

On the Carian Inscription from Mengefe

Zsolt SIMON*

Abstract: This article provides a new analysis of the recently published Carian inscription from Mengefe. It critically discusses the interpretation of the edition, demonstrates that it is mistaken at crucial points (in identifying the words for ‘grandfather’, ‘grandson’, and ‘and’ as well as a relative clause), and offers a more fitting translation (including an [appurtenance] adjective and a clitic correlative conjunction or disjunction), addressing neglected aspects of the inscription as well (a possible postposition and the word dividers).

Type: Research Article

Received: 14.11.2024

Accepted: 14.12.2024

DOI: 10.37095/gephyra.1585369

Language: English

Keywords: Carian; Carian epigraphy; Carian lexicography; Carian syntax; Mengefe.

Gephyra 29 (2025), 1-8

1. Introduction

A. Kızıl and I.-X. Adiego recently published a hitherto unknown Carian inscription on the rim of a pithos from the site of Mengefe, north of Keramos in Southern Caria (end of the fourth century BC).¹ The inscription reads as follows (although the inscription covers almost the entire rim, a longer empty section makes clear where the inscription starts)²:

eunklir : mane : teqtT : išn : pid[- 9² signs -] :² δ² : artmsi : miδs : ksbok : artmsik̄ : manek̄

As usual with longer Carian inscriptions that include more than onomastic formulae, the content of the inscription is mostly opaque.³ Almost nothing can be said about its first section before the broken part, except that it contains the well-attested personal name Mane⁴; *eunklir*⁵ recalls other Carian words starting with *ew^o/eu^o*; *pid[* has an assonance with *pjdl̄* ‘gift’; and the preceding *ışn* presumably stands in acc. sg. (-n), either as a demonstrative pronoun in agreement with *pid[* or referring to the pithos itself.⁶ Adiego argued, however, that the section following the unintelligible letters and the personal name *Artmsi*, i.e. Artemisios,⁷ is more transparent, which he translated as

* **Zsolt Simon**, PhD, Universitat de Barcelona, Institut Universitari del Pròxim Orient Antic
(zsltsimon@gmail.com |  0000-0002-6839-7070).

The paper was written as part of the author’s Ramón y Cajal research fellowship (RYC2022-036225-I), financed by the Agencia Estatal de Investigación of the Spanish state.

¹ Kızıl – Adiego 2024 (the philological-linguistic part was written by Adiego). The authors did not assign a siglum to the inscription, although sigla are generally used for the identification of Carian inscriptions. In Adiego’s own system (2007), the inscription would be C.Me 1.

² See Kızıl – Adiego 2024, 41-50 for a detailed discussion of the reading. Only a few ambiguous traces of the letters from the broken section have remained.

³ Adiego did not address the inscription’s word dividers: they consist of two vertical dots, representing the type already known from Hyllarima, Kaunos, and Sinyris (on the correct form of this toponym see Adiego forthcoming), and the inscription’s date provides yet another piece of evidence for both the late date of this type and the observation that inscriptions completely segmented by word dividers are typical for private inscriptions. On the typology of Carian word dividers, including these issues, see Simon 2023b, esp. 49, 55-57.

⁴ Kızıl – Adiego 2024, 52.

⁵ While it was correctly identified and transcribed on p. 43 as *eunklir*, it was falsely transcribed as *eunklir* in the later sections of the paper, both in ‘Complete reading’ (50) and in ‘Final remarks on the inscription’ (57-58).

⁶ For all these, see Kızıl – Adiego 2024, 57-58.

⁷ Kızıl – Adiego 2024, 52.

‘the grandfather and the grandson, who is Artemisios (and) who is Manes’. In other words, he proposed the following identifications:

1. *miδs* means ‘grandfather’
2. *ksbok* contains an enclitic conjunction =*k* ‘and’.
3. *ksbo* means ‘grandson’.
4. The section *artmsik manek* comprises two relative clauses with an enclitic relative pronoun =*k̂*.

