THE GOD SANDA IN LYCIA?

H. Craig Melchert (Chapel Hill)

The deity Sanda is directly attested in Hittite, Cuneiform Luvian, Hie-
glyphic Luvian and Lydian.¹ There is also broad agreement that the same
dity appears in Hellenistic sources as Σάνδος/Σανδής/Σανδών, associated
with Tarsus.² The divine name is also found as an element in
personal names from the time of the Old Assyrian trading colonies through
the period of the Hittite Empire and into the first millennium in Cilicia,
Lydia, Lycaonia, and Lydia.³ Lycia is conspicuously missing from this
dossier.⁴ Whether this absence is due to chance or reflects that Sanda truly
was unknown in Lycia remains to be determined.

The direct textual evidence for Sanda is quite limited, and there is no
consensus on his function or character. Some have called Sanda a “ve-
etation” god.⁵ Salvatori follows earlier scholars in viewing the Hellenistic
Sanda/Sandon as a solar deity,⁶ while he concludes that Sanda of the Hit-

¹ For the attestations in Hittite and Cuneiform Luvian see A. Kammenhuber, “Mardu-
nd Santa in der hetitischen Überlieferung”, Or 59 (1990), 188-195, for those in Hier-
glyphic Luvian J. D. Hawkins, CHLI, I, 488-490 & 558-559, and for that in Lydian
L. Gusmani, Lyd. Wb., 201 & 252 and Lyd. Wb. Erg., 84. I am grateful to Eric Rai-
nond and Olivier Casabonne for valuable references and advice. I alone remain re-
ponsible for all views expressed here.
² For this material see O. Höfer, in W. Roscher, Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen
und römischen Mythologie, Bd. IV (1897-1909), 319-322 s.v. Sandas, Sandes, Sandon.
³ For the name in older cuneiform sources see E. Laroche, NH, 156 & 291, and for the
text evidence Ph. H. J. Houwink ten Cate, The Luvian Population Groups of Lycia and
Cilicia Aspera during the Hellenistic Period (Leiden 1961), 137.
⁴ A. Kammenhuber, Or 59, 191, gives no basis for her characterization that Sanda “lebt
über das Hieroglyphen-Luwische und Lykische im I. Jt. ...fort.”
⁵ Thus Ph. H. J. Houwink ten Cate, loc.cit. with the qualifier “probably.” For an older
version of this idea see the reference to E. Meyer in O. Höfer, op.cit., 330. Cf. also
J. Lebrun, “L’Anatolie et le monde phénicien du Xe au IVe siècle av. J.C.”, in E. Lipinski
ed.), Studia Phoenicia V: Phoenicia and the East Mediterranean in the First Mil-
J. R. Levy, “The Oriental Origin of Herakles”, JHS 54 (1934), 40-53, but see O. Höfer,
op.cit, 330, for references to earlier versions of this analysis.
tite texts is a god of death, conceding that this difference makes the connection between the two problematic. Our honorand sees Sanda’s function as “not known precisely,” suggests that he may be a syncretic combination of local gods, but does cautiously join others in characterizing Sanda as “resembling a war-god.”

Salvatori summarily rejects Sanda as war-god, but there is growing circumstantial evidence to support the notion that he is at least a warrior god, if not primarily a god of war. The best argument for this is his close association with Iyarri, who definitely is a Luvian war-god and is armed with a bow, like Sanda. As noted by Popko, we now know that both Iyarri and Sanda have as associates the marwainzi (= ‘dark’) deities. This linkage seems to justify seeing Sanda also in the pairing D AMAR.UD D Iyarriš in the prayer (of Mursili??) KUB 31.121 (+) 121a i 17. Several have noted that in the Ḫukkana Treaty D AMAR.UD appears in the divine witness list after the gods of the army (KBO 5.3+ i 53), but here of course we cannot be absolutely sure that the reference is to Sanda.

