

Again on the Xanthos Pillar *hãtahe*. Between combinatory analysis and Greek epigraphic interference

Elena Martínez Rodríguez
University of Verona

§ 1. *Introduction*¹

The bulk of hapax legomena in the Lycian corpus of inscriptions is concentrated in compositions produced by the local dynasts, consisting of narrations of warfare, religious decrees, or administrative texts. Compared with the Letoon Trilingual (N320), whose Greek counterpart is illuminating in enabling us to understand the vocabulary, meaning, and syntactic structures of the Lycian text, the Xanthos Pillar (TL 44) remains far more obscure. Besides Lycian, the languages that the Xanthos Pillar contains are Milyan, the elusive dialectal sister of Lycian, and Greek (*CEG* 177), in a short epigram which does not correspond (at least not directly) to the Lycian text. The approach to the challenges that this text presents combines comparative linguistics and etymology, internal combinatory analysis, and contextual evidence.

These methodologies have given rise to the range of explanations that the lemma *hãtahe*, only attested in the Xanthos Pillar, has received. The word appears eight times on the southern face (TL 44a 42, 43x2, 46, 47, 50, 53, 55; see TEXT 1), and once on the eastern face (44b 56; see TEXT 2). Because of the concentration of

1. This paper is a result of the project PALaC, which received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (Grant Agreement No: 757299). I am grateful to Federico Giusfredi (Verona) for reading and discussing the manuscript with me. Needless to say, I remain responsible for any possible errors contained here.

attestations in such a short span of the composition (44a 42–55), the passage is commonly referred to as the *hãtahe*-narration. In 138 lines, the Lycian text covers at least 30 years of historical events, ranging from the defection of the Lycians from the Delian League, roughly identified with the death of the Athenian Melesander (TL 44a 45, Thuc. 2.69), to the reference to the Persian satrap Tissaphernes (TL 44c 15), which situates an *ante quem* date of around 400 BC. The enumeration of toponyms in the so-called *hãtahe*-narration conveys a sequence of military movements around the Lycian and Carian territories. Following Thonemann (2009: 175), this passage, in 14 lines, comprises the events of only two years, from the attack on Melesander (430 BC) to the defeat of Lysikles (428 BC).² The discussion of the historical context of the passage has received as much attention as the role, meaning and origin of the word *hãtahe*. Today, two main interpretations of its meaning are proposed: first, as a war-like god (cf. Luw. *Sanda*), or second as a word related to military victory. Yet, the greatest obstacle to its comprehension is the inflectional ending, which shows a genitival-adjective in *-ahe* that is not in keeping with the syntax of the passage.

In this article, I revisit the existing proposals for the meaning of *hãtahe* and offer a new interpretation, taking as a starting point the internal evidence from Lycian, and trying to align the synchronic developments with the word's elusive morphosyntactic features. Secondly, I examine the evidence provided by semantic typology and epigraphic genre interference to explore the origin and function of *hãtahe* within its cultural, historical, and epigraphical context, with the aim of introducing a more multidisciplinary approach into the debate.

TEXT 1 (TL 44a 41–55)³

⁴¹[pr]ulija e[p]i=de: izredi: zẽm̃tija: ehbije⁴²di: Zagaba: nelede: **hãtahe**:
Êtri: Tumine⁴³hi nelede **h[ã]tahe** Pttara: Malijehi: **hãt⁴⁴ahe**:

2. Thonemann *op.cit.* regards the reference to Amorges in line 55 of the passage to an unknown episode, rather than to his defeat in Iasos (412 BC), thus avoiding extending the chronology of the narration up to 20 years.

3. The present edition is that of Melchert 2001, to which some new readings have been added: *Ijalusas* for *Ijaeusas* in line 52 by Schürr (2009: 169), with restoration *Ijalusas[i]* by Sasseville (2021b: 167), and my suggestion, following Meriggi (1936: 279), that *uw[e]* should be read for *un[.]* in line 49 (Martínez-Rodríguez 2021: 303). The tentative translation offered here with regard to TEXT 1 (TL 44a 41–55) is a quite literal one intended to serve as a contextual guide to the reader. I recommend contrasting it with the very different interpretations recently proposed by Oreshko (2021: 138) and Sasseville (2021b: 165).

The spoils^(?) *zeṃtija* with his own hands in Zagaba, in the acropolis^(?) *hātahe*, in Lower Tymnessos in the acropolis^(?) *hātahe*, in Patara (in the precinct) of Malija *hātahe*.

Xbane: ese: Trbbēnīmi: tebete: terñ se ⁴⁵*Milasāntrā: pddēne=ke: Xbānīje: izredi* ⁴⁶*ehbijedi: hātahe:*

At Kyaneai, when^(?) *Trbbēnīmi* defeated the territory and Melesander, and also in the Kyanean places, by his own hands *hātahe*.

Tlāñ nele: nele: tarbil ⁴⁷*de: Xerēi: qastte terñ: Tlahñ: erbbedi: hāl* ⁴⁸*tahe:*

(He) overpowered Tlos in the (subsequent) settlements, *Xerēi* destroyed the Tloan territory in battle *hātahe*.

Medbijahe: ese: Xerēi: tebete: [t]er[ñ] ⁴⁹*se Waxssepddimi: ēti: zehi: hbāti:*

CII: uw[e] ⁵⁰*ñtepi: xlaina terñ hātahe: āka: Herikle* ⁵¹*se haxlaza: pabrati:*

At *Medbijahe*, when^(?) *Xerēi* defeated the territory and *Waxssepddimi*, there, in (the place of) the field they will fulfil with 12 cows, in the place they took the territory *hātahe*, like Heracles, and the *haxlaza* will *pabra-*.