The problem with this interpretation is that none of these identifications can be demonstrated and, moreover, probably all are mistaken, as will be shown below. In the following, these four points will be discussed in detail, with an additional analysis of *δ*, not addressed by Adiego.

2. *miδs* ‘grandfather’

This word is not attested until now in the Carian corpus, but Adiego was certainly right that it recalls Lycian *miñti*, translated by him as ‘the local supervisory authority mentioned in the Lycian funerary inscriptions’.⁸ Following O. Carruba’s etymological proposal for *miñti* (**miyant*- ‘grown’ > ‘old people, assembly of elders’), Adiego suggested translating *miδs* as ‘grandfather’ (although this logic could allow other interpretations as well, such as ‘uncle’). This is especially problematic from the point of view that it is the Carian word *quq* that is traditionally interpreted as ‘grandfather’.⁹ Adiego proposed several ideas on how to solve this problem¹⁰: one of the words may be more official, *quq* may have a more general meaning such as ‘ancestor’ (which, however, would rather be expected in the case of *miδs*), or *quq* was replaced in the common vocabulary (while he did not explain what he meant by this, he probably pointed to the fact that *quq* is until now limited to personal names). These are not improbable possibilities, but the entire idea is based on the *etymology* of the Lycian word, which is completely uncertain as the etymology of institutions’ names is frequently uncertain, especially if their history is unknown, as in this case. Moreover, there is no evidence that *miñti* consisted of old people.¹¹ In other words, the Carruba – Adiego etymology remains pure formal speculation.

Furthermore, a formal problem also argues against this explanation: maintaining that this word is a cognate of Lycian *miñti*, one has to explain the *-s* of *miδs*. As Adiego admitted, this is problematic, since he would expect here a nominative, which has, however, a zero ending. He suggested two possibilities: an outcome restricted to *-*ant-s* or a suffix *-s-* with the zero nominative ending (matching Lycian *-s-*, *-za-* or *-zi-*, with a question mark¹²). The Carian nom. sg. of *-*ant*-stems is currently unknown, and the proposed special outcome cannot *a priori* be excluded, but it is problematic since one would expect from *-*ants* either *-δ* (by the known Carian sound laws) or an affricate at best, not a cluster *-δs* (a recharacterisation with a nom. *-s* can be excluded since

⁸ Kızıl – Adiego 2024, 55. The word means a body of ‘servants of the local sanctuaries, who were entrusted with legal and religious obligations in the burial practices’, as critically discussed most recently by Christiansen 2020, 166-168, not quoted by Adiego.

⁹ See most recently Simon 2021a with critical discussion and refs.

¹⁰ Kızıl – Adiego 2024, 55.

¹¹ Cf. Christiansen 2020, 166-168. Accordingly, other etymologies, even though based on the same stem, assume different underlying meanings (e.g. ‘erwachsene Bevölkerung’ [Hajnal 1995, 129], ‘grown (man)’ [Sasseville 2021]).

¹² Kızıl – Adiego 2024, 56.

the nominative ending is zero in Carian, as per above). A suffix *-s-* is certainly possible since Carian does have at least one *-s-* suffix, the genitive adjective *-s-*.¹³ In this case, *miδs* would be an adjective qualifying either the preceding *Artmsi* or the following *ksbok*. This cannot, however, be reconciled either with the idea that it is a kinship word or with Adiego's proposed sentence structure, in which the *=k* 'relative pronoun' refers back to *miδs* and *ksbok*.

There is one more theoretical possibility, not mentioned by Adiego: a dative in *-s*. While Adiego has consistently denied the existence of Carian dative singulars in *-s*,¹⁴ the evidence for their existence is clear.¹⁵ Unfortunately, this does not solve the problem of *miδs*: while the distribution of the dative singular endings is not clear at this moment, **-nt-*stems seem to have a dative in *-e* as *Trqude* 'for Trqud' in C.Ia 3 shows, and thus, it is not probable that *miδs* is a dative.¹⁶

