Ilya Yakubovich

CARIAN MONUMENT

The Carian noun that has the highest frequency in the existing corpus of texts is *upe/ue* 'monument'[1]. The following inscriptions, all found in Egypt, supply us with its attestations:

M5 šdτarś|**upa**|ú|úetśχi|múdonśχi
M9 šarnaiś**upe**|quqśβemśχimdawn
M14 artaùś:**upe**:[
M18]uś|**upe**sa|trielś|mrsiś
M20 saruqś|**ue**|pntmunśχimúdonśχi
M28 úksmuś|**úpe**|lkorśχí|qarpsiś
M30 šwinś|**upe**ari[e]śχited
M33 •orś|**úpe**|qdarŕouś|trχatarś
M34 aríomś:**ue**:músatś:χimudonś:χi tbridbδś:χi
M35 luχsiś|**upe**|arquqśχi|ksolbśarliomś|mnośχi|
M43 arlišś|psikron|**ue**

MY D pikreś**ue**šarúlíatśmsnordś
MY E terweθś|**upe**|nuoλχ[ ]sarmroλχùt
MY F psmškúneitś|**ue**|naríaś|suKλiq|sara

In all the cases listed above we are dealing with actual inscribed stelae. The first group of inscriptions is especially instructive: they were found together in what originally was a temple precinct of the Late Egyptian period located at North Saqqara, near Memphis. It is clear that they were brought from a nearby place as a building material, and a cemetery of Carian mercenaries and their families naturally comes into mind as a source of such an impressive array of Carian monuments. This hypothesis is supported by the apparent funerary motives of sculptural compositions carved on the stelae[2]. On the other hand, at least one of the stelae of the second group was defined as *stèle de donation*[3].

---

[1] The Hittitological abbreviations used below are those of the Chicago Hittite Dictionary. I am obliged to Th. van den Hout, A. Kassian, and H. C. Melchert who took pains to read the first draft of this manuscript and made valuable remarks, as well as to Th. Wier who improved its style. Usual disclaimers, of course, apply. Prof. Melchert informs me that he has independently arrived to similar conclusions, although we differ in certain important details. H. C. Melchert's article devoted to the Luwian stem *uba-* will be published soon in another Festschrift.

[2] H. S. Smith, Foreword to (Masson 1979: V–VI). The author of the Foreword further hypothesizes that the destruction of the Carian cemetery could be connected with the rise of nationalistic feelings after the end of the Achaemenid Persian rule in Egypt in 404 BC.

[3] Masson, Yoyotte 1956: 18.

Moving to the inscriptions, in all but two cases the word *u(p)e* is preceded by a genitive case noun ending in *-ś*, and all of these nouns that succumb to identification represent personal names.[4] The same holds for the overwhelming majority of words that immediately follow *u(p)e*; the analysis of other Carian inscriptions makes it very likely that most of them represent extraposed patronymics. Thus the inscriptions begin with a stereotypical phrase '*u(p)e* of X son of Y'.[5] It is only natural to assume that the noun *u(p)e* itself denotes 'stele, monument'. Any other suggestion, such as 'grave' or 'votive gift', would divorce some of the stelae under consideration from their archeological and art historical context, and therefore must be *a priori* regarded as inferior[6].

Given the similarity of the sound shape of *upe* and *ue*, as well as their identical textual contexts, it is counterintuitive to presume that they represent two different words referring to two different kinds of funerary monuments. The obvious problem one needs to address is reconciling the divergent spellings of *upe*/*ue* and reconstructing its phonology. The phonological shapes of the second millenium Anatolian languages exhibit a binary opposition between voiceless/fortis and voiced/lenis consonants[7], and there are reasons to think that some of the original lenis consonants were intervocalically realized as voiced fricatives in Lycian and Lydian[8]. Extrapolating this development to Carian, one can hypothesize that its inventory of labial stops consisted of a voiceless stop /p/ and a voiced fricative /b/ (phonetically [b]~[β]). If we had only one grapheme for these two sounds, the reconstruction [uβe] would neatly account for the scribal variation *upe*/*ue.* In the second case, one would argue, [β] was (wrongly) perceived as a secondary epenthetic consonant.

In the reality, the situation is more complicated. Carian does have a grapheme *b* that is normally used to render a sound that corerponding to β ("beta") in Greek foreign transmission. It is logical to assume that Carians would have used the spelling ****ube* for a word that sounded [uβe]. If one wants to maintain that this word was written as either *upe* or *ue*, one must explain why the natural spelling ****ube* was proscribed in Carian.

The explanation of this phenomenon was made available by Schürr's discovery of Carian personal names containing the Egyptian theonym Bastet.[9] It appears that these names cover the majority of cases where the graphic sequence *-ub-* is used in Carian inscriptions from Egypt. The full documentation is provided below[10]:

---

[4] Cf. e.g. *arliš-* vs. Gk. Αρλισσις (Adiego 1993: 230–231), *artaù-* vs. Gk. Αρταος (ibid.: 231–232), *lwχsi-* vs. Gk. λύξης (ibid.: 232).

[5] Carruba (1998: 55) took *ue* and *upe* as enclitic particles going back to *=wa* and *=wa=pa* respectively. One can make several objections against this theory. First, the enclitic *=pa* is preserved as a second element of Car. *sb* 'and', which is never written ****sbe*. Second, the combination |*upesa*| (M18), convincingly analyzed in Hajnal 1998 : 86 as 'this stele', can hardly be explained within this approach. Third, Carruba does not explain why the sequence *upe*/*ue* does not appears only on those inscriptions that are engraved on stelae.

