Carian *trquδe*, *mλane* and *šanne* and Implications*

H. Craig Melchert
University of California, Los Angeles

§ 1. *C.Ia 3 and Carian dative singulars in* -e

My starting point is inscription C.Ia 3, with the readings of Adiego (2007: 147–148):[1]

(1) C.Ia 3 (late 6thC BC, following Loiacono 2019:43 with refs.)
[?] *areš* | *šanne* [|?] *mλne* | *siykloś* | *šann* | *trquδe* | *ḱλmu≈δ* [?]

There is broad agreement that *trquδe* is dat. sg. of the name of the Storm-god as recipient of a vow (Adiego 1994: 38 and 50, 2007: 318; Hajnal 1997: 155; Melchert 2010: 184, Valério and Yakubovich 2022: 347[10]). The first alternative of Loiacono (2019: 132) requires multiple unprovable steps to produce an acc sg. c. that is contextually unlikely. The internal structure of the sequence *trqδimr* in C.Ki 1 is entirely unclear (Adiego 2007: 422 with refs.) and provides no evidence for a Carian dat. sg. †*trqδi*. Loiacono's second suggestion (2019: 132) of a thematized variant following Schürr also has no basis: the Luwian(!) voc. sg. ^{d} IŠKUR-*ta* in Hittite context is /tarχont/ with zero-ending, just like ^{d}*Wišuriyanta* /wisoriyant/

* I am much indebted to Héctor Arroyo-Quirce, Michele Bianconi, and Ergün Laflı for invaluable assistance with Greek inscriptions of Caria and elsewhere (both sources and secondary literature) and to Zsolt Simon for help with citations of secondary literature on Carian inscriptions as well as very constructive critical remarks, likewise to Norbert Oettinger for further correctives. The usual disclaimers apply, and I am solely responsible for all claims not explicitly attributed to others.

1. But for the possibility that a word divider stood in the break after *šanne* see the photo in Loiacono (2019:67).

(Hoffner and Melchert 2008: 75). The only thematization of Luwian *Tarḫunt-* is that based on the nom. sg., which never reaches beyond the acc. sg.: HLuwian /tarχontˢas/, /tarχontˢan/.[2]

With Adiego (2007: 318) we may expect an *nt*-stem dat. sg. ending **-ei*, and Carian *trquδe* may match exactly Lycian *Trqqñti* (against Loiacono 2019: 79). Alternative derivations of Adiego (1994: 50) from a cognate of Lycian *-Vje* and of Hajnal (1997: 155) < **-āi-ō*(!) must assume stems for the name of the Storm-god for which there is no evidence. Given the archaic paradigm of the name of Storm-god in both Lycian and Milyan, we may suppose that Carian also preserved a reflex of **tr̥h₂wn̥téi*. That Luwian partially innovated is not diagnostic for the others, and as per above the Luwian secondary stem is based on the nominative singular, not on the consonant stem. A dat. sg. *trqude* in no way precludes the attractive analysis of Loiacono (2019: 122–133) that the apposition/epiclesis *ḱλmuδ* consists of acc. sg. *ḱλmu* plus postposition *≠δ* "to/for" < **endo*. See below on *δen* (*tumn*) in E.Sa 1. But I must insist that the formal expression of the thematic role recipient/beneficiary need not match in the head noun and its apposition. Whether *ḱλmu-* actually means "king" (Loiacono 2019: 133) is far more arguable: in view of his own discussion of Zeus Stratios (2019: 139–144) one may also entertain "commander".

It is the great merit of Loiacono (2019: 84) to have emphasized two points: that *šanne* and *šann* must share the same stem, and that adjacent *šanne* and *mλne* surely match morphologically. He then illuminatingly suggests (2019: 85–88) that *mλne* might be a nominal form. His later tentative proposal (2019: 90) to try to take *šanne* rather as a present third singular verb "offre?" and *mλne* as its object ignores his insight that *mλne* and *šanne* are the same morphologically, while taking both as direct objects leaves *šann* unexplained, as he concedes. The solution is rather to take *šanne* (which formally matches *trquδe*!) as the dat. sg. to an *n*-stem whose nom.-acc. sg. is *šann*, the real direct object referring to the krater that bears the text. For the latter see Simon (2008: 461), with a different parsing of *šanne* and *mλne*. The parallelism with *šanne* argues that *mλne* is also not merely a nominal form, but likewise dat. sg. to an *n*-stem. It is the implications of this lead that I will pursue in what follows.

2. The only Hittite name for the Storm-god is ^{d}*Tarḫunna-**: see DSg ^{d}IŠKUR-*unni* in Anitta (KBo 3.22:2,3 and 21, OH/OS). The nom. sg. ^{d}IŠKUR-*taššaš* in KUB 29.1 ii 38 is an unreal creation of the New Hittite copyist.

§ 2. *Carian* mδa(ne), mλne, mlane

§ 2.1. *Previous analyses: a verb or a sequence of particles?*

There is arguably no more vexed and controversial problem in Carian grammar than the analysis of the forms *mδa*(*ne*), *mλne*, and *mlane*, which occur frequently, but by no means exclusively, in votive contexts. See the thorough review by Adiego (2007: 322–324), which in terms of describing the competing analyses retains its currency. There have been two major approaches (with variants): (1) we are facing a sequence of particles (and a verb, if present, is to be sought elsewhere in the respective texts); (2) the sequences contain a finite verb. Adiego (1994: 54–55) and (2000: 140) argues for the first; Hajnal (1997: 153–155), Melchert (*apud* Adiego 2007: 322–323), and Schürr (2022) for the second, albeit with non-trivial differences.[3]

Neither approach is viable for the longer sequences ending in *-ne*. The Carian letter *e* clearly represents a phonetically long vowel, as shown by renderings with Greek eta: *lýḱse* = Λυξης, *mane* = Μανης, (*para*)*iβreλ* = Ιμβαρηλδος, etc.[4] Carian *-ne* therefore cannot reflect either an enclitic particle (whatever its function or source might be), enclitic acc. sg. c. *-n-* plus dat. sg. *-e* (Adiego 1994: 54), or an enclitic pronoun matching Lycian *-e*/*ẽne* (Schürr 2022: 148) whether the latter is analyzed as acc. sg. *-e*/*ẽne* with prop vowel or as *-e*/*ẽn*≠*e* with acc. sg. c. plus nom. sg c. (for the first see Melchert 2004: 19–20 and for the latter Kloekhorst 2011: 16–19).[5] The alternative analysis of forms in *-n*(≠)*e* as a finite verb plus enclitic are equally problematic for the same reason (on *mδa* see § 3.1. below).

3. My paper cited by Adiego never appeared, because I quickly realized that it was based on quite untenable premises, as described immediately below.

4. See Schürr 1992: 142–143, but as indicated by Hajnal (1995[1997]: 16), the Greek perception of Carian accented *e* and *o* as long does not prove that vowel length was synchronically contrastive in Carian. In the oral presentation of this paper I also claimed that Carian *e* and *o* are accented. That may often be true, but it can hardly be an inherent feature. Words containing two of these vowels do occur, including likely appellatives: e.g., *polo* in E.Me 8b. The length of *e* and *o* is quite sufficient to exclude their appearance in enclitics, much less as unaccented final prop vowels.

5. Carian *o* is consistently rendered by Greek omega (Schürr 1992: 143, Adiego 2007: 237): *plqo* = Πελ(λ)εκως, *ktmno/ktmño* = Εκατομνως, etc. This refutes the attempt of Adiego (2000: 142) to interpret *pisñoi* and *ñmailo* of C.Si.2 as preterite third plural verbs plus an enclitic direct object *-o*. Cf. the criticism of Simon 2020: 401–403.

A further problem is the improbability of preterite active third plural verbs ending in *-n*. There is a broad consensus that Proto-Luwic renewed the preterite third singular and plural endings in *-Vt* and **-Vnt* with **-Vto* and **-Vnto*.[6] The identification of Carian *ýbt* (as now read) as "has dedicated" by Melchert (1993: 78–79) has been widely accepted. *Pace* Hajnal (1997: 152) and Melchert *apud* Adiego (2007: 323), the same combination of syncope and apocope that would produce pret. 3rd sg. *ýbt* < **úbVto* could only lead to pret. 3rd pl. †*mλδ* < **mV́ldonto* (correct on this point Simon 2020: 403). The present consensus that *ý* represents a high front vowel has suggested rather a pres. 3rd sg. **úbVti* (see Hajnal 1995[1997]: 17 and Adiego 2007: 432), but again the same syncope and apocope would also lead to pres. 3rd pl. *-δ* < unaccented **-Vnti*.[7] Nothing speaks in favor of a third plural ending in *-n*.

