

THEO VAN DEN HOUT

-ms(-): A CARIAN ENCLITIC PRONOUN?

1. One of the most important finds since the decipherment of Carian is the recognition of the sequence *sb* as the conjunction “and” independently, it seems, by John Ray, Diether Schürr and Ignacio-Javier Adiego.¹ It is important because the obvious comparison by Günter Neumann² with esp. Lycian B *seb(e)* not only virtually proves the Indo-European-Anatolian character of the Carian language but also because it may enable us to detect syntactic structures more clearly in the somewhat longer texts of the Carian corpus. In the following I will expand Neumann’s comparison by trying to show the existence of enclitics attached to the conjunction *sb* thereby providing Carian with one of the most typical traits of the Indo-European languages of the Anatolian group. After a brief introductory discussion of *seb(e)* in Lycian (2) I will turn to the Carian material (3–6). Finally (7), some possible consequences of my proposal will be discussed.

2. Besides *me* the Lycian (A) conjunction *se* is massively attested throughout the entire corpus of Lycian A texts. The combination *sebe*, however, occurs only twice, both times on the same monument on which appear almost all occurrences of Lyc. B *seb(e)*, TL 44. The particle *-be* is likewise rare in Lycian A: only two cases besides the two following *se-* are known.³

¹ See the remarks by J. D. Ray, *Kadmos* 29 (1990) 77, *ibid.* 130, D. Schürr, *Kadmos* 31 (1992) 133, 152–153, and I.-J. Adiego, *St. Car.* 204, *Kadmos* 34 (1995) 31–32. In this article the editio princeps of the Carian-Greek bilingual 44* by P. Frei and Chr. Marek, *Kadmos* 36 (1997) 1–89, will be referred to as Frei-Marek, ed. followed by a page number. I want to thank here prof. I.-J. Adiego Lajara for many stimulating discussions on Carian problems.

² See the references in the preceding note as well as H. C. Melchert, *Kadmos* 32 (1993) 84, and I. Hajnal, *ibid.* 37 (1998) 84–86.

³ For all attestations the reader is referred to H. C. Melchert’s invaluable LL.

In Lycian B we also find both *me* and *se*, but the latter almost exclusively with the particle *-be* attached to it. Only twice is *se* attested without enclitic particles and one case of *sede* (44 c 51: *s≈ede* “and it” or *se* + particle *≈de* = Luw. *-tar*) is known. As shown by the sequence *sebe≈be*, Lycian B *sebe* seems to have been an almost fixed combination. Sometimes nouns or other orthotonic constituents formed an accentual unit with *seb(e)*, as is clearly shown when the final *-e* has merged with the beginning *e-* of the following word (e.g. *seb≈ênesi≈ke* 44 d 66–67 “and of the mother as well as . . .” or *seb≈erbbi* 55, 6 “and in battle”) or has been elided before a different vowel (*seb-uwedri* *ibid.* d 54 “and all”). In other cases, word dividers show *seb(e)* to have stood on its own (cf. *sebe* : *pasbâlpasbbâ* 44 c 32, 56 and 55,2; see further 44 c 39, d 54 and 55,4).

Lyc. B *seb(e)* occurs in total thirty times, in seven of which it is extended with further enclitics⁴:

<i>sebê</i>	44 c 47	= <i>sebe≈n</i>
<i>sebenê</i>	44 c 43	= <i>sebe≈n≈en?</i>
<i>sebebe</i>	44 c 52	= <i>sebe≈be</i>
<i>sebeda</i>	55, 4	= <i>sebe≈da</i> (= <i>≈de?</i> ⁵)
<i>sebedi</i>	44 c 54	= <i>seb≈ed≈i</i>
<i>sebedênê</i>	44 d 2	= <i>seb≈ed(≈ênê)</i>
<i>sebeite</i>	44 d 57	= <i>sebe≈i≈te</i>

The enclitic *≈ênê* in *sebedênê* is taken by H. C. Melchert as the equivalent of Lycian A *ênê* = Luw. *annan* “under”⁶; as such it is not an enclitic particle in the strict sense but could be added to *sebed-* to form an accentual unit. The interpretation of *sebenê* remains unclear: Melchert tentatively suggests seeing *ênê* “under” here as well. An alternative would be the above analysis with the enclitically used conditional conjunction *ê* “if” (“and if . . . him”). The nom.-acc. sg. n. *-ed* of the third person enclitic pronoun combined with the dat. *-i* is found in *sebedi*, the dat. alone followed by the particle *-te* = Luw. *-tta* in *sebeite*.

