The Beginning of the Lycian and Greek Versions of the Létôon Trilingual: Syntax and Semantics

1. ἐκείνη τῆς ἱστορίας: χαθότητα: πιγέσει
2. καταναλώσας τῆς ἱστορίας: πιγέσει
3. ἐπιδράσεις: πιγέσει
4. ἐπιτάχθηκες τῆς ἱστορίας: πιγέσει
5. διαρκείς καταστάσεις: πιγέσει
6. ἐπιτάχθηκες τῆς ἱστορίας: πιγέσει
7. καταναλώσας τῆς ἱστορίας: πιγέσει
8. καταναλώσας τῆς ἱστορίας: πιγέσει

The “synoptic method” applied to the interpretation of the Létôon Trilingual has been of much value, since it allowed scholars to make sense of a large part of the Lycian version by using the parallel Greek text. However, this method may sometimes also have been misleading, particularly when it comes to the first sentence of the two texts, whose syntax and semantics may not perfectly match. The first issue concerns the protasis in the Greek text which does not have the same extension as in the Lycian one. Some scholars have argued this discrepancy is due to a mistake made by the translator or the engraver, but, as I will try to show, this explanation is rather unlikely. The semantics of the protasis will also be under scrutiny, in so far as its causal value has been much discussed among historians who would like to know whether the establishment of the cult of two Carian gods depended or not on the appointment of Pixôdarus as satrap of Lycia. In the last part of this paper, I will deal with the apodosis of the Lycian text, whose syntax and semantics have been brought into line with those of the Greek text, in accordance with the “synoptic method”, but maybe wrongly.

1. Syntax of the protasis

According to Laroche and Metzger (1979)’s analysis, the syntax of the Greek text does not match the syntax of the Lycian one. This is problematic in the view of Blomqvist (1982) and Rutherford (2002) who try to understand the relationship between the two texts. How can we explain the fact that the translator did not model the syntax of the Greek text on the syntax of the Lycian one? We could a priori answer that the syntax of a target text does not need to match the syntax of its source text in every respect, as long as the meaning of the source text is conveyed. However, Jerker Blomqvist and Ian Rutherford seem to assume that the syntactic devices used in a source text and a target text must a priori match and that if there is any difference, it must be explained as a mistake. The way each of them explain the mistake is very similar. They both postulate the existence of an intermediate text. For Jerker Blomqvist, it is a Lycian text misinterpreted by the translator. For Ian Rutherford, it is a first version of the Greek text which the translator or the engraver would have copied with a spelling mistake.

1.1. Laroche and Metzger (1979)

In the beginning of the Létôon Trilingual, three events are dealt with (e₁, e₂, e₃), each of which is described by one clause in both versions (c₁-lyc, c₂-lyc, c₃-lyc ; c₁-gr, c₂-gr, c₃-gr).

I would like to thank Craig Melchert and Markus Egetmeyer for their very helpful comments on an earlier draft. I am solely responsible for any errors.

1 Cf. Briant (1998: 308) to whom I owe this expression.
These clauses are not put together in the same way in Lycian and Greek, as Laroche (1979: 62, 93) and Metzger (1979: 33) noticed in their first edition of the Trilingual inscription. In the Lycian version, c₁, lyc and c₂, lyc are joined with the coordinate conjunction se= and form a preposed subordinate clause which is linked to the independent clause c₃, lyc with the subordinate conjunction ᵇke and the “correlative” me=.² In the Greek version, c₁, gr is joined to c₂, gr with the subordinate conjunction ἐπεὶ, and they both form a sentence which is either coordinated or juxtaposed to c₃, gr depending on δῆ being construed as a connective or an emphatic particle.³

Syntactic analysis according to Laroche and Metzger (1979):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Clause (Lycian)</th>
<th>Clause (Greek)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e₁: “Πιξόδαρος becomes satrap of Lycia”</td>
<td>c₁, lyc: ὀπιμίσθης ᾧσσαθραπάζατε πιγέσερῃ καταμλαθ τιδειμὶ</td>
<td>c₁, gr: Λυκίας ξαδράπης ἐγένετο Πιξόδαρος Ἐκατόμην ἴος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e₂: “Πιξόδαρος appoints Hieron and Apollodotos as archontes of Lycia and Artemelis as governor of Xanthos”</td>
<td>c₂, lyc: =ἀνὴ=πᾶδδ=hadē ὀπιμίσθης πεςερὶ καταμλαθ τιдειμὶ</td>
<td>c₂, gr: κατάστησε ἂργοντας Λυκίας Ἴτερον καὶ Απολλόδοτον καὶ Χάνθου ἐπιμελητὴν Ἀρτεμημῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e₃: “the Xanthians and their periodoi agree to build a sacred altar for the King of Kaunos and Argazuma the king”</td>
<td>c₃, lyc: ὕδη=τυβηδῆ ἀρυς σε(j)=επέβεβλητει ἄρινα ὑμῖναίτε κἀμεζήζῃ ὧθη ἑταβατὶ ὑβίδεινι σε(j)=ἀρΚκαζόμα ἑταβατὶ</td>
<td>c₃, gr: ὅδοις Σανθίοις καὶ τοῖς περιοικοῖς ἱδρύσασθαι βομβὸν Βασιλεῖ Καυσίον καὶ Ἀρκεσίμαι</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2. Omission of se_coordinate=:

