H. Craig Melchert

CARIAN *MDOΩUN* 'WE HAVE ESTABLISHED'

The new Carian-Greek Bilingual of Kaunos has amply confirmed
the essential validity of the interpretation of the Carian alphabet
initiated by John Ray and elaborated by Ignacio-Javier Adiego and
Diether Schürr. At the same time, it has also added credence to the
view that we must be prepared to find regional variation in the use
of the Carian script: note the likely value of sign 15 as t_2 in Kaunos
(see Frei – Marek 1997: 34, 46 f.). The immediate contributions of
the new Bilingual to our understanding of the Carian language have
been more modest, for several reasons. One factor is that the con-
tents of the text are very different from those of the other Carian
texts available to us (with the important exception of text 16 R-D
from Kaunos). Another is that our knowledge of the language prior
to discovery of the Bilingual was quite limited, in contrast with the
situation in Lycian, where scholars were much better prepared to
exploit fully the additional information furnished by the Lycian-
Greek-Aramaic Trilingual of the Letoon. Beyond several very wel-
come confirmations, there is much in the new Bilingual that is sug-
gestive, but relatively little that may be regarded as assured in terms
of Carian grammar. These circumstances suggest an order of presen-
tation proceeding from that which seems most certain through the
probable to the more speculative.

I take as my starting point lines 2–9 of the Carian text:[1] *nik[ok]lan
lùsiklas[n] ot₂onosn sb lùs[ikl]an lùsikrat₂as[n] ot₂onosn sarni[Ρ]
mdoΩun sb unδo[. .]t₂ΛΡ kbdùnΡ sb Ρo[. .]olΡ· ot₂rΡ sb . . .* The
personal names and accompanying ethnicon are clearly in the (ani-
mate) accusative singular, and I conclude with Frei – Marek (1997:
37 and 48) that the accompanying words ending in -Ρ (sign 16) are

---

[1] For all aspects of the text itself I refer the reader globally to the magisterial *editio
princeps* of Frei – Marek 1997.

animate accusative plural (note with them in particular *kbdùnR*, surely "Kaunian, of Kaunos"). As further confirmation of this analysis one may cite *ot₂rR*, identified by several scholars independently as the cognate of Lycian *atra-* "them(selves)" (acc. pl. *atras**), the equivalent in context of Greek αὐτούς.

We need an operative verb expressing bestowal of the proxenia-status, and I follow Frei – Marek (1997: 37 f.) in seeing this in the form *mdoΩun* (line 7). I assume that the word is complete as given, but one should note that the break at the end of line 6 makes this assumption less than absolutely assured. As to the form, I take sign 23 (Ω) with Ševoroškin (1994: 152) as indicating a transition sound next to a rounded vowel, thus approximately [w], hence [mdowun].[2] Uncertainties regarding the syntactic structure of the opening of the text prevent us from proceeding further with a strictly combinatory analysis. Comparative evidence suggests three plausible formal interpretations, each with merits and difficulties.[3]

Frei – Marek (1997: 38) propose a preterite third plural, pointing out the comparable phraseology of the Lycian Letoon Trilingual. One may compare for the ending Luvian *-aunta*, attested e.g. in Cuneiform Luvian *na-ak-ku-uš-ša-a-ú-un-ta* and *i-ik-ku-na-a-ú-un-ta* and Hieroglyphic Luvian *wa/i-la-u-ta* 'they have died', whatever the ultimate source of this ending may be (see for a mere suggestion Melchert 1994: 260 f.). However, if(!) my comparison (Melchert 1993a: 78) of Carian *wbt* with Lycian *ubete* 'has dedicated' is correct, then Carian agrees with Lycian (and probably Luvian) in showing a preterite third singular ending derived from a preform *-*VtV*. One would thus tend to expect likewise a preterite third plural ending from *-*VntV* (seen certainly in Lycian -*Ṽte* and probably Luvian -*Vnta*).[4] By the same syncope and apocope as in *w-b-t*, one would

---

[2] In support of this interpretation one may cite with Ševoroškin the fact that all occurrences thus far of this sign are in the immediate environment of rounded vowels: *ùΩoru* (line 11 of the new Bilingual), *qoΩomu* (15 R-D), ...*punoΩot₂Rbi* (16 R-D line 5), [ ]*ɳmoΩoba* (16 R-D line 9), all from Kaunos. Compare with the last example the sequence *ouobims* of the Bilingual line 16.

[3] I take as established the status of Carian as a member of the Indo-European Anatolian family: on this topic see among others Ray (1990: 60 and passim), Adiego (1993: 285 ff.), Melchert (1993a), Janda (1994), Hajnal (1995), and Schürr (in press).

