

THE GOD SANDA IN LYCIA?

H. Craig Melchert (Chapel Hill)

The deity Sanda is directly attested in Hittite, Cuneiform Luvian, Hieroglyphic Luvian and Lydian.¹ There is also broad agreement that the same deity appears in Hellenistic sources as *Σανδαξ/Σανδηξ/Σανδων*, associated in particular 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, Pisidia, 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 “vegetation” 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-

For the attestations in Hittite and Cuneiform Luvian see A. Kammenhuber, “Marduk und Santa in der hethitischen Überlieferung”, *Or* 59 (1990), 188-195, for those in Hieroglyphic 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 Raimond and Olivier Casabonne for valuable references and advice. I alone remain responsible for all views expressed here.

For this material see O. Höfer, in W. Roscher, *Ausführliches Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, Bd. IV (1897-1909), 319-322 s.v. *Sandas, Sandes, Sandon*.

For the name in older cuneiform sources see E. Laroche, *NH*, 156 & 291, and for the later evidence Ph. H. J. Houwink ten Cate, *The Luvian Population Groups of Lycia and Cilicia Aspera during the Hellenistic Period* (Leiden 1961), 137.

A. Kammenhuber, *Or* 59, 191, gives no basis for her characterization that Sanda “lebt über das Hieroglyphen-Luwische und Lykische im 1. Jt. ...fort.”

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 R. Lebrun, “L’Anatolie et le monde phénicien du X^e au IV^e siècle av. J.-C.”, in E. Lipiński (ed.), *Studia Phoenicia V: Phoenicia and the East Mediterranean in the First Millennium B.C.* (Leuven 1987), 30.

S. Salvatori, “Il dio Santa-Sandon: uno sguardo ai testi”, *PP* 30 (1975), 402, 409, cites 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."⁷

Salvatori summarily rejects Sanda as war-god,⁸ 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.⁹ This linkage seems to justify seeing Sanda also in the pairing ^DAMAR.UD ^DIyarriš in the prayer (of Mursili?) KUB 31.121 (+) 121a i 17. Several have noted that in the Hukkana Treaty ^DAMAR.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 Zarpiya Ritual with the ^D*Anmarumienzi*, 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*Inmarawanteš*) are armed with daggers and bows and arrows (HT 1 i 29-34). Lebrun renders *anmarummienzi* as "les brutaux," and Laroche characterizes Sanda in the Zarpiya Ritual as "maléfique, belliqueux, terroriste."¹⁰ A similar view lies behind Salvatori's interpretation of Sanda in this ritual as a god of death.¹¹ However, as Kammenhuber properly in-

⁷ M. Popko, *Religions of Asia Minor* (Warsaw 1995), 93. For Sanda as a war-god see also A. Goetze, *Kleinasiens* (2. ed., München 1957), 160 (non vidi). See also E. Laroche, "Un syncrétisme gréco-anatolien: Sanda = Héraclès", in *Les syncrétismes dans les religions grecque et romaine* (Paris 1973), 113: "guerrier et archer." R. Lebrun, "Problèmes de religion anatolienne", *Hethitica* 8 (1987), 257 n. 19, agrees with Popko that Sanda's exact nature is uncertain, but suggests that as an archer god he has "un aspect chasseur autant que guerrier."

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 *marivda-* which appears alongside Sanda and Kubaba in the Lydian text 4a represents the Lydian equivalent of the Luvian *marwainzi* deities: **marwiyo-* > **marwida-* > *marivda-*.

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

¹¹ S. Salvatori, *PP* 30, 409.

sists,¹² the meaning of *anmarummi-* and its Hittite equivalent *immarawant-* is positive, approximately 'forceful, virile' or perhaps 'formidable, redoubtable.' Furthermore, in the HLuvian text of the "Beirut stone bowl" Sanda is the patron deity of the dedicator.¹³ In the other HLuvian text KULULU 2, the author indeed dies 'by Sanda,' but in his bed after eating and drinking.¹⁴ This description hardly suggests a violent death by a malevolent terrorist 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 Karhuha!), clearly in his role as the person's patron deity. We may assume the same for KULULU 2.

