

Further Thoughts on Carian Nominal Inflection

H. Craig Melchert

The discovery and gratifyingly prompt and excellent publication of the Carian-Greek Bilingual of Kaunos (Frei and Marek 1997) affirmed the essential validity of what has been labeled the “Egyptological” interpretation of the Carian alphabet, also referred to as the “Ray-Schürr-Adiego” system, as presented in the table in Adiego 1993, 8. While the value of a few individual letters remains debatable or indeterminate, the Carian alphabet may be regarded as deciphered¹. The new bilingual also brought welcome confirmation of a few grammatical features in the noun that show that Carian does in fact belong to the Anatolian subgroup of Indo-European, closely related to Lycian, Lydian, Luvian.

The bilingual did not, however, lead to the expected breakthrough in elucidating the overall grammar of the language. Although the bilingual text represents a proxeny decree, a Greek institution, the Carian formulation of its contents appears to be relatively independent in its formal expression from the quite stereotypical Greek text. As a result, there is still no generally accepted parsing of the text, but only competing analyses (for which see the various contributions in Blümel *et al.* 1998). There is in particular no consensus regarding the Carian verb, to the extent that we cannot even securely identify the verbs, in the bilingual or in other texts. Therefore, while the Carian script has been deciphered, the language remains only partially understood.

In what follows I will survey what is known about Carian nominal inflection. I will first treat those cases where the facts seem reasonably secure, then turn to those that are more problematic. For the latter I have not hesitated to offer in some cases what I hope are reasoned speculations. I will try throughout to distinguish explicitly what is known from what is probable or merely possible. I urge readers to give full value to all qualifiers.

The nominative singular of animate nouns in Carian is marked by a zero ending, as in Lycian and Sidetic, reflecting a prehistoric *-s, as still preserved in Hittite, Luvian and Lydian. Most assured examples are personal names, but some appellatives that appear as ethnic names or titles in apposition to personal names are virtually certain : *kbos* (M16) “of Keramos” (with Schürr 2003, 69, note 1), *koíol* (M36), *kloruλ* (MY G), *mdaùn* (M10, M25), *ùiasi* (M17), *ùnsmsos* (AS3)². In most cases the nouns in question refer to the name of the deceased in funerary inscriptions, but a few arguably appear as the subjects of a verb: e.g. *šrqur* (personal name) in 34* (cited in full below).

The Kaunos Bilingual has confirmed that the accusative singular of animate nouns in Carian appears as *-n* : *otonosn* = [ʼA]θηναῖον “Athenian”, *nik[ok]lan* and *lùs[ikl]an* = Νικοκλέα and Λυσικλέα. Identification of further examples depends on acceptance of certain accompanying words in context as verbs. I view as reasonably certain *snn orkn* (34*) “this bowl” (object of *ùbt* “dedicated”) and *kbidn* (44*) “Kaunos” (object of

¹ Discussion continues regarding the precise relationship to each other of the multiple letters that stand for some form of the vowel *u*. One should regard the now standard transliterations *u*, *ú*, *ù*, and *ü* merely as conventional. I do in what follows replace *w* for letter 28 with *û*, since this letter does clearly indicate a vowel (syllabic) just like the others.

² For the system of citing Carian texts used here see Adiego 1994b, 59-63.

uiomλn “they pledged” or the like). Less assured are *tumn* (MY L) “Atum” and *ūriχñ* (D 9) “?”. The latter may be rather neuter nominative-accusative singular (see below).

The best evidence for the opposition of animate nominative singular in zero versus accusative singular in *-n* consists of *kbos* versus *otonosn*, since both are ethnica with the same suffix *-(o)s-* reflecting the Anatolian suffix **-asso-* that also appears in Cuneiform Luvian *-ašša/i-*, Lycian *-ahe/i-* and elsewhere. One should note that in all native Carian examples *-n* follows a consonant. Greek names in *-an* may, though they need not be, analogical. I stress this point merely because we cannot at present entirely exclude that the ending for the animate accusative is *-n* only after consonant, due to syncope, as in Lycian *-ñ*, while stems in vowels may have some other form for the animate accusative singular (see on this point Hajnal 1995, 21-25, and further below).

The Kaunos Bilingual assures us that the animate accusative plural ending is *-š*, with a voiceless palatal fricative : *kdùnš* “Kaunians” and *otrš* = αὐτοῦς “themselves”. As argued by Schürr (1998, 146, and 2001, 111 and 117), the word *kδuśolš* (41*ab) is certainly an adjective describing the bracelets on which the inscription appears and is thus animate nominative plural (arguably “belonging to the king”, that is “the god”). It is hard to determine whether other words with the ending *-š* are nominative or accusative plural : *sarniš*, *39orsolš*, *qrdsołš* (D16), *molš* (Mylasa) “priests” (for the last example see Hajnal 1995, 14, note 7, and Adiego 2005, 92-93 *et alibi*). That the animate nominative and accusative plural have the same ending with a voiceless palatal fricative is in any case unsurprising. The Carian ending *-š* matches exactly the *-nzi* of Hieroglyphic Luvian, with the same generalization of the original nominative plural < **-nsi* to the accusative³.