Blomqvist (1982: 14-15) is, to my knowledge, the first scholar who assumed that the syntax of the Greek text did not match that of the Lycian one because of a mistake made in the translating process. He thinks that the translator must have disregarded the Lycian enclitics =ἀνή (=for them) and =πᾶδδ (=preverb, meaning ‘inside’) line 2 because they do not have any counterparts in Greek. Doing so, he would also have skipped the  se= line 2 which he should have translated by καὶ. Then, he would have interpreted the apodotic me= of line 5 as a coordinative me=.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lycian version</th>
<th>Intermediate text</th>
<th>Greek version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. καταμλαθ τιδειμὶ</td>
<td>2. καταμλαθ τιδειμὶ</td>
<td>2. Ἐκατόμην ἴος, κατάστησε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. =πᾶδδ=hadē ὀπιμίσθης πεςερὶ τιδειμὶ</td>
<td>3. =πᾶδδ=hadē ὀπιμίσθης πεςερὶ τιδειμὶ</td>
<td>3. ἂργοντας Λυκίας Ἴτερον καὶ Απολλόδοτον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ἰερυ σε=αντρβεζη ὑμὶ=αρινα</td>
<td>4. ἰερυ σε=αντρβεζη ὑμὶ=αρινα</td>
<td>4. καὶ Ἰάνθου ἐπιμελητὴν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ἀσαγαζαι ερτιμει</td>
<td>5. ἀσαγαζαι ερτιμει</td>
<td>5. Ἀρτεμημῶν, ἄθοδος δῆ Coordinate Σανθίοις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me_Apophatic=ὑδη=τυβηδῆ</td>
<td>me_Apophatic=ὑδη=τυβηδῆ</td>
<td>6. καὶ τοῖς περιοικοῖς ἱδρύσασθαι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ἀρυς σε(j)=επέβεβλητει ἄρινα</td>
<td>6. ἀρυς σε(j)=επέβεβλητει ἄρινα</td>
<td>7. βομβὸν Βασιλεῖ Καυσίον καὶ Ἀρκεσίμαι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ὑμῖναίτε κἀμεζήζῃ ὧθη ἑταβατὶ</td>
<td>7. ὑμῖναίτε κἀμεζήζῃ ὧθη ἑταβατὶ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ὑβίδεινι σε(j)=ἀρΚκαζόμα ἑταβατὶ</td>
<td>8. ὑβίδεινι σε(j)=ἀρΚκαζόμα ἑταβατὶ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Syntactic analysis according to Blomqvist (1982):

² Laroche names this me= “correlative”, while Hoffner & Melchert (2008: 416) consider the Hittite etymological and functional equivalent =ma as a “contrastive particle”. In this paper, I chose to name “apodotic” what Laroche named “correlative”.

³ Cf. the translation of Metzger (1979: 33). Metzger doesn’t explicitly analyze the syntax of the Greek sentence. Though, his translation can be considered as an implicit analysis, in so far as Classicists often model the syntax of the target text on the syntax of the source text. However we cannot tell from his translation how he chose to interpret δῆ. It seems likely that he interpreted it as a connective. Cf. Denniston (1954: 236-238) for the connective force of δῆ during the 4th century BC.
However, the Greek text makes perfect sense, making it hard to show that there must have been a mistake in the translating process. Moreover, the translator translated other chains of enclitics (line 9 and lines 12-13) and did not get confused. Thus the emendation of the text is only justified by the need of a parallelism with the Lycian text. But, as we said, a translation does not need to reproduce slavishly its source as long as the meaning is conveyed (cf part 2 for a discussion about the semantics).


Rutherford (2002: 207-208) thinks there was a version of the Greek text whose syntax matched the syntax of the Lycian text, with c₁-gr being coordinated to c₂-gr by καί and both c₁-gr and c₂-gr being subordinated to c₃-gr by ἐπεί. When this first copy was copied again, the καί translating the Lycian se= line 2 would have been omitted by haplography (καί κατέστησε > κατέστησε). Thus, at the beginning at least, the syntax of the Greek text would have been perfectly parallel to the syntax of the Lycian text, with ἐπεί corresponding to ἐκεί and the apodotic δῆ line 5 corresponding to the apodotic me= line 5.