Xbide: hrixñtawal ⁵²*tahi: ese tabāna: terñ: Ijānā: Ijalusas[i]* ⁵³*Krzz[ā]nase: hātahe:*

At Kaunos of the supreme rule, when^(?) defeated the Ionian territory, in *Ijalusas* (and) in the Chersonessos *hātahe*.

Mukale: tewēt[e]: Sāma ⁵⁴*=ti: trbbetē: Turaxssi: zxxāna terñ: es* ⁵⁵*e:*

Humrxxā: tebāna terñ: hātahe

At Mykale, which faces Samos, (he) resisted at Thorax, the territory that fought, when^(?) Amorges conquered the territory *hātahe*.

TEXT 2 (TL 44b 55–57)

urublijē ⁵⁶*hātahe: tubehi prñnezi: se lihbeze: eh[b]* ⁵⁷*ije: se dewē: zxxaza: se ñtuweriha: ade*

He made a building *hātahe* for the household of Tube^(?) and his *lihbeze*, and a dedication for the warriors, and a memorial^(?)

§ 2. Previous research and main points of the debate

§ 2.1 Early proposals

Several authors have followed Meriggi (1929: 438–439) in connecting *hātahe* with what seems to be its base formation *hāta-*, attested only in TL 84 (*me=te: ñta tāti ebññē: hātā: se ladā* “and here will put inside this corpse and (his) wife”, see below §3.1). Due to its position in the beneficiaries’ clause, immediately before the stereotypical mention of the owner’s wife, an autoreferential meaning similar to

atli “for himself” was proposed (e.g. TL 105 2 *atli ehbi se ladi se tideime* “for himself, and (his) wife, and (his) sons”). Under this reasoning, *hātahe* would be a pronominal element with a genitive singular case in /-he/, in turn resulting from an analogy with the plural genitival adjective of proper nouns.⁴ The same inflection is accepted by Hajnal (1995: 195) in light of the equation *ti* : *tihe* in the relative-interrogative pronoun, and also by Neumann (2007: 91).

In turn, Melchert (2002: 245) explained *hāta-* as a lexicalized *-nt-* participle from the verb *ha-* ‘let go, release’ and established its meaning as ‘deceased’ – unlinked, however, to *hātahe* due, precisely, to its ending. As a common noun, *hāta-* is expected to use the *-aha/i-* genitival inflection, which necessarily assigns a dat.-loc.pl. case to *-ahe*. Arguing that the syntactic functions that dat.-loc.pl. case carries do not agree with the syntax of the passage, Melchert establishes *hāta-* and *hātahe* as separate *lemmata*, the latter being a continuation of the Luwian war-god *Sanda* and, therefore, a proper noun that allows him to analyse it as a locative singular.

§ 2.2. The association with Luwian *Sanda*

The association between Lycian *hātahe* and Luwian *Sanda* stands on phonetic grounds. The acknowledged change Proto-Anatolian **s* > Lyc. *h* (AHP 288, 294), and the orthographic representation of /an/ as a nasalised vowel <ã> by Lycian, creates a suitable correspondence with the Luwian war-god *Sanda*, attested in Cuneiform ^D*Ša-an-ta-aš* (Melchert *in press*),⁵ and later on in Hieroglyphic Luwian ((DEUS)*sà-ta-*, ACLT, *s.v.*).

4. The so-called ‘genitival’-adjective is formally a relational adjective with separate inflections for common nouns and proper nouns. The first follows the inflection of *i*-mutated stems in the common gender, and of neuter *a*-stems in the plural of the neuter gender; the second partially coincides with *h*-stems but seems to follow a specific inflection whose exact distribution is still an open question. Much of the discussion depends on the origin and development of two formally and functionally similar morphosyntactic elements, the Luwic **-assa/i-* relational suffix and the prehistory of the genitive singular case. However, the description of the nominal and adjectival sub-classes of Lycian also as recategorization processes of these classes is likely to play a pivotal role which is still to be fully addressed. I refer the reader to the works of Adiego (2010) and Melchert (2012) on the topic in Lycian.

5. Often associated with the logographic writing AMAR.UTU-*aš*, which prompted the identification between *Sanda* and Babylonian Marduk (Rutherford 2017: 82). The Luwian origin of *Sanda* is traditionally postulated due to its presence in the Zarpīya ritual (Starke 1985: 46–55), as also for some theophoric names comprising Luwian elements (e.g. NH n°1102 *Šantawīya-* and n° 1103

In addition to the historical-phonetic coincidence, the alleged transmission of this god in the Lycian milieu is reinforced indirectly by two features: the presence of *Sanda* in Lydian sources (*Sānta*, LW 4a 3), accounting for the continuity of this divinity in the first millennium, and the traditionally assumed syncretism between Anatolian *Sanda* and Greek Heracles (Laroche 1973), a phenomenon thought to have arisen in Cilicia. This region is home to most of the onomastic evidence of this god under the form of theophorics (Σανδας, Σανδης, Σανδιος, Σανδων, or Σανδατις, Houwink Ten Cate 1961: 137). The mythological narration and the iconography related to it is another common element mentioned when connecting Heracles with *Sanda* and the Cilician region. For instance, the pyre on which Heracles self-immolated on Mount Oeta is thought to be the iconographical motif behind a series of geometrical figures displayed on some coins at Tarsus and in the so-called Sandon monument (Rutherford 2017: 85 w/reff.). Finally, the divine attributes of *Sanda* – warfare and the underworld – are two common features that connect him with Heracles (Rutherford 2017). Interestingly, Heracles is already mentioned in the Xanthos Pillar under the local adaptations *Herikle* (TL 44b 50) and *Erikle* (TL 44d 17), for which reason the kind of syncretism underlying *Hātahe-Sanda* and Heracles in the Lycian context would be that of a parallelism, which does not imply the notion of a fusion between the two divinities.⁶

