SOME REMARKS ON NEW READINGS IN CARIAI

I.-J. Adiego (1990a, 1992) has recently proposed in this journal several important modifications to the system of transliterating Carian established by J. D. Ray: in particular sign 22 = n, sign 14 = r, and sign 3 = d. See now Schäfer (1992) for several additional new values.1 I hope to show that there are further crucial examples confirming the new values suggested by Adiego and the basic overall validity of Ray’s system.

1. 28-10-14 = w-b-t

This word occurs in the ‘New York’ text, the first of two inscriptions published by Gusmani (1978). This text, inscribed on the inner rim of a small bronze bowl, now reads as follows in the Ray-Adiego-Schäfer system: s-e-p-w [probem] y[oblue] s-o[n] s-o[r] k|e-m-e-p|id. We would expect an inscription on such an object to consist of a dedicatory formula: ‘X has dedicated/given me this vessel to Y.’ The first two words may easily represent the name and patronymic of the donor. For the reading of the first as s-e-p-w, which also appears in text M 36, see Schäfer (1992: 141): likewise Adiego (pers. comm.), who for M 36 rightly refers to the photograph and drawing in Masson (1978), plates XXI and XXXVII.

1 I am indebted to I.-J. Adiego, W. Blümel, and G. Neumann for several useful suggestions and criticisms, some of which are explicitly acknowledged below. I alone, of course, remain responsible for the views expressed here. The rapidity of current developments in Carian studies has created a situation in which several scholars are apt to arrive independently at similar analyses. Where such a convergence of views is welcome, it does make it difficult to give proper credit for particular ideas. I have tried to take into account all contributions known to me, and ask indulgence for any unintentional omissions.

2 Use the now standard numbering system for Carian signs as in Masson (1978), Ray (1990a) and Adiego (1992). For the sake of conciseness, I have adopted Adiego’s transliteration system in its entirety and indeed in its very latest form (for which see Schäfer 1992: 153, Abb. 6 column A). For sign 11 as 8 see Adiego and Schäfer (1992: 146). This usage does not mean that I necessarily accept all of Adiego’s assigned values. For the signs used in referring to Carian texts see Ray (1990a: 54) and Adiego (1992: 257).
The patronymic, now to be read, with Adiego and Schürer, as φιλοκλή; may be compared directly with Korēklēma (Zgusta 1964: 761) and Korēklēma, a similar technique.

The expectation of a kline does not follow from the attestation of the Anatolian possessive adjective suffix seen in termoi and Milyan -ōrēs, etc., see Ray (1980: 161 and 1990: 231). The second element of the name itself, -ē, -ōrē, may also be attested with the participial suffix seen in Luvian -anām-w, and Lycian -ēmwr, as per Ray (1990: 71). Adiego (pers. comm.) applies comparative features, not directly with the Milyan particek gēbrei'mę (TL 44c. 35.64).

The crucial word, however, in the following s-w-b is follow Adiego in text: 23 as we, it is clear from his own examples that the sound heard may function as a syllabic peak, i.e. as /v/ or /v/ = Adēqēs (Adiego 1990a: 134 and 1992: 269).-w-b-w-r is Zawde' že (Adiego 1992: 31). In our current state of knowledge, it seems unsound to attempt to assign a fixed glide value /w/ to any Carian sign. All signs for /w/ and /w/ can probably also stand for the respective non-syllabic forms.

Carian s-w-b is a perfect match for the Hittite preterite third singular anē, which is perfectly "has dedicated," as shown by Laroche (1967: 5r6), based on N31,1; [EBR] hinači (line 13) or nrnntā (line 8) Adēnihas is dedicated as an offering to Artemis. Indeed, we have one example of the verb written on the rim of a marble basin, i.e. in a dedicatory formula on a vessel (N31,3m; see Neumann 1979: 35 and Bouquet 1992: 195). The formal match between Lycian anē and Carian /w-b/ is exact. This verb, which probably contains the preverb "sw-", litter; to" (Hittite a-w-) was in all likelihood accented on the first syllable. The syncope of the unaccented penultimate in Carian is therefore to be expected, as is the regular apocope of the unaccented final syllable (cf. the possessive adjective suffix "...") above). The equation of /w-b/ with Lycian anē is of particular interest, since this word represents the first securely identifiable finite verb in Carian (none of the alleged examples of Ray (1990a: 69f) is remotely persuasive). Furthermore, the verb is clearly an Indo-European Anatolian word (compare also Cuneiform Luvian a-p-a-b, confirming the long-suspected affinity of Carian with the family of Hittite, Luvian and Lycian.