[6] Similarly Schürr 1992: 155 and Vittman 2001: 40.

[7] Melchert 1994: 13–21.

[8] Ibid.: 301, 338. Phonetically speaking, the development was threefold. The etymological voiced stops were preserved as such in a position after nasals. On a phonological level, however, they can be regarded as allophones of voiceless fricatives in Lydian and Lycian (Melchert 1992: 38, fn. 13).

[9] Schürr 1996: 55–71.

[10] The list is based on Adiego 1993: 251, complemented by the new readings of Vittman (2001: 58–59).

1. MY A p̣iub[a]ζi-ś; Ab. 6 F p̣iuḅeζ
2. Ab. 10 F pdubeζ
3. Ab. 19 F, Ab. 28 Y ttubaζi; MY A ttbaζi-[ś]
4. MY b pduba; Ab. 4 F pdubi-ś
5. M 41 loubạú
6. Th. 55 Š ḷudtubạ
7. M 10a tašubt-ś

The names of the first three groups have been convincingly analysed as *Pa-Bꜣst.t* ~ Gk. Παυβαστις 'He of Bastet', *Pꜣ-dj-Bꜣst.t* ~ Gk. Πετοβαστις '(He), given by Bastet' and *Tꜣ-dj-Bꜣst.t* ~ Gk. Τετοβαστις '(She), given by Bastet' respectively.[11] The nouns of group 4 can be explained as Carian hypochoristic formations of *pdubeζ* '(He), given by Bastet'[12]. Thus 7 out of 10 names containing the sequence *-ub-* appear to refer to the Egyptian cat-shaped goddess. None of the remaining three names has an established etymology.

No Egyptian sign corresponds to the Carian vowel *-u-* preceding the divine name *ba(ζi)*, *beζ*. Ray thought that it represents a sort of anaptyctic vowel coloured by the following labial[13], but this explanation does not square with the fact that it can appear also in Greek transmission of Egyptian names beginning with Bastet[14], as well as in the Coptic reflex of the same name ⲞⲨⲂⲈⲤⲦⲒ. It seems that one would fare better accepting the argumentation of Özing[15], who reconstructs **ubĕst˘ < *wbĕst˘ < *bwĕst˘ < *buwĕst˘ < *buꜣĕst.˘t*. It is possible that Carian -*ubaζi*, -*ubeζ* reflects an intermediate stage of this development, where the sequence *-ub-* reflected the combination [wb], or something similar. Under this presumption one can see why Carians would feel uncomfortable using the same sequence *-ub-* in the word [uβe], and had to render it as either *upe* or *ue*[16].

It is obvious that my suggestion represents no more than an educated guess, unless one can provide external evidence supporting the existence of Carian [uβe] 'monument'. Below I shall try to demonstrate that this word has very suggestive cognates in the Luwic (South Anatolian) subgroup of the Anatolian group of languages.

The latest etymological statement about Car. *upe* 'monument' belongs to I. Hajnal, who compared it on the one hand with Hitt. *uppa-* 'to bring' and, on the other hand, with Lyc. *uba-* 'gift' with the verb *ube-* (presumably 'to dedicate, offer')[17]. A different approach is implied in the Cuneiform Luwian Lexicon of C. Melchert who separates CLuw. *uppa-* 'to bring' (and, by

---

[11] For the Egyptian correspondences cf. Vittman 2001.

[12] Differently Schürr (1996: 60), who compares these names with a Lycian PN *hrppidubeh* (gen). In my opinion, the analysis of this name as *hrppi-dube-h* is preferrable to that of *hr-ppid-ube-h*, and so it is no match to the Carian names under consideration.

[13] Ray 1998: 129.

[14] E.g. *Bꜣst.t-ỉ .ỉ r-tj-s*, lit. 'Bastet is one who gave her' is rendered as Ὀβεστερταις in Greek transmission (E. Lüddeckens et al. 1980–2000, 1(2): 136) .

[15] Özing 1976, Vol. 2: 856–857, fn. 1319.

[16] Carians also had another way to render a sequence /-uβ-/ in their writing, namely *-wb-*, cf. a Carian PN *kśatwbr* rendered as Ξανδυβερις in Greek transmission. The second part of this name seems to go back to the substrate verb *δaβar-* 'to rule', on which see Yakubovich 2002. The first vowel of this root was apparently labialized under the influence of the following consonant in this Carian name. It seems, however, that the Carian sign *w-* was never used in Egypt with the value /u/ in initial position.

[17] Hajnal 1998: 82. Hajnal's information about Lyc. *uba* 'gift' is based on Melchert 1993a. This is clear from the fact that he repeats Melchert's erroneous reference to TL 44 c 14 for this word, whereas it is in fact attested in TL 44 c 4.

extension, Hitt. *uppa-* 'id.') from CLuw. *upa-* 'to furnish, grant' (and, by extension, Lyc. *ube-* 'dedicate, offer').[18] None of the two authors, however, used the Hieroglyphic Luwian data in order to clarify the relationship between the two Luwian verbs and the Carian word for 'monument'. The publication of the monumental Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions (Hawkins 2000) has helped me in the solution of this "monumental" problem.