Syntactic analysis according to Rutherford (2002):

Lycian: [[ἐκεί c₁-lyc se=c₂-lyc protasis] [me=c₃-lyc ] apodosis] sentence 1
Greek: [[ἐπεί c₁-gr καί c₂-gr protasis] [c₃-gr δῆ ] apodosis] sentence 1

However, the Greek text we actually have is perfectly grammatical, since δῆ can be interpreted as coordinative. Moreover, as noticed by Metzger (1979: 32) and Briant (1998: 307), the inscription was carefully crafted, which makes the thesis of a mistake less likely.

1.4. Interpretation of se_coordinative= as se_apodotic/additive=

We could propose another hypothesis also implying a mistake by the translator. The Lycian text could display a syntactic ambiguity which would have misled the translator. He would have interpreted the

---

4 Cf. Denniston (1954: 224-225) for the use of δῆ after a temporal clause.
5 There is just one obvious mistake: line 33, ξ instead of е, in <ἐξ>στο.
6 This hypothesis was suggested to me by Melchert in an e-mail (05/16/2011): “I translated the clause in N320,17-18 as=ηἰθίτα γῆτατατε: ἐκείνες φθῆνει: se(j)=arkKazumahi: as an apodosis by taking the se like Hititite “additive” - ya ‘also’. The Hititite focus conjunction certainly can do this. See e.g. DUMU=ŠU=ma=wa-ar=a-s-si=za=kān ku=is A-NA (Alt) GUZA A-BI=ŠU e-sa-at nu=a a-pa-a-as-zza ka-ru-u 14d GURUS-an-za e-es-ta (KBo 3.4 i 11-12, Annals of Mursili) ‘The son who sat on the throne of his father, he too had already become an old man.’ Whether I was right in attributing this use to clause-initial and clause-linking Lycian se= is an open question. I certainly would not exclude that the Greek translator could have interpreted the opening as ‘When P.
coordinative se= line 2 as an apodotic or additive se=, and the apodotic me= line 5 as a coordinative me=.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lycian version</th>
<th>Intermediate text</th>
<th>Greek version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. καταληθι τειδινι</td>
<td>καταληθι τειδινι</td>
<td>Πιξόδορος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>se_ coordinative=τίτη=τίτε</td>
<td>me_ coordinative=τίτη=τίτε</td>
<td>2. Εκσεβόμενο ὕνα, κατάστρεπτο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. =πάδὶ=ηᾶδε τριμιλε παδὲνεχήμινις</td>
<td>=πάδὶ=ηᾶδε τριμιλε παδὲνεχήμινις</td>
<td>3. Ἀργοντας Λυκίας Ἱέρωνα και</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ιερο se=νατρβειμη se(j)=αρίνα</td>
<td>4. ιερο se=νατρβειμη se(j)=αρίνα</td>
<td>Ἀπολλόδοτον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ασαγιαζυ εττιμελι</td>
<td>ασαγιαζυ εττιμελι</td>
<td>4. και Χάννθου ἐπαμεληθην</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me_apodotic=τίτη=τιβεδε</td>
<td>me_apodotic=τίτη=τιβεδε</td>
<td>5. Ἀρτεμηλεν. ἐδοξε δῆς_ coordinative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. αρυ se(j)=επεβεγημει αριναϊ</td>
<td>6. αρυ se(j)=επεβεγημει αριναϊ</td>
<td>Ξανθίος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. τίματε κουμεζιζε θθε γιηταται</td>
<td>7. τίματε κουμεζιζε θθε γιηταται</td>
<td>6. και τοις περιοικοις ἑδρόσασθαι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. χβδενι se(j)=αρΚΚαζυμα γιηταται</td>
<td>8. χβδενι se(j)=αρΚΚαζυμα γιηταται</td>
<td>7. βομον Βασιλει Κανονι και</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Άρκησμαι</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We could even go further and say that the syntax of the first sentence of the Lycian version is actually the syntax of what I called previously the intermediate text, which matches the syntax of the Greek version.

Syntactic analysis according to this scenario:


Greek : [[έπει c1-gr] protasis, [se=c2-gr] apodosis] sentence 1- [c3-gr δῆ]sentence 2

However, both hypotheses are based on the assumption that se= can have an apodotic or additive value apart from its well established coordinative value. There is one case, apart from the case we are discussing, where se= could have such an apodotic or additive value. It is in line 17 of the Lycian version of the Trilingual: se=τίτη=τικμε se(j)=ζηθε θθε στται=τελι se=τ=αθνται γιηταταθε ζβδενμει se(j)=αρΚΚαζυμαθε. Melchert (cf footnote 6) thinks that this se= is an additive se= which can be compared to Hittite –ya/-a. He translates this passage as follows: “And however much (is) therein, / And (the spot) where the altar is set down, / Also (is) of the property of the King of Kaunos and Araggazuma”. However, there is no other instance of se= in the Lycian corpus construed as “also”. Moreover, if se= could have this value, we would expect the translator to have used an additive και in its translation, which is not the case: δεσον προς τοι άγροι και τα οἰκήματα εἶναι Βασιλέως Καυνίου και Άρκησμα (lines 14-16). Could se= have an apodotic value in this example? It cannot be excluded. However, it is more secure to follow Laroche’s analysis where se= is interpreted as a coordinative conjunction since apodotic me= (48 instances according to Melchert (2004: 38)) are much more frequent than apodotic se= (1 dubious case, line 17 of the Lycian Trilingual).