In Lycian A and B *se* and *se(be)* link clauses as well as constituents within a single clause.⁷ The latter function was certainly present in

⁴ Broken and therefore uncertain in this respect are 44 c 39 (end).

⁵ Thus H. C. Melchert, LL 116.

⁶ LL 117.

⁷ See Ph. H. J. Houwink ten Cate, LPG 72–76.

Carian witness sequences like *parEeum* | *sb-polo* “P. and p.” on the Egyptian pedestal MY Kb⁸ or in the epichoric inscription 44*, 2–6 *nik[ok]/lan lùsiklas[n] / ot₂onosn sb lùs[ikl]/an lùsikrat₂as[n] / ot₂onosn* “Nikokles, (son) of Lusikles, the Athenian and Lusikles, (son) of Lusikrates, the Athenian”. Clause linkage is likely at least in the same Carian-Greek bilingual 44*, 9 although absolute certainty can only be obtained when more is known of Carian verbal inflection. If the latter function existed in Carian we may expect *sb* in these cases to have been used occasionally for attaching enclitic elements to it, be they pronouns or indeclinable particles, the characteristic of Anatolian languages par excellence.

3. The following instances of Carian *sb*(-) are known; since in none of the cases where it is followed by further signs is word division used, they will be given with the immediately following sign sequences (in alphabetical order):

- sb*(-a²) D 16, 11⁹
- sb-an* D 16, 13
- sb-añmsñsimda*[D 10, 5¹⁰
- sb-aśbšt* Th. 60 Š
- sb-axmnnart₂nürobsmns*[D 16, 2
- sb-axt₂msk*[D 16, 5
- sb-axt₂[]km*(-) 44*, 9–10
- sb-axt₂x²*[44*, 11¹¹-
- sb-lùs[ikl]/an* 44*, 4–5

⁸ The function of *sb* in this text as connecting the two constituents *parEeum* and (-)*polo* seems ascertained whatever the interpretation of (-)*polo*; for the latter as a possible female PN cf. I.-J. Adiego, St. Car. 204, for *polo* as “descendant” vel sim. cf. H. C. Melchert, Kadmos 32 (1993) 83–84.

⁹ The reading seems uncertain. L. Deroy, AC 24 (1955) 321–322, shows what looks like a damaged or erased(?) A following *sb* in his copy of the text and this A is given in the transliteration in I.-J. Adiego, St. Car. 333. Frei–Marek, ed. 44 (w. Abb. 4) simply print *vacat* after *sb* without any comment in their “Kritische Anmerkungen”.

¹⁰ J. D. Ray, Kadmos 29 (1990) 129, reads *sr-* instead of *sb-* here which is justified as far as the hand copy by L. Deroy, AC 24 (1955) 317, is concerned. However, the photo of the Abklatsch in L. Robert, Hellenica 8 (1950) Pl. II 2 (see also *ibid.* Pl. II 3 and III) shows beyond doubt that the reading *sb-* as given in I.-J. Adiego, St. Car. 332, is the correct one.

¹¹ For the (sign?) trace just before the break see the remarks by Frei–Marek, ed. 16 and 42, and below.

sb-mnoś(-) D 15, 3
sb-ort₂ [44*, 15
sb-polo MY Kb
sb-š/t₂aqbos 4 Š
sb-u [D 16, 4
sb-unđo [44*, 7
sb-uTbit₂ D 16, 7
sb-Tor 44*, 15
sb-)(-Parios)ix [D 16, 3
sb-čorsolR D 16, 7
sb-ʋo[rs]olč 44*, 8–9
sb []ūΩoru 44*, 10–11¹²