It has long been known that possession or appurtenance is marked in Carian by forms ending in *-ś* (most notably in patronymics). The only point of dispute has been whether such forms represent the genitive singular of nouns or animate nominative singular of possessive adjectives with zero ending (since all assured examples are modifying what appear to be nouns in the nominative). In arguing for the latter (Melchert 2002, 310-312), I overlooked one crucial fact : word order. We have at least twenty-five attested adnominal examples, and all precede the head noun : e.g. *terwezś upe* (MY E) “stele (or similar) of T.”, *pdubiś mnoś* (M2) “(of) the son of P.”, *kbíomś χi en* (M24) “who (is) the mother of K.”. This consistent word order shows decisively that the forms in *-ś* are true genitives of nouns, as per Schürr 2001, 117⁴. We do have a single example of a secondarily inflected *accusativus genitivi*, again preceding its head noun : *pñmnnśñ pδaxñsuñ* (χi) (D10) “of the p. of P.”.

The correlation of the differing word order and differing sibilant in the patronymics in the Kaunos Bilingual means that we should restore and understand them with Frei and Marek 1997, 35, as : *nik[ok]lan lùsiklas[n] otonosn sb lùs[ikl]an lùsikratas[n] otonosn* “Nikokles (son) of Lysikles, the Athenian, and Lysikles, (son) of Lysikrates, the Athenian”. That is, the patronymics in *-asn* are animate accusative singulars of adjectives in *-as-*, entirely parallel to *otonosn*. Carian thus aligns exactly with Lycian, which

³ Derivation of the accusative plural ending *-š* with a palatal fricative from **-ns* by Hajnal 1998, 90-92, is phonologically implausible. Pace Hajnal 1997, 148 and 1998, 92, and Schürr 2001, 111-113, there is no correlation between Carian *-š* and Milyan *-z*!

⁴ Schürr correctly equates Carian *-ś* with Hieroglyphic Luvian */-asi/* and cites references for the plausible derivation from PIE **-osyo*, but Lycian *-(a)h(e)* cannot have the same source. The latter is also a true genitive ending reflecting PIE **-(o)so*, as shown by its word order (Adiego 1994a, 18 *et alii*, against Melchert 2002, 312 *et alibi*). For examples see below.

likewise shows consistent preceding true genitive (*huniplah tideimi* “son of H.”) with occasional secondarily inflected accusative (*urtaqijahñ kbatru* “daughter of Ortakia”) versus the inflected adjective that typically follows the head noun (*ēni mahanahi* “mother of the gods”).

Carian forms of the animate nominative and accusative singular and plural and of the genitive singular are thus reasonably well established. Identification of other case forms is far less secure. There are two major issues : (1) the form of the *neuter* nominative-accusative (singular and plural); (2) the function of the attested endings *-s* and *-τ* – are they genitive or dative?

Surprisingly, there has been thus far almost no discussion of the neuter gender in Carian (for one exception see Hajnal 1995, 21, with note 30). Given the existence of the neuter in the closely related and roughly contemporaneous Lycian and Lydian, as well as Luvian, it is not credible that Carian had no neuter forms. The question is whether we can securely identify any of them. Certain severe limitations in our Carian data make such identification especially difficult. As noted, the *animate* nominative singular in Carian has a zero ending, descriptively identical with the inherited zero ending of the neuter nominative-accusative singular in most stem classes. Furthermore, we would predict that the inherited neuter nominative-accusative ending of *o*-stems, namely **-om*, might well appear in Carian as *-n*, like the animate accusative singular. Disambiguating the zero and *-n* endings requires specific conditions. If the same stem is attested with both the zero and *-n* endings, it must be animate, nominative and accusative singular respectively. Unfortunately, we have no Carian stem attested with both endings (or with one of them and the unambiguous animate plural ending *-š*). If we could show that a noun with the *-n* ending appears in the role of subject or that a noun with the zero ending appears as a direct object, we could be assured that the noun is neuter. Here our inability to identify the finite verb with any certainty precludes any such definitive demonstration.