1.5. Conclusion.

All in all, the proposals of Jerker Blomqvist and Ian Rutherford to explain the discrepancy between the Lycian text and the Greek text do not seem convincing. First, to postulate a mistake made by the translator or the engraver is not economical and, given the quality of the inscription, not plausible. Second, since the Greek version is still perfectly grammatical despite the mistake they assume, their proposal to emend the text turns out to be only motivated by their presupposition about the correspondence between the syntax of a target text and its source text.

ruled... he also commissioned...’ I don’t know how many other instances of se in the corpus could be construed as ‘also’.”

1 Cf. Melchert (2004: 56-57) for the coordinative use of se=.
Thus it seems better to follow Laroche and Metzger (1979)’s analysis and to consider the discrepancy between the two texts as a basic fact. Why the translator used another syntactic device in the Greek text than in the Lycian one is another question.

2. Semantics of the protasis

The second problem concerns, from a historical perspective, the chronology of the events $e_1$ (“Pixŏdaros becomes satrap of Lycia”), $e_2$ (“Pixŏdaros appoints Hieron and Apollodotos as archontes of Lycia and Artemelis as governor of Xanthos”) and $e_3$ (“the Xanthians and their periokoi agree to build a sacred altar for the King of Kaunos and Argazuma the king”) and, from a linguistic perspective, the semantics of the preposed temporal clause introduced by ēke.

2.1. Temporal and causal relationships between $e_1$, $e_2$ and $e_3$: historical analysis

Two issues have been raised concerning the chronology of those events since the Trilingual was first published. The first one is a matter of absolute chronology and can be summed up in this question: when did Pixŏdaros become satrap of Lycia? The second one has something to do with the relative chronology of the events, and particularly with whether the establishment of the cult of two Carian gods depended or not on the appointment of Pixŏdarus as satrap of Lycia. The last discussion about these questions is to be found in a paper by Funke (2008), whose conclusions I will follow here. Against Dupont-Sommer (1979: 136-137, 166) and Maddoli (2006: 607) and with Badian (1977) and most scholars 10, Funke (2008: 604) argues that the Great King referred to in the Aramaic version was not Artaxerxes III Ochos (358-337) but his successor Arses (337-336), who was also called Artaxerxes IV. Therefore, Pixŏdaros became satrap of Lycia in 337 and not in 358. Concerning the second issue, he thinks, against Briant (1998: 325, footnote 70; 334-336) and with Dupont-Sommer (1979: 167, 169) that the introduction of a Carian cult in Lycia depended ultimately on the appointment of Pixŏdarus, a member of the Hekatomnids, the ruling dynasty in Caria.

The following figure presents the chronology of the events $e_1$, $e_2$ and $e_3$ according to Funke (2008). The arrows show a causal relationship

Chronology according to Funke (2008):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>341</th>
<th>340</th>
<th>339</th>
<th>338</th>
<th>337</th>
<th>336</th>
<th>335</th>
<th>334</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pixŏdaros becomes satrap of Caria (341/0)</td>
<td>Arses becomes Great King (June/July 337)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rightarrow e_1$ (337)</td>
<td>$\rightarrow e_2$ (337)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rightarrow e_3$ (337)</td>
<td>$\rightarrow$ Redaction of the Trilingual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of Pixŏdarus (335/4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2. Temporal and causal relationships between $e_1$, $e_2$ and $e_3$: linguistic analysis

The linguistic analysis of both the Lycian and Greek texts is consistent with the interpretation of the relative chronology by Peter Funke. There is indeed no linguistic basis, as I will try to show, for the claim made by Briant (1998: 323) that the preposed ēke-clause of the Lycian text functions rather as a

---

framing (‘while’ + imperfective aspect) than a sequential and causal device (‘after’ + confective aspect\(^{11}\)), as Dupont-Sommer (1979, 63), followed by most scholars, thought.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framing</th>
<th>Sequential and Causal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>While Pixôdarus, son of Katamla, was satrap of Lycia and Iyera and Natrirbiyemi were commissioners for the Lycians and Erttimeli was governor of Xanthos, the citizenry and the Xanthian periôkoi agreed (that) they built a sacred altar to the King of Kaunos and Arggazuma the king.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Pixôdarus, son of Katamla, became satrap of Lycia and he commissioned as commissioners for the Lycians Iyera and Natrirbiyemi and as governor for Xanthos Erttimeli, the citizenry and the Xanthian periôkoi agreed (that) they built a sacred altar to the King of Kaunos and Arggazuma the king.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A survey of the other instances of Lycian ēke (or allomorphs āka\(^{12}\) and ņke\(^{13}\)) suggests that the meaning of this conjunction is indeed rather sequential (‘after’) than framing (‘while’).