The following contexts bear witness to the existence of Luw. *u-pa-* 'to place, found, establish':

(1) ARSLANTAŞ (Tell Ahmar)[19]

§2 *a-wa/i ha-ta-ta-na*(URBS) ||URBS-*MI-ni-na* "1"-*ti-i* ("ANNUS")*u-si-i* ("AEDIFICIUM")*u-pa-ha-´*

'I **founded** the city Hatata in one year'.

(2) İSKENDERUN (Gurgum)

§ 3. *a-wa/i | za||-na*[-i] ("*255")*ka-ru-na-na* ("CAPERE")***u-pa-ha***[-i]

§ 4. *wa/i-tu-u-ta*[-i] 4×MILLE 4×CENTUM *a-ta* ("CAPERE")|| ***u-pa-ha***

'I **founded** this granary, and I **placed** into it 4400 [here, by *zipatani*-measure]

(3) KARKAMİŠ A11b+c (Building insciption of Katuwas)

§12. *a-wa/i pa-ia-´ |* REGIO-*ni-ia* ("VACUUS")*ta-na-tá-ha*

§13. *wa/i-ta-´* (SCALPRUM.CAPERE₂)***u-pa-ní-zi*** *a-tá |* ("CAPERE₂") || ***u-pa-ha***

'I wasted those countries and **erected trophies** in them'.

(4) KARKAMİŠ A1a, (Building inscription of Katuwas)

§9. | (*349) *á-la-ta-ha-na-ha-wa/i*(URBS) |*ARHA* | DELERE-*nú-wa/i-ha*

§10. |*wa/i-tú-´ | pa+ra/i-i-ha-´* (SCALPRUM.CAPERE₂)***u-pa-ní-na*** | (CAPERE₂) ***u-pa-ha***

§11. |9-*za-ha-wa/i-tú | pi-ia-ha*

'I destroyed the city Alatahana. I **erected a trophy** before him (i.e. Tarhunzas) and gave him a ninth <share>'.

(5) KARKAMİŠ A2 (Building Inscription of Katuwas)

§7 *wa/i-ta-´ mi-ia-za-´* LITUUS+AVIS-*ta-ni-ia-za* |REGIO-*ni-i a-tá* (DEUS)BONUS-*na* (DEUS)VITIS(-)*ti*-PRAE-*ia-ha* ||*ARHA* (CAPERE₂)***u-pa-ta***

'In my times he (Tarhunzas) **established** again the Grain-god and Wine-god in the country'.

J. D. Hawkins admitted the existence of HLuw. *u-pa-* 'to found' in (1) but translated the rest of the verbs cited as 'to bring', implying the comparison with Hitt. *uppa-* 'id.'. It is difficult, however, to understand how one can "bring" a granary, and bringing trophies to a defeated country also defies common sense. The determinative CAPERE, normally used for Luw. *ta-* 'to take' and representing an image of a grasping hand, is much closer in form to PONERE accompanying Luw. *tuwa-* 'to put' and representing an outstretched hand, than to the foot-shaped determinatives PES and PES₂ defining verbs related to motion.[20] As for the determinative CAPERE₂ consistently employed in Karkamiš, it was descided already by Laroche as 'main qui

---

[18] Melchert 1993b: 242.

[19] All the Luwian contexts cited below can be found in Hawkins 2000. The translation, however, is my own.

[20] Including transitives, such as e.g. PES₂ *hinu(wa)-* translated by Hawkins as 'cause to pass' (Hawkins 2000: 125–126).

pose'[21], and the transcription PONERE₂ would probably do more justice to its shape. Last but not least, the noun (SCALPRUM.CAPERE₂)*u-pa-ní-*, translated as 'trophy' also by Hawkins, probably indicates a kind of stone monument commemorating the victory. It is hard to see how a word of such a meaning can be derived from a root meaning 'to bring', whereas the derivation from *u-pa-* 'to place' is closely paralleled by that of Gk. στήλη 'monument, stele', derived from Gk. √στη 'stand', but also, 'place, establish'[22]. Going somewhat ahead, I believe that Car. /uβe/ was also derived from √ /uβ/ meaning 'to place'.

It would be, however, unfair to claim that my interpretation is entirely unproblematic. For example, § 4 of (2) could be rather translated as 'I brought into it 4400...', if not for the determinative CAPERE.[23] The following group of examples containing the determinative PES can be used as an additional argument for the existence of *u-pa-* 'to bring' in Luwian.

(6) BOYBEYPINARI 1 (Kummuh)

§1 [*z*]*a-wa/i* (THRONUS)*i-sà-tara/i-tá-za za-ha* MENSA-*za mu* ¹*pa-na-mu-wa/i-ti-sa* PURUS.FONS.*MI-sa* IUDEX-*ni-sa* FEMINA-*na-ti-sa* **PONERE-*wa/i-ha***
§4 (PES)***u-pa-tá-*pa-wa-tà*[-ʹ] ¹*á-za-mi-i-sá* PURUS.FONS.*MI* IUDEX-*ni-sa* SERVUS-*ta₅-sa* ‖
''I, Panamuwati, the wife of the ruler Suppiluliuma **established** this throne and this altar..., while Azamis, the ruler Suppiluliuma's servant, **brought** them.
Cf. BOYBEYPINARI 2
§5 *za-pa-wa/i i-sà-tara/i-ta-za* ‖ *za-ha* MENSA-*za á-mi-sà* ‖ *tá-ti-sa á-za-mi-sá ...* ‖ (PES) ***u-pa-tá***
§6 *wa/i-tà* PONERE-*wa/i-ta*
'And this throne and his altar my father Azamis **brought** and established.