The result is that at present a Carian nominal stem with zero ending may be either animate nominative singular or neuter nominative-accusative singular (this is possible for all declensions except *o*-stems). Likewise a Carian stem with *-n* ending may be either animate accusative singular (of any declension) or neuter nominative-accusative singular of an *o*-stem (equivalent to Greek *πέδον* or Latin *templum*). There is one further potential complication : we must also consider the possibility that Carian adds a postposed particle **-so(d)* (originally an enclitic demonstrative) to the neuter nominative-accusative singular, like Luvian. That this is a real possibility for Carian is made likely by the fact that it clearly does in some instances place the demonstrative after the noun, as in the Athens inscription : *śias san* = *σῆμα τόδε* “this memorial”. On the other hand, we must also reckon with the possibility that some Carian nominal stems ending in *-s* are animate nominative singulars of stems ending in a dental stop such as **-(n)t-* : compare Lycian *trqqas*, nominative singular of the name of the Storm-god, to a stem *trqqñt-*. Once again our inability to determine whether a given example is functioning as subject or direct object creates serious ambiguity.

In what follows I attempt to review systematically those examples that I think have some chance of being a form of the neuter nominative-accusative singular or plural. I cannot overemphasize the very speculative nature of all identifications proposed, which depend on quite uncertain analyses of the texts. This survey is intended merely as a

starting point for discussion of an issue that has heretofore been neglected, and all the interpretations offered are no more than suggestions.

Some Carian demonstrative pronouns may show a neuter nominative-accusative zero ending reflecting PIE **-od* with loss of the final stop (as in Luvian *kui* and Lycian *ti* “what” < **kuid*). Carian *an* in *an siḍi* (D2) “this tomb” may represent **élónod* (for the stem see Hajnal 1995, 20). Likewise I take *sa* in *upe sa* (M18) “this stele” as continuing **kōd* (= Cuneiform Luvian *zā*)⁵. Carian has apparently on the analogy of the two demonstrative stems *a-* < **é/ó-* and *an-* < **élóno-* created a longer stem *san-* beside *sa-* (assured in animate accusative singular *snn* in 34*). I therefore also analyze *śias san* Athens) = σῆμα τόδε “this memorial” as neuter nominative-accusative singular, with *san* showing the same zero ending as *an* and *sa* (on *śias* as a neuter see below, but compare the alternative analysis of Hajnal 1995, 23, as an animate stem in **-nt-s*). Finally, I suggest that the isolated *ú* in *upa ú* (M5) is also a postposed demonstrative < **ówod*, cognate with the Lydian demonstrative stem *os-* (for which see Gusmani 1982, 81, and Eichner 1988, but with a false etymology)⁶. For the agreement with the putatively neuter plural *upa* (see below) one may compare Hittite *šakuwa-šmet* “their eyes” or Lydian *laqrisa...qid* “what l.”.

Since Carian *siḍi* appears to mean something like “tomb”, I offer as pure speculation that it may represent a virtual **keyontid-* “lying place”. For the suffix and its function see Starke 1990, 176-209, and compare especially Cuneiform Luvian *dānit-* “cult stele”. For the putative presence of the suffix in Carian compare *pr37idas*. If this example is real, then it would show again the regular loss of word-final **-d*, as in Luvian and Lycian.

As suggested above, the certain evidence for the postposing of demonstratives in Carian means that we may also entertain the possibility that some Carian nouns in *-s* are neuters with a postposed particle matching Luvian *-sa*. In particular, this assumption would allow us to analyze *sḍis* (D14, D15), which appears to be a variant of *siḍi* “tomb, grave”, as in fact *siḍi* plus the particle (perhaps with a rightward shift of the accent conditioned by addition of the particle, that led to syncope of the first vowel)⁷. For the particle added to a stem in **-id-* (ending in *-i* in the nominative-accusative singular) compare Cuneiform Luvian *ḥaddulaḥi-ša* “health” and Hieroglyphic Luvian REX-*tahi-sa* “kingship”, abstracts in *-ahit-*. If this analysis is correct for *sḍis*, then we must assume the same for the preceding modifier *sñis* in D14, perhaps “single, sole”, to an *i*-stem matching Hittite *šani-* “single”.

As possible representatives of *o*-stem neuter nouns in Carian I suggest two examples ending in *-e*, which I take to reflect accented final **-óm*. As pointed out above, all assured examples of the ending *-n* as an accusative singular in native Carian words follow a consonant and thus reflect syncope. The *-n* in such cases was surely syllabic, like *-ñ* after consonant in Lycian. We do not know the outcome of the accusative ending in nasal in Carian in cases where the vowel was preserved. Possible support for the idea that the

⁵ Note that *upesa*, with postposed demonstrative, is written together without word divider. Hajnal 1995, 23, with note 30, also analyzes the form as neuter, but assumes a form with analogical nasal ending **kōm*.