1. \(\text{se ēke lati ddaqasa m=ene ſtepí tätī ſtīpe tezi se ladā ebbie kbi tike}\) (TL 88, 2)
   “And when Ddaqasa dies(?) they will place him within the inscribed(?) sarcophagos, and also his wife”.

2. \(\text{tebursseli: prinavnate: gasabala: ēke: ese: perikle: tebete: artturūnparā: se ſiṇparahe: telēzījē}\) (TL 104b)
   “Tebursseli built (it) for Gasabala when Periklé besieged(?) Artturūnparā and …(??) of Artturūnparā”.

3. \(\text{me: ņke: lat[i]: mūnuhe: m=ene ſtep[i] tätū}\) (TL 112, 2)
   “When Mūnuhe dies, they will place him within”.

In (1) and (3), the ēke-clause introduces a sequential and causal relationship between the events of the protasis and the apodosis. Concerning (2), we can neither tell whether the event described in the ēke-clause takes place before the event described in the main clause or at the same time nor if there is any causal relationship.

Moreover, there is a specific way in Lycian to convey a framing relationship between two events, that is the prepositional clause consisting of ēnē and the locative form of a noun,\(^{14}\) which could be compared to the Greek ἐπί + genitive. If Pierre Briant’s scenario was right, we would expect the beginning of the Trilingual to be rather something like *ēnē: χssadrara: pigeserehehe, “under the satrapy of Pixôdarus”.

   “This mausoleum, the one who built it (is) Sbikezijē, son of Mreṣisa, for his wife and his sons under the reign of Wataprddat.”

   “This mausoleum, the one who built it (is) Xluwānimi, for his wife and his sons under the reign of Perikles.”

---

\(^{11}\) I follow here the terminology used by Rijksbaron (1994: 1) for the Greek: “the present stem signifies that a state of affair is being carried out and is, therefore, not completed (imperfective value) […] the aorist stem signifies that a state of affairs is completed (confective value)”.  

\(^{12}\) Cf. TL 44a, 50. Actually, the passage where this allomorph appears is not understood.  

\(^{13}\) Cf. TL 112, 2.  

Furthermore, there are good reasons to think that the lexical aspect of the verb ἔπει τὸ διδάσκαλον ἰθανάτον ἀποτείχευσιν “to leave in place, commission” is confective, in so far as the simple verb ἅρμον “to release, let go” has a confective value. It would be very unlikely that the preterite form of this verb adds an imperfective value instead of reasserting the confactive value of the base form. If it was so, one would have to assume that the first sentence of the Lycian text means as follows: “While Pixôdarus was commissioning …, the citizenry and the Xanthian περιοικοί agreed …”, which does not make sense. The confective aspect of the Lycian verbal form ἄσανθραπατάζεσθαι can be concluded from the fact that it is coordinated to ἔπει τὸ διδάσκαλον ἰθανάτον ἀποτείχευσιν, which, as I have just shown, is marked by a confective aspect. It should thus be translated as “became satrap” and not as “was satrap”.

Finally, the ending of the Lycian text provides some further support to the view that e₁ did not only precede e₃ but also caused it. The following translation by Melchert (1999) suggests that Pixôdarus indeed had an active role in the establishment of the cult of the two Carian gods.

(6) Pigersereje: me=ii)=eser=hati: me=hiqla: ašiine: pzziti=ti

“They shall defer (authority) to Pixôdarus. The supreme temple authority is to carry out what he commands/wishes.”

In the Greek version, the association of ἐπιεῖ and the aoristic stem ἔγνωρε suggests that event e₁ was completed when event e₂ happened. The association of the connective particle δή with the aoristic stem ἔδοξε suggests that event e₁ happened after event e₂ was completed and that there is also a causal relationship between those two events. These semantics, which are corroborated by the Lycian text, are conveyed by syntactic devices (ἐπιεῖ, aorist stems and δή) which do not sound exotic in the Greek usage of the 4th century BC. Thus, I do not think convincing the thesis of Rutherford (2002: 216-217) according to which the Greek translator used an ἐπιεῖ-clause instead of a more common genitive absolute or ἐπιεῖ-clause because he was influenced by the Lycian ἐκεί-clause. The use of an ἐπιεῖ-clause to introduce an event marked by a confective aspect is perfect Greek, as can be seen in the following example from Demosthenes:

(7) Ἐλλήνων / Ἀρχηγοὺς, ἐπιεῖ στρατὸν ὀλέσει Μῆδον, / Παυσανίας Φοῖβο μνήμη ἀνέθηκε τόδε. (Dem., In Neaeram, 97)

“Pausanias, supreme commander of the Greeks, when he had destroyed the host of the Medes, dedicated to Phoebus this memorial”

The use of a genitive absolute or of an ἐπιεῖ-clause would have been in order only if e₁ and e₃ were framing events, which is not the case, as I have argued.