§ 2.2. mλne *and variants as dat. sg.* "*for a vow*, ex voto"

As per Loiacono (2019: 77), there is only space at the end of C.Ia 3 for two further letters (see the drawing in Adiego 2007: 147). Since Carian is almost certainly not verb-final, I assume with Loiacono that the text ends with *ḱλmu≠δ*.[8] This is not a serious problem: votive inscriptions may but need not contain a verb "(has) dedicated/vowed/ presented" or the like. Compare the following respective Lycian and Lydian examples:

6. The only point of debate has been whether the preterite active endings have been extended with a "prop vowel" (e.g., Eichner 1975: 79–80) or replaced by the corresponding mediopassive endings (e.g., Yoshida 1993: 29–34, with references to other advocates of this account). I favor the latter scenario (Lycian *-te* shows that the vowel must be **-o*), but the issue is immaterial for the outcome of the Carian endings.

7. On the other hand, if one accepts the proposal of Simon (2021: 56) that *usoτ muoτ* "in the fourth year" in C.Hy. is an ablative reflecting an ending **-(V)ti*, then one must return to the interpretation of *ýbt* as a preterite (2021: 59). Its vocalism would then need to be explained in terms of Melchert 2021: 108–13. Only a convincing identification of either a pres. 3rd pl. in *-δ* or a pres. 3rd sg. or pl. in *-τ* would settle the matter.

8. I also follow him (and others) in supposing that [ ]*areš* is probably a personal name in the nominative singular, but it may not be complete, and a nominative plural cannot be excluded (Adiego 2007: 354).

(2) N 312 (text in Bousquet 1992: 190, but with readings of Schürr 2001: 136–137)

1 Δεμοκλ[ει]δης Θε[ρ]βεσιος
2 Λιμυρευς ἀγαθηι τυχηι
3 Ἀρτεμιδι ἀνεθηκεν
4 *ñtemuxlida krbbe*[*s*ʔ]*eh*
5 *zemuris ertemi*
6 *xruwata*
"Democleides, (son) of *K.*, the Limyran, for Artemis a votive offering."

Whereas the Greek uses a finite verb and omits a direct object, the Lycian omits the verb and employs a noun *xruwata* (likely plurale tantum) equivalent to ἀνάθημα.

(3) LW 20 (text in Gusmani 1964: 259)[9]
nannas pakiwališ artimuλ
Νάννας Διονυσικλέος Ἀρτέμιδι
"Nannas (son) of Pakiwas for/to Artemis."

Here the Lydian is surely the primary text, and the Greek follows it in omitting the finite verb.

One may and should also compare the diction of so many Hellenistic Greek inscriptions from Asia Minor cited at this workshop:

(4) (text with Chaniotis *EBGR* 2003 [2006]: 363, no. 61 = *SEG* 53.2074; see Arroyo-Quirce, this volume)
Ἡρακλέων Ἀρτεί|μου Κακασζβῳ | εὐχήν
"Heracleon, (son) of Arteimas, for/to Kakasbos (as) a vow."

We are thus permitted to assume that there is no overt verb in C.Ia 3, repeated here for convenience as (5):

(5) C.Ia 3
[?] *areš* | *šanne* [|ʔ] *mλne* | *siykloś* | *šann* | *trquδe* | *ƙλmu≈δ* [?]
"A., for the sake of a vow of S. for a *š*.-vessel, (has given, or sim.) the *š*.-vessel to the Storm-god, the *ƙ*."

9. I employ the revised transliterations for Lydian, with *p* for the bilabial stop, *w* for the labial or labiodental fricative, *s* for the dental/alveolar sibilant, and *š* for the palatal sibilant.

Adnominal genitives normally precede the head noun in Carian, as in other Indo-European Anatolian languages. Compare the consistent gen. sg. PN-*ś upe* "monument of PN" in the Memphis tomb inscriptions. However, the sentence here reads more naturally if one assumes that A. carried out a vow made by S. The dependence of *šanne* on *mλne* "a vow for a *š*.-vessel" may have led to postposing the genitive. However, if one prefers the construal *siykloś šann*, the overall sense remains the same: "A., for the sake of a vow for a *š*.-vessel, (has given, or sim.) the *š*.-vessel for (on behalf of) S. to the Storm-god, the *k*." Use of the genitive to indicate for whom or what something is intended is commonplace in Anatolian (for Hittite see Hoffner and Melchert 2008: 254) and elsewhere in Indogermania. That is surely how historically the gen. sg. in *-s* in Carian comes to be used for dat. sg. and how the Lydian gen. pl. in *-av* comes to function almost exclusively as dat. pl.[10]

§ 2.3. *The primacy of* mλ(a)ne

For those who see a lexical morpheme in *mλne* and variants the obvious etymon is the PIE root **meldh-* "to solemnly declare", attested in Hittite *mald-*, which is used of any solemn utterance, but also means specifically "to vow, promise" (correct Hajnal 1997: 152).[11] This etymology, however, depends crucially on *mλne* being primary, vs. *mδane* ([m^{n}dane]) and *mlane*. Representation of the Carian letter *λ* in Greek as λλ or λδ is well established: it may be a unitary phoneme (Hajnal, loc. cit.) or a geminate (Adiego 2007: 249). Boisson (1994: 216 with refs.) makes plausible the former, a voiced lateral flap [ɺ]. It is clear that if we begin with either *mδane* or *mlane* there is no means of arriving at [ɺ] or any other result of original **ld*. Before addressing how to account for *mδane* and *mlane*, we must make a case that the *-λ-* of *mλne* reflects the older second consonant. Dating from the late 6th century BC, C.Ia 3 is not among the latest Carian texts, but neither is it strikingly old, and the obvious fact that it shows syncope of the *-a-* present in the other two variants is not per se favorable to its preserving an archaism.

10. Since there is actually no assurance that *siukloś* is a personal name (cf. Adiego 2007: 412), one should also seriously consider the suggestion of Michele Bianconi (pers. comm.) that it is simply a dependent genitive describing some feature of the *šann*-vessel: "A., for the sake of a vow for a *š*.-vessel, (has given) a *s*.-type *š*.-vessel…".

11. The rendering "to recite" of Güterbock and Hoffner (1983: 132–133) et al. is too weak. They are correct that the utterance need not be made in public (*pace* Laroche 1964: 10), but the latter's alternative "affirmer solennellement" is spot-on. For **meldh-* as ultimately derived from **mel*(*H*)*-dheh*$_1$*-* see Kölligan 2018: 231–233.

Fortunately, we now have confirmation of the primacy of the -*λ*- from C.Hd 1, likely the oldest Carian inscription from Caria proper and arguably as old as the oldest from Egypt (cf. Adiego 2019a: 25)—when properly read. The editio princeps by Türkteki and Tekoğlu (2012) is exemplary in establishing the oenochoe on which the text is inscribed in terms of its temporal and physical context (7thC BC from ancient Hydai very near Mylasa — 2012: 101–102) and in providing excellent photos. Also persuasive is their identification of the initial word as a name matching *idmuon* in E.Me 18b. But photos falsify some aspects of their drawing and reading, reproduced here:



31 30 29 28 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20 19[18] 17 16 15 14 13 12 11 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
dmuonśleosmlaneüšrot | *balíaùšraka* ←



The photo shows no trace of the alleged curved strokes ( ) flanking the fissure, rather to its left a small shape resembling letter 1. The reading of letter 6 is unclear, but definitely not Φ (*ś*). Reading of letter 7 as a damaged Δ is also dubious vs. the clear Δ in letters 12 & 23; Λ (*b*) is more likely (note against the drawing the absence of any trace of a base horizontal stroke). As per Adiego (email of 4.24.2024), correcting Adiego (2019a: 25), letter 21 is not *b*, but an inverted form of Ϭ.[12] The latter (Carian letter 42) is used in alternation with Ϛ for *l* in Carian alphabets that

12. In no Carian alphabet of Caria or Egypt does the letter *b* in its variant Γ have a remotely cursive shape, and the photo (Türkteki and Tekoğlu 2012: 103) shows that letter 21 of C.Hd 1 is more cursive than their drawing suggests. It does not even have a true vertical stroke.

use Δ for *λ* (Adiego 2019b: 27–31). This crucially means that in C.Hd 1 Δ spells *λ*, as in Mylasa, Kildara, Hyllarima, and likely Euromos.[13] With Simon (2023: 49[5]) the alleged word divider after letter 20 is a stray mark. We may and should thus read C.Hd 1 as: *dmuon* [x]*b*ʔ*eos mλane ýšrot laλja yšraka*. We may confirm that *mλne* is merely syncopated *mλane*, the source of all other variants.