Since no other fitting nominal ending is known¹⁷ and our knowledge of the verbal endings is insufficient to draw any conclusions¹⁸, the only formally attested possibility is the *s*-suffix of appurtenance mentioned above. In this case, *miδ* can be a substantive (either the Carian cognate of *miñti* or another substantive of unknown meaning) or a toponym. Since the institution of *miñti* is not known from Caria, it is better to abandon this proposed connection. Unfortunately, no perfectly fitting toponym presents itself either. The formally closest toponym is Myndos, a settlement west of Halicarnassus, but this would have been *†muδ* in Carian.¹⁹ That said, based on Myndos's homonymy with the Greek word for 'dumb', already Zgusta entertained the idea that we are dealing with a (folk-etymological) Hellenisation of a local toponym (if it is not outright Greek).²⁰ Thus, one can imagine that a local toponym **Miδ* was folk-etymologically Hellenised as Myndos, and therefore, *miδs* means 'of Myndos', but since the Carian name of Myndos is unknown, this remains unprovable.

3. *=k* 'and'

To be able to analyse *ksbok* as *ksbo* 'grandson', Adiego had to explain the final **k*. He suggested that we are dealing with an enclitic conjunction meaning 'and' (the non-enclitic conjunction is *sb*), although he admitted that 'unfortunately, further evidence of a Carian enclitic conjunction *=k* is unclear'.²¹ This is an understatement since there is *no* further evidence of such a Carian clitic conjunction. Adiego did not mention that an enclitic conjunction meaning 'and' is already attested in Carian: *=q*.²² This is not necessarily lethal because it is theoretically possible that a lan-

¹³ See, e.g., Adiego 2007, 392 with refs., the key example is *otono-s-* 'Athenian'.

¹⁴ Most recently Adiego 2019a, 35.

¹⁵ Melchert 2010, 182-183.

¹⁶ An anonymous reviewer suggested the following interesting possibility: if **mint-* received a suffix **-o-* in Carian as in Lycian (Sasseville 2018, 316), the *s*-dative would be the dat. sg. ending of this stem class. However, this cannot be judged at the moment because, as mentioned above, the distribution of the dat. sg. endings in Carian is still unknown. It would also face the problem that this institution is not known in Caria (cf. below).

¹⁷ On the Carian nominal endings, see generally Melchert 2010, for additional endings see Simon 2021d and 2024.

¹⁸ See the most recent discussions of Simon 2020b, Schürr 2022, and Melchert forthcoming.

¹⁹ Note that despite the recurring proposals, Myndos has nothing to do with the Carian word(s) *mday/yn* / *mw/udon*, see the critical discussion in Simon 2021e, esp. 178 with refs.

²⁰ Zgusta 1984, 408.

²¹ Kızıl – Adiego 2024, 53.

²² See most recently the critical overview in Simon 2020a. It is worth mentioning that although one piece of evidence for *=q* (that from C.Hy 1) was rightly abolished by Adiego 2019b, 16-20, 26-27, 33-34, the case of C.Tr

guage has several enclitic conjunctions meaning ‘and’. Adiego tried to overcome the other problem, the lack of evidence, with a new proposal: he suggested that the sequence ²(...)šodubrś ³sbmnośknor ⁴norilams of C.Kr 1 should be segmented as ‘[Šodubr-ś] sb [mno-ś=k nornorilams]’, meaning ‘of Šodubr and of the son and of the *nornorila-* (gen. pl.)’.²³ Setting aside that the meaning of the assumed *nornorila-* remains unclear (Adiego speculated about a kinship term) and there is no evidence for a Carian gen. pl. *-ms*.²⁴, the identification of Šodubr is undoubtedly correct and generally accepted.²⁵ From this point onwards, there are two possibilities. If we follow Adiego’s own segmentation, then the =*k* of the Mengefe inscription cannot be present in C.Kr 1 since its syntax shows NP NP=*k*, while the alleged =*k* of C.Kr 1 shows NP=*k* NP. Accordingly, ⁰*k* of C.Kr 1 is either a different clitic or an independent word, or belongs to the next word, i.e., it does not exist. The other possibility is the analysis of C.Kr 1 offered by Diether Schürr, which Adiego ignored: Šodubrś sbmnoś knornorilams’, literally ‘of Šodubr, of the stableman, *knornorilams*’.²⁶ Although one could suggest that in this case =*k* could syntactically regularly be segmented, leading to a meaning ‘of Šodubr and of the stableman’, this can be excluded since Šodubrś sbmnoś is a single nominal phrase (‘of the stableman of Šodubr’) as demonstrated by Schürr.²⁷