Thus, although the syntax of the Lycian text and the Greek text do not match at the beginning of the Trilingual (cf part 1), the semantics do match with each other and are also consistent with the sequence of the events as sketched by historians: e₁ caused e₂ which caused e₃. I think there is no reason to be as

17 Cf. Rijksbaron (1994: 74). Temporal ἐπιεῖ can establish a purely temporal relationship but can also add a cause-and-effect relationship in some instances (cf. Rijksbaron (1976: 160; 1994: 75) who calls that use “circumstantial”). Here e₁ may be considered as the cause of e₂.
18 This δή must be considered as the connective particle described by Denniston (1954: 236-240). We cannot absolutely exclude that it is the emphatic particle focusing a verb (cf Denniston (1954: 214-218)). Yet, the emphatic use of δή is rather poetic (cf Denniston (1954 : 214)) and thus we don’t expect it to appear in such an official text.
19 Cf. Denniston (1954: 236-240): “I have said that the connective sense of δή can be either temporal or logical, or something between the two.”
cautious as Peter Funke\textsuperscript{20}. Pierre Briant’s analysis must now be abandoned on both historical and linguistic grounds.

3. Syntax of the apodosis

I have assumed so far, following Laroche (1979) and most scholars\textsuperscript{21}, that the syntax of the Lycian apodosis \((c_{3,lyc})\) matches the syntax of the corresponding Greek sentence \((c_{3,gr})\) and that, in both cases, there is a main clause followed by an embedded clause, which is finite and paratactic in the Lycian text (cf the subordination hypothesis in the following figure) and non-finite in the Greek one \((\ĕδŏδε ὁ tôn Ξανθίος καὶ τὸς περιοίκος ἱδρύσασθαι βομὸν Βασιλεῖ Καυνίοι καὶ Ἀρκεσίμαι : “the Xanthians and their perioikoi decided to build an altar for the King of Kaunos and for Arkesimai”). However, as Craig Melchert suggested to me (personal communication), one could also argue that the Lycian apodosis is indeed composed of two coordinate clauses (cf coordination hypothesis in the following figure). It is not easy to choose among those two hypotheses because of the scarceness of data in Lycian. Therefore I will simply highlight which are to me the strong and weak points of the one and the other.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
 & Lycian & \\
\hline
\multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Clause 1} & \multicolumn{1}{c|}{Clause 2} \\
\hline
Subordination hypothesis & \textit{me}=\textit{hûti}=\textit{tubedê} \textit{arûs} \hspace{1cm} \textit{set(j)}=\textit{epewëthîmêi} \textit{arînâi} & \textit{nîmaiê} \textit{kumezijê} \hspace{1cm} \textit{00ê} \hspace{1cm} \textit{qûtawati} \hspace{1cm} \textit{çûdê}nî \\
 & \textit{The citizenry and the perioikoi of Xanthos agreed} & \textit{(that) they built a sacred altar to the King of Kaunos and Argegazuma the king} \\
\hline
Coordination hypothesis & \textit{me}=\textit{hûti}=\textit{tubedê} \textit{arûs} & \textit{set(j)}=\textit{epewëthîmêi} \textit{arînâmî} \hspace{1cm} \textit{nîmaiê} \textit{kumezijê} \hspace{1cm} \textit{00ê} \hspace{1cm} \textit{qûtawati} \hspace{1cm} \textit{çûdê}nî \\
 & \textit{The citizenry agreed} & \textit{(that) they built a sacred altar to the King of Kaunos and Argegazuma the king} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

1. 1\textsuperscript{st} hypothesis: paratactic subordination

There are three major weak points in this hypothesis. First, this is the only example of paratactic subordination in Lycian. Examples (8) and (9) are rather examples of coordinative subordination (with \textit{=me}):

\begin{itemize}
\item[(8)] \textit{se}=\textit{sûmatî}: \textit{çûddazas}: \textit{epî}=\textit{de arawâ}: \textit{hûti} \textit{kûmbê}tîs: \textit{me}=\textit{i}=\textit{pihitî}: \textit{sig}î\textit{s}: (lines 20-22 of the Trilingual)
\end{itemize}