§ 2.4. *Deriving* mlane

Taking **-ld-*, represented by *-λ-* ([ɭ] or the like), as the starting point also best accounts for replacement by ordinary *l* in Thebes (*mlane*) but by *-*ⁿ*d-* (*δ*) everywhere else. Taking the latter as original problematizes accounting for the *l*-variant. Contra Simon (2020: 405) the presence of *δ* in Thebes (against Adiego 2019a: 25) is no obstacle to identifying *mlane* with *mδane*, since we would predict that Carian in Thebes would have /ⁿd/ < **-nd-*, as must *all* Carian dialects, since all would have reflexes of **-nt-* (in *trquδe*, and *kδuśo-* "reign" [the latter with Adiego 2019b: 23–24] and Pret3Pl *-δ* < **-onto*; cf. Simon 2020: 403) and of **-nd-* in reflexes of **endo*(*n*), as per Adiego (2019b: 23). It is important to emphasize that the variant *mlane* with ordinary *l* occurs only in Thebes, against Schürr (2022: 150–151), who could not know of the new reading 𐊶 in C.Hd 1 and its implication for the value *λ* of the letter Δ in the same text.

What Thebes lacks (correctly Adiego 2019a: 34) is the standard letter 𐊴 for *λ*, or any of the variants of letters 𐊶 or 𐊹. As expected on phonetic grounds, no form of Carian has *λ* ([ɭ] or similar) word-initially. When we find that the Thebes graffiti without exception use the ordinary *l* not only for word-initial [l], but also for all instances of non-initial laterals (18x!), both those with the ordinary lateral (*qtblo* E.Th. 10 = Κοτοβαλως) and with the flap (*pnuśol* E.Th 27 and 40 vs. *pnuśoλ* E.Me 19 = Πονυσσωλλος), we can only conclude that in Thebes the highly marked lateral flap [ɭ] had merged with the ordinary voiced [l], an entirely unsurprising simplification in the phonological system.[14] The usage in Thebes cannot plausibly

13. C.Hd 1 shows a strong affinity with the Carian texts of Egypt in its choice of letter variants, surely an archaic feature: see Türkteki and Tekoğlu 2012: 107–108 and Adiego 2019a: 25. We may now add the use of letter 42 for *l* instead of 𐊹 in the later texts cited.

14. Since *mlane* in Thebes occurs only in graffiti, not in votive contexts (cf. §2.6.3), a separate verb "to write" from a root **mel-* is quite possible in principle (Schürr 2022: 152), but his analysis "wrote it" is impossible for reasons stated above in §2.1 with note 4. Furthermore, that just Thebes speakers would have created an unrelated dat. sg. *n*-stem *mlane* "for writing" that strikingly matches

reflect mere confusion between the two systems of distinguishing [l] and [ɬ]. Such confusion could only produce *orthographic* confusion: use of Δ for [ɬ] in some graffiti and Ɪ in others (or less likely both in the same graffito). That is not what we find.

§ 2.5. *Deriving* mδane

Aside from Theban *mlane* and the archaic *mλ*(*a*)*ne* of C.Hd 1 and C.Ia 3, we find only *mδane*. There can be no doubt of the functional equivalence of *mλ*(*a*)*ne* and *mδane* (*pace* Hajnal 1997: 155). Both appear in unmistakably votive contexts (C.Ia 3 and C.Hd 1 for the first, E.Sa 1 and E.xx 7 for the second). As per Bárta and Adiego (2021: 307–308), the cooccurrence of *mδane* and *-msaλ* in the graffito of the cemetery of Ty, where the first recalls Theban *mlane* and the second [--]*msal* (recte *msaλ*!) and similar from the graffiti of Buhen, argues that *mlane* functionally matches *mδane* in non-votive contexts.

The variant *mδane* may also be explained as a phonetically and phonologically motivated variant of *mλane*, but not as previously suggested. Loiacono (2019: 84[340]) cites the alternation in "Hittite" *maltalli-*/*mantalli-*, but on multiple grounds this comparison is very weak. First, in this clearly Luwian word, the sense must be "slander" or similar, and the *-nd-* variant is original (cf. Lyc. *mẽte-* and Lyd. *mẽtlid*/*mẽtrid* "harm" (or sim.) and Lat. *mendāx* "untruthful"). The variant *maltalli-* requires distant regressive assimilation *n*(*d*)…*l* > *l*(*d*)…*l*. Loiacono's reference (loc. cit.) to a dissimilation *mλane* > *mδane* must be a lapsus, since Carian would require distant regressive assimilation *l*(*d*)…*n* > *n*(*d*)…*n*. Second, this account does not address the shorter form *mδa*, which by this etymology must reflect **mλa*, but has no later *n* to trigger assimilation. Despite *-ne* 9x in nine different texts vs. *mδa* 4x in two texts, analogical spread of a non-trivial sound change from the longer to the shorter form is far from compelling.

I propose rather progressive assimilation by which (after Carian syncope in **mVld-*) the nasality of the *m-* spreads into the voiced lateral flap represented by *λ*. Indo-Europeanists are trained to regard nasals as sonorants, but they are in fact phonetically *stops*, with full obstruction in the oral cavity. The transition from [m] to [l] thus requires (besides a shift in the place of articulation, here necessarily abrupt, not gradual) a simultaneous change:

mλane and *mδane* elsewhere strains credulity. See also § 2.5., first paragraph, for the equivalence of *mlane* and *mδane*.

+nas → -nas
-cont → +cont
-lat → +lat

Changing the place of articulation leads to [n], and denasalization even a split-second before deoccluding the stop and lateralizing produces [d] (cf. Spanish future stems *pondr-* < **ponr-* etc.). In a language with a prexisting prenasalized [^{n}d] it would be easy to reanalyze [m^{n}l] as [m^{n}d]. I am not persuaded by the arguments of Adiego (2020: 105) that the letter *λ* stands for a sequence [ld] or [l̥d]. Given the frequency of aphaeresis in Carian, we might in that case expect at least one example of †*λV/C-* (as we do find for *δ-*). I stress that available evidence suggests that *mδ-* is the regular outcome of archaic *mλ-* everywhere except in Thebes.

§ 2.6. *Dative singular* mλ(a)ne *in context: morphology, syntax and semantics*

I believe I have shown that an analysis of *mλne* in C.Ia 3 as "for the sake of a vow, ex voto" is contextually viable and that the variants *mlane* and *mδane* may be plausibly explained as phonological variants of the oldest form *mλane* in C.Hd 1. However, for this account to go through, I must explicitly address the morphology of *mλane* in more detail and show that the interpretation of it as well as the other variants in context is syntactically and semantically plausible.

§ 2.6.1. *Morphology of* mλ(a)ne

I have in § 2.2. above argued that *šann* and *šanne* in C.Ia 3 are respectively nom.-acc. sg. and dat. sg. of a (neuter) *n*-stem and that *mλne* is likewise dat. sg. This implies that it should also belong to an *n*-stem paradigm whose nom.-acc. sg. is *mλ*(*a*)*n*. For *mλn-* as a neuter *n*-stem cf. (*kbidn*) *uiomλn* in C.Ka 5 line 1, which I now again take as nom.-acc. sg. of a compound "proclamation/decree (of Kaunos)". Compare also [*ui*]*omλŋ qrds* in C.Ka 2 line 1 with "sandhi"?[15] and probably *yomλn* in C.Ka 4 line 2.[16] I thus revive my suggestion in Melchert (1998: 37),

15. While its appearance here before *q* supports a dorsal value *ŋ* for letter 37, this interpretation works less well elsewhere and is not fully assured (cf. Adiego 2007: 252).