In other words, there is no evidence for separating =*k* in this word. The situation would be different if *ksbo* were assuredly segmented, but this is not the case as the next section shows.

4. *ksbo* ‘grandson’

Adiego claimed that *ksbo* ‘had been attested in Carian as a personal name: E.Me 1 *ksbo*, in Greek sources Χασβως’, and ‘it is commonly accepted’ that it comes from a Carian word meaning ‘grandson’.²⁸ While the description of *ksbo* is correct (except for the Greek connection, which is formally irregular²⁹), it must be emphasised that *ksbo* is *not* attested in Carian. First, the form is *ksbok* and we already saw that there is no evidence for segmenting *ksbo*. Second, the attested form is *ksbo*, not *ksbo*:³⁰ *ksbo* has *k-*, while *ksbok* has *ḱ-*, and these are two different sounds both etymologically³¹ and synchronically: these are different letters that are not interchangeable, and thus, the default interpretation is that they are also phonetically different (even if the precise phonetic value of *ḱ* is unknown). Adiego added (but only in a footnote³²) that ‘for the alternance between *k* and *ḱ*’, one should compare *ktmno* (E.Th 25) / *ktmn* (‘E.Th 32’, *recte* E.Th 37) against *ḱtmño* (C.Si 2). However, if the Theban forms exist at all (as is well-known, they have not been published until now in a scholarly way), this is not an alternance since this is the only case, which is, moreover, restricted to Egypt and within Egypt to a single findspot; therefore, we are dealing at best with a local

2 (*an siḍi artmi paús parḡaq* ‘here/underneath lie Artmi, (son) of Pau, and Parnḡa’ with Kloekhorst 2008b, 139-141) clearly argues for its existence.

²³ Kızıl – Adiego 2024, 53-55.

²⁴ In fact, Simon 2024 argues that it is *-(u)n*.

²⁵ See, e.g., Schürr 2013, esp. 25 with refs.

²⁶ Schürr 2013.

²⁷ Schürr 2013, 26.

²⁸ Kızıl – Adiego 2024, 53.

²⁹ See Simon 2023a with refs.

³⁰ Note that the reading *ksbok* (‘if one assumes an alternative reading of the controversial initial letter’, Kızıl – Adiego 2024, 53) is epigraphically impossible (pointed out by Adiego himself, Kızıl – Adiego 2024, 50).

³¹ *k-* goes back to Proto-Anatolian **k*, **g*, and the initial laryngeal; *ḱ-* to **k^w*-, cf. already Adiego 2007, 259-260.

³² Kızıl – Adiego 2024, 53 n. 5.

sound change in Egypt³³ that cannot be projected to Caria without further ado. Furthermore, if this change exists at all, it is probably to be explained by the simplification of the cluster $\hat{k}t$ -, which cannot be the case of $ksbo$, since it continues $*h_2$ -.³⁴ That said, ks - and $\hat{k}s$ - would probably result in the same cluster phonetically. This means that $\hat{k}sbo$ would be a hypercorrect spelling. While there is nothing *a priori* impossible about a hypercorrect spelling, the explanation of mainland Carian $\hat{k}sbok$ as a hypercorrect spelling of $ksbo$ caused by a possible sound change restricted to Egyptian Carian and combined with an unattested clitic is certainly a weak hypothesis.³⁵

Ideally, a new hypothesis for the meaning of $\hat{k}sbok$ would be put forward at this juncture, but the lack of any parallel in Carian prevents any solution at the moment.

