Lycian Text

1. ēke: trũmisin: xssaθrapazate: pigesere: katamlah: tideimi:
2. sě=fnė=ńte=ppdē=hadē: trũmile: pddēnehũmĩs: ijeru: se=natrbbijěmi: se(j)=ārũna: asaxlazu: erttimeli:
3. me=hāti=tubede: arus: se(j)=epewētlũmēi: arũnāi:
4. ŋmaîte: kumezi:j: 00ē: xũtawati: xbidēñni: se(j)=arKKazuma: xũtawati:
6. se=de; eseimijaje: xuwati=ti:
7. se=i pijětē: arawā:
8. ehbijē: esi=ti:
9. s=ed=eli=ntātē: teteri: se(j)=epewētlũmēi: hnũmada: ttaraha:
10. me=xbaite: zā: ese=xesũtedi: qũtati: se=pigrēi:
11. sě=ńte=ńte=kũmē:
12. se(j)=ěti: 00ē: sttat=tel:
13. se=t=ahntāi xũtawatehi: xbidēñnehei: se(j)=arKKazumah:
14. se=i=pibiti: uhažata: ada: H00: ěti: tllaxũta: arũna:
15. se=sũmati: xddazas:
16. epi=de arawa: hāti kũmētis:
17. me=i=pibiti: sixlas:
18. se=wa(j)=aitē: kumaha: ěti sttalı: ppuweti: kũmē: ebehi: xũtawataha: xbidēñnaha: se=rKKazumah:
19. me=ije=stēni=ti: hũmiphijata
20. m=ede=te=we: kumezidi: nuredi: arā: kumehedi: se=uhazata: uwadi: xũtawati: xbidēñni: se(j)=erKKazuma:
21. me=kumezidi: seimija:
22. se=de: seimijaje: xuwati=ti:
23. se=i=ehbi=aitē: tasa: mere: ebette: teteri: arũnas: se(j)=epewētlũmēi: arũnāi:
24. me=t=epi=tuwe: mara: ebeija:
25. ěti: sttalı: ppuwěti=mē: ebehi:
26. se=we=ne: xttadi: tike: ebi=ne=ńtewē: mahāna: ebette: ebi=ne: ńtewē: kumazi: ebehi:
27. xttade=me(j)=ē: tike:
28. me=ppdē: mahāna: sũmati: ebette: se(j)=ēni: qlahi: ebijehi pĩnērēni:
  se=tideime: ehbijе: se(j)=eļiļa:
29. pigesereje: me=i(j)=eserī=hhati:
30. me=hrīqla: asũne: pzziti=ti

Translation

1. When Pigesere, son of Katamla, ruled Lycia as satrap,
2. And he commissioned as commissioners for the Lycians Iyera and Natrbbiyemi
   and as governor for Xanthos Erttimeli,
3. The citizenry and the Xanthian
   perioikoi agreed
4. (That) they built a sacred altar to the King of Kaunos and Arggazuma the king.
5. And they made priest to these gods Eseimiyə, son of Qnturahi,
6. And whoever is close to Eseimiyə.
7. And they gave to him freedom
8. (Of) whatever is his.
9. And the city and the περιοικοί added land-sections belonging to the city.
10. Both Xesntedi the ___ and Pigrei (had) irrigated the plot.
11. And however much (is) therein,
12. And (the spot) where the altar is set down,
13. Also (is) of the property of the King of Kaunos and Arggazuma.
14. And they shall give as a yearly offering for Xanthos 120 adas according to the payment standard.
15. And they shall oblige the slaves,
16. As many as they release into freedom,
17. (That) they shall give shekels.
18. And they made sacred as belonging to the King of Kaunos and to Arggazuma however much is written on this stele.
19. And what lies therein as a surplus gift
20. 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.
21. Seimiya shall serve as priest,
22. And whoever is close to Seimiya.
23. And the city of Xanthos and the Xanthian περιοικοί have sworn oaths to him for these regulations.
24. (that) they shall execute these regulations
25. As they are written on this stele.
26. And no one shall do harm, neither against these gods nor against this priest.
27. If someone shall have done harm,
28. They shall bind (him) on the spot to these gods and to the πντρέννι mother of the sanctuary here and to her children and to the Eliyana.
29. They shall deferto Pigesere.
30. It (is) for the supreme authority to do what he decrees.

Notes

The following commentary focuses on discrepancies between the Lycian and the other versions and on those cases where the interpretation of the Lycian remains uncertain.

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 apparent contrast to the Greek, but cf. the remarks of Briant [1998] 324). One could also translate the Lycian figura etymologica pddēhadē pddēnehṁmis as ‘appointed appointees’ or ‘deputized deputies.’ pddē ha- is a univerbation meaning ‘leave in place’ (see Melchert 1989: 38-41). The unexpected plural in pddēne is apparently intended to have a distributive meaning: Iyera and Natrbbijemi are each put in their respective places (cf. the use of sixlas in clause 17 below). Ijeru is accusative singular of an a-stem Ijera- vs. Greek ἴερα (Laroche 1979: 61).
3. The sense given for the verb hūtitubedē is approximate, based on the context. 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.’ I tentatively analyze hū as a preverb ‘together’ and -tū- as the reflexive particle, thus perhaps more literally ‘joined/united together.’
For the basic sense of *arus* ‘citizenry’ see Laroch (1979: 103) among others, but I now take the word as an abstract with the suffix -s- identified by Borchardt-Eichner (1997-99: 83).

For an analysis of Lycian *epewėtlñme*- see now Adiego (1993).

4. The verb *timatiè* was correctly interpreted by Eichner (1983: 59-60) as ‘built’ and compared with HLVuvian *tama-* ‘build.’ All other analyses should be discarded, including mine in *Kadmos* 37 (1998): 39.