In the Zarpiya Ritual Sanda and the *Anmarummienzi* deities are asked specifically not to reenter the gates of the house 'for evil' (*attuwalahiti*, 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.¹⁵ 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.¹⁶

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 **Hāta-*.¹⁷ I wish to sug-

¹² A. Kammenhuber, *Or* 59, 192.

¹³ J. D. Hawkins, *Corpus*, vol. I, 559.

¹⁴ *Ibidem*, 488 ff.

¹⁵ Cf. R. Lebrun, in *Studia Phoenicia V*, 30-31.

¹⁶ O. Höfer, *op. cit.*, 332. Cf. also E. Laroche, 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. Lipiński, "La fête de l'ensevelissement et de la résurrection de Melqart", in A. Finet, *Actes de la XVII^e Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale* (Hamsur-Heure 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 *hātahe* that appears in the text of the Stele of Xanthos. The form recurs repeatedly in *TL* 44a, 41-55:¹⁸

[pr]ulija e[p]i=de: izredi: zēm̄tija: ehbije/⁴²-di: zagaba: nelede: hātahe:
 ētri: tumine-hi:/⁴³ nelede: h[ā]tahe pttara: malijehi: hāt/⁴⁴-ahe:
 xbane: ese: trbbēnimi: tebete: terñ se/⁴⁵ milasāñtrā: pddēne=ke: xbānije:
 izredi/⁴⁶ ehbijedi: hātahe:
 tlāñ nele: nele: tarbi/⁴⁷-de: xerēi: qastte terñ: tlahñ: erbbedi: h[ā]v/⁴⁸-tahe:
 medbijahē: ese: xerēi: tebete: [t]er[ñ]/⁴⁹ se waxssēpddimi: ēti: zehi:
 hbāti: C||: un[?][v]⁵⁰ñtepi: xlaina terñ hātahe: āka: herikle/⁵¹
 se haxlaza: pabrati: xbide: hri=xñtawa/⁵²-tahi: ese tabāna: terñ: ijāñā:
 ijaeusas/⁵³ krzz[ā]nase: hātahe:
 mukale: tewēt[e]: sāma/⁵⁴=ti: trbbetē: turaxssi: zxxāna terñ: es/⁵⁵-e:
 humrxxā: tebāna terñ: hātahe

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

se takedri: kerθθi: ade: urublijē/⁵⁶ hātahe: tubehi: prñezi: se lihbeze:
 eh[b]/⁵⁷-ije:
 se dewē: zxxaza: se ñtuweriha: ade: se/⁵⁸ xθθāna: xugaha: se xñmaha

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.¹⁹ It is

*-nt- would result in [-nd-]. Laroche's derivation (in *Les syncrétismes*, 111) from *sānt-, participle to a Luvian verb cognate with Hittite šā(i)- '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 Luwian Population Groups*, 136).

¹⁸ For the justification of my division into clauses, which essentially agrees with that of D. Schürr, "Kaunos in lykischen Inschriften", *Kadmos* 37 (1998), 151-152, see further below.

¹⁹ For the most recent discussion of the nature of the monument and its text see J. Borchhardt, H. Eichner, M. Pesditschek, P. Ruggendorfer, "Archäologisch-sprachwissenschaftliches Corpus der Denkmäler mit lykischer Schrift", *Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Anzeiger der phil.-hist. Klasse*, 134. Jhg., 2. Teilband, (Vienna 1997-1999), 17-56, especially on its authorship (with ample references to the many other viewpoints).