“And they shall oblige the slaves, as many as they release into freedom, (that) they shall give shekels”\textsuperscript{22} (Melchert 2000)

\begin{itemize}
\item[(9)] \textit{se}=\textit{i(j)}=\textit{ehbih(a)}=\textit{aîtê}: \textit{tasa}: \textit{ebetî}: \textit{teterî}: \textit{arînas}: \textit{set(j)}=\textit{epewëthîmêi}: \textit{arînâi}: \textit{me}=\textit{t}=\textit{epî}=\textit{tawê}tî: \textit{mara}: \textit{ebi}ji\textit{a}: \textit{e}ţî: \textit{sttali}: \textit{ppuwëtî}=\textit{mê}: \textit{ebêhi}: (lines 29-34 of the Trilingual)
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{20} Cf. Funke (2008: 605): “Pierre Briant hat sich entschieden gegen eine unmittelbare zeitliche und kausale Verknüpfung zwischen der politischen Neuordnung Lykiens durch die Perser und der Beschlussfassung über den Kult für Basileus Kaunos und Arkesimas ausgesprochen und vermutet, „that the incorporation of Lycia into Caria was part of a vast administrative reorganization ordered by Artaxerxes III after his expedition to Phoenicia and Egypte“. Aber auch wenn sich eine solche Auffassung mit dem lykischen und griechischen Text \textit{sprachlich} durchaus noch vereinbaren lässt…”

\textsuperscript{21} Cf. Laroche (1979: 26 and 64) and Garrett (1991: 21 and note 6).

\textsuperscript{22} Translation from Melchert (2000).
“And the city of Xanthos and the Xanthian πεπιοικοι have sworn oaths to him for these regulations (that) they shall execute these regulations”

Secondly, one hardly understands why the second verb (ṁmaite) would be a preterite and not a present, as in example (9) (preterite aitē in the main clause versus present tuwēti in the following clause). One way out would be to assume that there is a kind of ‘serial use’ of the verb ḥūti=tube- ‘to decide, agree (?)’, as with pai- ‘to go’ and uwa- ‘to come’ in Hittite;23 or that it should be compared to Hittite clauses with double finite verb forms and idiomatic meaning, like nu ĮL tarḫuzzi ḫāši “and he cannot open (it)” (KUB 17.10 I 33).24 However, this cannot be verified in so far as the verb ḥūti=tube- is not attested elsewhere.25 Third, Garrett (1991)’s hypothesis about the distribution between nasalized and non-nasalized preterites cannot account for the presence of a nasalized preterite (ṁmaite) in the second clause.

Distribution between nasalized and non-nasalized preterits according to Garrett (1991).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexical object</th>
<th>Nasalized preterite</th>
<th>Non-nasalized preterite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indefinite object</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enclitic object</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propositional object</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One would expect Ṽmaite instead of Ṽmaite since indefinite objects (here, kumezijē θθē corresponding to Greek βυμόν, which is clearly indefinite) do not trigger clitic doubling:26 we would expect to find Ṽmaite kumezijē θθē, “they built a sacred altar”, instead of Ṽmaite kumezijē θθē. One way out would be to suppose that Ṽmaite is a nasalized medio-passive.27 But, except ajagā ‘I became’, there is no secure preterite medio-passive form in the Lycian corpus that could be used as a parallel. Another solution would be to assume that in the Lycian writer’s view the altar was prominent enough in the reading situation to be referred to by means of a definite object (kumezijē θθē), which is right-dislocated and thus triggers a clitic doubling on the verb (hence the nasalized preterite): Ṽmaite kumezijē θθē, “they built it, the sacred altar”. Finally, the fact that tubēdē agrees with the singular arus and not with the plural arus se(j)=epewēltūmē (the plural form of the verb would be tubete) cannot be considered as an argument against this hypothesis since Lycian has a proximity agreement (cf. P3Sg tubidi in TL 75, 5 for instance).

25 There is a verb hri=tube- in Arbinas II, 13 but its meaning cannot be determined because the text is incomplete (cf. Laroche (1979: 62)).
26 Cf. Garrett (1992: 208). I do not understand Garrett’s explanation for this particular case: he says that “there is no clitic doubling of indefinite objects” but assumes at the same time that the nasalized form Ṽmaite can be accounted for by the presence of the indefinite object kumezijē θθē that he translates as “a sacred altar” (cf Garrett (1991: 22 note 6)).
28 Cf Melchert (2004: 72) for tubōdē analyzed as a singular third person preterite.
2. 2nd hypothesis: coordination

One first criticism could be made against this hypothesis: the semantics do not match those of the Greek text. However, as already noticed by Laroche (1979: 58-60, 79), the Greek text, if it is actually the target text, should not be considered as a word-for-word rendering of the source text. There are actually enough discrepancies\(^{29}\) between the two texts to think that the translator translated the Lycian quite freely. Thus, it would not be inconceivable that the Greek says ‘The citizenry (of Xanthos) and the perioikoi of Xanthos decided to build...', while the Lycian says ‘The citizenry (of Xanthos) agreed, and the perioikoi of Xanthos built....'. Given where the Létôon actually is,\(^30\) the perioikoi – who were inhabitants of the countryside as opposed to the inhabitants of the town, as shown by Casabonne (2003) – may have built it, at the behest of the citizens of Xanthos. The translator would have omitted to mention this division of roles, either because it did not matter to his eyes\(^31\) or because it sounded more politically correct to do so with regard to the audience (some Greek speakers) he was addressing.