⁶ I forgo a translation of this demonstrative. We would expect on etymological grounds that it have a far-deictic value, but Lydian *os-* in context, like Carian *ú*, appears to refer to the tomb installation. The radical reinterpretation of the Hittite deictic system by Goedegebuure 2002-2003 now requires a complete reevaluation of the history of the deictic stems in Anatolian.

⁷ I must make explicit that I am here following Adiego (personal communication) in segmenting the text as (*sñis*) *sḍis as* in D14 and D15, with a postposed demonstrative *as*, for which compare *upe sa*, *upa ú*, etc.

accented ending **-óm* appears as Carian *-e* comes from the personal name *pikre*, which may reflect a stem in **-ón* like Latin *Catō*, Greek *Στράβων*, or Lycian *Xudalijē*. Carian *pikre* could in fact equal directly the **Pigrē* attested with a further extension in Lycian *Pigrēi*. The alternate Carian form *pikra* would then represent ordinary **-os* (= Milyan *Pixre*). Whether the Carian vowel *-e* was still nasalized but not marked in the spelling or had been denasalized is indeterminate. For the analysis of *pikre* given here and discussion of the entire issue of nasalized vowels in Carian see Hajnal 1995, 21-25.

I see as specific examples of *-e* < **-óm* the frequent word *upe* “stele” (compare Hajnal 1995, 16, note 11) and *ue* (M20, M34, MY D, etc.), which I take as a renewed form of the demonstrative *u-* identified above, with analogical ending **-om* taken from neuter nouns. The previous attempts to take *ue* as a mere variant of *upe* with an unexplained irregular intervocalic loss of *-p-* are not convincing. A demonstrative pronoun referring to the object on which the inscription is found fits all occurrences.

We may also ask whether Carian has forms reflecting **-óm* plus the postposed particle **-so(d)* (matching Cuneiform Luvian *-an-za*). The most likely candidate here is *ś(í)as/śas* (D3, Athens, Hyllarima) “cult stele, memorial”, which may represent a virtual **dhh₁siyóm-so(d)*, a derivative of the stem **dhh₁s-óm* attested with the same meaning in Hieroglyphic Luvian *tasa-* and also in Lycian *θθē* “altar” (thus modifying slightly the very attractive etymology of the Carian word by Meier-Brügger forthcoming)⁸. If the demonstrative *as* isolated in D14 and D15 is real (see above with footnote 7), then it is more likely that it reflects a virtual **óm-so(d)* with the nasal ending of the *o*-stems than an older pronominal **ó(d)-so(d)*.

Finally, we must consider whether there are any Carian forms that are neuter *o*-stems with unaccented **-om*, where we would expect syncope and an ending *-n* after consonant, just as with the animate accusative singular ending. One likely example is *ann* in 28*, where the apparent absence of any verb makes an accusative implausible. I therefore take *ann* provisionally as neuter nominative-accusative singular of the demonstrative stem *an-* “this”, with the secondary nasal ending taken from the neuter *o*-stem nouns, versus *an* (D2) analyzed above as showing the original pronominal ending zero < **-od*. The noun *üriχñ* that occurs twice in D9 could also be a neuter in **-om*, but an animate accusative singular is equally possible, so long as the overall syntactic analysis of this text remains undetermined (see Hajnal 1995, 17-18, for his own speculative attempt and reference to mine, but there are other alternatives).

We would expect any reflex of the neuter nominative-accusative plural in Carian to end in *-a*, as it does in all other Anatolian languages. The unique variant *upa* (M5) for usual *upe* “stele” in Memphis-Saqqara is a promising candidate, but the motivation for the use of a collective plural just in this one instance is quite unclear. The word *orša* (Lion) has a good chance to refer to the dedicatory object (Adiego 1998, 19). If this is correct, then it may well be a neuter nominative-accusative plural. If they are correctly read and segmented, the words *úa* (Si 53F) and *ùa* (49*) could in principle be the corresponding forms of the putative demonstrative *u-*, but these examples are too dubious to be of any real value. In sum, the existence of neuter nominative-accusative forms in Carian can hardly be doubted, but none of the identifications proposed above may be

⁸ The palatal sibilant and *í* in the Carian require assuming a substantivized derivative in **-iyo-* rather than a direct equation with the Luvian and Lycian words. The syncope of the *í* in the variant *śas* does support the assumption that the accent was on the final syllable **-óm*.

regarded as anything beyond mere possibilities. We may hope that more secure syntactic interpretations of the texts in the future will allow some of these suggestions to be either affirmed or refuted.