[4] It is immaterial for present purposes whether this ending ultimately reflects medial *-*onto* (Yoshida 1991: 36 ff. and 1993) or active *-*e/ont* plus a prop-vowel (Eichner 1975: 80).

expect a preterite third plural in Carian to end in -δ,[5] or with dena-salization perhaps merely -*t*.

While my analysis of *wbt* must continue to be regarded as provisional (cf. the alternate analysis of text 34* by Janda 1994: 176 ff.), the new reading of sign 15 as t_2 at Kaunos has yielded a number of very suggestive preterite third person verb forms in text 16 R-D. I call special attention to the sequence *qrdsoλR ait₂* in line 8. A word boundary after *ait₂* seems assured by the appearance of the word *ʇmali*, which recurs later, while *qrdsoλR* recalls the other forms in -R of the immediately preceding lines, all very likely to be animate accusative plural, like the corresponding forms in the Bilingual. I tentatively take *qrdsoλ-* as an adjective with the suffix -*oλ*- matching Luvian -*alla-*, derived from the noun *qrds* that appears earlier in line 1 of 16 R-D.[6] In any case, I believe there is a good chance that we have in 16 R-D line 8 a collocation '(they) have made _ian', in which Carian *ait₂* matches exactly Lycian *aite* 'made' (pret. 3rd pl.).[7] If this is true, then it becomes difficult to justify *mdoΩun* as a preterite third plural ending in -*n*.

A second plausible analysis of *mdoΩun* in comparative terms is as an infinitive: cf. Palaic and Luvian infinitives in -*una* and probably Lycian -*Vne/a*. A construction of the type of Greek ἔδοξε plus infinitive is unlikely for Anatolian, but both Hittite and Lycian show rare examples of an infinitive construed with a verb indicating approval or injunction. For Hittite one may compare KBo II 6 iii 32–33: *mān=ma=za* DINGIR.MEŠ *ŠA* ᶠ.ᵈ*IŠTAR-atti* SISKUR *mantalliya ITTI* ᵈUTU^Šⁱ BAL-*uwanzi malān ḫarteni* 'If you gods have approved the m.-ritual of Šaušgatti to be performed with respect to His Majesty.' For Lycian note TL 112,4: *tibe me=i: martti: td[i]ke kbi alade[h]x-[xāne]* 'or (if) he orders someone to be laid out/buried in it'.[8] Similar syntax is thus quite possible for our Carian text.

---

[5] I accept fully the arguments of Schürr (1991–93: 169 f.) that sign 31 (δ) corresponds in all clear cases to a sequence of nasal plus dental stop *nd* elsewhere, whatever the precise synchronic realization may be in Carian.

[6] Whether this further matches Milyan *kridesi* (TL 44 c 54) and is a place-name may be left open.

[7] I was pleased to see from his handout for the Feusisberg Tagung that Professor Ševoroškin had arrived independently at a similar analysis of *ait₂*.

[8] This particular Lycian example shows the Anatolian version of the Indo-European "double-dative" construction, in which the logical object of the infinitive is in the dative, but the synchronically expected accusative is also found throughout the Anatolian languages (as in the Hittite example), and we would expect it in Carian as well.

However, we would then need to find a main verb expressing 'has/ have decided/approved' or the like in the opening lines of the text. The suggestion of Frei – Marek (1997: 29 f.) that this lies in the sequence ([ ])*uiomλn* faces the problem of explaining the ending. A preterite third plural in *-n* is open to the same potential objection as given above for *mdoΩun* itself. Nor is it likely that the preceding *kbid.* (perhaps *kbidn*)[9] contains an ethnicon 'Kaunians'. The presence of the *i* of the base (vs. its loss in the assured ethnicon *kbdùnꟼ* in line 8) and the absence of any trace of a derivational suffix argue strongly that we are dealing with a form of the place-name itself.[10] An initial phrase 'the Kaunians have _ed' on which an infinitive *mdoΩun* might depend thus is very far from assured and in my view unlikely.