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 *hātahe* is that it means 'personal, (one's) own,' a derivative of *hāta*- 'person, self' that occurs in the accusative singular in the tomb inscription *TL* 84, 1-3:²⁰ *ebēmē: prñmawā: m=e=ti: prñmawatē: mizretije: murāzah: tuhes: mhidaza: surezi/ hrppi atli: ehbi: se ladi: se tideime: ehbije: s=ed=adē: atli: hrzzē [i]spazijē: me=te: ñta tāti/ ebñmē: hātā: se ladā* "Mizretije, cousin of Murāza, the *m.* of Sura, built this grave-house for himself and his wife and his children. And he made the upper *i.* for himself. They shall put him *hāta*- in (it) and his wife." This analysis is unsatisfactory on all counts. First of all, it is very doubtful that *hāta*- means 'person, self.' We know the word for 'person, self' in Lycian: *atr/la*- (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 *hāta*- is most naturally taken as an old participle to the attested Lycian verb *ha*- '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 *hātahe* as attested cannot be a derivative of *hāta*- meaning 'personal, own.' Cau analyzes *hātahe* as belonging to a possessive adjective *hātahi*-. In that case, however, *hātahe* 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 *hātahe* to modify. One could suppose with Hajnal that *hātahe* is a genitive singular in *-ahe*, but as he concedes, this ending is not attested anywhere else in Lycian in an appellative, only in personal names.²²

²⁰ For this view see O. Carruba, "Contributi al licio", *SM EA* 11 (1970), 37; I. Hajnal, *Der lykische Vokalismus* (Graz 1995), 195 with note 276; and N. Cau, "La spedizione di Melesandro in Licia nel racconto della stele di Xanthos (*TL* 44a, 34ss.); un tentativo di interpretazione", *Studi Ellenistici* 12 (2000), 27, all following P. Meriggi, "La declinazione del licio", *Rendiconti d. Accad. Naz. d. Lincei*, Serie 6, vol. 4 (1928), 438-439 et aliter.

²¹ For the provision cf. *TL* 88, 2 *se ēke lati ddaqasa* "and when Ddaqasa is dead..." and similarly *TL* 112, 2.

²² Meriggi proposes that *hātahe* 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 *hātahe* as 'personal, one's own' is quite incompatible with the attested word order and makes no sense in context. In 44a, 42-44 *hātahe* 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 ehbijedi* 'by his hand,' but in 44a, 47-48 *erbbedi* 'with battle/defeat.'²⁴ In 44a, 50 and 55 it would modify *terñ* 'army' (or 'district'), but the reference cannot be to the subject as elsewhere. Finally in 44a, 53 it must modify *krzzānase* 'Chersonesos.' The choice of nouns designated as 'one's own' is peculiar to say the least!²⁵

As already seen by Schürr,²⁶ the word *hātahe* in 44a, 41-55 serves as a refrain-like device that divides the passage into successive parts. As per Schürr, *hātahe* in this function appears consistently in clause-final position except in 44a, 50, where the very salient comparison with Heracles is postposed even beyond *hātahe*. As is also clear from Schürr'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 *hātahe*, which seems to be a virtual add-on whose only function is to unify and organize the narrative.

The role of *hātahe* 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 (*tuwete kumezija*) in every district (*tere tere*) for the local Storm-god (*trqqñti pddātahi*) and speak further of *tumenehija kumezija* and *xākbija kumezija* 'sacred precincts/cults of Tymnessos and Kandyba.' The assured meanings of *tukedri* 'statue,' *ade* 'made,' and *kerθθi* as

ence of personal names it also came to be used freely as the genitive singular of *hāta-*, a second completely ad hoc and unparalleled assumption.

²³ Contra N. Cau, *op.cit.*, 27, *hātahe* cannot modify *nelede*, which is a verb (see further below). There is no ablative-instrumental plural in *-ede* in Lycian. The ablative-instrumental in *-a/edi* is indifferent to number, like its cognates in Hittite and Luvian.

²⁴ N. Cau, *op.cit.*, 29, takes *hātahe medbijahe* as 'con i suoi medbijahi,' but nowhere else does *hātahe* precede its putative head noun. Indeed, it is always clause-final (see below).