16. Apparently an "allegro" form in which the sequence of high back rounded vowel *u* and the high front unrounded glide *j* have merged into *y*. What cannot be determined is whether we should read [y.o.mln] with hiatus or [ɥo.mln] with a high fronted rounded glide.

retracted in Melchert (2010: 185[38]).[17] See Simon (2022a, following Adiego, and 2024) for renewed support for a Carian gen. pl. ending -(*u*)*n*, also Simon (2022b) for a suitably cautious endorsement of "decree of Kaunos" as one possible reading of the phrase.

As argued in Melchert (2007/2008: 185–187), following Alan Nussbaum, Hittite and Luwian neuter *n*-stems to roots in an obstruent likely reflect as a class original *men*-stems, converted for phonological reasons to simple *n*-stems. However, when extra-Anatolian evidence for even a *men*-stem is lacking, it is more realistic to suppose that examples like Hitt. *maškan-* "bribe" and Luw. **k^{w}alan-* "army" reflect *n*-stems created in the prehistory of the individual languages (Melchert 2007/2008: 182–183). We should thus assume the same for Carian *mλ*(*a*)*n-* "solemn declaration, vow". The consistent syncope in the first syllable argues for a "modified proterokinetic" inflection (cf. Melchert 2007/2008: 187 with refs.): a virtual (anachronistic) **méldh-n̥*, **mld̥h-n-és*. The result *mλan-* points to generalization of the accent of the weak stem, with the vowel *-a-* continuing the **-n̥* of the nom.-acc. sg., but anaptyxis in the weak stem probably would have led to the same result.[18]

§ 2.6.2. *Syntax and semantics of* mλane *and variants in votive contexts*

If *mλane* and variants are a nominal form "ex voto", we would expect them to occur with and without a finite verb in votive contexts. We have two examples of the former, in the first of which the verb surely expresses the act of giving or dedicating:

17. However, while Lat. *clāmāre* "to shout" is used of animal cries, there is no evidence that the word originated as an imitation of the sound made by an animal. My original comparison of *uio-* with CLuw. *wayamman-* "cry, howl" was a mere guess made faute de mieux. Rieken and Steer (2020) have a made strong case for a Luwian base **waya-* "life" < **g^{w}oih$_3$-o-*. A variant **g^{w}oih$_3$-éh$_2$-* would likely lead to Carian *uio-* ([ujó-] with syncope of the first vowel, and accent on the first member would also motivate the syncope of **-mλan* to *-mλn*. We would have a compound "life-decree"; i.e., the text we have is the permanent record of what was made as a public proclamation. Cf. for the sense Medieval Latin *viva voce* "with the living voice" for "expressed by speech".

18. For a similar leveling in a *men*-stem paradigm cf. Lyc. *hrm̃ma-* "temenos", which *pace* Sasseville (2017: 139[20]) is manifestly neuter: in TL 84,3–4 *s≂ed≂adẽ hrm̃mã: ijase: atlahi:* "and he made a temenos in his own *i.*" there is no possible neuter antecedent in the preceding context, so *≂ed*(*e*) can only represent "clitic doubling" with *hrm̃mã*. Here a preform **sér-mn̥*, **sr̥-mn-és* likewise led to a leveled **sr̥-mn̥*/*n-*.

(6) C.Hd 1
dmuon [x]*b*$^{?}$*eos mλane ýšrot laλja yšraka*
"D. (has) dedicated to [ ] for the sake of a vow *l*-ish/ian gifts."[19]

We have already seen (§ 2.3.) that the reading of the beginning as *dmuonś* (Türkteki and Tekoğlu 2012: 102) cannot be correct, and we do not expect a gen. sg. (ibid. 108) to begin a votive text. The personal name (surely with them an aphaeresized variant of *idmuon-* attested in E.Me 18b) is the subject. The dative seems more likely to refer to the recipient (divine name or epithet) than to someone else on behalf of whom the subject made the offering. A reading of the verb as pres. 3rd sg. is possible (§ 2.1.), but less likely. I take the verb and direct object as a figura etymologica. A neuter plurale tantum for an oenochoe seems problematic. I tentatively assume a collective referring to it and other objects offered as an assemblage, a virtual ἀναθήματα ἀνέθηκε, with a suitably positive epithet of the noun.

The structure of the other example with what is likely a cooccurring finite verb is rather different:

(7) C.xx 2
ýšbiks not: *alos≠δ karnos≠δ*: *jzpe mδane*:
"Y. has *approved* (to give) (it) to the *Halicarnassian* J. for the sake of a vow."

I follow Adiego (2007: 284–285), with reference to Adiego (2000: 153–155), in taking *ýšbiks* as nom. sg. of a personal name and *jzpe* as dat. sg. (cf. *zidks* in (8) below). Since Luwian *nana-* like Hittite *nai-* means "to lead", I find it unlikely as a verb "has brought" for a dinos (cautiously thus Adiego, loc. cit.). I tentatively suppose a reflex of **neu-* in the sense "to approve, assent": for CLuwian *nūt-* as a

19. English cannot reproduce the figura etymologica because "dedication" has not been concretized to "the thing dedicated". While it is necessarily speculative, I believe that a factitive to a *ro*-adjective to the root of Luwian *wašḫa-* "thing pledged, devoted" (anachronistically **wVs-iréh*$_2$-) for *ýšro-* is compatible with what we know of Carian phonology and morphology. See Sasseville (2020b) for the suggestion that **éh*$_2$ may yield Carian *o*. Whether one follows the historical account of Sasseville (2020a:70–73) or not, it is a descriptive fact that Luwian and Lycian factitive verbs < **-éh*$_2$- show no trace of the laryngeal (2020a: 20–21, 45). For *wašḫa-* and related words in Hittite and Luwian see Melchert 2015, but the claim (2015: 410) of a sense "sacred" with the double-edged sense of Latin *sacer* must be rejected. All uses show only "to pledge, devote" and "pledged/devoted".

noun "approval, assent" see Rieken (2006).[20] The context of *alos ƙarnos* in E.Me 45 demands the title of a person (the tomb occupant). Furthermore, the analysis of Loiacono (2019: 122–133) of *ƙλmu≈δ* as "for/to *ƙ*." in C.Ia 3 now supports taking *alos ƙarnos* as the recipient/beneficiary here as well. With due reserve, I follow the suggestion of Adiego (2021) that *alos ƙarnos* represents the ethnicon to a double place name (cf. Budapest), thus permitting, though hardly proving, a connection to Halicarnassus.

As we would expect based on C.Ia 3, we also find further examples of votive texts without a finite verb:

(8) E.Sa 1
šarkbiom: zidks mδane: *ýn*-[ ]*mo* | *δen tumn*
"Šarkbiom for the sake of a vow for/of Zidk (has given, or sim.) *yn*[ ]*mo* for/to Atum."

I follow the illuminating analysis of Adiego (1995: 21–23) by which *δen tumn* means "for Atum", with *δen* as a preposition taking the accusative. On Carian *δen* as formally matching Lydian *dãv* < virtual **endó-en* see Melchert *apud* Yakubovich (2019: 304), which explains the respective vocalism (Adiego's comparison with Lyc. *ñte* is less satisfactory both functionally and formally). The function of the reinforced preposition *δen* is the same as that of the postposition *-δ* in C.Ia 3 as analyzed by Loaicono (see § 1.) and in C.xx. 2 just discussed (from enclitic and thus reduced **endo*). I take *zidks* as a dative dependent on *mδane*. Use of the case in *-s* for a patronymic seems less probable. However, besides the interpretation that Šarkbiom made the votive offering to the god for the benefit of Zidk, it is also possible that Šarkbiom has carried out a vow that Zidk made (on his behalf, in his stead).[21] In the latter case, a genitive reading "for the sake of a vow of Zidk" makes just as much sense. This may be yet another example of a context that would have permitted reanalysis by a speaker of a genitive as a dative (cf. § 2.2., end, on C.Ia 3).

20. This interpretation of *not* would require the remarkable (and thus suspect) archaism that Carian retained a direct reflex of the PIE verb **neu-* "to nod the head", for which see Kümmel and Rix 2001: 455–456 with refs. Mention should also be made of CLuw. *nudu-*, cautiously interpreted by Sasseville (2020a:195) as "to approve".