The finite verb /w-b/ has dedicated calls for a direct object, and thanks to Adiego’s value for sign 22 (cf. already Schürer apud Ray 1990a: 80ff) we may reasonably find this in the following s-w-b-w-r. The so-called Anatolian animate accusative singular ending *-w-omy includes in its preservation here as /w- o- my/ to syncope the preceding unaccented vowel. Compare Lycian animate accusative singular *-w-utur into *-w-utur, as brilliantly identified by Adiego (1992: 25f.) in the Athens bilingual: *-w- o- my- n- /εμα το τήρον (compare the Anatolian animate accusative singular *-w-otur into *-w-otur, as brilliantly identified by Adiego (2002): 33). The verb is particularly well attested in the Cuneiform Luvian demonstrative "this." The Carian form with initial /w/ is of interest in showing that Carian shares with Luvian and Lycian the development of PIE voiceless palatal stop *b> to a dental affricate /w/ (Luvian a-b> and eventual fricative (Lycian and Carian): it is seen (Schürer 1989: 23f.)

The stem /w-b/ with an /w- o- my/ is at first glance surprising, but I would compare Carian bent. nom. accus. singular *w- o- my/ directly with the root Hittite a(w)-i(t), attested as an adjective “look here, lo!” (cf. Otten 1973: 237). For a pronominal form in -w/ as. nom. -acc. singular compare Hittite e(m)-i (this, aforementioned), established by Federspiel (1938: 61f) and Laroche (1979c: 169f). As shown by the corresponding animate nominative and accusative forms *w- o- at and a(w)-i the ending of e(m)-i and *a(w)-i was originally an indeclinable particle. However, it is commonplace that such forms are reanalyzed as stems and become the basis for paradigms with end-inflation. Note Hittite animate, plural personal and /w-b/ at /w-b/ or Lycian animate, /w-b/

1 The doubts expressed by Schürer (1992: 13f) are unwarranted. The suffix has a geminata /w-b/ in Luvian and similar examples in Anatolian represented by Greek -.w-om. The sound is thus perfectly distinct from from -w-b-in which is in all clear cases thus far matches Luvian a-w- as a voiceless allomorph of /w/ as. Schürer himself (Schürer 1992: 136) has provided the best confirmation. With his demonstration that sign 20 is a kind of canal vessel, the word /w-b-b-w/ of D 182 (Sinnot) is shown clearly to be an animate accusative singular of a genitival adjective, where -w- may or may not be attached to Lycian a-w- (also correctly Adiego, pers. comm.). Hence, the many patronymics in -s- may likewise be interpreted as genitives of nouns or as animate nominative singulars of a genitive adjective agreeing Lyc. a-w-, which also often shows the apocope which is regular in Carian.

2 For the complete text see now Neumann (1979: 26) and Bouquet (1992: 159). Contra Neumann, the beginning sequence is not problematic: Ebina is nominative singular, /w-b- is a common form of the etiological accusative singular pronoun /w/ and the /w- is merely a hiatus filler, is often.
singular *-i'ny', secondary to *s're *[anyone] < */p*'-m*-h. I therefore suggest that in similar fashion Carian neuter *sani* (or its preform *s*an-*i* = Hitt. *sani* < */s*ani) became the basis of a new paradigm of which *s*san is the regular animative singular.

If the preceding analysis be correct, the following *or-ß* is the word for the vessel itself, in the animate accusative singular. Günter Neumann and Edwin Brown have each independently furnished me with an attractive comparison: Grik *lipp* and Lat. *oca*, which refer to large earthenware jars used for storing various materials. In this sphere of vocabulary, the discrepancy in the size and material of the respective vessels does not seem to me to be a weigthy objection.

In analyzing the last two words of the text we necessarily enter the realm of speculation. The nature of the text calls for a dedicata, and it is tempting to compare as-ß with the Lydian name for Apollo, *nasi-r* (a, or more certainly, in the name *Narsii-ofi* = Ναρσίδες and probably in Milyan *nasi* (see Laroche 1979b: 61). Indeed, we now have in 1. Mylasa 11.19 and 12.6 a Carian name *Narsepho* (Blinde 1990: 40). According to W. Blumel (pers. comm.), O. Carrafa has identified this with Lydian *Narsii-ofi*.

Without denying this obvious parallel, one may now wonder with Blumel if we should not view the *Narse* element as genuine Carian, directly attested in *ars-si*1. If the comparison be correct, the context demands a dative singular.