It is immediately apparent that *a* is by far the most frequently attested letter after *sb-*. Unfortunately, the status of the *-a* in *sb-a* D 16, 11 is not clear; if it is real, it is the only sure example of a free standing *sb(-)* since there is enough room after the *-a* before the end of the line to represent an explicit word division sign. In all other cases *sb-* is followed, without word division, by further sign sequences. We can recognize the ‘simple’ *sb* in the sequences *sb-lūs[ikl]/an*, *sb-mnoś(-)*, *sb-polo*, *sb-š/t₂aqbos* because the second element is either a clear PN (*lūsikla-*, *š/t₂aqbos*), a noun (*mno-* “child, descendant”) or with certainty one of the two (*polo*). Probably the two attestations *čorsolR* and *ʋo[rs]olč* should be added to this list as variants of the same noun.¹³

4. In a similar fashion I. Hajnal suggests splitting off a noun (“descendants” vel sim.) *aχt₂mskmt₂* which occurs three times in D 16 and 44* although never fully preserved (see above).¹⁴ The remaining *absims* is tentatively taken as a pronoun (“their”). Frei and Marek¹⁵ in their edition of 44* analyse differently (*aχt₂mskm t₂absims*) and

¹² The *sbd* to be read in the coin legends D 18 D and E most likely represents either a personal or a geographical name and does not belong to the category discussed here.

¹³ Cf. Frei–Marek, ed. 38–39 (“Nachkommen?”), and I. Hajnal, *ibid.* 164–165 (“Ehrenbürger?”).

¹⁴ Kadmos 36 (1997) 164–165; why Hajnal takes the *-t₂* with this word rather than with the following *absims* is unclear. Along with Frei and Marek he too restores to *aχt₂[mskm]* in line 11 where the next line starts with *buxū* [. This and the obviously related *t₂obsms* in D 16, 10 and *]t₂bsms* *ibid.* 12 strongly suggest reading the *t₂* with the next word.

¹⁵ Ed. 42.

just wonder whether *sb-axt₂m₁skm* could twice introduce the granting of certain privileges. They observe that after the first *sb-axt₂[]km* two terms linked by *sb* appear, *t₂absims* and *[?]ūΩoru*, which might correspond to the Greek terms ε[ἴσπλουν και ἔκπλουν]. In their edition of the new Fragment III of the same text they convincingly withdraw this interpretation in favour of a restoration to ἔ[γκτησιν followed by another privilege (ἀτέλειαν, προεδρίαν, ἀσυλίαν).¹⁶

The reason that Hajnal seems reluctant to accept such a correspondance here might be – he does not explicitly say so – that he is troubled by the asyndetic juxtaposition and inverted order of elements of *Πο[rs]o/R ot₂rR* in the preceding lines 8–9 if taken as the literal rendering of [αὐτο]ὺς και ἐκγόνους (24–25) along with the equation *ot₂r-* = Lyc. *atra-latla-* “person, self” proposed by several scholars and mentioned by Hajnal.¹⁷ Although usually very faithful to the Greek text Hajnal is now forced to add a word to the Carian version (*Πο[rs]o/R* “Ehrenbürger” vel sim.) which cannot be found in the Greek. He has to accept likewise the repeated mention of “descendants” (in Hajnal’s analysis *axt₂m₁skmt₂*) in lines 9–10 and 11. For Hajnal the clause about the right of freely sailing in and out cannot start before the end of line 10 (*sb[. .]ūΩoru*). The problems of inversion and asyndesis can be solved by supposing with Frei and Marek that the Carian text speaks of “and their offspring” (instead of “(their) offspring and they”).¹⁸ This would imply a genetical adjective of *ot₂r-* in the acc. pl. which should be something like **ot₂rsR* (or **ot₂rsR*). With 16 R as a sibilant a merger of the sibilants (**ot₂rsR* > *ot₂rR*) is conceivable.¹⁹

Preferring the general interpretation of the lines 8–11 and their correspondence to the Greek lines 24–26 as given by Frei and Marek in their *editio princeps*²⁰, this would leave only the Greek [ὑπάρχει]ν αὐτοῖς to match *sb-axt₂[]km* in the Carian version.²¹ Regardless of

¹⁶ Kadmos 37 (1998) 13, 14–15.

¹⁷ Kadmos 36 (1997) 164.

¹⁸ Ed. 38–39, and Kadmos 37 (1998) 12–13.

¹⁹ A similar reduction is assumed by G. Neumann, Kadmos 37 (1998) 29, to explain Carian *sarni-* “proxenos” from **zars(i)nmi-*. Note, however, such cases as *arlišš* (M 1.1, 7.1), the gen. of a sibilant stem, *jqššiš* (M 45), *idūess* (M 48d) and the enigmatic Caunian 28*, 2 *anniβrsš* as read by Schürr, Kadmos 35 (1996) 157–163. None of these involve 16 R.