5. $=\hat{k}$ ‘relative pronoun’

The problem with identifying $=\hat{k}$ with the relative pronoun $\hat{k}i$ is that $\hat{k}i$ is very well attested (more than 50 times) and is never written without the vowel ($\hat{k}j$ in E.Me 36 is equivalent to $\hat{k}i$ ³⁶). Therefore, Adiego called $=\hat{k}$ an ‘apocopated version’ and explained the difference in that the full form with the vowel always follows a consonant, while the ‘apocopated version’ follows a vowel.³⁷ While, descriptively speaking, this distribution is correct, there is no other example for it,³⁸ and thus, it can be accepted only if the interpretation of $=\hat{k}$ is syntactically fitting. However, this is not the case, since we could see that the alleged antecedents, ‘grandfather’ and ‘grandson’, do not exist. Therefore, another interpretation is necessary in which it makes sense to repeat the personal names already mentioned in the preceding part of the inscription.

There are two circumstances that can help to identify this element, a phonological one and a syntactical one. First, the sound $[\hat{k}]$ (whichever sound it is synchronically) clearly goes back to Proto-Anatolian $*k^w$ (as per above). Second, it appears doubled in two subsequent nominal phrases (in this case, two personal names), either extrametrical or introducing a new clause, considering that they represent the end of the inscription and repeat two personal names already mentioned in the inscription. A new clause can be excluded since lacking any overt verb, the verb could have only

³³ See already Simon 2021b, not quoted by Adiego.

³⁴ See most recently Sasseville 2023.

³⁵ An anonymous reviewer reminded me of two other possibilities: a spelling mistake or a sporadic change (i.e. $k > \hat{k}$). Although neither can be ruled out *a priori*, a spelling mistake is both palaeographically and phonetically implausible (see above), and both ideas are methodologically problematic, since it is dubious to solve the problems of interpreting an inscription by introducing unprovable and arbitrary emendations. Moreover, neither of them solves the overall problem, since $ksbok$ remains inscrutable.

³⁶ Simon 2022 with refs. and attestations.

³⁷ Kızıl – Adiego 2024, 56. This also implies that $\hat{k}i$ was clitic, which is in accordance with the fact that whenever word dividers are applied, $\hat{k}i$ appears in a common unit with another word. There is a single exception, E.Me 32, where even $\hat{k}i$ is separated by word-dividers (Simon 2023b, 58, 68).

³⁸ Adiego referred to the personal name $yrik$ based on his etymology (from the Luwic adjective $*ura/i$ - ‘great’ with $=\hat{k}$, Adiego forthcoming). However, independently from this etymology’s validity, $yrik$ is not a good parallel, because even if Adiego’s etymology is correct, it represents a lexicalised case (where shortening and suffixing is normal), while the inscription presents a productive, morphosyntactic usage. The same applies to his additional consideration of whether the personal name $yiskbiks$ (E.Me 46) should indeed be read as it is (interpreting it as $yis=\hat{k} biks$ ‘ yis who (is) luminous’) and not corrected as $yis\{\hat{k}\}biks$, as is usually done based on $yiskbiks$ (C.xx 2). It is further weakened by the problem, admitted by Adiego as well, that in this case, the alleged vowelless $=\hat{k}$ is postconsonantal, i.e. irregular according to his own rule, which he explained with a ‘strong univerbation’.

been ‘to be’, leading to a clause (‘who is ...’), which turned out to be ill-fitting above. Therefore, we are rather dealing with a correlative pair of conjunctions or disjunctions (instead of a single one used twice). Clitic (postnominal) correlative conjunctions and disjunctions are well-known in Indo-European languages and the Anatolian branch is no exception. While $\dots=\hat{k} \dots=\hat{k}$ is not attested yet in Carian inscriptions (which is no surprise considering their extent and genres), the related Anatolian languages provide two formally and semantically fitting parallels: Lycian B $\dots=ke \dots=ke$ ‘both ... and ...’³⁹ and Hittite $\dots=(k)ku \dots=(k)ku$ ‘whether ... or ...’.⁴⁰ Both the Lycian B and the Hittite form clearly go back to $*=k^we$ ⁴¹, which would regularly lead to Carian $=\hat{k}$ (as per above).⁴² Also the semantics of both parallels fit the context as referring back to the actors of the preceding part of the inscription, but since the nature of their activity cannot be identified yet, it is impossible to tell, which meaning is present here. Considering, however, that Lycian B as a Luwic language stands definitively closer to Carian than Hittite does,⁴³ the meaning ‘both ... and ...’ is slightly more probable.