Sanda is associated in the Zarpia Ritual with the D Annarumienzi, who are described as wearing bloody (or blood-red) clothing (KUB 9.31 ii 22-24). Their description in the Hittite portion of the ritual goes on to say that they (the D Imarawantes) are armed with daggers and bows and arrows (HT 1 i 29-34). Lebrun renders annarumienzi as “les brutsaux,” and Larroche characterizes Sanda in the Zarpia Ritual as “maléfique, belliqueux, terroriste.” A similar view lies behind Salvatori’s interpretation of Sanda in this ritual as a god of death. However, as Kammenhuber properly in-sists, the meaning of annarummi- and its Hittite equivalent imarawantes- is positive, approximately ‘forceful, virile’ or perhaps ‘formidable, dreadful.’ Furthermore, in the HLuvian text of the “Beirut stone bowl” Sanda is the patron deity of the dedicant. In the other HLuvian text KULULU 2, the author indeed dies ‘by Sanda,’ but in his bed after eating and drinking. This description hardly suggests a violent death by a malevolent terrorizing deity. Nor does the invoking of Sanda’s marwainzi deities against tomb violators later in the same text suggest any special connection of Sanda with death. In the Beirut bowl text Sanda himself is similarly invoked (along with Kubaba and Karhuhal), clearly in his role as the person’s patron deity. We may assume the same for KULULU 2.

In the Zarpia Ritual Sanda and the Annarumienzi deities are asked specifically not to reenter the gates of the house ‘for evil’ (attinwaladziti, KUB 9.31 ii 26). Nothing requires the assumption that Sanda or his associates are inherently malevolent or hostile. Like any other deity, they may be angered by some human delict, send pestilence as punishment, and require appeasement/atonement, but the sum of the evidence suggests merely that Sanda was a powerful god of arms who could act for either good or ill. It also seems simplest to assume with Höfer that it was the shared quality of being a mighty warrior that led to the later synthesis with Heracles.

In searching for a possible Lycian reflex of Sanda, we may thus tentatively take as our starting point a warrior god (not necessarily a god of war per se), suitable as a patron, who at least in Tarsus was eventually associated with Heracles. In regard to form, *Sant da- would by regular phonological developments appear in Lycian (A) as *Hatta.- I wish to sug-

---


8 S. Salvatori, PP 30, 406.

9 M. Popko, op.cit, 93 with refs. See also the remarks by J. D. Hawkins, Corpus, vol. I, 489-490, who terms Sanda and Iyarri “similar if not identical deities.” I further suggest that the word marwida- which appears alongside Sanda and Kubaba in the Lydian text 4a represents the Lydian equivalent of the Luvian marwainzi deities: *marwīyo- > *marwida- > marwida-.

10 R. Lebrun, Hethitica, 8, 257 n. 19; E. Larroche, in Les syncrétismes, 110.

11 S. Salvatori, PP 30, 409.

---

12 A. Kammenhuber, Or 59, 192.


14 Ibidem, 488 ff.


16 O. Höfer, op.cit, 332. Cf. also E. Larroche, in Les syncrétismes, 114. R. Lebrun, in Studia Phoenicia V, 30, underscores that it is the deity Heracles, not the Greek hero, who is identified with Sanda (and with Phoenician Melqart). It is unlikely, however, that there is no connection between the two. See E. Lüpke, “La fête de l’ensevelissement et de la résurrection de Melqart,” in A. Fines, Actes de la XVe Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale (Hammar-Heuré 1970), 49-50, on Melqart-Heracles viewed as a divinized man. In emphasizing the nature of Sanda as a warrior, I do not mean to deny that he may have also been seen in the later period as an agrarian god of death and resurrection.

17 By the regular voicing of stops after nasals in at least Lycian and Lydian (H. C. Melchert, AHP, 300 & 356) and probably throughout first-millennium Anatolia, an original
gest that this predicted stem may be attested in the problematic word hātāhe that appears in the text of the Stele of Xanthos. The form recurs repeatedly in TL 44a, 41-55.⁸


The word also occurs crucially once in 44b, 55-58:

se tukedī: kerōk: ade: urublijē/⁵⁶ hātāhe: mbehē: prīmezi: se liheze: eh[b][?]⁵⁷-ije:

se dēvē: xzxana: se tunuwerīha: ade: se ⁵⁸ xōānā: xugaha: se xīnaha

I must preface my arguments with the reminder that any interpretation of a portion of TL 44 should be regarded as provisional. This fact will be evident from the serious divergences between my analysis and those of others cited below. Nevertheless, there is widespread agreement on the general content of the text: it recounts military exploits and the establishment of various cultic installations by the ruling dynasty at Xanthos. It is

*nt- would result in [-nd-]. Laroché’s derivation (in Les syncrétismes, 111) from *sānt-, participle to a Luvian verb cognate with Hittite sā[ti]- ‘rage, be furious,’ would imply *nt-, but I do not exclude a non-Indo-European Anatolian name with original *nd- (for the name as Asianic see Ph. H. J. Houwink ten Cate, The Luvian Population Groups, 136).