²⁰ Compare especially Kadmos 37 (1998) 10–18.

²¹ Frei–Marek, Kadmos 37 (1998) 13, rightly stress this parallelism but seem to tend towards an interpretation in which the alleged *axt₂m₁skm* matches ὑπάρχειν rather than αὐτοῖς.

whether *mdoΩun* in line 7 is a finite verb (with Frei-Marek and Melchert²²) or an infinitive dependent on *uioμλn* in line 1 as Hajnal tentatively suggests²³, in both cases a new section starts with *sb-axt₂[]km* meaning something like “and to them there will be right of . . .”. In any Anatolian language the most natural way of expressing this would be a nominal sentence with a *dativus commodi* or *possessivus* (“they will have the right of . . .”). In this interpretation only Greek αὐτοῖς is a candidate to correspond to the Carian (*sb-axt₂[]km*). Such a dative can be expected to be expressed by way of an enclitic or orthotonic (either demonstrative or anaphoric) pronoun. Moreover, its recurrence in line 11 is not surprising since any additional privilege may again be introduced by referring to the beneficiaries in this way.²⁴

If we go along with the restoration of both (*sb-axt₂[]km* and (*sb-axt₂[* to (*sb-axt₂m₁skm* after *sb-axt₂m₁sk* [D 16, 5, nothing comparable within Anatolian comes to mind when looking for an orthotonic pronoun matching *axt₂m₁skm*. However, if we allow for an enclitic chain, *-ms-* might be related to Hitt. *-šmaš*; CLuw. *-(m)maš*; Hluw. *-maⁿz(a)* and Lyd. *-ms²⁵*, that is, the dat. pl. of the third person enclitic pronoun.²⁶ Of course, Carian *-ms* cannot directly reflect a PA **-smos* since the final sibilant would not have been preserved. However, if we assume the same preform which is also responsible for the Hluw. *-maⁿz(a)*²⁷ the Carian form presents no problems.

²² Apud Hajnal, *Kadmos* 36 (1997) 163–164 n. 34, and *ibid.* 37 (1998) 33. This is a very attractive solution; for the use of the first person plural in such proxeny decrees after ca. 350 B.C. see already W. Larfeld, *Handbuch der griechischen Epigraphik* (1907) I, 528–529. It does, however, imply that the Carian version was styled differently from the Greek text.

²³ *Kadmos* 36 (1997) 151–157, 162 and *ibid.* 37 (1998) 100.

²⁴ Compare Frei-Marek, *Kadmos* 37 (1998) 13 with n. 11. According to Frei-Marek, ed. 16, the oblique stroke visible above the break at the end of line 11 – if at all the remainder of a sign – could only be 20 Φ *ñ* because of the length of the alleged hasta. However, the hasta of 20 Φ always seems to be drawn straight rather than oblique. If compared to the sign 11 Nm at the very beginning of line 7 which also seems to be (unintentionally) extended by a similar oblique stroke, a reading/restoration (*sb-axt₂[m₁skm]* or (*sb-axt₂[m₁]skm]* seems fairly safe.

²⁵ See O. Carruba, Part. 44, and R. Gusmani, *Lyd. Wb. Erg.* 2,77.

²⁶ For Lycian we have the enclitic pronoun *-ñne* in this function, which however does not seem to be directly related to the PA **-smos* in the other Anatolian languages; cf. H. C. Melchert, *HS* 105 (1992) 197–199.

²⁷ For the Hluw. form see A. Morpurgo Davies, *KZ* 94 (1980) 89, keeping open the possibility of a non-nasalized form *-maza/*, and H. C. Melchert, *AHP* 270, assuming a nasalized *-manza/* probably influenced by the dat. pl. of the nouns in *-nza*.