(7) SULTANHAN (Tabal)

§2 | *a-wa/i* | *za-a-na* | (DEUS)TONITRUS-*hu-zá-na* | *tu-wa/i+ra/i-sà-si-i-na* | *ta-nu-wa/i-ha* ‖
§3 | *a-wa/i-sa*(!) | *á-pi-i* | CRUS-*nú-wa/i-mi-i-na* | BOS(ANIMAL)-*ri+i-i* 9 OVIS *a+ra/i-ma-sa- ri+i-i*
§4 | *a-wa/i-na* | ***u-pa-ha*** | HWI-*i*
§5 |*wa/i-sá* | OMNIS-*mi-ri+i* | [*sa*]-*na-wa/i-sa-tara/i-ri+i* | *á-wa/i-tà-ʹ*
'I established this Tarhunzas of the vineyard, providing <him> with an ox and nine monthling sheep. When I **placed** him, he came to me with all goodness'.
Cf. below:
§10 | *ta-nu-wa/i-ha-wa/i-na* | REL-*i*
§11 | REL-*i-pa-wa/i* | (TERRA) *ta-sà-*REL+*ra/i* | 2 "OVIS"-*sa* 80 "HORDEUM" CRUS+*RA/I* ‖
§12 | *wa/i-na-ʹ* | *á-pi-i* |*zi-na* |"AVIS"(-)*ta-wa/i-na-ri+i* | ("PES")***u-pa-ha***
'When I established him, and 2 sheep costed 80 [measures of] barley, I **provided** him then with *tawani*-birds.

---

[21] Laroche 1960: 43 (sign # 43). E.Laroche explicitly translated (*43)*u-pa-* as 'to found'.

[22] It is interesting that Gk. √στη- was apparently borrowed into Lycian only in its technical meaning 'to be erected, set down'. Lyc. *sttati sttala* 'a stele will be set down' (TL 44 c 5; Melchert 1993c: 31) represents a *figura etymologica* comparable to Luw. *ubaninzi ubaha* in (3).

[23] It is possible that a scribal error of perseveration is responsible for the occurrence of CAPERE in this clause.

(8) TOPADA (Tabal)

§5. *á-mu-ha*[?]*-wa/i* REX+*RA/I-ti* (ANIMAL)EQUUS-*wa/i-ti* **u-pa-ha**

'I **provided** mysef with the "Royal Horse"'.

Cf. below:

§15. **274-ia-pa-wa/i* FEMINA.MANUS-*zi/a-ha* SERVUS-*sa* ("PES")**u-pa-ta**$_x$.

'It **brought** the militia[24] and women-and-children into slavery[25]'.

The determinative PES that appears before many attestations of *u-pa-* in the passages cited suggests that this verb was synchronicaly connected with motion. In some passages the meaning 'to bring' makes indeed a perfect sense; thus one can analyze (6) as an account of a queen who sponsored the creation of a new altar, and her servant who actually supervised its transportation, installation, and inauguration. In some other cases, however, *u-pa-* 'to establish' seems to match the context better; thus *á-pi-i* ... ("PES")*u-pa-ha* 'I provided (vel sim.)' in (7), §12 can be compared with *á-pi-i* | CRUS-*nú-wa-mi-i-na* 'provided (acc. part.)'[26] in (7), § 3. If the basic meaning of *u-pa* in this context was similar to that of (CRUS) *tanu*(*wa*)- 'place', it is easier to explain why their derived meanings[27] are also similar.

Summing up, Hieroglyphic Luwian seems to provide the evidence for two originally different verbs, (AEDIFICIUM/CAPERE/ CAPERE$_2$) *u-pa* 'to place, found, establish' and (PES) *u-pa* 'to bring', even though it is not always possible to distinguish between the two meanings in individual cases. This situation can be explained if we assume that both verbs merged in (some dialects of) Late Luwian that underlies Hieroglyphic inscriptions of the first millenium. In fact, the same hypothesis is also entertained by Hawkins (*CHLI*, 259), even though our analyses of the individual attestations of this verb are different. Another important conclusion is that *u-pa-* does not seem to mean 'to offer, dedicate' in Hieroglyphic Luwian texts. A least, only in (4) has the beneficiary of the erected stele been mentioned.

Moving to the Cuneiform Luwian texts that illustrate the state of the same language some five hundred years earlier, we see that the two verbs under consideration were also phonetically different. Laroche (1959 : 101–2) was still willing to consider CLuw. *ú-pa-* as a variant of CLuw. *up-pa-* 'to bring', but Melchert (1993b : 242), following Starke (1990 : 520, fn. 1921) set CLuw. *ú-pa-* aside, assigning to it a different meaning 'to furnish, grant'. CLuw. *up-pa-* 'to bring', obviously cognate with Hitt. *up-pa-* 'id.' was never regarded as semantically problematic[28], but the semantics of CLuw. *ú-pa-* deserves further discussion. All the available contexts are listed below[29]:

---

[24] For the translation of 274-*ia* cf. Marazzi 2002: 509.

[25] I tentatively take SERVUS-*sa* for a free-standing genitive of a word meaning 'slavery'. For free-standing genitives in factitive constructions in Hittite cf. e.g. Yoshida 1987: 8.

[26] Differently Hawkins (2000: 465–466) where CRUS-*nú-wa-mi-i-na* is translated as a 1 pl. form 'we presented'. Hawkins does not comment on functional motivation for the alternation between 1 sg. and 1 pl. in the same inscription.