Melchert cautiously supports the association of *Hātahe* with *Sanda*, independently of the possible syncretism of the latter with Greek Heracles. Under this interpretation, *Hātahe* would be the recipient of offerings in each of the towns mentioned, and of a building in TL 44b 55–56 (2002: 247 “an *urublije-* for *Sanda*”), syntactically assumed to be a genitive singular *-he* ending with a dative function

Šantaziti-), a question recently revisited by Kloekhorst (2019: 179–180) in relation to the Kültepe names *Ša(n)taššu-* (NH n° 1097) and *Ša(n)taššušar-* (NH n°1098).

6. Arguing in favor of avoiding the notion of fusion that the term ‘syncretism’ would imply, Rutherford refers to this concept with the term ‘translation’, defined as “the practical convention using the name of a deity from one religious tradition as an equivalent of a deity in another one” (2017: 82). For the linguistic connotation that translation carries in terms of addressing the phenomenon of linguistic contact, I opt for the nomenclature proposed by Budin (2004: 97–98 w/reff.), and refer to it as syncretism by parallelism or *interpretatio*, which simply conveys the identification of a foreign divinity with one from the local pantheon. In a recent communication at the 66th RAI (Frankfurt – Mainz), V. Pisaniello and L. Warbinek (“Borrowing, translation, and syncretism of deities in Ancient Anatolia”) proposed a new religious-linguistic taxonomy, according to which the *Sanda* – Heracles association would respond, linguistically, to a borrowing, and, in terms of the assimilation strategy adopted towards the native deity, to a full syncretism. I refer the reader to their forthcoming publication for a full discussion on the terminology.

(2002: 250). The same meaning of the lemma is supported by Sasseville (2021b: 166), who, however, defines the morphology of *Hãtahe* as a genitival adjective inflected in dative plural with an unexpressed head-noun “(in honor) of the War-god” (‘in (Ehre) des Kriegsgottes’).

§ 2.3. Contextual meanings

The argument on which a last group of interpretations of the term *hãtahe* is primarily based is the context of the passages in which the word occurs. In view of this enumeration of toponyms, where all but one of the *hãtahe* attestations are found, the semantics related to the concept of ‘victory’ has recently been proposed by Oreshko (2021). The author argues that the lack of verbal elements in the passage leads to the attribution of a verbal function to *hãtahe*, assuming a sense ‘(to be) victorious’. The morphology is adduced to respond to a ‘free standing genitive’, ultimately going back to a noun **hãta-* ‘victory’, distinct from the *hãta-* ‘corpse’ of TL 84 (Oreshko 2021: 98 fn.9). In a second hypothesis, he opts to interpret it as a genitival adjective from a reconstructed noun **hãta-* ‘victory’, functioning as the modifier of *prulija* in line 41,⁷ thus “the trophies of the victory” (Oreshko 2021: 99). Also based on the structure shown in the sequence of toponyms (TL 44a 41–55), Schürr (2009: 170) proposes that *hãtahe* functions as a refrain word that marks the end of clauses, formally interpreted as a dative plural from a genitival adjective derived from *hãta-* “in the ways of a *hãta-*”, as a way to convey ‘marvellous, lordly’ (‘herrlich’). The semantic transfer is explained by assuming the meaning ‘owner’ (‘Inhaber’) for *hãta-* in TL 84 3, taken as the participle form of verb *ha-* ‘to have’.

Eichner proposed the meaning ‘victory (in combat)’ (‘für die Siege im Kampf’) as well; however, in relation to the attestation in TL 44b 56 and, unlike Oreshko (*op.cit.*), he linked *hãta-* with the meaning ‘corpse’ that was established by Melchert (2002). In order to account for a sense related to victory in the Xanthos Pillar, Eichner (2005: 34 w/fn. 187) defends the semantic transfer ‘physical’ (‘körperlich’) → ‘athletic’ (‘athletisch’) → ‘competition’ (‘Wettkampf’) and ‘military combat’ (‘militärischer Kampf’).

7. Under the argument that the mention of τροπᾶια ‘trophies’ (TL 44c 30) in the Greek epigram (TL 44c 20–31/ *CEG* 177 11) is represented in the content of the Lycian version (Eichner in Borchhardt, Eichner, Pesditschek and Ruggendorfer 1997–1999: 46), Melchert (2002: 249) suggested that *prulija* might be its Lycian counterpart.

To sum up, the problems facing the various interpretations of *hātahe* can be grouped in:

- (1) the morphosyntax of the /-he/ ending (genitive singular or genitival adjective inflected in dative-locative plural) and its role in the sentences (a verbal action, a modifier of *prulija*, a modifier of an unexpressed head-noun, a benefactive dative, or an adverbial clause divider);
- (2) its derivation and/or etymology (a continuation of the Luwian warlike god *Sanda*, a derivate of the lexicalized participle *hāta-*, from v. *ha-*, or a derivative of *hāta-* of unknown origin).
- (3) its meaning as adduced from the connection with *hāta-* (a semantic transfer from ‘corpse’ into ‘victory’ or from ‘possessor, owner’ into ‘marvelous, lordly’).