I would therefore like to propose a third alternative for *mdoΩun*: a preterite first plural. For the ending one may compare Hittite *-wen* and Lydian *-wv*. Preservation of the final *-n* would be due to syncope of the preceding vowel as in animate accusative singulars in *-Cn* (e.g. *ot₂onosn* 'Athenian' in the Bilingual). A formulation with the first person plural would not be unprecedented in a proxenia decree: see the references in Swoboda (1890: 22 f.) to what he terms a 'direkte Redeweise', with the earliest example cited coming from Samos in the second half of the fourth century BCE. It is true that these examples show expressions such as ἡ ἡμετέρα πόλις 'our city', not a first plural verb, but given the pervasiveness of the ἔδοξε + infinitive construction, the latter is hardly to be expected. A more serious question is the plausibility of a bare 'we have _ed' without reference to city, assembly, or δῆμος. I can offer no firm answer to this question, but I do recall here the point emphasized by Frei – Marek (1997: 55 f.): the Carian text of the Bilingual uses entirely native vocabulary to describe what we know otherwise as a Greek institution. Under these circumstances I believe we must allow for

---

[9]   The tentative reading with *-n* is based on the report of Professor Frei at the Feusisberg Tagung that further examination of the inscription suggests that the damaged fifth sign of line 1 should be read as sign 22 (see p. 2 of this volume).

[10]   Carian certainly would have had a range of suffixes available for forming ethnica: Luvian shows *-izza-* and *-iya-* besides *-wann(i)-* (the last matching the *-ùn-* of *kbdùn-*), and such a use of *-ol-* = Luvian *-alla-* would not surprise me. But if *kbid.* is to be 'the Kaunians', the subject of *uiomλn*, then the fifth letter must contain the inflectional ending (a zero ending for the animate nominative plural is not credible in the face of Luvian *-Vnzi*, Milyan *-Viz*, Lycian *-Ṽi*, and Lydian *-Vs*, all reflecting *-Vnsi* [see Melchert 1991: 138 with note]).

the possibility that the entire phraseology of the Carian may also be quite independent of the very formulaic Greek.

Any analysis of the opening sequence *kbidn̠*(?) *uiomλn i*[*poζ*]*inis=δ rual* is at this point speculative. I do find it likely that *=δ* is a post-position [nd] matching either Lycian *ēti* 'under' or *ñte* 'in(to)'.[11] The phrase *i*[*poζ*]*inis=δ rual* would thus mean 'under/in the _ship of Hipposthenes' and correspond to ἐπὶ δημιοργοῦ Ἱπποσθένους (which is now attested in the newly found third fragment). If the reading of the fifth sign as *n̠* is correct, then *kbidn̠* is in all likelihood the genitive (plural) of the place-name corresponding to an unattested Lycian *Xbidē**. This would argue that *uiomλn* is a noun, putatively nom.-acc. sg. neuter, meaning 'decree' or similar: 'A decree of Kaunos, under the _ship of Hipposthenes: we have _ed . . .'.[12] I certainly do not insist on this analysis. Present evidence permits a number of possibilities, including *rual* as a verb form (even perhaps medio-passive 'it was decided/decreed'), on which *mdoΩun* as an infinitive could depend. I do think that a preterite first plural should also be considered.

Whether *mdoΩun* is taken as an infinitive or preterite first plural, there remains the separate issue of its lexical content. The context calls for a sense 'establish, appoint, install (as)'. The stem is probably *mda-** (with an *o* in Kaunos as in *ot₂onosn* 'Athenian'). I suggest as a likely comparandum Hittite *midā(i)-* 'fix, fasten', attested chiefly in asyndeton with its near synonym *tarmā(i)-* (cf. English 'cease and desist'): *n=at tarmāizzi mitaizzi* 'nails and fastens down' (a bloody sheepskin); *tarmānun mitānun* 'I have nailed and fixed' (the wrath, anger, etc. of the Storm-god). For the sense I now follow Oettinger (1979: 377) and especially Catsanicos (1986: 254 ff.). The attempt of Güterbock and Hoffner (1986: 304) to derive the verb from *mītali-* 'red' via a sense 'tie with red wool' (approved by me in Melchert 1994: 50) is not plausible. Such a development is not impossible in principle (cf. English 'to redline' = 'to disapprove' < 'draw a red line through'). However, this presupposes a privileged role for red wool in tying objects for magical purposes, while the texts show

---

[11] The former idea is mine; the latter that of I. Hajnal (personal communication).