21. See Jim (2014: 629–631) for such ambiguity in the widespread use of Grk. ὑπέρ in dedicatory inscriptions, including votive texts (2014: 634–635).

(9) E.xx 7
ntros: *prŋidas orša nu mδane*: *uksi wrmś*
"To/for Apollo of the *Branchidae* Uksi (son of) Ur(o)m *now* (has given, or sim.) *orša* for the sake of a vow."

For the epithet of Apollo I follow Schürr (1998: 158), but the single named recipient is more likely the god (thus also Simon 2020: 407), not a priest. The case in *-s* is in any case dat. sg. in function, and its separation from *mδane* argues against it being dependent on the latter. If the order of the constituents as parsed is correct, it privileges the divine recipient over the human dedicator—hardly shocking. For an alternative parsing of *orša nu* see Simon (2020: 407), but this has no effect on the analysis of *mδane*. In sum, I assert that all examples of *mλane* and variants in votive contexts are compatible with its being a dative singular with the sense "for the sake of a vow, ex voto".

§ 2.6.3. mδane *and* mlane *in non-votive contexts*

The examples in votive contexts just treated in § 2.6.2. confirm the equivalence of *mλ*(*a*)*ne* and *mδane*. As argued by Bárta-Adiego (2021: 307–308), there is also no basis for separating *mδane* in the graffito of the cemetery of Ty from the *mlane* in graffiti of Thebes. The contexts of the longer graffiti of Thebes that contain *mlane* remain obscure, but the following is not credible as being votive (nor is the graffito of the cemetery of Ty, which recalls rather the graffiti of Buhen):

(10) E.Th 35
lýkse | *šišś* | *mlan*[*e*]
"L., (son of) Š., for the sake of a vow."

Any attempt to interpret the graffiti of Thebes as votive (putatively "legends" like plaques in museums referring to modest and perishable offerings placed nearby—a notion I once entertained) is refuted by the complete absence in all clear cases of *any* dedicatee —hardly a credible omission. But **meldh*- refers to any solemn declaration (cf. *uiomλn*), and nothing precludes that some Carian mercenaries had vowed (effectively boasted) to fellows that they would leave evidence of their literacy and of their presence in a foreign country. Soldiers have for centuries left such graffiti virtually everywhere, and other visitors of every kind have left them and continue to leave them as proof that they have visited famous places. That this specification appears in only a very small subset of such egocentric dis-

plays is to be expected, as is the lack of any mention of those to whom the vow/oath was made (few of whom would have had a chance to see the text). Of the dozens of Carian graffiti from multiple sites we thus have a grand total of five containing *mlane*/*mδane*.[22] The only point would have been to insist to a reader that one had made good on one's word. Also improbably votive by its lack of a recipient/dedicatee is:

(11) E.Th 44
dquq | *ewmlane* | *tebοτ* | *γkemś*
"D., *the Theban*, (son of) G., for the sake of an *ew*(*m*)-vow."

Just what nuance the apparent prefix or first compound member *ew*(*m*)- adds is not clear. I very tentatively take *tebοτ* as an ethnicon formed with the suffix **-tyo-*, as used in Lycian (cf. *Pttaraze/i-* "of Patara"). Compare perhaps *mdoτ-* "foreigner" in the gen. pl. *mdoτ$_2$un* "of the foreigners" (Simon 2024, modifying Adiego 1998: 22 and 2002: 17–18). For supposing that *ew-* stands for elided *ewm-* cf. E.Th 10, where *eum* stands at some distance from *mlane*. The restriction of *eu*(*m*)*mlane* to graffiti and its absence in votive texts do seem to suggest that the *eu*(*m*)- took the meaning of "solemn declaration" in a direction other than "vow".

§ 3. *The problem of* mδa

§ 3.1. *Formal issues*

I must insist that my objections (1998: 34–35) to finding any plausible source for *mλne* or *mlane* as pret. 3rd sg. verbs—the absence of any trace of a dental stop as in *ýb-t* "dedicated"—applies equally to *mδa* as pret. 3rd sg.[23] A pret. 3rd pl. ending *-δa* (Simon 2020: 403) < **-nto* explains the *-δ*, but given *ýbt* < **úboto*, how could the equally *unaccented* final vowel of **-onto* be preserved in (*i*)*mδa*?[24] The variant *mδ*/*lane*~*mλne* also is unexplained as a verb: Carian *-ne* with final full vowel (accented and phonetically long as per above in § 2.1.) cannot (*pace* Simon 2020:

22. E.Th 10, 12, 35 and 44 and the graffito in the cemetery of Ty, plus perhaps a faulty version *ewlane* in E.Th 49.

23. And equally to its reflecting a pres. 3rd sg. of the shape **-Vti* (cf. § 2.1., end), by the standard derivation or that of Simon (2021).

24. It is possible that in certain verbal stem classes the accent may have stood on the first vowel of the pret. 3rd pl. ending **-Ýnto*, but an accent **-Vntó* that would have led to †*-δa* is quite unthinkable.

409) match the unaccented Lycian nasalized ending *-ntẽ* beside *-nte*: we could only expect †-*Vδn*/*ñ* beside *-*Vδ*.

§ 3.2. *Semantics*

In at least one of its occurrences *mδa* stands in what is unmistakably a votive context, and it is not credible that it does not belong to the same root **meldh-* as the nominal *n*-stem attested in the words treated in the rest of this paper. C.Ha 1 is inscribed on a bronze phiale just like C.xx 1, and there can be no doubt that *snn orkn* refers to the object bearing the text, which is surely dedicatory like that in C.xx 1:

(12) C.Ha 1
smδýbrs | *psnλo* | *mδ‿orkn týn* | *snn*

The first two words indicate the giver and the recipient. Given other personal names in *-dybr-* I favor taking *smδýbrs* as dat. sg. and *psnλo* as the nom. sg. subject, but as per Adiego (2007: 284), one may entertain the opposite. My recent attempt (Melchert 2021: 112) to take *týn* as "I/they placed" left *mδ*(*a*) entirely unaccounted for, and a pret. 3rd pl. faces the same objections made in Melchert (1998: 34–35) and reiterated above: no trace of a dental stop < **-onto*. A pret. 1st sg. is formally possible, but the word order would be very peculiar, and likewise a first-person formulation in the presence of two personal names. If, as I insisted above, Carian is hardly verb-final, then the position of *týn* also argues against an infinitive on which *orkn* depends. An attributive adjective to *orkn* would be expected to precede its head noun: cf. *laλja yšraka* in (6) above. Likeliest seems a predicatival acc. sg. noun, specifying *orkn* in some way (cf. *pídl* "gift, offering" in C.xx 1). I tentatively suggest a **tū́win* "dedication" < virtual **dhh₁úwin*. Use of the verb /tu:wa-/ "to place" for "to dedicate" is assured for HLuwian, used of a throne and table in BOYBEYPINARI 1 §1 (text in Hawkins 2000: 336) and similarly elsewhere.[25] The sense is likely also for CLuwian (see Yakubovich and Mouton 2023.1: 366–367 on KBo 22.254 iii 6′–8′). These uncertainties notwithstanding, the

25. Deradical/deverbative *i*-stems are not plentiful in Luwic, but cf. CLuwian *tarpi-* "strength; stronghold" and *walli-* "thigh". The phenomenon labeled "*i*-mutation" by which there is a merger of historical consonant stems, *i*-stems and *o*-stems into a single inflectional class (see e.g. Yakubovich 2015 § 6.2.) makes it otiose to speculate on the model for the proposed **tuwi-*, which would have to be a Luwic creation at the earliest.

basic sense must be: "P. for/to S. (or S. for/to P.) a vessel (as?) a *t.*, this very one." The dedicatory act is expressed in *mδ*(*a*). The question is: how?

§ 3.3. mδa (*mλa) *as a nominal form*

In the oral presentation of this paper I tried valiantly to justify *mδa* as a finite verb, specifically a pres. 3rd sg. representing a much evolved cognate of New Hittite *maldai* "vows". While not strictly impossible, this account was based on a series of unverified and in some cases unverifiable premises that make it extremely strained.[26] I am deeply indebted to Romain Garnier (pers. comm.) for suggesting that **mλa* (in its variant *mδa*) represents a nominal form. This is not implausible in formal terms: a dative preform **m*(*o*)*ldhéh₂-i* with the same sense as the *n*-stem treated above could arguably lead to **mλa* "for the sake of a vow". For the at least modest productivity of both the "φυγή-type" and the "τομή-type" in Luwic see Sasseville (2015: 287–288).[27] Thus one possible parsing of C.Ha 1 is: "P. for/to S. (or S. for/to P.) for the sake of a vow (gave/dedicated) a vessel (as?) a *t.*, this very one."