In my view, the assumption that *hātahe* and *hāta-* are unrelated lemmata arises from the difficulty of tracing a plausible semantic connection between the two meanings, *hāta-* ‘corpse’ with *hātahe* as either ‘*Sanda*’ (Melchert 2002, Sasseville 2021b: 166) or ‘victory’ (Oreshko 2021: 98). Opting for a *lectio difficilior* seems unjustified given the phonetic closeness of the two items, which, on the basis of linguistic proximity, should encourage us to explain the connection by means of inductive reasoning. The two proposals that in fact support the morphological derivation between *hāta-* and *hātahe* are forced either to explain the meaning of the latter through multiple semantic transfers (‘corpse’ > ‘military victory’, Eichner 2005: 34 w/fn. 187) or to provide a different meaning of its base form v. *ha-* (‘to have’ rather than ‘to release’, Schürr 2009: 170).

§ 3. Analysis

§ 3.1. Morphology and syntax within the passage

There are two premises that seem assured from the perspective of internal combinatory analysis: the derivative connection between *hāta-* and *hātahe*, and the meaning of *hāta-* ‘corpse, deceased’ in relation to the verbal origin from *ha-* ‘to release’.

Starting from the most primary form in this group of words, the Lycian verb *ha-* is etymologically connected to Luw. /sa⁽ⁱ⁾/ ‘to release’, whose root goes back to PIE **seh₁(i)-* ‘to let sth. go’ (LIV²: 518, different from PIE **seh₁-* which develops into Hittite *šāi-/i(ya)*^(hi) ‘to press, to seal’). The Lycian form v. *ha-* would have an original sense ‘to release from the hand’, according to Melchert (2015),

with slight variations on its meaning in function of the preverbs and particles that complement it (see in detail Sasseville 2021a: 307, 357–358). The univerbation v. *alaha-* ‘to arrange, to lay out (in a tomb)’ (DLL 3) further provides the semantic grounds for establishing the sense of *hāta-* as the ‘the laid out’ → ‘corpse, deceased’, as proposed by Melchert (2002: 245) in relation to its sole attestation in TL 84 (2–3 *s=ed=adē: atli: hrzzē [i]spazijē: me=te: ñta tāti ebññē: hātā: se ladā:* “and he made it, an upper bench for himself, and here will put inside this corpse and the wife”). When in the beneficiaries’ clause of a funerary inscription a family member precedes the mention of the *lada-* ‘wife’, it must be the owner, generally referred to either through his personal name (e.g. TL 101 2) or by the autoreferential construction *atli ehbi* “for himself” (e.g. TL 27 2). On this occasion, TL 84 has two beneficiaries’ clauses: one which mentions the recipients of the funerary monument (1. 2 *hrppi atli: ehbi: se ladi: se tideime: ehbije*), and a second specifying the place in the tomb to be occupied by them (TL 84 2–3 see above). Besides, it seems possible that *hātā* was omitted in TL 131 1, where *ebññē:* appears in an almost identical context (*m=ene: ñtepi: tāti: ebññē: se ladā: ehbi*). Given the identification of *hāta-* with the owner of the tomb in TL 84, a sense ‘owner, possessor’ from v. *ha-* ‘to have’ as projected by Schürr (*op.cit.* w/reff.) is not implausible. However, in terms of the Anatolian cognancy and of Lycian internal evidence, the meaning ‘to have’ does not seem as straightforward as the meaning ‘to release’ and its derivatives.

The derivation process in *hāta-* ‘deceased, corpse, (what is released)’ involves a lexicalization of a *-nt-* participle from *ha-* ‘to release’ (Melchert 2002: 245). This word-formation mechanism is attested as well in *ahñta-* ‘possessions’, from **ah-* ‘to be’ (cf. Luw. v. *as-* ‘id.’) and *lāta-* ‘dead’ from *la-* ‘be dead’. The ending of *hātāhe* points without much doubt to a genitival-adjective derivation *-ahe/i-*, which in Lycian and Luwian creates the productive type of relational adjectives, thus *hāta-* ‘dead/corpse’ > **hātahi* ‘of the dead/corpse’. A second process of word-formation in **hātahi* could have eventually taken place, creating a lexicalized *-ahe/i-* formation, parallel for instance to *prñnezi(je)-* ‘household’ > *prñnezijehi-* lit. “of the household”, lexicalized into “the one of the household” → ‘household member’ (Neumann 2007: 285–6). Secondary derivations from already lexicalized participles are attested at least once, cf. *lāta-* ‘dead’, from *la-* ‘be dead’, → *lataza-* ‘member of the dead’.