[12] Carian *uiomλn* may be equated in purely mechanical fashion with a Luvian **wayammallan*, which could be taken as a substantivized adjective from the noun attested in CLuvian *wayamman-* 'cry, howl' (of a wolf). Cf. Hittite *wiyāi-* 'to cry, wail' (also of people). The attested meanings are not encouraging for a connection with the Carian, but the semantic development of 'proclamation' from Latin *proclamatio* 'outcry, shout' shows that the difference is not unbridgeable.

tying with white, blue and yellow/green wool as well as red.[13] There is no evidence at all in some cases for wool being involved in the action expressed by *midā(i)-*. The single passage where the verb takes SÍG 'wool' as a determinative may be a conscious or unconscious play on SÍG *mītali-* 'red wool', but this does not justify extending this connection to all instances of the verb. The virtually constant pairing with *tarmā(i)-* 'nail (down)' argues for the sense 'fix, fasten'.[14]

For the semantic development from 'fix, fasten' to 'appoint, establish as' compare the use of Italian *fissare* to mean 'designare, incaricare, scegliere una persona (da assumere al.proprio servizio, da destinare a particolari uffici)', e.g. 'in ogni quartiere . . . sarà fissato un medico, un cerusico, ed una levatrice'.[15] A Carian *mdoΩun* 'we have appointed, established as' cognate with Hittite *midā(i)-* 'fix, fasten' is thus quite in order.

My main purpose here has been to make a case for the connection of Carian *mdoΩun* with Hittite *mitā(i)-*, but there may be further cognates in Anatolian. If we assume that the secondary semantic development took place already in Proto-Anatolian, i.e., that it applied already to the noun *$h_2$moíto-*, not only *'fixing' but also *'appointing', then this nominal base may also be indirectly reflected in HLuvian *mí-tì-(i)-*, conventionally rendered as 'servant'.[16] This interpretation rests chiefly on KARATEPE I.6, where HLuvian EGO-*wali-mi Á-za-ti-i-wali-ta-sá* (DEUS)SOL-*mi-sá* CAPUT-*ti-i-sá*

---

[13] See for example KUB IX 31 iii 20–24, KBo IV 2 i 28 ff, V 1 ii 14–15, or V 2 iii 19–22.

[14] In rejecting Catsanicos' derivation of *midā(i)-* from a base *$h_2$moíto-* *'fixing, fastening', I was influenced in part by my belief that a diphthong *oi would lead to Hittite *e (see Melchert 1994: 149). Strictly speaking, however, we have no evidence for the Hittite result of pretonic *Vi (see the examples cited there). Since we have attested only the derived verb *mitā(i)-*, where the accent was probably on the second syllable, one can easily construct a chronology by which *(h_2)moíto- > *mẹdo-* ("lenition" after accented long vowel) and later in the derived verb pretonic *$ẹ$ > Hitt. *i, a claim which cannot to my knowledge be affirmed or falsified. For the rest of the phonological developments see Catsanicos (1986: 165 ff.). Another solution is to take the word as Luvian (or derived from a Luvian base noun), where an *i*-diphthong probably would yield *i*-vocalism under all conditions (Melchert 1994: 265). This idea may not be as ad hoc as it first appears – see immediately below.

[15] See S. Battaglia, Grande Dizionario della Lingua Italiana 6.39.

[16] For the reading *mí-tì/ti₄-(i)-* with *i*-vocalism instead of *mí-ta₄/₅-(i)-* see Hawkins – Morpurgo Davies 1975: 131 f. For further evidence for the use of the sign usually read *ta₄* as /di/ see Poetto (1992: 432) and Hawkins (1995: 115). If one assumes an *a*-stem in Luvian, then the word could represent a direct concretization of the action noun *$h_2$moíto-*: 'appointing' > 'the appointed, appointee'. Cf. Palaic *tārta-* 'curse'.

(DEUS)TONITRUS-*hu-ta-sa mí-tì-sá* 'I am Azatiwadas, person of the Sun-god,[17] *m.* of the Storm-god' is matched by Phoenecian ʾnk ʾztwd h-brk-Bᶜl ᶜbd Bᶜl 'I am A., *whom* Baal *blesses*, servant of Baal'. In view of the very approximative Phoenecian rendering of the first title, we can harbour some doubt about the precise equation of *mí-tì-* and ᶜbd 'servant'. The HLuvian word, used consistently with genitive of a divine or human name ('(beloved) *m.* of X') certainly refers to someone in a subordinate position, but nothing shows that it is the word for an ordinary servant or slave. CLuvian *ḫutarlā-* and Lycian *xddaza-* (see Eichner 1983: 54 ff.) would in fact point to another word for the latter, while *mí-tì-* could easily be 'appointee, designee, representative'. The *i*-stem *mí-tì-* 'appointee' would stand in relation to **mida-* 'appointing' as Lycian *xñtawati-* 'ruler' to *xñtawata-* 'rule, ruling'.

