

The Trilingual Inscription of the Létôon

Lycian Version

Lycian Text

1. ēke: tr̄m̄misñ: xssaθrapazate: pigesere: katamlah: tideimi:
2. sē=ñne=ñte=pddē=hadē: tr̄m̄mile: pddēneh̄m̄mis: ijeru: se=natrbbijēmi:
se(j)=ar̄ña: asaxlazu: erttimeli:
3. me=hñti=tubedē: arus: se(j)=epewētl̄m̄mēi: ar̄ññai:
4. m̄maitē: kumezijē: θθē: xñtawati: xbidēñni: se(j)=arKKazuma: xñtawati:
5. sē=ñn=aitē: kumazu: mahāna: ebette: eseimiju: qñturahahñ: tideimi:
6. se=de: eseimijaje: xuwati=ti:
7. se=i pijētē: arawā:
8. ehbijē: esi=ti:
9. s=ed=eli=ñtātē: teteri: se(j)=epewētl̄m̄mēi: hr̄m̄mada: ttaraha:
10. me=xbaitē: zā: ese=xesñtedi: qñtati: se=pigrēi:
11. sē=ñte=ñte=kñm̄mē:
12. se(j)=ēti: θθē: sttati=teli:
13. se=t=ahñtāi xñtawatehi: xbidēñnehi: se(j)=arKKazumahi:
14. se=i=pibiti: uhazata: ada: H00: ēti: tllaxñta: ar̄ña:
15. se=sñmati: xddazas:
16. epi=de arawa: hāti kñm̄mētis:
17. me=i=pibiti: sixlas:
18. se=wa(j)=aitē: kumaha: ēti sttali: ppuweti: kñm̄mē: ebehi: xñtawataha:
xbidēñnaha: se=rKKazumaha:
19. me=ije=sitēni=ti: hl̄m̄mipijata
20. m=ede=te=wē: kumezidi: nuredi: nuredi: arā: kumehedi:
se=uhazata: uwadi: xñtawati: xbidēñni: se(j)=erKKazuma:
21. me=kumezidi: seimija:
22. se=de: seimijaje: xuwati=ti:
23. se=i=ehbi=aitē: tasa: mere: ebette: teteri: ar̄ñnas: se(j)=epewētl̄m̄mēi: ar̄ññai:
24. me=t=epi=tuwēti: mara: ebeija:
25. ēti: sttali: ppuwēti=mē: ebehi:
26. se=we=ne: xttadi: tike: ebi=ne=ñtewē: mahāna: ebette:
ebi=ne: ñtewē: kumazi: ebehi:
27. xttade=me(j)=ē: tike:
28. me=pddē: mahāna: sñmati: ebette: se(j)=ēni: qlahi: ebijehi pñtrēñni:
se=tideime: ehbiye: se(j)=elijāna:
29. pigesereje: me=i(j)=eseri=hhati:
30. me=hriqla: asñne: 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 *περιουκοι* *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 Eseimiya, son of Qnturahi,
6. And whoever *is close to* Eseimiya.
7. And they gave to him freedom

8. (Of) whatever is his.
9. And the city and the *περιουκοι* *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 *περιουκοι* 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 *pntreñni* mother of the sanctuary here and to her children and to the Eliyana.
29. They shall *defer* to 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 pddēnehñmis* 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 ἱερῶν (Laroche 1979: 61).

3. The sense given for the verb *hñtitubedē* 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 *hñ-* as a preverb ‘together’ and *-ti-* as the reflexive particle, thus perhaps more literally ‘joined/united together.’

For the basic sense of *arus* ‘citizenry’ see Laroche (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 *epewētlm̄me-* see now Adiego (1993).

4. The verb *m̄maitē* was correctly interpreted by Eichner (1983: 59-60) as ‘built’ and compared with HLuvian *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 *tašūra-* ‘offering table’ (or similar) suggests that ‘altar’ is not far off the mark.

The discrepancies between *ArKKazuma x̄ntawati* 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 ethnonym 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 ethnonym, and it is tempting to connect this with the attested Carian place-name *Αργασ(α)-* (see Zgusta 1984: 90). The discrepancy in voicing vs. Greek *Αρκεσιμω-* is not a serious obstacle in view of other evidence for voicing fluctuation next to *r* (cf. the Lycian names *Pigrēi* 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 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 ‘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 *n̄ta-* is haplogenic for *n̄ta-ta-* ‘put in,’ and *-ed(e)-* is merely a proleptic pronoun anticipating the object *hr̄m̄mada 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 *q̄ntati*, 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 *q̄ntati* as a present third-person verb (singular or plural). The interpretation of *xbaitē* as ‘irrigated’ with Laroche, (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 *περιοικτοι*) *adjoined the plot* (that) Xesntedi and Pigrei *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 tllaxn̄ta* refers to the standard of payment, in which case *-xn̄ta* would mean ‘monetary standard/titre/Währung.’ While I have followed the Greek and translated *Ar̄na* as an independent dative ‘for/on behalf of the city,’ it is possible

that *Arīna* is an adjective modifying *tlaxñta*: ‘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 *sitēni* as literally ‘lies’ cf. Melchert (1992:). In this example the more productive ending with *-t-* (cf. Hittite *kittari*) has replaced that without (Lycian *sijēni* and Cuneiform Luvian *zīyar*). The precise meaning of *hlñmi-* 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 tuwēti* 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 ποιήσειν ἐντελῆ, 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 sñmati* 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 κύριος ἔστω. 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 Létôn or to some higher authority in Xanthos.

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

- I. J. Adiego, «Licio *epewētlmēi*», *AuOr* 11 (1993): 139-149
 J. Borchardt, H. Eichner et al., «Archäologisch-sprachwissenschaftliches Corpus der Denkmäler mit lykischer Schrift», *ÖAW Anzeiger, phil.-hist. Klasse* 134, 2. Teilband (1997-99): 11-96
 O. Carruba, «AR/^w/AZUMA», *Kadmos* 38 (1999): 50-58
 H. Eichner, «Etymologische Beiträge zum Lykischen der Trilingue», *Or* 52 (1983): 48-56
 I. Hajnal, *Der lykische Vokalismus*, Leykam, Graz (1995)
 H. C. Melchert, «New Luvo-Lycian Isoglosses», *HS* 102 (1989) 23-45
 H. C. Melchert, «The Middle Voice in Lycian», *HS* 105 (1992) 189-199
 G. Neumann, «Namen und Epiklesen lykischer Götter», in *Florilegium Anatolicum. Mélanges offerts à Emmanuel Laroche*, Bocard, Paris (1979): 259-271
 D. Schürr, «Luwisch-lykische Wettergottformeln», *Die Sprache* 39/1 (1997): 59-73
 L. Zgusta, *Kleinasiatische Ortsnamen*, Winter, Heidelberg (1984)

[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.]