Taking the hypothesis of a lexicalized genitival-adjective formation **hātahi-* ‘of the dead/corpse’, I propose a semantic transfer into a spatial specification → ‘place of the dead’, that is, ‘burial ground, cemetery’. Considering **hātahi* as a substantive has the further advantage of providing a better scenario for explaining

the morphosyntax of its elusive ending /-he/. If the word maintains the inflection of *-ahe/i-* genitival-adjectives, independently of its lexicalization, *hātahe* must be a dat-loc.pl. case with a locative function “in the places of the dead”, “in the cemeteries”. Behind the plural inflection, this might be a *plurale tantum* arising from the collective notion of ‘group of deceased’, and therefore semantically referring to a singular number, i.e., ‘in the cemetery, in the burial ground’ (e.g., *wawa-* ‘cow’, but coll.pl. *uwa-* ‘cattle’, *DLL* 78). Alternatively, **hātahi* might have been reanalyzed into the inflection of *h-*stems, which might account for the locative singular ending /-he/ “in the place of the dead, in the cemetery”, analogous to the loc.sg. inflection of common nouns. Taking **hātahi* as a lexicalized adjective has the advantage of maintaining the coherence with its base formation, while avoiding the need of case agreement with other elements of the sentence. The meaning (**hātahi* ‘burial ground, cemetery’) and syntactic case (dat-loc.pl. *hātahe* ‘in the burial ground’) would fit both contexts where the lemma appears: the enumeration of military victories (TL 44a 41–55), and the dedication of a building (TL 44b 55–57).

§ 3.2. Semantics and intertextuality

The semantic transfer that might confer a meaning of ‘burial ground’ on **hātahi* finds typological parallels in several Indo-European languages. Much of the semantics related to death and burial involves metaphoric uses of the notion ‘to go’ or ‘to lie down’: e.g. **leit(h)-* ‘go away’ > ON *līða* ‘go, pass’ → ON participle *līðinn* ‘dead’, *leiði* ‘burial place’ (Buck 1949: 288); or **kei-* ‘to lie down’ > with *m-*suffix Gr. κομᾶω ‘put to sleep’ (IEW 539–540) ‘to lie down (dead)’ → κομητήριον ‘sleeping room’, which acquires the late meaning ‘cemetery’ in the Judeo-Christian context. More literal connotations imply the root **uelh₃₋* ‘to wound’ (→ ON *valr* ‘one who dies on the battlefield’, OE *wæl* ‘slaughter, carnage’, in pl. ‘dead bodies’, IEW 1144–1145, De Vries 1977: 642), to which Lyc. *la-* and Luw. *wala-* ‘to die’, with their respective derivations Lyc. *lāta-* and Luw. *ulant(i)-* ‘deceased’, go back (LIV² *Add.-Corr.* s.v.). Interestingly, the concept behind Lyc. v. *ha-* ‘to release’ and *hāta-* ‘deceased’ reflects more the notion of preparation and disposal of the tomb (cf. **sep-* > Gr. ἔπω ‘serve, prepare’; **sepelje/o-* > Lat. *sepeliō* ‘bury’ → *sepulcrum* ‘tomb’ (IEW 909); **d^heh₁₋* ‘to put’ → *d^heh₁-to* > Arm. *di* ‘corpse’)⁸ than the euphemistic and literal meanings first referred. Therefore, the reason for deriving a meaning of ‘burial ground’ from

8. Kölligan (2015: 114–118) on this *vṛddhi*-formation with further semantic parallels; see Martirosyan (2009: 240) on the derivative *dir*, from the same verbal root, with the meaning ‘cemetery’.

hãta- rather than from *lãta-* would be the preservation of the primary meaning as ‘arrangement’, which, in this case, leads to an etymological understanding of **hãtahi* as the disposal of the tombs in the burial ground.

If, alternatively, the meaning is not transferred from the underlying concept ‘disposal/arrangement of the deceased’, but from the literal notion ‘corpse, deceased’, as in fact the morphology of the **hãtahi* derivation implies in relation to *hãta-*, another semantic transfer might be ‘of the deceased’ → ‘tomb’. This view deserves further exploration by incorporating the perspective of linguistic contact between Lycian and Greek and, in particular, the interference between different epigraphic genres.

§ 3.2.1. Public epitaphs in military contexts

The Greek epigram (*CEG* 177) has been discussed ever since the *editio princeps* of the Xanthos Pillar because of its potential for showing connections with the Lycian composition that might eventually lead to a better interpretation of the text. Most of the correlations, however, have been challenged as our understanding of the Lycian language has advanced.⁹ The Greek epigram, in turn, has received attention from an intertextual point of view, especially with regard to the exact parallel between its *incipit* (v.1 [ἐ]ξ οὗ τ’ Εὐρώπην [Ἀ]σίας δίχλα πόν[τ]ος ἔνεμ[ε]ν) and that of a famous epigram of Simonides (*FGE* XLV). The comparison with the Simonidean epigram has traditionally sparked strong criticism of the poetic skills of the author of the epigram in the Xanthos Pillar (Bousquet 1992: 165), on the basis of the irregularity of its metric composition (a mix of hexameters, pentameters and elegiac distiches), the alleged patchwork of literary formulas, and the syntactic error that the exact reproduction of the Simonidean *incipit* creates in relation to the particle τε. However, after a detailed analysis, Ceccarelli (1996) has convincingly shown that the Xanthos Greek epigram is a notable, conscientious creation, where the syntactic error is seen as an express desire to make the Simonidean *incipit* identifiable for the public, while at the same time aiming to compete with it.¹⁰

9. E.g., the alleged reference to the Twelve Gods seen in Lycian *mahãnaha tusãti* (TL 44a 12, Laroche 1974: 146, fn.41, Bousquet 1975: 140 fn.7) in light of the Greek epigram (v.3 [δ]ώδεκα θεοῖς) cannot be sustained on the grounds of Lycian internal evidence. The form *tusãti* responds to an iterative form of v. *tuwe-* ‘to place’ (Melchert *DLL* 74). The identification in Lycian *hbãti*: *CII* (44a 49) of the hoplite soldiers mentioned in the Greek (v.10) epigram has also been discussed (Martínez-Rodríguez 2021 w/reff.).