⁸ For the justification of my division into clauses, which essentially agrees with that of D. Schürr, “Kaunos in lykischen Inschriften,” Kardmos 37 (1998), 151-152, see further below.


---
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this general content that is crucial for the present purpose, independent of the validity of the various individual lexical and grammatical identifications that I propose.

The standard view of hātāhe is that it means ‘personal, (one’s) own,’ a derivative of hātē- ‘person, self’ that occurs in the accusative singular in the tomb inscription TL 84, 1-3.²⁰ ebēnē: prīnānwa: m-e-iti: prīnānawē: mizrei[te]: murzāhe: tihes: mēnīdaza: stirezi: hrrp̣i ati: ehh: se lādē: se tīkēne: eh: bije: s- ed-adē: ati: hrrē 1[pr]azjē/me-iti: itā tātē/ebēnē hātā: se lādā “Mizrei[te], cousin of Murzā, the m. of Sura, built this grave-house for himself and his wife and his children. And he made the upper i̯. for himself. They shall put him hātā- in (it) and his wife.” This analysis is unsatisfactory on all counts. First of all, it is very doubtful that hātā- means ‘person, self.’ We know the word for ‘person, self’ in Lycian: at[r]a- (see the article by Theo van den Hout elsewhere in this volume). Given that the usual word occurs elsewhere in this very inscription, its alleged replacement in this one instance by the hapax hātā would be entirely unmotivated. A stem hā-tē- is most naturally taken as an old partiple to the attested Lycian verb hār- ‘release, let go,’ also in the compound ala-ha- ‘let down, lay out (for burial).’ The very general semantics of the verb leave open several possibilities for hātā, but the context suggests that it is effectively equal to ‘deceased.’²¹

Furthermore, even in the unlikely event that hātā means ‘self,’ a more serious problem is that hātāhe as attested cannot be a derivative of hāta-meaning ‘personal, own.’ Cau analyzes hātāhe as belonging to a possessive adjective hātahī-. In that case, however, hātāhe could only be dative-locative plural. It is obvious that in several of its occurrences there is no noun present in the dative-locative plural for hātā to modify. One could suppose with Hajnal that hātāhe is a genitive singular in -ahē, but as he concedes, this ending is not attested anywhere else in Lycian in an appellative, only in personal names.²²


²¹ For the provision cf. TL 88, 2 se ēke lāti ddaqâsa “and when Ddaqâsa is dead...” and similarly TL 112, 2.

²² Meriggi proposes that hātāhe was first used for all cases of the plural (for which he can offer no parallels in Lycian), but then is still forced to suppose that under the influ-
Even if one allows for this unique exception, an interpretation of ḫāṭāhe as ‘personal, one’s own’ is quite incompatible with the attested word order and makes no sense in context. In 44a, 42-44 ḫāṭāhe would have to modify the respective place names: ‘in (his) own Zagaba, Lower Tymnessos, Patara.’23 In 44a, 46 it would modify (quite redundantly) izredi ebbijedi ‘by his hand,’ but in 44a, 47-48 erbbidi ‘with battle/deeat.’24 In 44a, 50 and 55 it would modify terē ‘army’ (or ‘district’), but the reference cannot be to the subject as elsewhere. Finally in 44a, 53 it must modify krazzānāse ‘Chersonesos.’ The choice of nouns designated as ‘one’s own’ is peculiar to say the least!25

As already seen by Schür,26 the word ḫāṭāhe in 44a, 41-55 serves as a refrain-like device that divides the passage into successive parts. As per Schür, ḫāṭāhe in this function appears consistently in clause-final position except in 44a, 50, where the very salient comparison with Heracles is postponed even beyond ḫāṭāhe. As is also clear from Schür’s analysis (with which I am in agreement on most structural points), the description of the various military exploits in 44a, 44-55 is essentially complete without ḫāṭāhe, which seems to be a virtual add-on whose only function is to unify and organize the narrative.