5. The proposal to recognize Carian *-ms* as the dat. pl. of the third person enclitic pronoun forces us to interpret the immediately adjacent *-axt₂-* and probably also *-km* as enclitic elements as well. In fact, the entire sequence *(sb-)axt₂m₂mskm* is especially reminiscent of such chains as Lyd. *(alfa)≈(a)k≈mś≈ad* “and to them it” with Carian *χ* corresponding to Lyd. *≈k*.²⁸ The *t₂* in the Carian chain may be compared with the *-t-* (co-occurring with *-k-*!) in e.g. Lyd. *(fa)≈(a)k≈t≈ś≈ad* (with the sequence *≈t* + reflexive pronoun *≈ś* written τ) where the *≈t* is a particle frequently encountered in the enclitic chain and appearing before the pronoun *-a-*. A preliminary analysis of the Carian chain would then result in *(sb-a)≈χ≈t₂≈ms(≈)* “and to them”. The *-a-* may be the vowel inherent to the *b* of *sb* which is usually compared to Luw. *(-)pa* and Lyc. *-be*, appearing only when *sb* is followed by enclitics and when carrying the accent within the resulting chain, and dropped when in Auslaut after the unextended conjunction or when a following orthotonic word took the accent. If *sba* D 16, 11 is real, it may also have been written when *sb* carried the accent standing by itself (see above).

That with *t₂absims* following *(-)km* a new word begins, seems assured because of the forms *[δiur] t₂obsms* (D 16, 10) and *#t₂ab (sb-)* (44*, 15); compare also *[t₂bsms* (D 16, 12). Unless we assume some sort of an adverb not present in the Greek text (compare, for instance, Hittite *kāšma* “behold”) – an assumption in itself gratuitous – we have to accept *-km* as an enclitic element as well. According to its position after the assumed pronominal *-ms-* it is most likely to belong to the category of sentence particles such as Hitt. *-an*, *-(a)pa*, *-(a)šta*, *-kan*, *-šan*, Luw. *-tta*, *-tar*, Lyc. *-te*, or Lyd. *-t*. No easy match recommends itself.³⁰

6. Besides the sequences already discussed we have *sb-an*, *sb-añmsñ(-)* and *sb-aśbśτ* while the sequence *sb-aχ-* is also attested in *sb-aχm₂nart₂nūrobsm₂s*. The problem, however, with the attestations outside the bilingual 44* is that they occur in contexts which are very hard, if at all, to interpret and for which no obvious Greek parallel exists. The

²⁸ For this element see R. Gusmani, Lyd. Wb. 140–142 with literature and Erg. 2, 62, and H. C. Melchert, AHP 331, 356.

²⁹ See R. Gusmani, Lyd. Wb. 46–47, Erg. 2, 92–93 (with literature), and H. C. Melchert, Kadmos 30 (1991) 135–142.

³⁰ The perhaps attractive comparison with Hitt. *-kan* seems impossible because of the *-m-*: if both would go back to a PA **-kom* the Carian form should likewise end in **-n* just like the acc. sg. c.

sole criterion for the following analyses can therefore only be their formal feasibility: they are not based on any contextual evidence and can therefore only be tentative.

The sequence *sb-axmnart₂nũrobsmns* (D 16, 2) might in part contain the same pronominal elements we just saw and a tentative analysis could be *sba≈χ≈m≈n* (*nart₂nũrobsmns*) like in Lyd. *a≈k≈m≈av* “and him/her” with a possible adversative or similar value because of the *≈m*. The particle *≈m* would be identical to enclitic Hitt. *-ma*, Lyd. *-m* and orthotonic as well as enclitic Lyc. *(-)me-* while the *-n* could be the acc. sg. c. of the enclitic third person pronoun. Unfortunately, there seem to be no sequences in Anlaut starting with either *nart₂^o* or *art₂^o* to suggest a likely end to this possible introductory chain; the proposed split would at least get rid of the double *-nn-*.

Since *sb-an* in D 16, 13 stands at the end of the line and the beginning of the next line is broken away we cannot be sure whether this was a complete sequence or not. Another *sb-an^o*, but this time with certainty not complete, can be seen in the Carian inscription from Sinuri D 10, 5³¹: *sb-añmsñsimδa*[?] with the immediately preceding context lost. The fact that we have *sb-añ* here as opposed *sb-an*[?] in the former text does not stand in the way of taking them as potentially identical since the alphabet from Sinuri can use *ñ* where, for instance Kaunos, has *n*: compare *pñmmnsñ* (D 10, 2) versus *ot₂onosn* (44*, 4, 6). The final *(-)mδa*[may cause problems if considered to contain the conjunction *(-)m-* = Lyc. *(-)me-* followed by a verb as suggested for similar sequences by Hajnal in connection with the form *(-)mln* in 44*, 1.³² If the syntax of this *(-)m-* were similar to the Lycian one with *(-)me-* with its frequent clitic doubling of a preceding “topic constituent”³³ little is left for a separate clause introduced by *sb* + enclitics + verb or *sb* + noun and/or verb. If however *mδa*[should start a completely new sentence, there might be no problem.