10. Nonetheless, and in spite of this poet’s wish to make Simonides’ quotation identifiable, note that without the τε particle the number of feet of the hexameter verse would simply not have worked. I refer the reader to Ceccarelli’s study for a literary analysis of the poem (pp. 51–54) and for a further

Most interesting for the purpose of this article is to contextualize the Xanthos Greek epigram (*CEG* 177) and the Simonidean parallel (*FGE* XLV) in the framework of their epigraphic genre, and to place it in the historical context that surrounds the narration in the Lycian version of the Xanthos Pillar.

The Simonidean epigram, in which the Greek passage of the Xanthos Pillar is allegedly inspired, commemorates the military victories of Eurymedon (468 BC) and Salamis (449/8 BC) and pays homage to the soldiers fallen in these battles. This genre, referred to as war-memorial, is closely related to that of the public funerary epitaphs located in the place of a battle (e.g., the epigram for the Spartans fallen in the *Thermopylae*, only indirectly attested, *Hdt.* 7.228). These were intended to mark the place of communal tombs, which receive the denomination *πολυανδρεῖον*. For the sake of being honoured in their homelands, the sepulchral inscription of a *πολυανδρεῖον* might have a reproduction in the respective *pólis*, which on some occasions was accompanied by an epigram contextualizing the epitaph and honouring the dead in battle. This is important in order to understand that, in the military context, the limits between these categories (epitaph for a *πολυανδρεῖον*, its replica with an epigram, war-memorial, or even a cenotaph) might appear rather blurred, for they accept a number of variants and combinations.¹¹

In turn, it is commonly believed that the Xanthos Pillar, besides exalting the figure of the ruler *Xeriga* and the Harpagid dynasty, conveys the turbulent times around the defection of the Lycians from the Delian League, for which reason the monument is held to display a double function and its epigraphic genre normally referred to as that of funerary *laudatio* and triumphal accounts. The second category involves a major part of the Xanthos Pillar composition, of which the so-called *hātahe*-narration is representative. In my view, the topic that the *hātahe* passage conveys, that is, a series of military encounters in Lycia and Caria, is to be understood in the context that the epigraphic genre of the Greek epigram encompasses, that is, in relation to the sites of battles and the communal tombs of the fallen. A meaning similar to that of a *πολυανδρεῖον* is not only plausible in terms of the derivation from *hāta*- ‘deceased’, but also fits the contexts of the various attestations: 1) toponyms + *hātahe*, “in the *X*-place [v. a.42 *Zagaba*, Lower

compilation of rare metrical compositions, accounting for the validity of the Greek epigram of Xanthos (pp. 55–61).

11. I refer the reader to the commentaries on Simonides by Page (1981: 186–302). The distinction is further complicated by the fact that several of these epitaphs or war-memorial epigrams have only endured in secondary or even tertiary sources.

Tymnessos, v. a.43 *Patara*, v. a.53 *Chersonesos*], in the communal tomb”, 2) v. a.45–46 *izredi ehbijedi + hãtahe* “by/with his hands, in the communal tomb”, 3) v. a.47 *erbbedi + hãtahe* “with battle/defeat in the communal tomb”, 4) v. a.50, a.55 *terñ + hãtahe* “the army [DO] in the communal tomb”; 5) b.55 *urublijẽ + hãtahe* “a monument [DO] in the communal tomb”.

The final issue to consider in this debate is how the semantics of *hãtahe* would respond in view of a possible correspondence with the concept of a πολυανδρεῖον, and from the perspective of linguistic contact. In this regard, the option of a calque from Greek into Lycian is limited because its base meanings do not correlate exactly (Gr. ἀνὴρ ‘men’, Lyc. *hãta-* ‘deceased, corpse’) – only through establishing further semantic transfers to force the lexical equivalence (Gr. ‘men’, Lyc. ‘corpse’ → body). In spite of this, the role of the epigraphic genre cannot be dismissed. While funerary inscriptions bear a strong Lycian identity, note that it is precisely in the Xanthos Pillar where we find the use of the Greek loanword *sttala-* (Neumann 2007: 333),¹² which is particularly surprising for a culture with a particularly rich terminology to refer to their epigraphic monuments, either funerary or commemorative. The context that further explains the presence of military lexical borrowings, such as the trireme (Lyc. *trijere* 44b 22 and 23, cf. Gr. τριήρης), and in which the use of *hãtahe* as an equivalent word for πολυανδρεῖον might have arisen, is to be understood in the deep involvement of the Lycians in the events of the Athenian power in coastal Asia Minor (Thonemann 2009). In other words, the epigraphic genre to which the Greek epigram belongs, together with the military interactions between Lycia and Athens, provides indirect evidence for understanding the possible meaning of *hãtahe*.

§ 4. Conclusions

Earlier proposals regarding the origin and meaning of the Xanthos Pillar lemma *hãtahe* can be divided into two main groups: the ones that defend the lack of a relation to *hãta-* and the ones that maintain the hypothesis of a derivation from it. The first are either based on the phonetic diachronic proximity with the Luwian theonym *Sanda*, which would find its Lycian continuation in *Hãta* (Melchert 2002, Sasseville 2021b), or account for a contextually inferred meaning related to victory (‘victorious’ or ‘of the victory’, Oreshko 2021). The second rely on establishing

12. Besides the Xanthos Pillar (TL 44a 1*, 44c 5, 7), it is only attested in two further dynastic inscriptions (45B 8 and N320 23, 33–34).

several semantic transfers between *hāta-* and *hātahe* in order to arrive at a meaning that suits the context of the passage ('victory (in combat), Eichner 2005), or modifies the meaning of the base of its derivation ('lordly', Schürr 2009). All the explanations try to navigate the problem that the genitival adjective ending /-ahe/ posits in relation to the syntax of the *hātahe*-passage, which constitutes the crux of the debate.