The role of ḫāṭāhe is quite different in 44b, 57. While the meaning of many individual words remains approximate or totally unknown, the context here is clearly one of cult dedications, not military actions. The preceding lines 44b, 51-54 relate that the author of the stele established sacred precincts or cults (tūwete kumezija) in every district (mare marte) for the local Storm-god (tqaqhī pddātahi) and speak further of tumenehija kumezija and ḥākkiba kumezija ‘sacred precincts/cults of Tymnessos and Kandyba.’ The assured meanings of tukedri ‘statue,’ ḥed ‘made,’ and kero as a place-name (cf. 44b, 49) guarantee a similar content for the clause containing ḫāṭāhe and the ones following it cited above: ‘And he made a statue in Kerēthi...’, and he made a ḏedwē for/to the warriors and hūnveriha, (and he made) xēthāna for the grandfather(s) and grandmother(s).’ The word ḏedwe- is not, as previously claimed by me and others, a sequence of particles, but a noun whose approximate meaning ‘gift, thing dedicated, memorial’ is confirmed by its appearance in the personal name ḥtiimīdewe-, a compound directly comparable to ḥtiimī-pijata in the Lēdon Trilingual (N320, 25), which must mean something like ‘income-gift.’ It is noteworthy that we find the same collocation ḏedwē xaxazā ‘dedication memoria to the warriors’ (literally gen. pl. ‘of the warriors’) in 44c, 6, where the phrase refers to a stele. While I cannot follow Hajnal in his connection of xēthāna with Hitite šatešar ‘pit,’27 he is surely right in seeing xēthāna as a votive object or installation for the ancestors.28 I tentatively take urublijē with Carruba as a variant of urubija,29 which in 26,1 clearly means something like ‘monument.’ In any case, in 44c, 9 an urublijē is said to ‘stand’ or ‘be erected’ (stati), so it must again refer to some kind of dedicatory installation. In our clause in 44b, 55-56 I take it as predicative with tukedri: ‘And he made a statue in Kerēthi (as) an urublijē...’

In the following clauses we have as expected mention of those to whom the objects are dedicated: the warriors and the ancestors. We would expect a dedicatee in lines 44b, 55-56 as well, in the remaining ḫāṭāhe tu-bēhī ḫremi se lihbeze ebbihe. The modifier ebbihe ‘his’ assures us that lihbeze is dative plural, whatever its meaning, and the preceding tu-bēhī ḫremi ‘i. of the household’ can easily be dative singular, as its coordination with lihbeze ebbihe would suggest. We thus arrive at: ‘And he made a statue in Kerōthi as an urublijē- to (the) tu-bēhī of the household and his lihbeze.’ Whether ebbihe ‘his’ refers back to the subject or to the dedicatee tu-bēhī is impossible to determine. We are left with ḫāṭāhe not yet accounted for.

In principle ḫāṭāhe could be construed with either urublijē or tu-bēhī (prēmēi). I suggest that it goes with the former and expresses the dedicatee, with the same word order and syntax as ḏedwē xaxazā ‘dedication/monument for the warriors’ cited above: ‘an urublijē- for Sanda.’ So long as we do not know the meaning of tu-bēhī, I leave open whether we

23 Contra N. Cau, op.art. 27, ḫāṭāhe cannot modify nelōde, which is a verb (see further below). There is no ablative-instrumental plural in -ede in Lyceian. The ablative-instrumental in -o-ede is indifferent to number, like its cognates in Hitite and Luwian.
24 N. Cau, op.art. 29, takes ḫāṭāhe medbijehi as ‘con i suo medbijehi,’ but nowhere else does ḫāṭāhe precede its putative head noun. Indeed, it is always clause-final (see below).
25 P. Merigggi, “La declinazione del licio III,” SMEA 22 (1980), 223 n. 11, tries to save ḫāṭāhe as ‘proprio’ in the last instance by taking it as an adverb in the sense ‘appoint.’ But before one can assume such a semantic development one first needs to prove the basic meaning ‘one’s own’ for some context, which he fails to do.
26 D. Schür, Kadmos 37, 157.

27 I. Hajnal, Der lykische Vokalismus, 215 n. 268.
28 Ibidem, 34 n. 19.
29 O. Carruba, “Beiträge zum Lunwischen,” in F. Neumann, 42.
are to assume a series of three dedicatées (“And he made a statue in Kerēth as an u. for Sanda, for the t. of the household and for his L.”) or an apposition (“...as an u. for Sanda, the t. of the household, and for his L.”).