We turn finally to the much vexed question of identifying forms of the dative in Carian. Since a number of Carian inscriptions appear to be dedicatory, we would expect to find some instances of the dative marking the recipient. However, dedications may also be expressed with the genitive, since the given object belongs to the recipient. It is thus difficult to demarcate genitive from dative from context alone. It is for this reason that the status of the Carian ending *-s* has been the subject of some controversy. Schürr 1992, 153-154, 1996, 66, and *apud* Adiego 1998, 19, has argued that *-s* marks the dative singular⁹. This interpretation is especially plausible for *šarnaís sb taqbos* (4Š) “for Šarnai and Taqbo” (on a statuette of Isis) and *śas : ktais idùriχś : mn[os]* (D3) “memorial for Ktai (i.e. Hekataios), son of I.”. Adiego 1998, 19, protests that both examples allow equally for a possessive interpretation “of”, in which case Carian *-s* would be a second genitive ending beside *-ś*. Such competing endings would not be surprising in view of the multiple genitive singular endings zero and *-Vh(e)* in Lycian, and in Melchert 2002, 307-309, I allowed for both synchronic dative and genitive value. However, I now think that the word order facts of the assured true genitive in *-ś* cited above decide the issue of *-s* in favor of Schürr’s analysis. We know that adnominal genitives in *-ś* marking possession without exception precede their head noun. Thus the fact that *ktais* (and its appositive *mn[os]*) follows the noun *śas* in D3 means that *ktais* cannot be functioning synchronically as an adnominal genitive. It must rather be a dative expressing the dedicatee¹⁰. Based on this incontrovertible example, I take the ambiguous *šarnaís sb taqbos* likewise with Schürr as dative “for Šarnai and Taqbo”. In view of other personal names ending in *-d)ù/ùbr-*, which never appear with *-s* in the nominative, *smδùbrs* in text 33* (inscription on a phiale) must represent the case in *-s* and thus also a dative naming the recipient of the dedicated object : *smδwbrs | psnλo | mδ orkn tûn | snn* “To/for S. P. (gave) this *t.* bowl.”

Whether other instances of nouns ending in *-s* are also dative singulars is less certain. Schürr 1992, 153-154, interprets *ntros pr37idas* (Lion) and *ζīdks* (MY L) likewise as referring to the recipients of the objects bearing the inscriptions. This may well be true, but unfortunately in our present state of knowledge it is hard to exclude the alternative that these forms are rather animate nominative singulars of stems with the suffix *-s*-discussed above. In MY L *ζīdks* could be a title in apposition to the preceding personal name *šarkbiom*. Schürr 1998, 158, has ingeniously suggested that *ntros pr37idas* refers not directly to the god Apollo, but to a priest of Apollo of the family Branchidae. He sees the *-o-* as suffixal, but one may rather suppose that *ntro* is the divine name (cognate with Lycian *natri*) and that it is the *-s-* that is the suffix : “(priest) of Ntro, of the Branchidae”.

⁹ For its derivation from an earlier genitive singular ending **-e/oso* matching Lycian *-Vh(e)* see Melchert 2002, 309, with typological parallels for the shift from genitive to dative. The crucial question, however, remains the synchronic function of the ending in Carian.

¹⁰ The alleged example of a preposed adnominal genitive in *-s* in the Kaunos Bilingual does not exist. The segmentation *i[poz]inis δ rual* “in/under the ___ship of Hipposthenes” (Hajnal 1997, 150, and Melchert 1998, 37) is impossible, since the genitive of the name could only be *†ipozinas* (cf. *nik[ok]lan* and *lûs[ikl]an* for Greek eta = Carian *a* in Kaunos). The supposed word order of noun + adposition + noun is also totally unattested in Anatolian! The segmentation must be *i[poz]ini sδrual* (cf. Schürr 2001, 109) with a possessive adjective in *-i-* < **-iyo-*.

I now take it as established that *-s* is an ending of the dative singular, as per Schürr. It need not, however, be the only ending for that function, especially in proper names. One may compare Lycian, which in personal names has three endings *-i*, *-je*, and zero. The strongest candidate for a dative singular with zero ending is *ntro* in text 34* (inscription on a phiale) : *šrquq | qtblemś | ûbt | snn | orkn | ntro | pídl*. Upon further consideration, I now return to my original interpretation in Melchert 1993, 78-80 : “Š. (son) of Q. dedicated this bowl to N. (= Apollo) as a gift” (against Schürr 1998, 158, and Melchert 2002, 309). It is hardly credible that a dedicatory inscription would not name the dedicatee, and only *ntro* can be serving in this function. It is also more likely that the recipient would be the deity (at least in name), rather than an unnamed priest¹¹. That Carian had a zero ending for both animate nominative singular and for dative singular (the latter at least in personal names) is not implausible. We know that this is true for Lycian, as noted above, and context and word order would have made clear the role of a given example to native speakers, if not to us.