In this study, I have given priority to a solution that is consistent with the Lycian internal comparative evidence, and secondarily, I have explored its suitability inside the context of the narration, using both semantic parallels and interference phenomena in order to account for its origin. The present proposal is based on two Lycian common derivations: the creation of a genitival adjective from *hāta-* (→ adj. **hātaha/i-*) and the lexicalization of its resulting adjective into a common noun (→ **hātahi-*). In maintaining the semantic literality of this derivation (*hāta-* 'deceased' → **hātahi-* 'related to the deceased'), I infer a meaning 'cemetery, burial ground' or 'communal tomb', which has the advantage of reducing the sequence of semantic developments between *hāta-* and **hātahi*, while maintaining the base meaning of *ha-* 'to release' that is consistent with the etymological and internal analysis. The semantic transfer into a sense 'cemetery, burial ground', though lacking Anatolian *comparanda*, is typologically likely and finds semantic parallels in different Indo-European languages. I have also compared the Greek epigram of the Xanthos Pillar (CEG 177) and the epigraphic genre that encompass the historical events of the Lycian text in order to explore a more specific term, i.e., 'communal tomb', that may have arisen via the contact between Athenian and Lycian powers in a military context, thus responding to the Greek concept of the *πολυανδρεῖον*, but also through interference due to the epigraphic genre, that is, the close relation between war-memorial epigrams and public epitaphs in communal tombs. This hypothesis does not intend to explain Lyc. **hātahi-* as a Greek calque *per se*, but to understand it, historically and philologically, from the interconnections with the Greek culture.

A final note regarding the methodological approach in fragmentary languages is to stress the importance of maintaining inductive reasoning and of incorporating the philological perspective that may lead to a consideration of historic-cultural contacts and linguistic contact as a further source of evidence.

§ 5. Literature

ACLT = I. YAKUBOVICH. online. *Annotated corpus of the Luwian texts/Hieroglyphic vocabulary*, <http://web-corpora.net/LuwianCorpus/search/> (30/09/2020).

ADIEGO, I.-X. 2010. “On Lycian Genitives in *-h*, *-he*”. In: R. Kim, N. Oettinger, E. Rieken and M. Weiss (eds.), *Ex Anatolia Lux. Anatolian and Indo-European Studies in Honor of H. Craig Melchert*. Ann Arbor/New York: Beech Stave Press, 1–8.

AHP = H. C. MELCHERT. 1994. *Anatolian Historical Phonology*. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.

BORCHHARDT, J., EICHNER, H., PESDITSCHKE, M. and RUGGENDORFER, P. 1997–1999. “Archäologisch-sprachwissenschaftliches Corpus der Denkmäler mit lykischer Schrift”. *Anzeiger der Philosophisch-Historischen Klasse. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften* 134/2, 11–96.

BOUSQUET, J. 1992. “Les inscriptions gréco-lyciennes”. In: H. Metzger (ed.), *Fouilles de Xanthos IX*. Paris: Klincksieck, 147–204.

BUCK, C. D. 1949. *A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages*. Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press.

BUDIN, S. 2004. “A Reconsideration of the Aphrodite-Ashtart Syncretism”. *Numen* 51/2, 95–145.

CECCARELLI, P. 1996. “La struttura dell’epigramma di Xanthos”. In: A. dell’Era and A. Russi (eds.), *Vir bonus docendi peritus. Omaggio dell’Università dell’Aquila al Prof. Giovanni Garuti*. San Severo: Gerni editori, 47–69.

CEG = P. A. HANSEN (ed.). 1983 and 1989. *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca*, II vols. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.

DE VRIES, J. 1977. *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch (zweite verbesserte Auflage)*. Leiden: Brill.

DLL = H. C. MELCHERT. 2004. *A Dictionary of the Lycian Language*. Ann Arbor/New York: Beech Stave Press.

EICHNER, H. 2005. “Die philologische Evidenz”. In: J. Borchhardt, H. Eichner and K. Schulz (eds.), *Kerththi oder der Versuch, eine antike Siedlung der Klassik in Zentrallykien zu identifizieren*. Antalya: AKMED: Suna ve Inan Kiraç Akdeniz Medeniyetleri Araştırma Enstitüsü Yayınları, 19–37.

FGE = D. L. PAGE (ed.). 1981. *Further Greek Epigrams. Epigrams before A.D. 50 from the Greek Anthology and Other Sources, not Included in Hellenistic Epigrams or the Garland of Philip (Revised and Prepared for Publication by R.D. Dawe and J. Diggle)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

HAJNAL, I. 1995. *Der lykische Vokalismus. Methode und Erkenntnisse der vergleichenden anatolischen Sprachwissenschaft, angewandt auf das Vokalsystem einer Kleincorpusssprache*. Graz: Leykam.

HOUWINK TEN CATE, Ph. H. J. 1961. *The Luwian Population Groups of Lycia and Cilicia Aspera*. Leiden: Brill.