Contra Cau, I contend that the content of the first series of actions in the long “hātahe narrative” is also dedicatory and not military. As per note 23 above, nelede cannot be an ablative-instrumental plural (which could only be neledi), but must be a preterite third singular verb (by Cau’s analysis the entire three lines 44a, 41-43 implausibly would have no finite verb). Its approximate meaning is assured by the occurrence in 44a, 34: [ ə]θεθε: axă: ara: nelede arīna “... he n-ed in due form an axa-sacrifice in Xanthos.” Pace Cau, axă cannot be a preterite first singular verb (all other verbs in 44a are third person!). It is rather accusative singular of a noun axa- which is the base of the noun axa-ultis, a kind of priest. Given the presence of siste wawadra ‘x-ed cattle’ and uwadra xi ‘cattle x-ing’ in the immediately preceding lines 44a, 32-33, I suggest that axa- means specifically ‘animal sacrifice,’ but this is of decidedly secondary concern. The neuter nom.-acc. plural ara is functioning here as an adverb equivalent to Latin rite. The meaning of nelede must be something like ‘established, laid down.’

Lines 44a, 41-43 are thus dedicatory like 44b, 55-57. Just what is being dedicated is less certain. The generally accepted restoration [prulija in 44a, 41 is based on the occurrence ebei: kbija: prulija: ēti pddāyi [ 1] yjāna tijja in 44b, 1-2, which directly follow the “hātahe narrative” after the open space at the bottom of column a. Since kbi- means ‘other,’ it seems rea-

31 Ibidem, 25.
32 The word axa in the following line 44a, 35 has the same meaning. Contra P. Meriggi, “Der Indogermanismus des Lykischen”, in Fs Hirt, 273, et al., one cannot interpret pededi...edsedi of 44a, 34-35 (which are separated by several words of quite unknown meaning) as ‘with foot and horse’ ‘infantry and cavalry’ and then assign the meaning ‘band (of troops)’ to xre- ‘hand,’ appealing to Latin manus. It is the asyndetic pair ivery pededi that forms a collocation ‘with hand (and) foot.’ The meaning in context is probably ‘with total devotion’ or the like.
33 It is true that the verb nele- must be a derivative of the noun nele attested in 44a, 46: tīn nele: nele: tarbide xerēi ‘Xerēi 1-ed Tīs in every nele.’ While nele certainly could mean something like ‘battle,’ the iterated nele nele could just well mean ‘in every instance’ or ‘in every place.’ I suggest the latter: nele- is ‘settlement’ or the like (something smaller than teteri ‘city,’ roughly κατοφα or κατω). For the semantic relationship to nele- ‘lay down, establish’ cf. German niederlassen and Niederlassung.

sonable to assume that there has already been mention of another set of prulija in 44a, 41. Indeed, the word prulija would frame the entire “hātahe narrative.” In view of the arguments of Borchhardt for the Xanthos Stele as a cenotaph, I suggest that prulija may mean ‘trophy,’ Lines 44b, 1-2 would read: “Here on the spot [i.e. the Xanthos Stele] (are) other trophies which are Ionian(?).” These trophies would have been taken from the Greeks in the defeats narrated in the preceding “hātahe narrative.”

By my understanding, the military exploits narrated were preceded by the dedication of other trophies in various other places (lines 44a, 41-43): “Moreover, he laid down his (own) hand zērītja trophies in Lagbos for Sanda, laid (them) down in Lower Tynnesos for Sanda, in Patar (sacred to) Malija for Sanda.” The meaning of the adjective zērītja is quite unknown. As should now be clear, I assume that following the dedication of the prulija (tentatively military trophies) to Sanda, all the succeeding military exploits are also said to have been done in his honor. I concede that I myself find this somewhat peculiar – as far as we can tell, no other military actions in the text of the Xanthos Stele are dedicated to a deity in this fashion. However, I find the function of hātahe as a dedicatée very plausible in both dedicatory passages (44b, 55-57 and 44a, 41-43).