³¹ For the Greek texts see L. Robert, *Le sanctuaire de Sinuri près de Mylasa* (Paris 1945) 97–98 (nos. 75a–b + 74), *Hellenica* 8 (1950) 13–14 with Pl. II–III, the join of which we owe to D. Schürr, *Kadmos* 31 (1992) 136–138; see further L. Deroy, *AC* 24 (1955) 317, I.-J. Adiego, *Cuadernos de Filología Clásica* 4 (1994) 247–256.

³² *Kadmos* 36 (1997) 153–157; see also X. Tremblay, *Kadmos* 37 (1998) 123–124. For a comparable interpretation of *mδa-* as containing one or more introductory particles but without verbal constituent see I.-J. Adiego, *Dec. Car.* 54–55.

³³ For the phenomenon and the terminology see A. Garrett, *HS* 105 (1992) 200–212.

Whatever the analysis, since the interpretation of this *mδa[* and related forms is by itself uncertain, the present theory about *sb* + enclitics preceding it can only be taken as a further hypothesis in the discussion on Carian syntax. Returning to the beginning of this sequence, a split into *sba≈ñ msñsimδa[* would give us another instance of the acc. sg. c. *≈ñ* of the third person enclitic pronoun. It can be directly compared to Lyc. B *sebê = sebe≈ñ*. The resulting *msñsimδa[* brings to mind the name *msnoriś* (MY D, M 40) which is compared to the geographical name *Μασσανώρα(ν)δα* and analyzed as containing Luw. *maššanali-*, Lyc. *mahana-* “god, deity”.³⁴ The *msñsimδa[* part would then give an attestation for the noun for “god, deity” or one of its derivatives.³⁵

This leaves us finally with the attestation *sb-aśbšt* in the Theban graffito Th. 60 Š³⁶

dbiks | kbíomś | údún | sbaśbšt | eúm

There can be hardly any doubt that *dbiks* is an asigmatic nominative (of an *s*-stem)³⁷ followed by a patronym in the nom. of the genetical adjective in *-ś*. The rest of the inscription is unfortunately less clear

³⁴ See I.-J. Adiego, St. Car. 232, and Dec. Car. 36, and Hajnal, Der lykische Vokalismus (Graz 1995) 227–229 and Kadmos 37 (1998) 86–88, 92 with n. 26. For /ñ/ between vowel and consonant compare D 10, 2–3 (*pδalχmsúñχ*) and *ibid.* 7 (*[tuñdñ]*), between consonant and vowel compare *ibid.* 1 (*χtmñōś*).

³⁵ If words with #ñ- in Anlaut are acceptable, *sba≈ñ=msñsimδa[* might be another possibility but a not very likely one. The *(sba)≈ñ/n* could not be the acc. sg. c. of the third person enclitic pronoun (“and him/her”) followed by the dat. pl. *-ms* of that same pronoun since in Anatolian the plural of the enclitic pronoun, if combined with the singular of the third person enclitic pronoun *-a-*, always seems to precede the latter (**≈ms≈n*); cf. for Hittite H. A. Hoffner, Festschrift Güterbock² 93–94, for Lydian compare sequences like *fa≈k≈mś≈ad*, *a≈k≈mś≈aś*. In explaining the *-ñ-* in this combination one might also take recourse to the Lycian enclitic conditional conjunction *-ê* (cf. H. C. Melchert, LL 21) but there is evidence pointing to the fact that this is usually preceded rather than followed by enclitic pronouns, cf. A. Garrett, HS 105 (1992) 207 n. 12. For a completely different and in view of the expected contents of the inscription D 10 not very convincing analysis see J. Faucounau, Dec. Car. 236.

³⁶ The reading of this inscription follows I.-J. Adiego, St. Car. 328 with the additional remarks *ibid.* 60.