As shown by the Lydian text N311 cited above, such a dedicator formula can also contain a word for 'gift, offering' in apposition to the named object itself. The final word, which now reads as *p*ê-*l*ê2, is certainly reminiscent of the Anatolian stem to 'give' seen in Hieroglyphic Luvian *p*_ē*-i* and Lydian *p*-i. The final -ê may be surprising, but such a noun is possible in Anatolian. Cop (1976: 541) argues persuasively that Hittite deverbal nouns in *-a* may reflect *-ê*, with the same connective *-a* seen in Hitt. *-a*-ê < *-a*-ê. Cop compares directly Lat. *aebis*, but for the *-ê* in

1 Günter Neumann (pers. comm.) suggests as an alternative, comparing the ending of *s-san* with Luvian *aebés*, which appears to be a dually characterized noun, acc. singular: the st. nom.-acc. sg. *aeb* could then be compared with Luvian *aeb*, which is neuter at once (T. 74; 149, 13 ak dois). This suggestion is very attractive in its simplicity, but I must harbor some doubt as to whether the original final *-e* in the neuter would be preserved in Carian after a vowel.

2 Dörthel Schach, who had independently arrived at the comparison of *s-san* with *p*-ê, will soon discuss this name in more detail elsewhere.

1976: 78) notes the adverbial *s-san* in this text as *s*, but freely admits that this reading is uncertain. The reading is required by the equation of *s-san* with Kappel's *Kappel* cited above. The sign is the same in both words.

2 We may thus tentatively translate the inscription as: *Ss [sos] of Q₂, has dedicated this vessel to Apollo as a gift.* In offering this apparently cohrete translation, however, I must stress that I consider only the verb *or-ß* = Lydian *nasii* 'has dedicated', the identification of the names and the overall structure of the text to be reasonably certain. The remaining elements must be regarded as in varying degrees provisional.

The overall interpretation is suggested, however, by the *Halicarnassus* text, an inscription on a bronze bowl published by Jucker and Meier-Brügger (1978: *sm-ôô-ôô-bôô-oô-ôô, môô-ôô-ôô-ôô-ôô-ôô-ôô-ôô-ôô*). It cannot be coincidental that the words *or-ß* and *s-san* occur in all of Carian just as two bronze bowls. The structure of this text is entirely parallel to that treated above. The verb 'has dedicated/given' is omitted, as not infrequently in this type of text (cf. Luvian text N312 as, per Neumann 1979: 291. and Bouquet 1992: 190f.).

However, the name of the giver, *sm-ôô-ôô-bôô-oô*, clearly belongs to the group in *da/bur* established by Alcoë (1992: 30), following already Ray (1990a: 60). Blumel (1990: 181) makes an attractive comparison with the name *Ophka=* in 1. Mylasa 12.6. The omission of the pre-consonantal /l/ in the Carian version is not surprising. If the comparison be correct, we would have another example of Luvian *s* (cf. PII palatal *S*) appearing in Carian as *s* (as is possible in Anatolian. Cop (1976: 541) argues persuasively that Hittite deverbal nouns in *-a* may reflect *-ê*, with the same connective *-a* seen in Hitt. *-a*-ê < *-a*-ê. Cop compares directly Lat. *aebis*, but for the *-ê* in

the last three words again refer to the bowl itself, with the same animative accusative ending *-ê*. The placement of the demonstrative *s-san* after the noun presents no difficulty: cf. *s-san* = *s*san in the bilingual cited above or the frequent postpositioning of the *s*-sign in Lydian. In the present case the final position of *s-san* may be for emphasis. The word *or-ß* = 'bowl, vessel'
Here has mādāw attached to the front of it. Given the likely use of the owl for either drinking or pouring (see Jucker 1978: 108), one is tempted to compare mādāw with the Luwian word madâw -" wise" and to suppose a compound 'wise-bird cup'. However, this connection comes more than a guess. The remaining accusative

3 In purely formal terms, the Carian stem -AWZ- recalls the stem *AWZ*, attested in Milyan and Lydian kōw "wine", but also "second, other". However, *K* (has given) this second other 4 to *V* seems an odd sentiment for a dedicatory inscription.

right by addition of the suffix > *madâw* - with syncope of the post-tonic vowel and then attested /madâw/ - with syncope of the pre-tonic vowel and preservation of the accented diphthong /au/. The position of two different accented types is not ad hoc: cf. Lydian kōw "the wine" < *AWZ*, i.e. /AWZ/ must by its position be an adjective, but we can only speculate on its meaning. The parallel structure and partially shared vocabulary of this text strengthens the analysis often offered "above the New York" inscription containing ma-di.