6. δ ‘for, to’?

Adiego did not address the word δ . If the restoration is correct (based on the photo, it is certainly plausible), there are two possibilities: First, δ ‘during’⁴⁴, but this can be excluded since, on the one hand, it is a prefix followed by the office and preceded by the personal name (according to Adiego), which is not the case here, and, on the other, it most probably does not exist.⁴⁵ The second possibility is the postposition $=\delta$ ‘for, to’, attested in C.Ia 3, according to M. Loiacono’s proposal.⁴⁶ Assuming that this is correct, it still does not provide a perfectly fitting case since the alleged postposition is a clitic (clearly marked by the word boundaries of C.Ia 3), while the present one is not. However, as we saw above in the case of E.Me 32, sometimes even clitics can be separated by word dividers. Therefore, we may be dealing here with the postposition $=\delta$ ‘for, to’.

7. Conclusions

The interpretation of the new Carian inscription from Mengefe provided by Adiego is built on a series of unwarranted assumptions; thus, it cannot be demonstrated and is probably mistaken. Based on the discussion above (see esp. Sections 2, 5, and 6), a less comprehensive but formally more fitting interpretation reads as follows: ‘... Mane(s) this[?] gi[ft][?] (acc.) (or: the pithos[?] as a gi[ft][?] (acc.)) [...] for/to[?] [...] Artemisi(os) the *mi* δ (of *Mi* δ [?] / of *Myndos*[?]) ... , both Artemisi(os) and Mane(s) (or: whether Artemisi(os) or Mane(s))’.

³⁹ Sasseville 2020a.

⁴⁰ Hoffner – Melchert 2008, 405. Puhvel 1997, 203 (followed by Kloekhorst 2008a, 483) claimed that it means ‘both ... and ...’ as well, but did not provide any example. ‘both ... and ...’ is expressed in Hittite by $\dots=a/ya$ (Hoffner – Melchert 2008, 400-401).

⁴¹ E.g., Sasseville 2020b and Kloekhorst 2008a, 483-484, resp.

⁴² The only question is whether the loss of the vowel is to be explained by the suffixation process or as a part of the general loss of Carian vowels. The rules of the latter still elude us, but there is some evidence that it affected the unaccented vowels (Simon 2023c, esp. 248-251), and thus, the two scenarios would be in fact the same.

⁴³ Not to mention that Lycian B and Carian show a remarkable shared and exclusive innovation among the particles, i.e., *sebe* / *sb* ‘and’, cf., e.g., Adiego 2007, 411 with refs.

⁴⁴ See most recently Adiego 2020, 136-138.

⁴⁵ Simon 2021c with detailed discussion and references; see already Melchert 2010, 183 n. 27, ignored by Adiego 2020, 136-138.

⁴⁶ Loiacono 2019, 122-133.

