, Storme (2014: 130) argues against the analysis (in my previous translation of 2000) that se=t=ahñtāi is predicatival “also as the property”. Against Laroche (1979: 68) and Melchert (2004: 2) there is no motivation for a local particle =te and an alleged †ahñtāi as a calque on Greek tâ ὄντα or ἦ οὖσια. As per Schürr (2016: 125), tahñtäi (sic!) refers to buildings or structures (= Greek οἰκήματα!) associated with the altar ððẽ (both mean essentially
‘installation’). Second, this means that the two preceding relative clauses are embedded as noun phrases coordinated with tahñtãi and these together form the subject of the main predicate.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

24. As they stand, the Lycian and Greek seem to diverge rather seriously: the Lycian has a general formula *’No one shall do violence...’*, and the threat appears to be directed at the gods and the priest. The Greek prohibits modifying of the provisions of the text by the Xanthians and the perioikoi or their authorizing anyone else to modify them. Against Metzger (1979: 42) μετακινεῖν cannot be a calque on the Lycian, which has *‘to do violence’* (with an apparently different expressed target), and the sense is the usual one of *‘modify, alter, change’* (also in Thucydides V, 21 by every modern translation, *pace* Metzger 1979: 39). The attempt of Laroche (1979: 74-5) to bridge the gap between the Lycian and Greek by supposing a sense *‘to remove’* for *xtta* - is entirely ad hoc (see the objection by Neumann 2007: 134). But Schürr (2005: 151) points to the juxtaposition of *mara ebeija* and *se=we=ne xttaiti* in TL 45B, 4-5, and perhaps also the use of *tusšii* with *mara* ibid. 11 (cp. *epi tussëti*). His rendering ‘ändern’ for *xttaiti* is based solely on the supposed match between *xtta-* and μετακινεῖν in our passage, which is otherwise totally unsupported. One cannot separate the denominative verb *xtta(i)-* from the phrase *xtta...adi* in TL 118,2, nor *xtta ‘violence’* from CLuvian *ḥatta ‘violence’* and Hittite *ḥatta- ‘to strike; pierce’*. The discrepancy between the Lycian and Greek versions is thus serious and not easy to explain. I have tentatively tried to account for it by supposing that Lycian *xtta- ‘to do violence’* had a use like Hittite *hulle/a- ‘to smash, defeat’, which is used of stipulations in the sense *‘to repudiate’*, including in contexts directly parallel to *wahnu- ‘to change, alter’*. Compare KBo 6.28 Ro 29 *kuiš=ma=an ḫullai ‘But whoever repudiates it...’* and KBo 1.28 Vo 8 *kuiš=ma=an=kana wahnuζi ‘But whoever alters it...’,* in both cases referring to the word of the king that is immutable. The absence of any overt object remains surprising, but perhaps could be inferred from context in the Lycian. One must further assume that the translator of the Greek on his own authority altered the general *‘No one shall do violence/repudiate...’* to a construction where the oath-takers are made the potential violators. These discrepancies leave this solution less than assured.

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

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

28. For the syntax see now Neumann (1998) and Melchert (1999). It is also possible that *hri-qla* is in the dative: ‘It is for the supreme temple authority to do...’. Still unresolved is the precise status of the *hri-qla-. The word is transparently a compound of *hri- ‘over’* and *qla-*, which elsewhere appears to mean something like ‘precinct, temenos.’ What seems tolerably clear is that the word is used in this context in the sense of an authority (as in ‘the palace decrees’). Laroche (1979: 76) renders the term as *Oberhof*, interpreting it in context as referring to the
acropolis of Xanthos. This is quite reasonable, but in every other clear instance Lycian qla-refers to a religious institution. It is thus not certain whether the institution referred to is civil or religious and in the latter case whether it refers to the chief administration of the Létôon or to some higher authority in Xanthos. I now interpret pzzi- as a verbum dicendi, thus ‘decree, declare’ or the like, rather than ‘wish’, because in the Milyan passage TL 44c 41ff. it appears to be followed by imperative second singulars pibi and slâma (similarly Eichner [1993: 145])
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