IEW = J. POKORNY. 1959–1969. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Tübingen/Basel: Francke.

KLOEKHORST, A. 2019. *Kanišite Hittite The earliest attested record of Indo-European*. Handbuch der Orientalistik 1.132. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

KÖLLIGAN, D. 2015. “Zwei armenische Vřddhibildungen: *di* ‘Leiche’ und *lic/lič* ‘See’”. In: Th. Krisch (ed.), *Diachronie und Sprachvergleich. Beiträge aus der Arbeitsgruppe “historisch-vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft” bei der 40. Österreichischen Linguistiktagung 2013 in Salzburg*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck, Bereich Sprachwissenschaft, 112–120.

LAROCHE, E. 1973. “Un syncrétisme gréco-anatolien: Sandas=Hérakles”. In: M. Simon (ed.), *Les syncrétismes dans les religions grecque et romaine. Colloque de Strasbourg 9–11 juin 1971*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 104–114.

LIV² = R. HELMUT. 2001. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstambildungen. Unter der Leitung von Helmut Rix und der Mitarbeit vieler anderer bearbeitet von Martin Kümmel, Thomas Zehnder, Reiner Lipp, Brigitte Schirmer*. Zweite Auflage. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert Verlag.

LIV² Add.-Corr = K. MARTIN (online) *Addenda und Corrigenda zu LIV²*, <http://www.martinkuemmel.de/liv2add.html> (03.02.2015).

NEUMANN, G. 2007. *Glossar des Lykischen*. Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 21. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

MARTÍNEZ-RODRÍGUEZ, E. 2021. “Lycian *hba-*. Towards the interpretation of TL 44a.49”. In: Ll. Feliu, A. Millet and J. Vidal (eds.), *Sentido de un empeño. Volum d’Homenatge a Gregorio del Olmo Lete*. Barcino Monographica Orientalia 16. Barcelona: Edicions de la Universitat de Barcelona, 295–307.

MARTIROSYAN, H. 2009: *Etymological dictionary of the Armenian inherited lexicon*. Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 8. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

MELCHERT, H. C. 2001. *Lycian Corpus* (last modified 07/06/2001). On-line self-published: <https://linguistics.ucla.edu/people/Melchert/lyciancorpus.pdf>

MELCHERT, H. C. 2002. “The God Sanda in Lycia?”. In: P. Taracha (ed.), *Silva Anatolica. Anatolian Studies Presented to Maciej Popko on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Warsaw: Agade, 241–251.

MELCHERT, H. C. 2005. “The Problem of Luvian Influence on Hittite”. In: G. Meiser and O. Hackstein (eds.), *Sprachkontakt und Sprachwandel, Akten der XI. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft 17.–23. September 2000, Halle an der Saale*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 445–460.

MELCHERT, H. C. 2012. “Genitive Case and Possessive Adjective in Anatolian”. In: V. Orioles *et al.* (eds.), *Per Roberto Gusmani. Studi in ricordo. Linguistica storica e teorica, vol. II, tomo I*. Udine: Forum, 273–286.

MELCHERT, H. C. (in press). *A Dictionary of Cuneiform Luvian*.

MERIGGI, P. 1929. “La declinazione del licio”. *Rendiconti della Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche. Reale Accademia nazionale dei Lincei*, Serie VI, vol IV, fasc.7–10. Roma, 410–459.

MERIGGI, P. 1936. “Der Indogermanismus des Lykischen.” In H. Arntz (ed.), *Germanen und Indogermanen. Volkstum, Sprache, Heimat, Kultur. Festschrift für Herman Hirt*. Heidelberg: Winter, 257–288.

N = N. GÜNTER (ed.). 1979. *Neufunde lykischer Inschriften seit 1901*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

NH = L. EMMANUEL. 1966. *Les noms des Hittites*. Paris: Klincksieck.

ORESHKO, R. 2021. “Observations on the Xanthos Trilingual: Syntactic Structure of TL 44a, 41–55 and the Lycian Terminology of Art and War”. *Hungarian Assyriological Review* 2, 95–144.

RUTHERFORD, I. 2017. “Sandas in Translation”. In: A. Mouton (ed.), *Hittitology Today: Studies on Hittite and Neo Hittite Anatolia in Honor of Emmanuel Laroche’s 100th Birthday*. Istanbul: Ege Yayinlari, 81–110.

SASSEVILLE, D. 2021a. *Anatolian Verbal Stem Formation: Luwian, Lycian and Lydian*. Brill’s Studies in Indo-European Languages & Linguistics 21. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

SASSEVILLE, D. 2021b. “Die Deutung von lykisch *terñ* und ihre Konsequenz für die Kriegspolitik Lykiens”. *Hungarian Assyriological Review* 2, 161–172.

SCHÜRR, D. 2009. “Zum Agora-Pfeiler in Xanthos II. Selbstlos auf Perserart und Ordnung des Raumes”. *Kadmos* 48, 157–176.

STARKE, F. 1985. *Die Keilschrift-Luwischen Texte im Umschrift*. Studien zu den Boğazköy Texten 30. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

THONEMANN, Peter. 2009. “Lycia, Athens and Amorges”. In: J. Ma, R. Parker and N. Papazarkadas (eds.): *Interpreting the Athenian Empire*. London: Bristol Classical Press, 167–194.

TL = E. KALINKA (ed.). 1901. *Tituli Lyciae Lingua Lycia conscripti (Tituli Asiae Minoris I)*. Wien: Akademie der Wissenschaften (Alfred Hoelder).