Even if the semantics could be acceptable, this hypothesis nevertheless implies formal problems. First, it does not explain away the problem of the nasalized preterite πνµαιτε better than the subordination hypothesis. Furthermore, it also leaves unexplained the first nasalized preterite ḥιτί=tubedê that could be accounted for by the previous hypothesis.\(^32\) One way out would be to suppose that both verbs are nasalized medio-passive preterites,\(^33\) but, as said before, there are no secure third person medio-passive preterites in the Lycian corpus which could be used as parallels.

4. Note about the stylistics of the Greek text

As already noted by Briant (1998: 322), the syntax of the ἔδοξε structure in the Greek version is a bit odd compared to other Greek decrees in Lycia and elsewhere. Indeed, in most cases, the ἔδοξε phrase which appears within the first lines of a text is preceded by a genitive absolute (TAM II, 1, 1-6; 158, 1-2; 159, 1-2; 160, 1-3; 262, 1-7) or an ἐπι-clause (TAM II, 161, 1; 168, 1-5), which serves as a means for dating when the decision was made. Moreover, it is not followed by δή. But in the Trilingual, as I have argued, events e₁ and e₂ are not mentioned to provide the reader with a point of reference for the following narration, but they are part of the narration itself (cf part 2.2). This difference of perspective can account for the fact that here the verb ἔδοξε is followed by the coordination δή (“and then”), while in decrees it is very unusual. Here, the decision is presented as an episode of the narration while in ordinary decrees it is presented as its starting point. All in all, I think the oddity of the Greek ἔδοξε structure in the Trilingual can be accounted for as a stylistic intrusion of a Greek formula from the decrees into a text of a different nature.

\(^{29}\) Some parts of lines 9-10, 13, 15, 29-30 have been omitted in the Greek text and others are free and idomatic renderings of the Lycian: ἔδοξε: ἔρις=de arawa: ἕτι =κήθετης (lines 20-21) / ὅ σοι ἄν ἀπελεύθερος γένονται (lines 18-19); ἐσε=νε: ἔττακι: ἕθε: ἕβι=νε: ἔνει: καµάζη: ἑθείη: (lines 34-36); και μη µετακινήσθαι µηδαµά µηδ' ὄλλοι ἐπίτρεψαν (lines 30-32); πδδή: µαχανά: σµαιτε: ἐβέτε: (lines 37-38); ἔµαρτελος <ἐς>τὸ τὸν θεὸν τούτον (lines 33-34); ἀν: ἕθε: ἑθείη πµηρέθηνι (lines 38-39); Ἀνων (line 34); <π>µερερε: µεν: η(j)=eseri=πθαι: µε=πρηκα: ασθη=πζζη=τι (lines 40-41)/ Πιζζόταρος δὲ κύριος ἐστιν (line 35).

\(^{30}\) Cf Metzger (1979: 9).

\(^{31}\) One could think that Greek could not express as easily as Lycian the fact that a decision was made by some people and it was carried out by others. The ἔδοξε structure implies that the subject of the decision is the same as the subject of the action which has been decided.

\(^{32}\) According to Garrett (1991: 20-21), sentential objects (here πνµαιτε κµεηηζη=θθε ζηηωταζι λβιδεθηνι se(j)=arKazuma ζηηωταζ, which is the object of ḥιτί=tubedê according to the first hypothesis) need a nasalized preterite when objects of a preterite verb.

\(^{33}\) Melchert (2004: 72) suggests that ḥιτί=tubedê could be a medio-passive form.
5. Conclusion

Three conclusions can be drawn from this paper. 1) The discrepancy between the syntax of Greek and Lycian should not be explained as the result of a mistake by the translator or the engraver. 2) The semantics of both the Greek and the Lycian texts point to a causal relationship between the three events dealt with at the beginning of the Trilingual – which is also confirmed by the last sentence of the Lycian text. 3) The analysis of the apodosis of the Lycian sentence remains problematic because of the scarceness of data in Lycian, but it should not be excluded that its syntax and semantics do not perfectly match those of the Greek text (cf the coordination hypothesis). I also hope to have shown that, even if the Greek text has been of much help to make sense of the Lycian one, we should be careful not to focus too much on it when it comes to syntactic analysis, since the translator – if we are actually dealing with a translation and not with two parallel texts – uses idiomatic Greek and not word-for-word renderings of the Lycian text.
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