The final word above is among the most frequently occurring in the Carian tomb inscriptions for themselves. We may now confirm this interpretation, thanks to Adiego's new value of n (see 22). Removing the problematic particle *y* and the -i of the possessive adjective suffix (as above), we are left with a stem mēdāwā. The final -OāN is the unsurprising Carian reflex of the Western Anatolian suffix -ōn seen in CLavian -ōn, i.e. Milyan -ōn/i and Lydian -ōn (see among others Laroche, 1960: 171 ff.). For its use to form rhinna, compare CLavian -OāN/Nāwanān/i: *of Nāwān* or Milyan Xhādenān/i: = Lydian Xhāden/i: - of Kaunte. The phonetically unremarkable contraction of */ÄYVA/ to -v may be compared to a similar change in Lydian (fördo: "put < *dďava/ (see Guarnani, 1964: 30 and 116). This interpretation of -ON is further supported by Adiego's new reading for the much less frequent word which appears in M10 and M25 as mēdā-on (yu) and in M3 as mēd-ō-ān. The position of the word in the texts already suggests that it is a variant of mēdā-on, and Adiego's values now confirm this. It cannot be accidental that in the less frequent variant we find a diphthong */Ai/ and deletion of the -i of the first syllable seen in /madâw/-i. We are facing two forms of the same word conditioned by different place of the accent: (1) *madâwâm/i* (with accent of the base) > *madâwâm* - with syncope and then attested /madâw/ with contraction of the unaccented diphthong /au/ to /O/; (2) *madâwâm/i* (with accent displaced to the
w-f-u] as a patronymic, but the absence of the possessive suffix -s makes this quite unlikely. It is most likely an ethnonym in -/or- (see above), but a title "herald" is also possible (see also now Schür 1992: 152).

Ray (1982: 192) offers several alternatives for the word *nkh-póo (nkh-póo) by his reading. Two of these are now eliminated by the presence of the element *r. As noted by Ray (1990a: 77), the prothetic sequence *r- appears to function as a connective "and" (see also Ray, 1990b: 130). Ray's own compari-
nion of *r- with Hurrian *sár "is notcredible. As pointed out by G. Neumann (pers. comm.), the correct comparison is rather Miljans *sáv 'and', see also Schür 1992: 133 and 153. The loss of both *wéwés in Carian in a word which is consistently prothetic is hardly surprising. We may with Neun-
mann add *r- * sáv to the small but growing list of Carian words with assured Anatolian cognates.

The presence of *n- 'and', linking p-o-o to the preceding personal name, is incompatible with taking p-o-o either as a title (which would have to be in apposition to the name) or as an imperative third person verb [Ray's first two suggestions]. The coordination 'p. and ... ' argues strongly for Ray's third possibility for p-o-o: that it is a term of relationship such as 'descendant'. Compare with him n-kh-mu in D 15, line 3. Already Masson and Yoyotte (1956: 45f) had raised the possibility that the word p-óo in the Egyptian text is not 'herald', but a personal name, that of a second dedicatee. In the second part of the Carian text this person would be designated by his rela-
tionship to p-óo.

I would not hazard any further analysis had I not recently learned of the claim of Hoffmann (1992) that p-óo is the Hitite word for 'child, son' (a reference I owe to H. Hoffner). The evidence for Hoffmann's equation of Hitite p-óo (a hapax) with DUMU 'child, son' is circumstantial, and it is clear that she has been influenced by the fact that the word is identifiable as Indo-European (compare, with het, Latin pāpu 'young' of animals, etc.). A Carian hapax added to a Hitite hapax is still very far from proof, but the resemblance of *p-o-o (now thus in Adiego's reading) to p-óo is at the very least intriguing. Without further evidence Iforego as pointless any dis-
cussion of the possible phonological or morphological relationship of the two words.

The case of Carian p-o-o and Hitite p-óo is merely a tantalizing possibil-
ity. However, I believe that the equation of Carian w-f-u with Lycian w-f-yu 'has dedicated' and the interpretation of w-f-yu as a reflex of a Western Anatolian suffix forming ethnics are reasonably secure. They thus serve to corroborate the readings of Carian signs established by Adiego, Ray and Schür on the basis of quite independent evidence.
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