§ 3.4. mδa (*mλa) *as a match for* εὐχήν *in votive texts of Asia Minor?*

Multiple papers presented at this conference suggest another possibility. We have already seen briefly in example (4) above in §2.1 one example of a votive inscription in Greek from south Asia Minor consisting merely of the human dedicator, the divine recipient, and εὐχήν, with no expressed verb. As amply demonstrated at this conference, this formulation is very widespread in Asia Minor in the

26. I will not repeat the full argumentation here, but mention only two points. First, despite assistance from colleagues I have found vanishingly little support for the use of a present-future in such votive contexts. In her survey of a thousand archaic Greek votive texts, Lazzarini cites a single example (1976: 287, no. 774) and underscores its uniqueness (1976: 70). A survey of dozens of Greek dedicatory inscriptions of Caria, votive and honorary (see § 4. below) found none. Second, the motivation offered for an accent shift from **máldāi* to **maldắi* required to explain the preserved final *-a* of **mλa* was egregiously ad hoc.

27. Further examples may be added: HLuw. dat.-loc. /wala/ "for death" likely represents a **wol-éh₂-* "death" that is the base of Lyc. *la-* "to die", with syncope and simplification of the initial cluster: **wl-éh₂-*. For the intransitive semantics in a factitive cf. Sasseville 2020a:18 and 32–34. Sasseville (2020a:104) also plausibly derives Lyc. *xtta-* "violence" (or sim.), cognate with CLuw. *ḫatta-* "violent blow, striking" < **h₂ot-éh₂-*. See Yates (forthcoming) for further reflexes of both the root zero-grade and *o*-grade types, also in Hittite.

Hellenistic period. Further investigation confirms that variations of it are attested in at least ten sites in Caria, one as old as the third century BC:[28]

(13) *I.Knidos* I 140 (text in Blümel 1992, no. 140)
Ξενὼ
Δήμητρι καὶ
Κούραι εὐχήν
"Xeno (dedicated) to Demeter and Koura as a vow."

Since the votive object or a base for it is typically the bearer of the inscription, it is not usually mentioned in the text, and we have merely the dedicator, the divine recipient(s), and the indication that it was given as (the fulfillment of) a vow. However, there are exceptions:

(14) Kidrama (text in Robert and Robert 1954: 362–363, no. 183)
Ἀρτ̣έμιδι Κυ-
[.c.4.]εν̣δι τὸν βω-
μὸν καὶ τὴν λιβα-
νωτρίδα Λούκι-
ος Ἀκίριος Μύ-
ων ε̣ὐχήν
"To Artemis Ky[….]endi Lucius Acirius Myon (dedicated) the altar and the censer as a vow."

There can also be no doubt that the omitted verb is predominantly a form of ἀνατίθημι:

(15) Panamara (text in Deschamps and Cousin 1888: 488, no. 69)
Διῒ Πανημερίῳ, ἐπὶ ἱερέος Μάρ(κου) Διοφάντου, εὐχὴν Εὐήθις ἀνέθησα κόμας
"For Zeus Panemerios, under the priest Mar(cus Aurelius) Diophantos, I, Euethis, dedicated hair as a vow."

28. Thus per G. Hirschfeld on the basis of the script (Blümel, loc. cit.). In the archaic period Greek votive texts used forms of the verb εὔχεσθαι and less often εὐχωλήν, but from the 4thC BC onward εὐχήν became predominant, in Asia Minor and elsewhere: see Lazzarini 1976: 101 and Jim 2014: 634 with refs. Two older instances of εὐχάν are decidedly atypical (Lazzarini, loc. cit.).

I believe that we are justified in entertaining the possibility that Carian *mδa* contextually and syntactically matches εὐχήν. Note that in this instance with a finite verb εὐχήν is not in its standard clause-final position. The reading of *mδa* as an acc. sg. is supported by two of the other three examples we have:[29]

(16) C.Si 2 (text in Adiego 2007: 139)
[--]*ryin ktmñoś: sb ada ktmñoś*
eri: pisñoi mδa: pñmnnśñ: pδa-
kmśuñ ki šaoyrkri mtkelŋ
ñmailo mδa lrTñ: stspñ vacat

As already established above (§2.6.1), a form of **mλ-* may easily refer to any solemn declaration, so the use of its variant *mδa* in a decree of the Hecatomnid co-rulers Idreus and Ada is unproblematic.[30] Adiego (2000: 134–137) and (2007: 140) follows Schürr (1992: 136–138) in taking not only the Greek text preceding the Carian of C.Si 2, but also another Greek text as closely related, perhaps even belonging to the same inscription. The latter is not entirely assured, but it is clear that the rulers have made a decree honoring one Ponmoonnos.

While the lexical identifications suggested by Adiego (2000: 141) for *pisñoi* and *ñmailo* are reasonable, the uncertainty of how closely the adduced Greek text matches the Carian in content leaves them of limited value. I prefer to focus here on the syntax. The attempt of Adiego (2000: 141–142) to analyze *pisñoi* and *ñmailo* as pret. 3rd pl. verbs *pisñ* and *ñmailλ* plus an enclitic direct object pronoun *-o* is impossible on multiple grounds: the first cannot continue **-onto* (see §2.1), and to take the second as a variant of **ñmait* is egregiously ad hoc. Furthermore, the Carian vowel *o* cannot be the reflex of a enclitic pronoun **-om* or **-od* (cf. the critique by Simon 2020: 402–403). As already argued in §3.1, Simon's suggestion (2020: 405) to see a pret. 3rd pl. in (*i*)*mδa* is also untenable.

His arguments regarding the word division in C.Si 2 (2020a: passim) are also unpersuasive. In C.Ha 1 cited as example (12) above, the word divider in *psnλo* | *mδ* makes it clear that *mδa* begins with *mδ-* and belongs with *mδane* and *mλ*(*a*)*ne*. This means that in C.Si 2 line 4 we must read *ñmailo mδa*, and the word divider and matching final nasals argue for reading with Adiego (2007: 139) *lrTñ: stspñ*.

29. The third occurrence in C.Si 2 is in too broken a context to be usable (see Adiego, loc. cit.), but there is no reason to think that it is not parallel to the two cited in (16).

30. For Carian *eri* as "companion", in context "co-ruler", see Simon 2016–2017: 263.

Given other evidence for dative singulars in *-o* (see Simon 2020: 404), I assert that we may read *ñmaiλo mδa lrTñ stspñ*, where *ñmaiλo* expresses the reason for or purpose of the rulers' bestowing on Ponmoonnos the benefit expressed by the acc. sg. c. object: "(granted) *l. s.* as (= by means of) a declaration for/because of *ñ*."

As to the preceding *pisñoi mδa: pñmnnśñ: pδakmśuñ ki šaoyrkri mtkelŋ*, Simon is correct that we cannot be sure how to divide *šaoyrkri*(-)*mtkelŋ*, but we definitely expect the "accusativus genetivi" *pñmnnśñ* and the *pδakmśuñ ki* dependent on it to precede a direct object, which surely is expressed by *šaoyrkri*(-)*mtkelŋ*, whose final nasal may also express an acc. sg. c. object. I repeat that the precise value of the sign transliterated *ŋ* is far from assured—as per Adiego (2007: 252). I also again insist that the genitive may express for whom something is intended (see § 2.2., end, with refs.), so *pñmnnśñ* may easily mean "(X) for/to Ponmoonnos". His following title expressed in a dependent relative clause has, as often in syntagms involving genitival adjectives, not only adopted the case of its head noun, but also its suffix (see on such syntax Neumann 1982: 152–159). We thus may parse all but *pisñoi* as "(granted) *š.*(-)*m.* to Ponmonnoos, the *p.*, as (= by means of) a declaration." While the Carian dat. sg. *ñmaiλo* may belong to a stem in **-eh₂-*, matching the dat. sg. in *-a* of Luwian *a*-stems < **-eh₂-*, I dare to suggest that *pisñoi* may belong to a stem in **-eh₂i-* of the type of Luwian *ḫarmaḫi-* "head" for whose existence in other Anatolian languages see Sasseville (2020a: 213–214), following Watkins (1975: 364–365). We would again have an expression indicating the reason for the Hecatomnids' granting to Ponmonnoos the benefit expressed by the clause-final direct object.