Other examples of datives with vocalic ending are less certain. Adiego 1994b, 38 and 50, has plausibly interpreted *trquðe* (38*) as dative “to/for Tarhunt”. He compares the ending *-e* with Lycian *-Vje* (*Ijamaraje/Pigesereje*). See for essentially the same analysis Hajnal 1995, 25-26, who makes explicit that it does presuppose a secondary stem in *-a-* for the divine name beside the usual stem in *-nt-*. Since we have no idea what the other case forms of this name were in Carian, it is impossible to be sure just how to segment *trquðe* synchronically. In any case we must at present allow for the existence in Carian of dative singulars, especially in names, with endings other than *-s*.

The last Carian case ending to be considered is that in *-τ*. This ending is relatively rare, occurring with certainty only in the Hyllarima inscription, where it appears four times in two paired syntagms¹². Interpretation of the case ending unavoidably depends on syntactic and lexical analysis of the entire text, about which there is nothing remotely resembling a consensus. The following discussion thus once again inevitably blends what is reasonably secure together with much that is mere speculation. I provisionally read the text with the following segmentation and order of reading (A1+B1, then A2+B2):

(A1) *šas qarío ððùmða* (B1) *kðuśopizipus usot*
 (A2) *muot armotrqðos-q* (B2) *molś msot ùlarmiτ*

For an excellent *editio princeps* of the new combined Hyllarima text see Adiego, Debord and Varinlioğlu 2005. Segmentation of *usot* as a separate word is assured by its occurrence in 39*ab (Keramos). Reading in the order given is assured by the syntagm *usot muot*, which must be parallel to *msot ùlarmiτ*, and by the further syntactic parallelism of *kðuśopizipus usot muot* to *armotrqðos...msot ùlarmiτ*. In each instance we find an apparent dative singular in *-s* followed by a two-word phrase with the *-τ* ending. This parallel structure confirms the interpretation by Adiego (in Adiego *et al.* 2005, 617) of *-q* as enclitic “and”, cognate with Luvian *-ha* and Milyan *-ke*. But his analysis “priests

¹¹ I have been influenced in this change of opinion by arguments of I.-J. Adiego (personal communication).

¹² I reject categorically identification of letter 23 (Ω) at Kaunos with letter 40 (i.e. τ) by Adiego (2002). All examples of Ω are between rounded vowels. Those that appear at word boundary may easily represent a hiatus-filler. I retain the value as a glide *w*. Adiego’s attempt to integrate the word *punoΩ* as a genitive plural *punoτ* does not illuminate the contexts in which it appears.

of Arma-Tarhunt and of the gods of Hyllarima” (p. 619) is quite impossible. The syntax of the Anatolian enclitic conjunction “and” is just like that of Latin *-que*. Adiego’s interpretation would demand a word order **armotrq̄δos molš msoτ-q ùlarmiτ* (as if *Iouis sacerdotēs deum-que Romānōrum*). The conjunction *-q* must rather be connecting two clauses with parallel constructions in *-s...-τ*. A verb could appear in both clauses, or it could be omitted in the second by so-called “gapping” (as in English “I gave a scarf to my mother, and a shirt to my father”).

The identification of *msoτ ùlarmiτ* by Hajnal 1995, 14-15, and Adiego 2002, 17, as a plural “gods of Hyllarima” seems assured. Also plausible is their further analysis of *molš* as a plural “priests”. Their analysis of the ending *-τ* as specifically genitive plural is based on ἱερεῖς θεῶν πάντων in the accompanying Greek inscription, but *τ* in Carian represents a voiceless affricate (= Egyptian *t̥* [č]). Derivation of an ending in a voiceless affricate from the PIE and Anatolian genitive plural ending **-ōm* is quite impossible. The analysis as a genitive in **-t+s̄* by Hajnal 1995, 15, note 9, or as a genitive in *-n+s̄* by Adiego 2002, 18-19, are farfetched. The ending *-š* is exclusively *singular*. Furthermore, note that the word order again argues decisively against an adnominal genitive, since *msoτ ùlarmiτ* follows its putative head noun *molš*.

The context as far as we understand it is equally compatible with a dative plural “priests for the gods of Hyllarima”. Derivation of a voiceless affricate [-ts] < **-ns* via **-nts* is trivial. One may compare Milyan animate accusative plural *-z* < *-ns*, also presupposed by Lycian animate accusative plural *-s*, and Cuneiform Luvian animate accusative plural *-nz(a)*. For a dative-locative plural *-nts* from **-ns* compare Luvian *-anz(a)*¹³. The presence of two datives in the same clause is quite possible: A has dedicated B to C on behalf of D. Against Adiego (in Adiego *et al.* 616-617) *armotrq̄δos* is more likely to be a personal name than a “dvandva” of two divine names. Compare the attested personal name *Armatarhunta-* in cuneiform. Thus I tentatively analyze the last clause as : “and on behalf of Armatarhunta priests for/to the gods of Hyllarima”.