[27] I believe that both verbs were modified by the preverb *api* cognate with Gk. ʼεπι (cf. Ivanov 2002: 5) and responsible for the associative semantics of the phrasal verbs.

[28] A clear occurrence of CLuw. *uppa-* 'to bring' is available in (10).

[29] All the four contexts below are translated in Starke (1985: 132, 226, 278, 65 respectively). Starke's translation is similar, but not identical to mine.

(9) KBo 9.145. left 2ff , CTH 770 (Unidentified Luwian text), NS

2' [ ]×-in **ú-pa-an-ti** a-an-t[a
3' [du-]pa-in-ti a-ah-ha-ti-ya-a[n
4' [A]N.BAR-ti tar-ma-ti tar-mi-ta hu[

'They **u-pa-**, ... strike.., when .. it ... (he) nailed with iron nails...'.

(10) KUB 35.88 III 11ff, CTH 765 (Luwian Birth Ritual), NS[30]

9'   l[a-la-a-at-ta
10' 9-za GIŠGA.ZUM-za ha-la-ta-pa DZu-li-ya-ya-a[n
11' **ú-pa-at-ta**-pa-wa-du ša-ar-ri-ya-ni-in 2-šu 9-u[n-za
12' an-ta-wa-aš-ta wa-al-lu-na-<aš>-ša-an wa-a-ni **up-pa-an-t[a**
13' ša-ar-ri-wa-tar DUMU-in wa-al-li-it-ta

'He took nine combs and *hala*-ed[?] Zuliya. He **u-pa-ed**[?] for him *sarriyani*, two times nine. They **brought** them to the woman of lifting. She lifted the child up'.

(11) KUB 35.133 II 27ff, CTH 772 (an Istanuwian ritual), NS

27' a-a-wa DU-an tu-ú-iš UD.KAM-iš ta-at-ta
28' uš-ma-an-ti-in šu-na-at-ru-wa-an-ti-in **ú-pa**
29' URUha-at-tu-sa-ya ap-pa-ra-an-ti-en a-ri-in
30' an-na-ru-ma-a-hi hu-u-it-wa-la-a-hi-ša-ha **ú-pa**

'Lo, Storm-god, your day is appointed. **Make** future day(s) in Hattusa full of wealth and abundance! **Establish** vitality and life!'

(12) KUB 35.54 III 17ff., CTH 758 (Ritual of Puriyanni for the purification of a house), NS.

17. [w]a-a-ar-ša-at-ta ÍD-ti [ ]×-am-ma-an
18. [M]UN-ša-pa a-a-la-a-ti u-wa-a[-ni-ya-ti] **ú-pa-am-ma-an**
19. [w]a-a-ar-ša-at-ta zi-i-l[a ÍD-i] an-da
20. [n]a-a-wa i-ti MUN-ša-pa-a[t-ta z]i-la
21. [a-a-]li-i u-wa-a-ni-ya na-a[-wa i-t]i

'Rain is ... by the river and salt is **provided** by the steep saltlick. Rain will not go again into the river and salt will not go again into the steep saltlick'.

The difficult passages (9)-(10) do not allow for any positive conclusions, but examples (11)-(12) show the same basic meaning of *ú-pa-*, that is 'to cause'. Both 'to bring' and 'to found, establish' could in principle be used metaphorically with a meaning 'to cause', but phonetic considerations tip stakes in favour of the second alternative. One should keep in mind

---

[30] The reconstruction of broken lines is based on a parallel passage KUB 35.89 10ff

that the Cuneiform Luwian corpus, almost exclusively limited to incantation rituals, does not represent a direct match to Hieroglyphic Luwian building inscriptions. Both genres illustrate the complementary meanings of Luw. **uba-* that is physical construction and metaphysical creation. If this analysis is correct, 'to furnish, grant', implying an underlying beneficiary, does not appear to be the best translation of the Luwian verb. In fact, only the obscure example (10) features the dative pronoun as an argument of CLuw. *ú-pa-*.

If the verbs *upa-* 'to bring' and *uba-* 'to found' were phonetically distinct in Cuneiform Luwian, then the hypothesis of their merge in (some dialects of) Hieroglyphic Luwian crucially depends on assuming special sound changes at that period. One of the possible solutions in assuming a frontal change of intervocalic *-p-* to *-b-* in (some dialects of) Late Luwian. I should like to stress that this change must be considered distinct from the common Luwian lenition, which was dependent on the quality and accentuation of adjacent vowels[31]. It goes without saying that, in the lack of independent evidence, this suggestion remains purely hypothetical.

What one can claim with much more certainty, is the fact that CLuw. *uba-* does not result from a recent dialectal lenition of *upa-*. In my opinion, Luw. √ *b* 'to found' is attested in Early Luwian *ubādi(t)-* 'estate, holding, demesne' that was borrowed in Old Assyrian, Hittite (OS+), and, later, in Ugaritic.

The different attestations of this group of words were discussed at length by Beal (1992: 539–549), and there is no need to reiterate this discussion here. It is enough to say that Hitt. *ubādi-* , and its Luwian counterpart *u-pa-ti-t°* can be used either with reference to a land holding, which is large enough to be mentioned in a political document, or to a military unit, presumably levied in a particular area[32]. The Ugaritic *ubdy* 'land, plot, farming (in a taxed leasing system)'[33] shows that the same Luwian word could also be used on a smaller scale. Finally Akk. *ubadinnu*, attested exclusively in Old Assyrian economical texts, apparently designates a service-unit, a group of people living in a paricular area and having certain common responsibilities.