Nothing remotely resembling proof is possible, but the syntax of the first section of C.Si 2 matches very well that of example (14) from Kidrama and, modulo the finite verb, example (15) from Panamara. Since we have in effect only two Carian texts with *mδa*, the absence (thus far) of any with a finite verb may easily be due to chance.

§ 3.4. *Can* mδa (*mλa) *represent a common-gender accusative singular?*

Attentive readers will have been asking: but in view of the overwhelming evidence for Carian acc. sg. c. nominals ending in *-n*, how could a word ending in a vowel be in the same case? A possible answer is: accent. A heavy preponderance of the examples cited above (and others) show syncope of the vowel of the final syllable, so that the result is *-Cn*, where the nasal is likely realized as syllabic. We cannot be sure where the accent stands in the Carian adaptations of the Greek personal names Nikokles and Lysikles: *Nik*[*-k*]*lan* and *Lys*[*ikl*]*an* (C.Ka 5). If it was

not on the final syllable, there may have been reluctance to syncopate the vowel in a foreign name. The accent was almost certainly penultimate in gen. pl. *mdoτ₂un*. Simon (2024: 96) leaves open whether the *-u-* is part of the ending (< **-om*) or reflects a syncopated **-wo-*. Both Hajnal (1995[1997]: 22–24) and Melchert (2010: 181) suggest candidates for accented final **-V́N#* appearing as simply *-V* (whether the latter represents a still nasalized vowel or not). However, none of their proposed examples for an acc. sg. c. showing such a result are compelling. More suggestive is the possibility that either Carian *Pikra-* or *Pikre-* reflects a personal name in **-ṓn* of the type of Lycian *Xudalijẽ* (cf. with "*i*-mutation" attested Lycian *Pigrẽi*). The operative word here, however, is "suggestive", and I cannot affirm that Carian **-éh₂m#* (already PIE **[-ā́m#]*) yielded Carian *-a#*, while **-éh₂* in other contexts led to *-o*.[31] The direct comparison with εὐχὴν in Greek votive texts of Caria and elsewhere must remain for the present a tantalizing speculation.

§ 4. *Conclusion*

The chances of my "solving" the crux of Carian *mδa*(*ne*), *mλ*(*a*)*ne* and *mlane* in a single stroke were vanishingly low, and I make no pretense to having done so. Building on the suggestions of Loiacono and Garnier, I do think that I have made a strong case for analyzing these forms as *nominal* expressions for "ex voto", and the evidence of C.Hd 1 that *mλane* is the oldest variant makes viable some stem based on **meldh-* "to make a solemn declaration" and specifically "to vow". C.Hd 1 also is important in that it almost certainly shows *mλane* in a text that *has* an overt finite verb expressing the act of dedicating the votive object: *ýśrot* (whether my speculative etymology is correct or not).

Omission of the finite verb in votive texts is not unique to Caria or to Asia Minor: see *SEG* 30.1604 for a votive inscription for three Egyptian deities from Arsos on Cyprus and *SEG* 33.765 for one from Herakleia (Italy). However, after reading dozens (well over a hundred) votive and honorary inscriptions in Greek

31. As should be obvious, the alternatives of *mδa* (for **mλa*) as either dat. sg. or acc. sg. c. are mutually exclusive: one requires that a virtual **m*(*o*)*ldh-éh₂-i* result in final *-a*, and the other that it lead to final *-o*. I certainly do not claim that our current control of Carian historical phonology can decide the matter. Parsing *mδa* as acc. sg. c. also conflicts with the proposed derivation of Carian *δen* < **endó-en* (see § 2.6.2. on example (8) E.Sa 1). One could instead compare the Carian preposition to other Luwic univerbations in **-éni* with benefactive semantics (Boroday and Yakubovich 2015: 12–16), but this is a quite secondary concern. The real problem is the absence thus far of *positive* evidence for Carian acc. sg. c. *-V#* < **-V́m#*.

from Caria, I can attest that omission of the verb is in most sites in Caria by far the majority usage, while use of a finite verb form, though by no means rare, is a less favored option. The absence of any verb "(has/have) dedicated" in all but one of our Carian votive texts is thus not unexpected, and likewise in our one honorary inscription. I therefore believe that the thrust of my account is sound and hope that others may be able to refine and improve its formulation.

§ 5. *Bibliography*

ADIEGO, I.-X. 1994. "Les identifications onomastiques dans le déchiffrement du carien". In: M. E. Gianotta et al. (eds.), *La decifrazione del cario*. Rome: CNR, 27–63.

ADIEGO, I.-X. 1995. "Contribuciones al desciframiento del cario". *Kadmos* 34, 18–34.

ADIEGO, I.-X. 1998. "La nueva bilingüe greco-caria de Cauno y el desciframiento del Cario". *Aula Orientalis* 16, 5–26.

ADIEGO, I.-X. 2000. "La inscripción greco-caria de los Hecatómnidas en el santuario de Sinuri". *Kadmos* 39, 133–157.

ADIEGO, I.-X. 2002. "Cario de Cauno *punoΩ*". *Aula Orientalis* 20, 13–20.

ADIEGO, I.-X. 2007. *The Carian Language*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

ADIEGO, I.-X. 2019a. "'Archaic' Carian". In: O. Henry and K. Konuk (eds.), *Karia Arkhaia*. Istanbul: Institut Français d'Études Anatoliennes Georges-Dumézil, 23–41.

ADIEGO, I.-X. 2019b. "A Kingdom for a Carian Letter". In: I.-X. Adiego et al. (eds.), *Luwic dialects and Anatolian: Inheritance and diffusion*. Barcelona: Edicions de la Universitat de Barcelona, 11–50.

ADIEGO, I.-X. 2020. "Consonant Clusters, Defective Notation of Vowels and Syllable Structure in Caromemphite". In: R. I. Kim, J. Mynárová and P. Pavúk (eds.), *Hrozný and Hittite: The First Hundred Years*. Leiden: Brill, 95–119.

ADIEGO, I.-X. 2021. "Carian *alos k̂arnos* = *Halicarnassus* (?) 30 years later". Paper presented at the XI. Uluslararası Hititoloji Kongresi, Hitit Üniversitesi, Çorum,13–19 Aralık/December 2021 (downloadable at https://ub.academia.edu/ IgnasiXavierAdiegoLajara).

BÁRTA, M., and ADIEGO, I.-X. 2021. A new Carian inscription from the cemetery of Ty. In: M. Bárta, F. Coppens and J. Krejčí (eds.), *Abusir and Saqqara in the year 2020*. Prague: Faculty of Arts, Charles University, 303–08.

BLÜMEL, W. 1992. *Inschriften von Knidos I*. Bonn: Habelt.

BOISSON, C. 1994. Conséquences phonétiques de certaines hypothèses de déchiffrement du carien. In: Maria Elena Giannotta et al. (eds.), *La decifrazione del cario: Atti del 1o Simposio Internazionale. Roma, 3–4 maggio 1993*. Rome: CNR, 207–32.

BORODAY, S., and YAKUBOVICH, I. 2018. "Hittite local adverbs in comparative perspective". In: E. Rieken (ed.), *100 Jahre Entzifferung des Hethitischen*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1–22.

BOUSQUET, J. 1992. "L'inscription bilingue de Démocleidès et les inscriptions lyciennes unilingues". *Fouilles de Xanthos* 9, 189–196.

CHANIOTIS, A., and MYLONOPOULOS, J. 2003[2006]. Epigraphic Bulletin for Greek Religion (EBGR). *Kernos* 19, 362–390.

DESCHAMPS, G., and COUSIN, G. 1888. "Inscriptions du temple de Zeus Panamaros: la consécration des chevelures". *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 12, 479–490.

eDiAna = HACKSTEIN, O., MILLER, J. L., and RIEKEN, E. (eds.), 2016–: *Digital Philological-Etymological Dictionary of the Minor Ancient Anatolian Corpus Languages*. München/Marburg. https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/

EICHNER, H. 1975. "Die Vorgeschichte des hethitischen Verbalsystems". In: H. Rix (ed.), *Flexion und Wortbildung*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 71–103.