³⁷ See I.-J. Adiego, Kadmos 34 (1995) 25–29.

and an analysis in terms of *sb* + enclitics would certainly be forcing the issue.³⁸

7. A final note concerns the *-s* of the supposed *-ms* = Hluw. *-maⁿz(a)*. The Hieroglyphic form has been explained as due to an intrusion from the nominal (acc.-) dat. pl. ending *-nz(a)*.³⁹ If the Carian form goes back to the same preform or Carian witnessed the same development, the dat. pl. of Carian nouns can likewise be expected to have ended in *-s*. Such a form may be present in *moruos* in the Carian-Greek bilingual 44*, 17⁴⁰ if related to the Hluw. ^{STELE}*maluwa*, a nom.-acc. pl. (tantum) n., and the Sidetic *malwa* “stela”.⁴¹ H. Eichner brought the last two forms together and compared them with the Lydian neuter *mru-/mruwaa-/murwaa-* “stela” assuming the *r/l* interchange not infrequently attested in Anatolian (compare e.g. Lyc. *atla-/atra* versus Carian *ot₂r-*). The Carian form *moruos* could go back to a form **mor/luonz* being the dat. pl. of a stem *moruo-*. Whether this *moruo-* matches Lyd. *murwaa-* < **mṛuó-* exactly⁴² or represents a form with a full-grade first syllable **me/oru(o)-* remains to be seen.

This proposed dat.-loc. “on the stela” could find its place in the formula which one often finds at the end of such proxenies, that is, to publish the decree on “a stone stela” (ἐν στήλῃ λιθίνῃ) in a deity’s

³⁸ M. Janda, Dec. Car. 182–183, follows Adiego in splitting off *sb-* from the sequence *sbašbšt* and takes *údún* and *(-)ašbšt* as two probably co-ordinated words; for *údún* he prefers an interpretation as an acc. sg. (“Weihung, Inschrift” vel sim.) to a verbal one. Hajnal, Sprache 37 (1995) 26–27, sees in *údún* a 3. pl. pret. (“anbringen (eine Inschrift)” vel sim.) with *sbašbšt eúm* as another name + patronym in an inversed order (*-ašbšt* < **ašbšt-š*). The recognition of *eúm* as a name seems a random choice which, moreover, requires an emendation in Th. 56 Š where he wants to read the same name in a “gen.” *eúms*. It seems more consistent to link this *eúm* to the *eúm* followed by *lane* in Th. 59 Š, Th. N ined. A (apud Hajnal, Kadmos 36 (1997) 153) and to the *eú lane* in Th. N ined. C (ibid.); for a completely different view cf. Hajnal loc. cit. If *eú(m)* is indeed an adverb as Hajnal proposes for Th. N ined. A one might think of an alternative interpretation “Dbiks, (son) of Kbiom (and) Údun, (son) of Sbašbšt (were) here”. In that case we are not dealing with *sb-* “and” at all.

³⁹ See H. C. Melchert, AHP 270, or slightly different F. Starke, Festschrift Neumann 422–423.

⁴⁰ For the reading of the last sign as *s* instead of *m* see Frei-Marek, Kadmos 37 (1998) 9.

⁴¹ On these forms see H. Eichner, MSS 45 (1985) 5–21.

⁴² Cf. H. C. Melchert, AHP 363.

temple.⁴³ A candidate for the Carian word for “decree” might be *lmnlia* in line 16. That this is a separate word follows from the observation that the preceding *-ms* could be (part of) an ending (compare *t₂absims* 44*, 10, *t₂(o)bsms* D 16, 10 and 12) and the space left open after *lmnlia*. In the Hluw. inscription from Kargamis (A 31/32,5 § 9) we read the form (LOQUI)*la-ma-ni-sà-ti*, probably a 3. pl., which was tentatively rendered as “proclaim” by J. D. Hawkins.⁴⁴ The Carian *lmnlia* can be considered a substantivized (“the things proclaimed”) neuter pl. of a *-lli(ja)-* derivative of the stem *lmn-*. Together with H. C. Melchert’s and V. Ševoroškin’s proposal to recognize the Luwian verbum faciendi *ajia-*, Lycian *a-lai-* in the sequence *ait₂usi* in line 18 this might result in a rendering “they(?) have laid down the(se) proclamations on the stela”. How to fit in the remaining words of the sentence starting with *sb(-)Tor* at the end of line 15 must be left to future research.