This semantic amalgam can be plausibly explained if we assume that the original meaning of Luw. *ubādi(t)-* was simply 'estate'. In its ordinary use, this word could designate a plot of land that was regarded as an agricultural unit, and the maintenance of which required some communal labour (for our present purposes it is irrelevant whether it was free or corvée labour). The same term could be also metonymically used for a group of people who were living on this plot of land. When used in a political or diplomatic context, the same word could designate the land holding of an Anatolian ruler. The personal army of such a ruler would be formed from the men of his *ubādi(t)-*, and, therefore, could be metonymically designated as *ubādi(t)-*. Finally, if this prince was a vassal of the Hittite king, his personal retinue could be regarded as a detachment of the Hittite army, and therefore `ubâdi(t)-` could occasionally function as 'military unit'[34].

---

[31] See Morpurgo-Davies 1982–1983: 245 ff. for the inductive formulation of the Proto-Luwian lenition of dentals.

[32] For the list of attestations see Starke 1990: 195 ff. and cf. Marazzi 2002: 509. Starke asserts the Luwian origin of the Hittite word, but does not suggest any etymology for Luw. *ubadi(t)-*.

[33] Olmo Lete and Sanmartín 2003, vol. 1: 7.

[34] This analysis is preferable to that of R.Beal (1992), who tentatively assumes that the original meaning of *ubadi(t)-* was 'association / group'. The metonymy from as certain geographic area to the people living in it is common (cf. e.g. H. Nelson's "England expects everyone to do his duty"), whereas the opposite metonymy is extremely unusual. Melchert (1993b:, 243) suggested that Luw. *ubadi(t)-* originally meant 'landgrant < donation',

Now, if the original meaning of Luw. *ubādi(t)-* was indeed 'estate', this word can be derived from Luw. √*ub* 'to found' on the assumption of a common semantic change that is exemplified by Lat. *fundus* 'foundation, estate', MPers. `bun xânag` and Bactr. βονο καδγο 'personal estate' and, ultimately, the English word 'estate' itself. As for morphology, one can explain Luw. *ubādi(t)-* by positing an old Anatolian suffix *-at- < *-ot-/-et-*, extended by a productive suffix *-it-* in Luwian[35]. It is especially interesting that that Hitt. *ubādi-*, *ubadi-* is occasionally written with the BA sign (HZL №205) in Old Hittite. The only other Hittite common noun in which this sign occurs is the title *tabarna-* / *labarna-* that was probably borrowed from the substrate language(s) of Southern Anatolia via Luwian.[36] It is possible that this sign was used in Old Hittite in order to signal a special articulation of the Luwian phoneme /b/, distinct from that of its Hittite counterpart. Alternatively, and perhaps more likely, A.Kassian (pers. comm.) suggests that the BA sign could denote the same sound combination as PA, but only in markedly borrowed lexemes.[37]

Thus it appears that a derivative of Luw. √*ub* 'to found' was attested already in the first half of the second millenium BC. With Melchert 1993b and pace Hajnal 1998: 82, this root must be kept distinct from Hittite/Luwian *uppa-* 'to bring'. Pace Melchert, this verb did not mean 'to dedicate' or 'to grant' and, therefore, did not require any explicit beneficiary in Luwian. Having this conclusion in mind, let us consider the other derivatives of √*ub* in Lycian and Carian.

The verbal form /ub/ 'to place' is attested in two Lycian and one Carian inscriptions cited below:

(13) N313m (Xanthos, rim of a marble basin)
]•ẽnida **ubet**[e

(14) N311 (Xanthos, fragment of a limestone block)
[erb]bina(j)=ẽne **ubete** xruwata ertẽmi
[xer]igah tideimi se(j)=upeneh
'Erbbina, the son of Xeriga and Upene, **placed** it as an offering to Artemis'.

(15) *34 ("New York bronze bowl")
šrquq qtbelemś **wbt** snn orkn ntro pidl
'Šarkuk, son of Kotbelem, **placed** this cup as a gift to Netr'.[38]

---

but this interpretation, prompted by his understanding of the meaning of Luw. √*ub*, would make the metonymic usage of *ubādi(t)-* less likely.

[35] For the suffix *-ot-/-et-* see Rieken 1999: 100 ff., for the Luwian suffix *-it-* see Starke 1990: 151 ff. The only Luwian word that preserves the unextended (Pre-)Anatolian suffix *-ot-/-et-* is *Tiwad-* 'Sun-(god)'. Melchert's suggestion to regard Luw. `ubâdi(t)-` as an extended agent noun *ubata-* is less likely since the action noun suffix `-ata-` never undergoes lenition in Luwo-Lycian.

[36] On the substrate origin of the `tabarna- / labarna-` title cf. Stefanini 2002: 791–792; Yakubovich 2002, *passim*. The former article is also to be consulted for the likely hypothesis about the original function of this title among the Hittites.

[37] A. Kassian turns my attention to the fact that the BA sign is regularly used in cult terms (D)*abati/e* and `ambassi-` (c), both of Hurrian origin.