34 J. Borchhardt et al., Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Anzeiger der phil.-hist. Klasse, Jg. 134, 37 ff. See also ibidem, 46, for the specific suggestion that the monument may have included examples of the zērītja mentioned in the Greek epigram.
35 It is worth noting that the mention of the ‘other prulija’ in 44b, 1-2 is closely followed in 44b, 3 by ere ere tanaede zezaxize ‘everywhere in the buildings/installations (?) of the warriors’ (for a similar analysis of tanaede zezaxize as ‘monuments guerriers’ see R. Lebrun, “Notes de lexicologie lyciene,” Hethitica 10 (1990), 162. While the rest of the sentence containing tanaede zezaxize remains unclear, I think the mention of warriors tends to support the idea that prulija are dedicatory objects that have some kind of military connection.
36 I take epi-de here as an adverb ‘on top of that’ = ‘moreover.’ So also N. Cau, Studi Ellenistici 12, 27, following Meriggi.
37 Note that since these activities are dedicatory, not military, there is no basis for the conclusions drawn by N. Cau, op.cit., 32-34, about the geographic milieu of the various Greek expeditions. The defeat of Melesandros took place in Kyanei and its territories (xanne and pddāne = xešanne). His arguments in N.A.B.U. 1998/1, No. 8 against the identification of Zagreb with Αργίξαος by O. Carruba, “Dynasten und Städte. Sprachliche und sonstige Bemerkungen zu den Namen auf den lykischen Münzen”, in J. Borchhardt, G. Dobesch (eds), Akten des II. Internationalen Lykien-Symposiums (Vienna 1993), 11-14, also lose much of their force. The author of the Xanthos Stele could have made such dedications in any place under his control.
And it is hard to see what other notion might unite the dedicatory passage of 44a, 41-43 with the military narrative that immediately follows it. As further qualified support for my hypothesis I cite the association of ἡταύθε with warriors in 44b, 55-56 and the comparison of the exploits of Xeréi with those of Heracles in 44a, 50. 38 I readily concede that both of these intersections with ἡταύθε may be mere coincidences, but they are consonant with what we know of the established associations of Sanda.

I must address two formal problems with my interpretation of ἡταύθε as ‘for/to Sanda.’ First, as Diether Schürr (pers. comm.) has rightly objected, there are no other assured examples of the genitive ending -(V)he with a divine name (we find rather the inflected possessive adjective in -Vhe/-i-). This is true, but akaijē malijehe in TL 26, 12 has rather a better chance of meaning ‘a sum of akē’s for Maliya’ than ‘a sum of akē’s for those of Maliya’ (we cannot exclude, of course, that in this instance we are dealing with a theophoric personal name). We also find both the genitive singular -ahe and a form of the possessive adjective with place-names: Aρρήναθε and Aρρήναθε (Xanthos) and Ζα-καβαθε and Ζακαβαθε (Lagbos). There is thus no principled reason why we might not find both for divine names.

The reason why we find only ἡταύθε and no ἡταύθε/-i- has to do with the syntax of the former, which is the other formal problem that has to be addressed. One normally finds the dative to mark the recipient or beneficiary in Lycian, and we have already seen examples. One is 44b, 56-57: dewē zxaata se hūnwerihā ađe “And he made a d. for/to the warriors and u.” However, this phrase is followed directly by se xūdāna xugaha se xūnaha, which also depends on ađe. While this phrase may be rendered literally as ‘x. of the grandfather(s) and grandmother(s),’ the meaning in context clearly is ‘(and he made) x. for/to the grandfather(s) and grandmother(s).’ The ancestors here are not the possessors of the x. installation in the true sense, but the dedicatees or recipients of it, just as much as the zxaata are the recipients of the dewe-. An even more striking example of the genitive

38 For the phrase āka herakle as a comparison ‘like Heracles’ see D. Schürr, Kadmos 37, 152, following already P. Meriggi, in Fs Hirt, 281, contra N. Cau, Studi Ellenistici 12, 29. The details of the comparison remain unclear due to the thus far unanalyzable sequence ēti: zēhi: hūti: C||: u/[I ] of line 49. Contrary to the received opinion (D. Schürr, Kadmos 37, 152, et al.), the number C|| cannot refer to the seven hoplites of the Greek epigram. Nowhere in Lycian does the symbol for ‘five’ have the rounded shape seen here (rather always a sharp-angled < or <). C|| must represent an incomplete or damaged O||, i.e., a ‘twelve’ referring to the twelve deeds of Heracles.

39 E. Laroche, “L’inscription lyccienne”, in Fouilles de Xanthos 6 (1979), 73.

40 This does not preclude that -(i) is dative ‘to him,’ which could be “clitic-doubling” ebbi̇ja. For such clitic-doubling with a dative cf. s=ē-fene..trīmīle... “And for them...the Lycians...” in N320, 2-3. See A. Garrett, “Topics in Lycian Syntax”, HS 105 (1992), 201 f.