I assume that likewise in the first clause the sequence *kδuśopizipus* expresses the person on whose behalf the action was taken, while *usoτ* expresses the purpose. Whether *kδuśopizipus* contains a title or a personal name (with *kδuś* as a patronymic in the genitive?) is quite unclear to me. A subject or direct object in the first clause parallel to *molš* “priests” is probably furnished by the initial word *šas*. In view of the sacral context I take this to be a variant of *ś(i)as*, “cult stele, memorial”, discussed above (for the possible alternation of *ś* and *š* cf. *psmaśk/psmśk-* “Psammetichus”). For the use of this word to refer both to a tomb and to a cult stele see Meier-Brügger forthcoming, Watkins forthcoming, and also Hutter 1993 on similar words in Luvo-Hittite context.

The purpose for which the cult stele was dedicated lies in *usoτ muoτ*, probably “great/mighty rites”, or similar. As per Hajnal 1998, 88, Carian genitive singular *wasōš* (M48) likely matches a virtual Luvian **waśhant-* “sacralized”, thus either a title “priest” (cf. Lycian *wasaza-* for both the phonology and semantics) or a personal name (i.e.

¹³ Against Hajnal 1997, 149, Melchert 1998, 37, and Adiego 2002, 19, there is no compelling evidence that Lycian *Xbide* is a plurale tantum! The attested *Xbide* can in all instances be just as well locative singular (so now Melchert 2004, x and 82). Thus Carian *kbidn* in 44* is unlikely to be dative-locative plural from an older genitive plural as in Lydian. I now take the word as animate accusative singular, object of *uiomλn*, tentatively identified as a preterite third plural verb : “They have pledged Kaunos to appoint (*mdoQun*)...”.

“Sanctus”). Carian *uso-* may match Cuneiform Luvian *waš^haiya-* “sacralized”. Far more tentatively *muo-* could mean “mighty”, from a virtual **mūwaiya-* to the family of Cuneiform Luvian *mūwa-* “might, power”, but this is no more than a guess based on the word’s shape, and many other appropriate modifiers of “rites” are possible.

One might expect the person who dedicated the stele and the priests to be named, and this could be found in *qario*, with the verb somehow residing in *δδὺμδα*. However, so long as we do not understand the structure of the frequent sequence *mδ(a)*, which *seems* to stand where we would expect the verb, this is mere speculation. It is also possible that the sequence *qarioδδὺμδα* somehow expresses location or the manner in which the dedication was made. I forgo any further speculation and assert merely that the overall structure of the Hyllarima text is consistent with interpretation of the ending *-τ* as a dative plural instead of a genitive plural. The former analysis is far more plausible in formal terms.

I must make explicit that derivation of the putative dative plural ending *-τ* from word-final **-ns* with *t*-epenthesis necessarily implies that original word-final **-nts* also should appear as Carian *-τ*. Compare Lycian *trqqas* = Milyan *trqqiz*, nominative singular of “Tarhunt-” < **-ent-s* beside the animate accusative plural ending *-s=-z* cited above. Such an assumption provides a likely account of the nominative singular personal name *p^latτ* (AS 6) beside *p^lat* (Ab. 5a-cF). One may compare Luvian *Zida/Zidi* with the suffixed *Zidanta/Zidanza* (the latter originally nominative singular of *Zidant-*, then secondarily made into a stem). The single-word inscription *usoτ* in 39*ab cited earlier is also unlikely to mean “for the rites”, as in Hyllarima. It may be rather nominative singular of a further derivative of **washaiya-* with the suffix **-ent* (= unattested Luvian **waš^haiyant-s*) “the sacralized one”, used as personal name, roughly then “Sanctus”. Finally, the word *teboτ* appears in two unpublished graffiti from Thebes. If Carian mercenaries took the name for Egyptian Thebes from Greek Θῆβαι (first appearance in Homer *Il.* 9,381-384 beside the Greek city name), then *teboτ* is the predicted Carian form of “in/at Thebes”. I readily concede, however, that I cannot motivate why Carian would have adopted the Greek, and not the Egyptian, name for the city.

I may summarize the results of this survey of Carian nominal inflection with the following table (I omit mention of the neuter nominative-accusative as too speculative):

	Carian Nominal Case Endings	
	Singular	Plural
Animate Nominative	zero	-š
Animate Accusative	-n	-š
Genitive	-ś	?
Dative	-s/zero/-e	-τ(?)