If we confront this dat. pl. ending *-s < -nz(a)* as proposed here with the likely acc. pl. c. in *-R*⁴⁶ we can speculate on the form of the nom. pl. c. In Cuneiform and Hieroglyphic Luwian as well as probably Lycian B the dat. pl. is either identical to the acc. pl. c. (cf. Cluw. *-nz(a)* versus the nom. pl. *-nzi*) or stands by itself while the acc. pl. is identical to the nom. pl. (cf. Hluw. dat. pl. *-nz(a)* versus the nom.-acc. pl. c. *-nzi* and Lyc. B *-z*).⁴⁷ If then in Carian the dat. pl. (*-s*) differs from the acc. pl. c. (*-R*) we may expect the nom. pl. (in Kaunos) to have ended in **-R* as well and to have originated from **-nzi*.⁴⁸

8. The interpretation proposed here for the sequences *sb(-)axt₂mskm* in the Carian-Greek bilingual 44* offers a solution which enables us

⁴³ Cf. the example from Kaunos found in the vicinity of 44* quoted by Frei-Marek, ed. 41. Frei-Marek, *Kadmos* 37 (1998) 17 with n. 31, suggest the possibility of recognizing in the last lines a stipulation about the person(s) financially responsible for the setting up of the stela. In that case *mnos* in line 17 could be part of the filiation of that person. However, as they admit, candidates for two personal names (“A son of B”) are hard to find in these lines.

⁴⁴ An. St. 31 (1981) 156, 157; the link with Hitt. *laman* “name” and its derivative *lammija-* “to name, appoint” remains disputed because of Hluw. *adaman-*, cf. Hawkins, loc. cit., F. Starke, *StBoT* 31, 290–291.

⁴⁵ *Kadmos* 37 (1998) 35 with n. 7.

⁴⁶ Frei-Marek, ed. 39, Hajnal, *Kadmos* 36 (1997) 148–149 n. 11, Neumann, *ibid.* 37 (1998) 22–23, Adiego, *ibid.* 58.

⁴⁷ See F. Starke, *Festschrift Neumann* 419–424.

⁴⁸ Although in a different way, Hajnal, *Kadmos* 36 (1997) 148–149 n. 11 and *ibid.* 37 (1998) 104, reaches the same conclusion.

to remain close to the Greek version while circumventing some of the problems legitimately raised by Frei-Marek and Hajnal. It suggests, moreover, possible analyses for a series of forms in other inscriptions which otherwise would be uncomfortably (note esp. *sbaxmn* D 16, 2) resembling them without our being able to explain them.

The Carian connective *sb* thus shares some characteristics with Lyc. B *seb(e)* and with connectives in Anatolian in general. First of all, like its Lycian counterpart Carian *sb* is an apparently fixed combination with no certain examples of an **s-* hitherto known.⁴⁹ Judging by the lack of word dividers, nouns or names may in most cases have formed an accentual unit with *sb*, and occasionally enclitics were appended. If the sequence *sba* in D 16, 11 (see above) be real this may be our sole example of the connective orthotonically used like sometimes Lyc. B *sebe*. The present interpretation would also offer evidence for clause linkage since with enclitics attached to the connective *sb* a new clause would begin.

Of course, there are also problems facing this interpretation. First of all, the assumption of enclitic chains outside the Carian-Greek bilingual 44* is hard to substantiate. No real solution can be offered for the closing element $\approx km$. Moreover, the obvious comparisons with enclitic elements known from Lydian would bring Carian closer to this language although Lycian connections seem sometimes to be favoured.⁵⁰ But then, the linguistic position of Carian can never be an either – or: being geographically in between the two, it may also linguistically take up an intermediary position between Lydian and Lycian. The comparison with Lycian B *seb(e)* on the one hand and the Lydian enclitic elements $\approx k \approx t \approx$ on the other illustrates this.

⁴⁹ For the alleged unextended *s-* “and” in D 10, 5 of J. Faucounau, Dec. Car. 236, see above § 6.

⁵⁰ See the remarks about *wbtistas* and *pidlistas* by I.-J. Adiego in Dec. Car. 239–240.