²⁵ P. Meriggi, "La declinazione del licio III", *SMEA* 22 (1980), 223 n. 11, tries to save *hātahe* as 'proprio' in the last instance by taking it as an adverb in the sense 'appunto.' 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. Schürr, *Kadmos* 37, 157.

a place-name (cf. 44b, 49) guarantee a similar content for the clause containing *hātahe* and the ones following it cited above: "And he made a statue in Kerθθi..., and he made a *dewē* for/to the warriors and *ñtuweriha*, and (he made) *xθθāna* for the grandfather(s) and grandmother(s)." The word *d(d)ewē-* 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 *Hlīmī-dewē-*, a compound directly comparable to *hlīmī-pijata* in the Létōon Trilingual (N320, 25), which must mean something like 'income-gift.' It is noteworthy that we find the same collocation *ddewē xxxazāi* 'dedication/memorial 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 *xθθāna* with Hittite *hateššar* 'pit,'²⁷ he is surely right in seeing *xθθāna* as a votive object or installation for the ancestors.²⁸ I tentatively take *urublijē* with Carruba as a variant of *erublija*,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' (*sttati*), 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 Kerθθi (as) an *urublije-...*"

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 *hātahe tubehi prñezi se lihbeze ehbije*. The modifier *ehbije* 'his' assures us that *lihbeze* is dative plural, whatever its meaning, and the preceding *tubehi prñezi* 't. of the household' can easily be dative singular, as its coordination with *lihbeze ehbije* would suggest. We thus arrive at: "And he made a statue in Kerθθi as an *urublije-* to (the) *tubehi* of the household and his *lihbeze-*." Whether *ehbije* 'his' refers back to the subject or to the dedicatee *tubehi* is impossible to determine. We are left with *hātahe* not yet accounted for.

In principle *hātahe* could be construed with either *urublijē* or *tubehi* (*prñezi*). I suggest that it goes with the former and expresses the dedicatee, with the same word order and syntax as *ddewē xxxazāi* 'dedication/monument for the warriors' cited above: 'an *urublije-* for Sanda.' So long as we do not know the meaning of *tubehi*, I leave open whether we

²⁷ I. Hajnal, *Der lykische Vokalismus*, 215 n. 268.

²⁸ *Ibidem*, 34 n. 19.

²⁹ O. Carruba, "Beiträge zum Luwischen", in *Fs Neumann*, 42.

are to assume a series of three dedicatees ("And he made a statue in Ker00i 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,³⁰ I contend that the content of the first series of actions in the long "*hãtahe* 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: [*jetehi: axã: ara: nelede arĩma* "... he *n*-ed in due form an *axa*-sacrifice in Xanthos." Pace Cau,³¹ *axã* 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 *axã/uti-*, a kind of priest. Given the presence of *xistte wawadra* 'x-ed cattle' and *uwadraxi* '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.³² The neuter nom.-acc. plural *ara* is functioning here as an adverb equivalent to Latin *rĩte*. The meaning of *nelede* must be something like 'established, laid down.'³³

Lines 44a, 41-43 are thus dedicatory like 44b, 55-57. Just what is being dedicated is less certain. The generally accepted restoration [*pru*]l*ija* in 44a, 41 is based on the occurrence *ebei: kbija: prulija: eĩi pddãt[i] ?/ ijãna tija* in 44b, 1-2, which directly follow the "*hãtahe* narrative" after the open space at the bottom of column *a*. Since *kbi-* means 'other,' it seems rea-

³⁰ N. Cau, *Studi Ellenistici* 12, 27-28.

³¹ *Ibidem*, 25.

³² The word *axã* 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...esbedi* 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 *izre-* 'hand,' appealing to Latin *manus*. It is the asyndetic pair *izredi 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: *tlãñ nele: nele: tarbide xerẽi* 'Xerẽi *t*-ed Tlos 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 *κατοικία* or *κώμη*). 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 "*hãtahe* narrative." In view of the arguments of Borchhardt for the Xanthos Stele as a cenotaph, I suggest that *prulija* may mean 'trophies.'³⁴ 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 "*hãtahe* narrative."³⁵