Bibliography

- Adiego, I.-J. (1993) : *Studia Carica*, Barcelona.
- (1994a) : “Genitiu singular en lici i protoluvi”, *Annuari de Filologica*, 17, 11-33.
- (1994b) : “Les identifications onomastiques dans le déchiffrement du carien”, in : Giannotta *et al.* 1994, 27-63.
- (1998) : “La nueva bilingüe greco-caria de Cauno y el desciframiento del cario”, *Aula Orientalis*, 16, 5-26.
- (2002) : “Cario de Cauno punoΩ”, *Aula Orientalis*, 20, 13-20.
- (2005) : “La nueva inscripción caria de Mylasa”, *Kadmos*, 44, 81-94.
- Adiego, I.-J., P. Debord, and E. Varinlioglu (2005) : “La stèle caro-grecque d’Hyllarima (Carie)”, *Revue des études anciennes*, 107, 601-653.
- Blümel, W., P. Frei and C. Marek (1998) : *Colloquium Caricum (Kadmos, 37)*, Berlin.
- Collins, B. J., M. Bachvarova and I. Rutherford (forthcoming) : *Anatolian Interfaces: Hittites, Greeks and their Neighbors. Proceedings of an International Conference on Cross-Cultural Interaction, September 17-19, 2004, Emory University, Atlanta, GA.*
- Eichner, H. (1988) : “os-, eine sidetisch-lydische Wortgleichung?”, *Kadmos*, 27, 44-56.
- Frei, P. and C. Marek (1997) : “Die karisch-griechische Bilingue von Kaunos. Eine zweisprachige Staatsurkunde des 4. Jh.s v. Chr.”, *Kadmos*, 36, 1-89.
- Fritz, M. and S. Zeilfelder (2002) : *Novalis Indogermanica. Festschrift für Günter Neumann zum 80. Geburtstag*, Graz.
- Giannotta, M. E., R. Gusmani, L. Innocente, D. Marozzi, M. Salvini, M. Sinatra and P. Vannicelli (1994) : *La decifrazione del cario*, Roma.
- Goedegebuure, P. (2002-2003) : “The Hittite 3rd person/distal demonstrative *aši (uni, eni etc.)*”, *Sprache*, 43, 1-32.
- Gusmani, R. (1982) : *Lydisches Wörterbuch. Ergänzungsband. Lieferung 2*, Heidelberg.
- Hajnal, I. (1995) : “Das Vokalsystem des Karischen: Eine provisorische Bestandsaufnahme”, *Die Sprache*, 37, 12-30.
- (1997) : “Die karisch-griechische Bilingue 44* aus Kaunos: ein erster Augenschein”, *Kadmos*, 36, 141-166.
- (1998) : “ ‘Jungluwisches’ *s und die karische Evidenz”, in : Blümel, Frei and Marek 1998, 80-108.
- Hutter, M. (1993) : “Kultstelen und Baityloi”, in : Janowski *et al.* 1993, 87-108.
- Janowski, B. *et al.* (1993) : *Religionsgeschichtliche Beziehungen zwischen Kleinasien, Nordsyrien und dem Alten Testament*, Göttingen.
- Meier-Brügger, M. (forthcoming) : “Zur Bildung von griechisch θεός”, *Incontri Linguistici*, 29.
- Melchert, H. C. (1993) : “Some remarks on new readings in Carian”, *Kadmos*, 32, 77-86.
- (1998) : “Carian *mdoΩun*”, in : Blümel, Frei and C. Marek 1998, 33-41.
- (2002) : “Sibilants in Carian”, in : Fritz and Zeilfelder 2002, 305-13.
- (2004) : *A Dictionary of the Lycian Language*, Ann Arbor/New York.
- Schürr, D. (1992) : “Zur Bestimmung der Lautwerte des karischen Alphabets 1971-1991”, *Kadmos*, 31, 127-156.
- (1996) : “Bastet-Namen in karischen Inschriften Ägyptens”, *Kadmos*, 35, 55-71.
- (1998) : “Kaunos in lykischen Inschriften”, in Blümel, Frei and Marek 1998, 143-162.

- (2001) : “Karische und lykische Sibilanten”, *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 106, 94-121.
- (2003) : “Zum Namen des Flusses Kalbis bei Kaunos in Karien”, *Historische Sprachforschung*, 116, 69-74.
- Starke, F. (1990) : *Untersuchungen zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens*, Wiesbaden.
- Watkins, C. (forthcoming) : “ ‘Hermit Crabs’, or new wine in old bottles. Anatolian and Hellenic connections from Homer and before to Antiochus I of Commagene and after”, in : Collins et al. (forthcoming).