[38] With Melchert (1993d: 81) and pace Melchert (2002a: 309), I believe that *–o* in *-ntro* represents a dative-locative marker that can be directly compared with datives-locatives in *–a* in Lycian. The precise phonetic environment for the change */a/>/o/ in Carian (on which see e.g. Schürr 2002: 168) remains to be investigated, but it is very likely that the stress was one of its conditioning factors. Even if the Carian genitive in *-s* indeed assumed

Since inscriptions (14) and (15) are clearly dedicatory in their nature, the temptation to translate their predicate as 'dedicated' is understandable. Yet such a translation would not be compelling in any of the two cases. In both (14) and (15) the beneficiaries of the act of dedication are not expressed by the arguments of the respective predicates, but rather embedded in adjunct phrases 'as an offering to Artemis' and 'as a gift to Netr'. But even if one opts for the translation 'to dedicate' on stylistic grounds, the semantic development 'to erect' > 'to dedicate' in the inscriptions of this genre is quite natural. One can compare the Greek predicate ᾽ανέθηκε that is translated in inscriptions as either '(he/she) erected' or '(he/she) dedicated', depending on a number of arguments it takes.

It is more important to take sides with regard to the original meaning of √ *ub* when we consider the following Lycian passages taken from the inscription on the Pillar of Xanthos.

(16) TL 44 c3–5, 6–7

me=ñne=(e)mu axagã: maraza: me **ubu**=hãte: kbijẽti: se utãna: sttati: sttala:... se xbide: sttati mẽ: sttala: ...

'I became a mediator for them (i.e. Persians and Spartans?) . They "issued" (i.e. ordered) a double **monument**. In Hytenna a stele will be erected ... and in Kaunos likewise a stele will be erected ...'.

(17) TL 44 c13–14

ñtube: τer[e] kizzaprñna: epriti: se parza: me=ñ[ne]: t[a]mã: axa:

Where a **stele**? will be prepared? for Tissaphernes and the Persians, I made a building? for them.[39]

The historical background of the passages cited remains somewhat uncertain, but Keen conjectures that the Xanthian ruler Xeriga functioned as a confidant of the Persian satrap Tissaphernes in his negotiations with the Spartans[40]. It appears that two stelae were erected as a result of these negotiations. Presumably, they featured the text of an agreement between the Persians and the Spartans, or something similar. Given the existence of HLuw. *u-pa-ni-* 'trophy' and Car. [uβe] 'monument', as well as Lyc. *ub-* 'to place', it is only natural to assume that Lyc. *ubu* (acc.) also refers to a kind of a monument, that in the next close is designated by the Greek borrowing *sttala* 'stele'. Melchert's provisional translation of *me ubu=hãte: kbijẽti:* as 'they issued a double(?) guarantee (?)' can be immediately improved.

It is more difficult to provide a probative interpretation for (17) due to a number of unknown lexical items. For Melchert (1993a: 83), *ñtube* is the predicate of the first clause of this sentence, expressed by 3sg. of an (^{Ÿi}) conjugation verb. Since the existence of (^{Ÿi}) conjugation verbs in Lycian has never been proven, I find it safer to assume that the sentence predicate was expressed by a normal 3sg. *epriti*, even if the exact meaning of this verb is unknown to us. If this assumtion is correct, then the potential candidates for the subjects of the first close are *ñtube* and *kizzaprñna: ... se parza:*. The second option is clearly inferior because

the dative function, as Melchert (2002a) claims, this was a development within Carian that does not preclude the existence of an earlier dative in *-o/-e*.

[39] The translation of the predicate *epriti* is conjectural. I tentatively derive this verb from **epre < *apara-* 'later, after' on the assumption of a semantic derivation similar to that of Hitt. *appai- / appija-* 'be finished, be done' (if this verb is indeed derived from Hitt. 'behind', as per Puhvel 1984: 95). For *tama-* 'building', cf. Melchert 2002b: 249, fn. 35.

[40] Keen 1998: 137. This suggestion ultimately goes back to Melchert 1993c: 31–35.

kizzaprñna: ... se parza: in the nominative can only mean 'Tissaphernes and the Persian', and it is utterly unclear why Xeriga would refer to someone by his nationality, as opposite to his personal name. On the contrary if we take this group as a dative, it can be translated as 'for Tissaphernes and the Persians', an obvious reference to a Persian satrap and his troops/subordinates. With regard to the nominative *ñtube*, I am glad to accept the suggestion of Theo van den Hout to regard this noun as a kind of architectural term, formally resembling *ñtata-* 'sarcophagus'(?)[41]. The two nouns were probably formed in an identical way from the roots √ *ta* 'to put' and √ *ub* 'to place, found'. I believe that *ñtube* designates a certain part of the monument(s) introduced several lines above as **ube/sttala*, but only further study of TL 44 as a whole may provide us here with a definite answer.

We have seen that the existence of the South Anatolian √ *ub* 'to place, found' is supported by the combined evidence of Luwian, Lycian and Carian. Yet the impact of various dialects was not identical. The meaning of √ *ub* in Cuneiform Luwian is obfuscated by the genre of texts available to us in this dialect. The Hieroglyphic Luwian data are difficult to analyze because two verbs, 'to bring' and 'to found' were not distinguished in Hieroglyphic orthography. The Lycian (and Carian) verbal forms appear only in dedicatory inscriptions, while Lycian nouns **ube* and *ñtube* belong to the most complicated and controversial text in the Lycian corpus. By contrast, Carian *upe / ue* 'monument' can be immediately linked to the set of objects it denotes, and this prevents us from a skewed interpretation of this word and its cognates. For the first time in Carian studies, the tiny Carian corpus can provide a tangible contribution to the understanding of other Anatolian languages.