The context makes clear that *θθē* refers to a concrete installation. The precise meaning of the Lycian word and its cognates is hard to determine: see Eichner (1983: 59-62), who renders the word as ‘Kultmal.’ The further cognate Palaic *tasōra-* ‘offering table’ (or similar) suggests that ‘altar’ is not far off the mark.

The discrepancies between *ArKKazuma xñtawati* of the Lycian and the equivalents in the Greek and especially the Aramaic remain puzzling. Carruba (1999) 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 *Aprγσατα*-(see Zgusta 1984: 90). The discrepancy in voicing vs. Greek *Arkæσμα* is not a serious obstacle in view of other evidence for voicing fluctuation next to r (cf. the Lycian names *Pigreĩ* and *Pixre*). For a very different view see Neumann (1979: 269).

6. The interpretation of *xuwati* as ‘follows’ and comparison with Hittite *huwāi*- contemplated by Laroch (1979: 66), and accepted by others is impossible on both formal and functional grounds. In particular, the Hittite verb and its Luvian cognate mean ‘run, flee (from)’ and are never construed with a dative expressing a goal. A more likely comparison is with the Luvian hapax *huwayalli*- in Hittite context parallel to *kutruwan-* ‘witness.’ The basic sense would be ‘stand by, attend, be close to.’

9. I assume that here as elsewhere *ūta-* is haplogonic for *ūta-ta-* ‘put in,’ and -ed(e)- is merely a proleptic pronoun anticipating the object *hrũmada ttaraha*, but the intervening element -(e)li- is unparalleled. Since a meaning such as ‘sur-ajouter’ fits the context, one is vaguely reminded of Cuneiform Luvian *ala/i-* ‘high,’ but the comparison is mere speculation.

10. The interpretation of *ese* as ‘both,’ coordinated with *se* ‘and,’ is by no means secure. Even more problematic is the status of *qũtati*, which I tentatively take as nominative singular of a noun in apposition to *Xesntedi*. However, there is no matching epithet of *Xesntedi* in the Greek. One could also follow those who take *qũtati* as a present third-person verb (singular or plural). The interpretation of *xbaĩē* as ‘irrigated’ with Laroch, (1979: 68), is also not entirely beyond doubt. One could also compare this verb with Cuneiform Luvian *hap(ā)i-* ‘bind’ and entertain a very different interpretation: ‘They (i.e. the city and πριτουκοτ) *adjoined the plot* (that) *Xesntedi* and *Pigreï* till’ (or similar). I take *za-* to be the base of the verb *za-* and its derived noun *zata-*, hence in the first instance ‘portion, parcel.’

14. 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 tllaxũta* refers to the standard of payment, in which case -xũta would mean ‘monetary standard/titre/Währung.’ While I have followed the Greek and translated *Arrĩna* as an independent dative ‘for/on behalf of the city,’ it is possible
that Arñana is an adjective modifying tllaxña: ‘according to the Xanthian payment standard.’

17. 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.

19. For sitënî as literally ‘lies’ cf. Melchert (1992:  ). In this example the more productive ending with -t- (cf. Hittite kitītari) has replaced that without (Lycian sijēnî and Cuneiform Luvian zîyâ). The precise meaning of hlûnmi- remains elusive. I now 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.

24. The combination epi tuwe- is attested elsewhere only in the concrete sense of ‘erect’ a statute or other standing object. Laroche (1979:74) renders epi tuwëñti 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 περιοικοι 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 15 and 17) and that Lycian epi tuwe- is used here in a sense close to that of Greek σουηγεῖν έντελη, with epi having a “telicizing” force.

28. The basic meaning of this sentence is not in doubt: the guilty party is to be held accountable by the deities named. Because of the syntax and sense of xddazas stûmati in clause 15, I must follow Laroche (1979: 70&75) in assuming that the verb is transitive with an unexpressed subject, versus scholars such as Hajnal (1995: 85) and Schürr (1997: 64). Given the general usage of the text and the unambiguous plural -hhati in the next clause, I assume a formal present plural, with the subject ‘they’ referring to the Xanthians, as elsewhere, or used impersonally. The specific translation ‘bind on the spot’ is tentative. I must make explicit that this analysis presupposes that the pronominal object -(e)ne ‘him’ has been omitted (the object is explicit in TL 84,7, as per Laroche, contra Schürr). This assumption needs further scrutiny.

29-30. 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 (as properly emphasized by Briant [1998: 333ff] this is quite distinct from claims that the satrap is to “ratify” the provisions). This interpretation remains quite plausible. However, given the absence of any expressed object in clause 29, this analysis implies that the Lycian expression eseri ha- plus dative ‘hand over to X’ had the status of a formula roughly equivalent to the Greek κυρίος ἔσπερα. This can be neither affirmed nor denied. One should not therefore entirely exclude the proposal of Briant (1998: 330f.) that clauses 29-30 in the Lycian are more closely linked to the preceding clause 28, as he argues for the corresponding Greek. If one assumes that an object ‘him’ has been omitted in clause 28 (see above), then one could assume the same for clause 29: ‘they shall hand over/deliver (him) to Pigesere.’ That is, as elsewhere, the violator is held responsible to the gods, but the actual punishment is to be left to human authority.

30. For the syntax see now Neumann (1998) and Melchert (1999). 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 “Ober-hof,” 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 Létōon or to some higher authority in Xanthos.

[To be added to the bibliography already given following the Greek translation:]

I. Hajnal, Der lykische Vokalismus, Leykam, Graz (1995)

[Please also add to the reference already given to Frei, SNR 55 (1976), that to SNR 56 (1977): 66-78 (continuation of the same article). This actually contains far more discussion of the Trilingual.]