Finally, I recall also the problematic hapax Lycian verb *m̃maitẽ* in the phrase *m̃maitẽ kumezijẽ ϑϑẽ* '_ed a sacred votive offering' in line 7 of the Letoon Trilingual. My own solution (Melchert 1993b: 45) of an "allegro-form" of *m=ẽn=aitẽ* 'they made it' is entirely ad hoc. Eichner (1983: 59–60[61]) suggests either a perfect **mimaye < *mi-* 'fasten, fix' or a cognate of HLuvian *dama-* 'build' with syncope of the first syllable and assimilation: **dama- > *d/tm(m)- > m̃m-*. Neither of these derivations accounts for the attested inflection of Lycian *m̃ma(i)-*, which is most easily analyzed as a denominative stem in **-eh₂ye/o-* (cf. Lycian *xtta(i)-* 'harm' derived from a noun cognate with CLuvian *ḫatta-* 'violence, harm'). I suggest that Eichner's first connection with the PIE root **(h₂)mei-* 'fix, fasten' is correct, but the immediate preform of Lycian *m̃ma(i)-* is the same denominative verb stem that yields Hittite *midā(i)-* and Carian *mdoΩun*. I concede that this equation requires an unusual progressive assimilation in Lycian in both manner and place of articulation for which there is predictably no relevant corroborating or refuting evidence. This proposal must remain therefore mere speculation.

We have travelled a considerable distance from the text of the new Carian-Greek Bilingual. In the absence of a compelling interpretation based on combinatory analysis alone, I believe it is legitimate to draw with due caution upon comparative evidence from

---

[17] For the correct analysis of (DEUS)SOL-*mi-sá* (**/tiwadamis/*) as an adjective of appurtenance functioning as a genitive see Arbeitman (1980: 10 f.). There is no need, however, to assume that the form is the participle of an unattested verb. It may easily be a direct denominative adjective from the noun *tiwad-*: cf. CLuvian *maššanāmali-* 'priest' < '(one) belonging to the god(s)'.

Carian's closest known relatives. Whether my particular application of this method has been successful only time and further investigation can determine.

References

Arbeitman, Y. 1980. E Luvia Lux. Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University 12, 9–11

Catsanicos, J. 1986. À propos des adjectifs hitt. *šu-ḫmili-* et ved. *sū-máya-*: quelques remarques sur le traitement du groupe °V-H$_x$C° à la jointure des composés. BSL 81, 121–180

Eichner, H. 1975. Die Vorgeschichte des hethitischen Verbalsystems. In: Flexion und Wortbildung. Akten der V. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, ed. H. Rix, 71–103. Wiesbaden: Reichert

Eichner, H. 1983. Etymologische Beiträge zum Lykischen der Trilingue vom Letoon bei Xanthos. Orientalia 52, 48–66

Güterbock, H. G. – H. A. Hoffner 1986. The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. Volume 3, Fascicle 3. Chicago: The Oriental Institute

Hajnal, I. 1995. Das Vokalsystem des Karischen: Eine provisorische Bestandsaufnahme. Sprache 37, 12–30

Hawkins, J. D. 1995. The Hieroglyphic Inscription of the Sacred Pool Complex at Hattuša (SÜDBURG). StBoT Beiheft 3. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz

Hawkins, J. D. – A. Morpurgo Davies 1975. Hieroglyphic Hittite: Some New Readings and their Consequences. Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society 1975, 121–133

Janda, M. 1994. Beiträge zum Karischen. In: Decifrazione, 171–190

Melchert, H. C. 1991. The Lydian Emphasizing and Reflexive Particle *-ś/is*. Kadmos 30, 131–142

Melchert, H. C. 1993a. Some Remarks on New Readings in Carian. Kadmos 32, 77–86

Melchert, H. C. 1993b. Lycian Lexicon. 2nd revised edition. Chapel Hill: self-published

Melchert, H. C. 1994. Anatolian Historical Phonology. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi

Oettinger, N. 1979. Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums. Nürnberg: Hans Carl

Poetto, M. 1992. Nuovi sigilli in luvio geroglifico. In: Hittite and Other Anatolian and Near Eastern Studies in Honor of Sedat Alp, ed. H. Otten et al., 431–443. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi

Ray, J. D. 1990. An Outline of Carian Grammar. Kadmos 29, 54–82

Schürr, D. 1991–93. *Imbr-* in lykischer und karischer Schrift. Sprache 35, 163–175

Schürr, in press. Karisch "Mutter" und "Vater". Sprache 38

Ševoroškin, V. 1994. Carian – Three Decades Later. In: Decifrazione, 131–165

Swoboda, H. 1890. Die griechischen Volksbeschlüsse. Epigraphische Untersuchungen. Leipzig: Teubner

Yoshida, K. 1991. Anatolian Verbal Endings: The Third Person Plural Preterite. Journal of Indo-European Studies 19, 359–374

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