Bibliography

- Adiego, I. J. 2007. *The Carian Language*. Handbuch der Orientalistik I/86. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Adiego, I.-X. 2019a. “Archaic’ Carian.” In: O. Henry – K. Konuk (edd.), *Karia Arkhaia. La Carie, des origines à la période pré-hekatomnide. 4èmes Rencontres d’archéologie de l’IFÉA. Istanbul, 14-16 novembre 2013*. Istanbul: Institut Français d’Études Anatoliennes Georges Dumézil/CNRS USR 3131, 23-41.
- Adiego, I.-X. 2019b. “A Kingdom for a Carian Letter.” In: I.-X. Adiego – J. V. García Trabazo – M. Vernet *et al.* (edd.), *Luwic dialects and Anatolian: Inheritance and diffusion*. Barcino Monographica Orientalia 12. Series Anatolica et Indogermanica 1. Barcelona: Edicions de la Universitat de Barcelona, 11-50.
- Adiego, I.-X. 2020. “The Beginning of the Carian Inscription of Euromos C.Eu 2. A New Reading and Interpretation.” *Kadmos* 59: 129-143.
- Adiego, I.-X. forthcoming. “The God Formerly Known as Sinuri.” In: M. P. de Hoz – H. Arroyo Quirce (edd.), *Gods of Anatolia*. Barcino Monographica Orientalia. Series Anatolica et Indogermanica. Barcelona: Edicions de la Universitat de Barcelona.
- Christiansen, B. 2020. “Grave Matters. Legal Provisions for a Proper Final Rest in Classical Lycia.” In: M. Zimmermann (ed.), *Das Xanthostal in archaisch-klassischer Zeit. Eine archäologisch-historische Bestandsaufnahme*. Die hellenistische Polis als Lebensform 7. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 166-260.
- eDiAna = Hackstein, O. – Miller, J. L. – Rieken, E. (edd.) 2016–. *Digital Philological-Etymological Dictionary of the Minor Ancient Anatolian Corpus Languages*. München/Marburg. <https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de>
- Hajnal, I. 1995. *Der lykische Vokalismus. Methode und Erkenntnisse der vergleichenden anatolischen Sprachwissenschaft, angewandt auf das Vokalsystem einer Kleincorpusssprache*. Graz: Leykam.
- Hoffner, H. A. – Melchert, H. C. 2008. *A Grammar of the Hittite Language 1. Reference Grammar*. Languages of the Ancient Near East 1. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Kızıl, A. – Adiego, I.-X. 2024. “A Pithos with Carian Inscription from Mengefe Settlement, North of the Ancient City of Keramos, Caria.” *Kadmos* 63: 39-58.
- Kloekhorst, A. 2008a. *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 5. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Kloekhorst, A. 2008b. “Studies in Lycian and Carian Phonology and Morphology.” *Kadmos* 47: 117-146.
- Loiacono, M. 2019. *L’iscrizione caria C.Ia 3 e il culto di Zeus Megistos a Iasos. Per la storia religiosa di una comunità cario-greca nel suo contesto regionale*. PhD diss. Università degli Studi di Perugia.
- Melchert, H. C. 2010. “Further Thoughts on Carian Nominal Inflection.” In: R. van Bremen – J.-M. Carbon (edd.), *Hellenistic Karia. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Hellenistic Karia – Oxford, 29 June - 2 July 2006*. Bordeaux: De Boccard, 177-186.
- Melchert, H. C. forthcoming. “Carian *trqude*, *młane*, *šanne* and Implications.” In: M. P. de Hoz – H. Arroyo Quirce (edd.), *Gods of Anatolia*. Barcino Monographica Orientalia. Series Anatolica et Indogermanica. Barcelona: Edicions de la Universitat de Barcelona.
- Puhvel, J. 1997. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary 4. Words beginning with K*. Trends in Linguistics. Documentation 14. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Sasseville, D. 2018. “New Evidence for the PIE Common Gender Suffix *-eh₂* in Anatolian: Luwian *-ašša-* (c.) and Lycian B *-asa-* (c.)” In: E. Rieken (ed.), *100 Jahre Entzifferung des Hethitischen. Morphosyntaktische Kategorien in Sprachgeschichte und Forschung. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 21. bis 23. September 2015 in Marburg*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 303-318.
- Sasseville, D. 2020a. “Lycian B =*ke* ‘and’.”
In: eDiAna. <https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=986>
- Sasseville, D. 2020b. “Proto-Anatolian **=k^he* ‘and’.”
In: eDiAna. <https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=986>