By my understanding, the military exploits narrated were preceded by the dedication of other trophies in various other places (lines 44a, 41-43): "Moreover,³⁶ he laid down with his (own) hand *zẽmĩtija* trophies in Lagbos for Sanda, laid (them) down in Lower Tymnessos for Sanda, in Patara (sacred to) Malija for Sanda."³⁷ The meaning of the adjective *zẽmĩtija* 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 *hãtahe* as a dedicatee 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*, Jhg. 134, 37 ff. See also *ibidem*, 46, for the specific suggestion that the monument may have included examples of the *τροφαία* 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 *xere xere tamade zxxazije* 'everywhere in the buildings/ installations (?) of the warriors' (for a similar analysis of *tamade zxxazije* as 'monuments guerriers' see R. Lebrun, "Notes de lexicologie lycienne", *Hethitica* 10 (1990), 162. While the rest of the sentence containing *tamade zxxazije* 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 Kyaneai and its territories (*xbane* and *pddẽne=ke xbãnije*). His arguments in *N.A.B.U.* 1998/1, No. 8 against the identification of *Zagaba* with *Λαγβοσ* 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 *hātahe* with warriors in 44b, 55-56 and the comparison of the exploits of Xerēi with those of Heracles in 44a, 50.³⁸ I readily concede that both of these intersections with *hātahe* 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 *hātahe* as 'for/to Sanda.' First, as Diether Schürr (pers. comm.) has rightly objected, there are no other assured examples of the genitive ending *-Vhe* with a divine name (we find rather the inflected possessive adjective in *-Vhe/i-*). This is true, but *adaijē malijehe* in TL 26, 12 has rather a better chance of meaning 'a sum of *ada*'s for Maliya' than 'a sum of *ada*'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: *Arīmahe* and *Arīnaha* (Xanthos) and *Zaxabahe* and *Zaxabaha* (Lagbos). There is thus no principled reason why we might not find both for divine names.

The reason why we find only *hātahe* and no *hātahe/i-* has to do with the syntax of the former, which is the other formal problem 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 zxxaza se ŋtuweriha ade* "And he made a *d.* for/to the warriors and *n.*". However, this phrase is followed *directly* by *se xθθāna xugaha se xīnaha*, which also depends on *ade*. 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 *zxxaza* 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: zehi: hbāti: C||: u/[]* 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.

used in a dative function is found in the Trilingual, N320, 30-32: *se=i(j) =ehbij(a)=ai/tē: tasa: mere: ebette: teteri: arīn/as se(j)=epewētlīmēi: arīnāi* "And the city of Xanthos and the Xanthian *περιοικοι* made oaths to him (the priest Simias) for these laws." As per Laroche³⁹ the enclitic *-i(j)-* may be taken either as a dative 'to him' or as *-ij(e)* 'there, in that case.' I also follow him in assuming that *ehbij* is elided for *ehbija* agreeing with *tasa* 'oaths.' However, he does not make clear what 'son serment'/'his oath' would mean in a sentence where the subject is plural. The force of *ehbija tasa* obviously is 'oaths to him.'⁴⁰ The priest Simias certainly does not possess the oaths made by the Xanthians.

It is true that the examples just cited use a form of the possessive adjective, not a genitive in *-Vhe*. And I see no reason why the possessive adjective could not have been used in the sentences of 44a, 41-43: [*pru*] *lija...hātaha* 'trophies...for Sanda.' Note, however, that in the rest of the "*hātahe* narrative" an inflected adjective would not have been possible under this analysis, since it is the entire action of the sentence that is being dedicated, not a specific direct object. The example *ddewē zxxazāi* 'dedication/memorial to the warriors' in 44c, 6 shows that a genitive may also be used even where a possessive adjective is possible. A more serious question to which I have no answer is why the text would not simply use a dative for the deity in all instances (**Hāta* or **Hāti*), a more straightforward construction which would seem to serve just as well. In the face of this and other uncertainties, and in the absence of supporting evidence for the presence of Sanda in Lycia, the equation of Sanda=*Hātahe* remains a hypothesis, and I offer it here with all due reserve.

³⁹ E. Laroche, "L'inscription lycienne", in *Fouilles de Xanthos* 6 (1979), 73.

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