GUSMANI, R. 1964. *Lydisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Winter.

GÜTERBOCK, H. G., and HOFFNER, H. A. 1983. *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, Volume L–N, Fascicle 2. Chicago: The Oriental Institute.

HAJNAL, I. 1995[1997]. "Das Vokalsystem des Karischen". *Die Sprache* 37, 13–29.

HAJNAL, I. 1997. "Die karisch-griechische Bilingue *44 aus Kaunos: Ein erster Augenschein". *Kadmos* 35, 141–166.

HAWKINS, J. D. 2000. *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*. Vol. 1, *Inscriptions of the Iron Age*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

HOFFNER, H. A. and MELCHERT, H. C. 2008. *A Grammar of the Hittite Language. Part I: Reference Grammar*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

JIM, T. S. F. 2014. "On Greek Dedicatory Practices: The Problem of *hyper*". *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 54, 617–638.

KLOEKHORST, A. 2011. "The Opening Formula of Lycian Funerary Inscriptions". *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 70, 13–23.

KÖLLIGAN, D. 2018. "Funktionsverbgefüge und Sekundärwurzeln". In: E. Rieken (ed.), *100 Jahre Entzifferung des Hethitischen*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 219–237.

KÜMMEL, M., and RIX, H. 2001. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben: Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen*. 2nd ed. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

LAROCHE, E. 1964. "La prière hittite: Vocabulaire et typologie". *EPHE, V^e section, Sciences Religieuses, Annuaire, tome* 72, 3–29.

LAZZARINI, M. L. 1976. *Le formule delle dediche votive nella Grecia arcaica* (*Atti dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Memorie Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche,* Serie 8, Volume 19, Fascicolo 1). Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei.

LOIACONO, M. 2019. *L'iscrizione caria C.Ia 3 e il culto di Zeus Megistos Iasos*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Perugia.

MELCHERT, H. C. 1993. "Some Remarks on New Readings in Carian". *Kadmos* 32, 77–86.

MELCHERT, H. C. 1998. "Carian *mdoΩun*". In: W. Blümel, P. Frei and C. Marek (eds.), *Colloquium Caricum*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 33–41.

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

MELCHERT, H. C. 2007/2008. "Neuter Stems with Suffix *-(*e*)*n* in Anatolian and Proto-Indo-European". *Die Sprache* 47, 182–191.

MELCHERT, H. C. 2010. "Further Thoughts on Carian Noun Inflection". In: R. van Bremen and J.-M. Carbon (eds.), *Hellenistic Karia*. Paris: de Boccard, 177–186.

MELCHERT, H. C. 2015. "Reciprocity and Commerce in Bronze and Iron Age Anatolia". In: A. Archi, (ed.), *Tradition and Innovation in the Ancient Near East: RAI 57*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 409–416.

MELCHERT, H. C. 2021. "A Possible New Greco-Carian Contact Phenomenon". In: M. Bianconi (ed.), *Linguistic and Cultural Interactions between Greece and Anatolia*. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 108–115.

NEUMANN, G. 1982. "Die Konstruktionen mit Adiectiva genetivalia in den luwischen Sprachen". In: E. Neu (ed.), *Investigationes Philologicae et Comparativae: Gedenkschrift für Heinz Kronasser*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 149–161.

RIEKEN, E. 2006. "Zur Etymologie von luwisch *nū*(*t*)-". In: Gerd Carling (ed.), $^{GIŠ.ḪUR}$*gul-za-at-ta-ra: Festschrift for Folke Josephson*. Göteborg: Meijerbergs institut för svensk etymologisk forskning, 284–297.

RIEKEN, E. and STEER, T. 2020. "Cuneiform Luwian **waya*-". In *eDiAna*: https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=853 (viewed September 26, 2024).

ROBERT, L. and ROBERT, J. 1954. *La Carie: histoire et géographie historique avec le recueil des inscriptions antiques. t. 2. Le plateau de Tabai et ses environs*. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.

SASSEVILLE, D. 2015. “Anatolische verbale Stammbildung: das Faktitivsuffix *-*eh*$_2$-”. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 69, 281–297.

SASSEVILLE, D. 2017. “The Lydian nominal paradigm of *i*-mutation”. *Indo-European Linguistics* 5, 130–146.

SASSEVILLE, D. 2020a. *Anatolian Verbal Stem Formation*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

SASSEVILLE, D. 2020b. “5. Reconstruction PLuwic *uss(i)- ‘year’”. In *eDiAna*: https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=1140 (viewed September 19, 2024).

SCHÜRR, D. 1992. “Zur Bestimmung der Lautwerte des karischen Alphabets 1971–1991”. *Kadmos* 31, 127–156.

SCHÜRR, D. 1998. Kaunos in lykischen Inschriften. In: W. Blümel, P. Frei and Ch. Marek (eds.), *Colloquium Caricum: Akten der Internationalen Tagung über die karisch-griechische Bilingue von Kaunos 31.10.–1.11.11 1997 in Feusisberg bei Zürich* (= *Kadmos* 37). Berlin–New York: de Gruyter, 143–162.

SCHÜRR, D. 2001. “Bemerkungen zu Lesung und Verständnis einiger lykischen Inschriften”. *Kadmos* 40, 127–154.

SCHÜRR, D. 2022. “Drei karische Verben”. *Kadmos* 61, 145–153.

SEG = Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum. Alphen aan den Rijn/Amsterdam/Leiden: Sijthoff&Noordhoff/Gieben/Brill.

SIMON, Z. 2008. “Review of Adiego 2007”. *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 48, 457–475.

SIMON, Z. 2016–2017. “Zur Bedeutung von kar. *eri*”. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 70, 259–264.

SIMON, Z. 2020. “The Carian verb (*i*)*mδa*”. *Res Antiquae* 17, 399–412.

SIMON, Z. 2021. “Die karische Endung -*τ*”. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 126, 53–64.

SIMON, Z. 2022a. “Carian *sarni* ‘guarantor, representative *vel sim.*’”. In: *eDiAna*: https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=2446 (viewed September 12, 2024).

SIMON, Z. 2022b. “Carian *uiomλn* ‘(unknown)’”. In *eDiAna*: https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=2440 (viewed September 12, 2024).

SIMON, Z. 2023. “Die karischen Worttrennungszeichen”. In: T. Roth, E. Dupraz, and V. Belfiore (eds.), *Schriftkonventionen in pragmatischer Perspektive*. Leuven/Paris/Bristol CT: Peeters, 46–75.

SIMON, Z. 2024. “*Mdoτ*$_2$*un*: a possible example of Carian genitive plural”. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft,* 76/2, 91–100.

TÜRKTEKI, S. and TEKOĞLU, R. 2012. “Une inscription carienne sur une œnochoé au musée de Sadberk Hanım”. *Kadmos* 51, 91–113.

VALÉRIO, M., and YAKUBOVICH, I. 2022. “From ‘Foreman’ to ‘Warlord’: Royal Titles in Iron Age Western Anatolia”. *Aula Orientalis* 40, 345–353.

WATKINS, C. 1975. “Die Vertretung der Laryngale in gewissen morphologischen Kategorien in den indogermanischen Sprachen Anatoliens”. In: H. Rix (ed.), *Flexion und Wortbildung*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 358–378.

YAKUBOVICH, I. 2015. “The Luwian language”. *Oxford Handbooks Online. Luwian Language-Oxford Handbooks* (viewed September 28, 2024).

YAKUBOVICH, I. 2019. “The Lydian Dating Formulae”. In: I.-X. Adiego et al. (eds.), *Luwic dialects and Anatolian: Inheritance and diffusion*. Barcelona: Edicions Universitat de Barcelona, 299–316.

YAKUBOVICH, I., and MOUTON, A. 2023. *Luwili: Hittite-Luwian Ritual Texts Attributed to Puriyanni, Kuwattalla and Šilalluḫi* (*CTH 758–763*). Vol. 1, *Edition and Commentary*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

YATES, A. forthcoming. “The Anatolian reflexes of Indo-European τομή-, φυγή-, τόμος-, and τομός-type nominals and their historical implications”. *Indogermanische Forschungen*.

YOSHIDA, K. 1993. “Notes on the Prehistory of Preterite Verbal Endings in Anatolian”. *Historische Sprachforschung* 106, 26–35.