- Sasseville, D. 2021. "Lycian A *miñte*/i- 'mindis (institution)'." In: *eDiAna*. <https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=1626>
- Sasseville, D. 2023. "Proto-Anatolian **h₂éns-u-* 'progeny, grand-child'." In: *eDiAna*. <https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=3434>
- Schürr, D. 2013. "Kaunisch-Karisches in Krya: Revision der Grabinschrift und Vergleiche." In: O. Henry (ed.), 4th *Century Karia. Defining a Karian Identity under the Hekatomnids*. *Varia Anatolica* XXVIII. Istanbul/Paris: Institut français d'études anatoliennes Georges-Dumézil/De Boccard, 21-31.
- Schürr, D. 2022. "Drei karische Verben." *Kadmos* 61: 145-153.
- Simon, Zs. 2020a. "Carian =q 'and (connective particle)'." In: *eDiAna*. <https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=986>
- Simon, Zs. 2020b. "The Carian verb (i)m δ a." *Res Antiquae* 17: 399-412.
- Simon, Zs. 2021a. "Carian **quq* 'grandfather'." In: *eDiAna*. <https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=1500>
- Simon, Zs. 2021b. "Carian **kt* > **kt* ' (unknown)'." In: *eDiAna*. <https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=2072>
- Simon, Zs. 2021c. "Carian *s δ rual* ' (a type of public magistrate, "demiurge"'." In: *eDiAna*. <https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=2137>
- Simon, Zs. 2021d. "Die karische Endung - τ ." *Indogermanische Forschungen* 126: 53-64.
- Simon, Zs. 2021e. "Who is a *mdayn* / *mdayn*? On the Carians in Egypt." *Egitto e Vicino Oriente* 44: 175-189.
- Simon, Zs. 2022. "Carian *k $\acute{i}$* '1. relative particle; 2. optional particle of adjunction'." In: *eDiAna*. <https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=2889>
- Simon, Zs. 2023a. "Carian **ksbo* 'grandchild (?)'." In: *eDiAna*. <https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=3434>
- Simon, Zs. 2023b. "Die karischen Worttrennungszeichen." In: Th. Roth – E. Dupraz – V. Belfiore (edd.), *Schriftkonventionen in pragmatischer Perspektive. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft (Brüssel, 13.-14. September 2018)*. *Lettres Orientales et Classiques* 22. Leuven/Paris/Bristol: Peeters, 46-75.
- Simon, Zs. 2023c. "Egyptian in Carian Transmission: Towards a Better Understanding of Carian Vocalism." In: J. V. García Trabazo – I.-X. Adiego – M. Vernet *et al.* (edd.), *New Approaches on Anatolian Linguistics*. *Barcino Monographica Orientalia* 22. *Series Anatolica et Indogermanica* 4. Barcelona: Edicions de la Universitat de Barcelona, 241-252.
- Simon, Zs. 2024. "*M δ o τ ₂un*: A Possible Example of the Carian Genitive Plural." *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 76/2: 91-100.
- Zgusta, L. 1984. *Kleinasiatische Ortsnamen*. Beiträge zur Namenforschung Beiheft 21. Heidelberg: Winter.

Mengefe'de Bulunan Karca Yazıt Üzerine

Özet

Bu makalede, (Karia'nın güneyinde yer alan Keramos'un kuzeyindeki) Mengefe'de bulunmuş ve yakın zamanda yayımlanmış bir Karca yazıtın yeni analizi sunulmaktadır. Yazıt pişmiş topraktan bir pitosun ağız kısmının üzerine çepeçevre kazınmıştır. Makalede yazıtın edisyonunun yorumu eleştirel bir şekilde tartışılmakta, önemli noktalarda ('dede', 'torun' ve 've' kelimelerinin yanı sıra bir ilgi cümlesinin tanımlanmasında) hatalar olduğu gösterilmekte ve yazıtın ihmal edilen yönleri de (olası bir edat ve kelime bölücüler) ele alınarak (bir [ek] sıfatı ve klitik bir bağlaç veya bağlaçsızlık da dahil olmak üzere) daha uygun bir çeviri sunulmaktadır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Karca; Karia epigrafisi; Karca sözlük bilimi; Karia söz dizimi; Mengefe.