<div align="center">***</div>

I am offering this Carian monument as a votive gift to Professor L. Gercenberg, who answered the prayers of my heart by training a new generation of Russian Indo-Europeanists. Not being formally his student, I nevertheless also had a chance to experience his generosity at the very beginning of my scholarly career. Against all odds of the transitional period in Russia, L. Gercenberg continues his relentless pedagogical efforts, laying the foundation of the St.-Petersburg School of Indo-European Studies.

<div align="center">BIBLIOGRAPHY</div>

Adiego Lajara, Ignacio-Javier. 1993. Studia Carica. Investigaciones sobre la escritura y lengua carias. Barcelona: Promociones e publicaciones universitarias.

Beal, Richard. H. 1992. The Organization of the Hittite Military (Texte der Hethiter 20). Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Carruba, Onofrio. 1998. "Zum Stand der Entzifferung des Karischen". Kadmos 37: 47–56.

Hajnal, Ivo. 1998. ""Jungluwisches" *s und die karische Evidenz: Versuch einer dialektologischen Klärung". Kadmos 37: 80–108.

Hawkins, J. David. 2000. Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions. Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Ivanov. Vyacheslav V. 2002. Review of Hawkins 2000. Indo-European Studies Bulletin 10/1: 1–17.

Keen, Anthony G. 1998. Dynastic Lycia: a political history of the Lycians and their relations with foreign powers. Leiden: Brill.

Lüddeckens, Erich et al. 1980–2000. Demotisches Namenbuch. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Laroche, Emmanuel. 1959. Dictionnaire de la langue louvite. Paris: A. Maisonneuve.

——. 1960. Les hieroglyphes hittites. Paris: CNRS.

---

[41] Melchert 1993a : 48.

Masson, Olivier. 1979. Carian Inscriptions from North Saqqāra and Buhen. London: Egypt exploration society.

Masson, Olivier and Yoyotte, Jean. 1956. Objets pharaoniques à inscription carienne. Cairo: Institut d' archéologie orientale.

Marazzi, Massimilano. 2002. "Esercitazione di carri da guerra". Anatolia Antica: Studi in Memoria di Fiorella Imparati (Eothen 11). Florence: Lo Gisma, pp. 507–18.

Melchert, H. Craig. 1992. "The third Person present in Lydian". Indogermanische Forschungen, 97: 31–54.

——. 1993. "Some Remarks on New Readings in Carian". Kadmos 32: 77–86.

——. 1993(a). Lycian Lexicon. Chapel Hill: self-published.

——. 1993(b). Cuneiform Luwian Lexicon. Chapel Hill: self-published.

——. 1993(c). "A New Interpretation of Lines 3–9 of the Xanthos Stele". Akten des II. Internationalen Lykien-Symposiums (ed. J. Borhardt and G. Dobesch). Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.

——. 1994. Anatolian Historical Phonology. Amsterdam; Atlanta: Rodopi.

——. 2002(a). "Sibilants in Carian". Novalis Indogermanica. Festschrift für Günter Neumann zum 80. Geburtstag (edd. M. Fritz & S. Zeilfelder). Graz: Leykam. pp. 305–313.

——. 2002(b). "The God Sanda in Lycia?" Silva Anatolica: Anatolian Studies Presented to Maciej Popko on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday (Ed. by P. Taracha). Warsaw: AGADE, pp. 241–252.

Morpurgo-Davies, Anna. 1982–1983. "Dentals, Rhotacism and Verbal Endings in the Luwian Languages". Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung 96: 245–70.

del Olmo Lete, Grigorio and Sanmartín, Joaquin. 2003. A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic tradition. Leiden: Brill.

Özing, Jürgen. 1976. Die Nominalbildung des Ägyptischen. Mainz: von Zabern.

Puhvel, Jaan. 1984. Hittite etymological dictionary. v. 1. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Ray, John. 1998. "Aegypto-Carica". Kadmos 37: 125–36.

Rieken, Elisabeth. 1999. Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 44). Wiesbaden: Harassowitz.

Schürr, Dieter. 1992. "Zur Bestimmung der Lautwerte des Karischen Alphabets". Kadmos 31: 127–156.

——. 1996. "Bastet-namen in karischen inschriften Ägyptens". Kadmos 35, pp. 55–71.

——. 2002. "Karische Parallelen zu zwei Arzawa-Namen". Kadmos 41, pp. 163–77.

Starke, Frank. 1985. Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 30). Wiesbaden: Harassowitz.

——. 1990. Untersuchungen zur Stammbildung des Keilschrift-Luwischen Nomens (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 31). Wiesbaden: Harassowitz.

Stefanini, Ruggero. 2002. "Toward a Diachronic Reconstruction of the Linguistic Map of Ancient Anatolia". Anatolia Antica: Studi in Memoria di Fiorella Imparati (Eothen 11). Florence: Lo Gisma, pp. 783–806.

Vittman, Günter. 2001. "Ägyptisch-Karisches". Kadmos 40: 39–59.

Yakubovich, Ilya. 2002. "Labyrinth for Tyrants". Studia Linguarum 3 (Memoriae A.A. Korolev dicata), Moscow: Languages of Slavonic Culture. Vol. 1, pp. 93–116.

Yoshida, Daisuke. 1987. Die Syntax des althethitischen substantivischen genitivs (Texte der Hethiter 13). Heidelberg: Carl Winter.