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Our monograph has a long-standing interest in the "minor" Indo-European languages of Anatolia, to whose understanding he has made so many contributions. Professor Neumann has always exemplified, both in his own work and in his generous reception and facilitation of the work of others, the collaborative and incremental nature of our discipline. In this spirit, and in gratitude for the many personal kindnesses he has shown to me, I offer him what I hope is one more small step in elucidating one of the more difficult puzzles that Carian presents us.

The Carian alphabet has at least three letters that appear to represent sibilants, and probably a fourth.1 Despite the efforts of a number of scholars (e.g. Schütz 1991-93, 171 f., Atzge 1993b, and Hajnal 1998), there is still no consensus on the approximate phonetic value of these sounds nor on their prehistoric sources. In sorting out this tangle of conflicting claims, I will try to adhere to two basic principles. First, I give priority to syncronic evidence, in the form of alternations between sounds (or lack thereof) and equivalences in other writing systems (notably Egyptian and Greek). I then try to reconcile presumed prehistoric developments based on comparison with related languages with this evidence (not vice-versa). Second, I apply "Ockham's razor" and seek the simplest account consistent with the data.

For letter number 15 (outside Kaznou), the synchronic evidence points clearly to a voiceless palatal (or at least palatalized) sibilant. Ray 1981, 153 cites the equivalence in MY L of the Carian name $arkbion$ (now read $arkbion$) with Egyptian $šmḥbrn$ (see for the essentials already Kowalski 1975, 90). As per Atzge 1993a, 152 ff, this value is confirmed by additional name equations such as arll

1 With the confirmation of the new Carian-Greek Bilingual, from Kaznou, I now take for granted the essential validity of the Adiego-Ray-Stichlere interpretation of the Carian alphabet (see most recently Adiego 1993a). The system naturally remains open to revision of details. I use what is now the conventional numbering of the Carian letters and of the Carian texts, for which see Schütz 1992 or Adiego 1993a. Based on the equation of the name ramus with Egyptian 𐎍 weaponry (Adiego 1993a, 146ff with reference), it seems likely that letter 40 (now transliterated $s$) is some kind of affixative, $[s]$ or $[x]$. The letter is rare in Carian inscriptions, but occurs notably as an ending in Di 7 from the 2nd millennium, and in other 17th. The suggestion of Hajnal 1993, 15, note 9 that the ending represents a genitive in *$a$ (cf. already Adiego 1993a, 214) is possible, but while non-plural must also be considered, I will have no more to say about this sound here.
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Letter 17 has long been assigned a value σ based on the shape of the sign (= Greek "san"). The rendering of the Carian name πρισκδε- by Nebra in M 7 brought signification (see Ray 1981, 158 and for the emendation of the first letter Schürer 1992, 136, as did the consistent rendering of Egyptian ḫnwk as πρισκδε-. Of special significance is the use of this letter in the new bilingual to render Greek σ in personal names: ḫnwk- for Λουσακος, ḫnwk- for Λουσακός. No note also the equivalences ḫnwk//Ἀγαθύς, ḫnwk//Ἀγαθος (Neumann apud Adiego 1993a, 236) and ḫnwk//Πάδοσσος etc. (Adiego 1994b, 42 f. and 46; 1995, 25 ff; Schürer 1996b, 151 ff). All evidence thus points to a synchronic value of a voiceless dental/alveolar sibilant. It is also worth noting that there are no assured examples of alternation between s and either f or s.

This value also is consistent with the likely prehistoric sources of Carian s. As per Adiego 1993a, 169 (following already Georgiev), we can isolate a Carian demonstrative stem ταγιν- 'this' cognate with Luvian as- < *ταγινα. See further Melchert 1993a, 79 f.; and Hajnal 1998, 86. This comparison suggests that Carian, like Luvian, developed the affixed [s] (or similar) further to a simple dental sibilant [s]. Support for this assumption comes from the equation of Carian sb 'and' with Milyan sb (Neumann 1993, 296), a reinforced form of Carian s 'and', which in turn could plausibly have derived from *ke, comparing Venetic kee. Other sources for s are controversial. What has been lacking is an incontrovertible example of Carian s reflecting prehistoric simple s.

Schürer has now provided this desideratum. Already in Schürer 1992, 153 f. he proposes that the ending -sarks depicts dative singular in Carian. In Schürer 1992c, 66 he explicitly interprets MY Larkibon: Τάκις μηανά: as 'Larkibon dem Stück gab'dem'. Apud Adiego 1993a, 19, Schürer further argues that the Carian portion of 4 s, which he now reads as ἀρμάνας ἰπ ταγίνα, means 'to š and T' and forms a 'complementary' bilingual with the formulaic Egyptian text 'lists, give life'. Adiego himself doubts that the two texts are integrated in this fashion, but admits the possibility that

Hajnal, since neither Egyptian nor Greek has a ση [s] or [σ], we obviously cannot prove that writing did not take place, but I find this a plausible transcription in the absence of positive evidence.

It is the insertion of the equivalence that is crucial. Since Carian has only one sibilant fricative, its use of σ/η to render Carian σ and ι is predictable. It is quite noteworthy that Carian σ is not, or was, closest to represent Greek πρισκδε-.

The occurrence of a specific Greek ι/ιη is related to the consonantal element αι-η-αι-η. See the objections raised by Hajnal 1993, 12, note 9.
the giver as a priest of Apollo, the recipient would hardly need to be named explicitly. The context of ἵππος is far too obscure to assure any particular morphosyntactic analysis (the inscription is incomplete at beginning and end). In sum, I see nothing that stands in the way of Schiirr’s synchronic dative singular ending -s.12

Confirmation that Carian s continues prehistoric simple *s, combined with the synchronic evidence for [r], supports the idea cited above that Carian, like Lydian, also simplified prehistoric *s < *r to simple *r. This lends credence to the claim of Hajnal 1989, 86 ff. that Carian s also reflects *n- and *s-.13

There can be no doubt that letter 25 (now conventionally I) represents a further voiceless sibilant: note the equivalence of λάσπος- and λασπολός (Ray 1981, 161, following Meier-Brügger). The alternation of I and I in the Carian rendering of Egyptian Pirmu (usually pirmu – but at least once pirmu-) suggests a second sibilant with a palatalized quality. Adiego 1995b offers as further support the observed alternation [i:i] (a word referring to the tomb), and Schiirr 1998, 146 has added the further example of [k]:[kλαδό]: [kladiro]. The first word has no etymology, and Schiirr’s suggestion for the second is merely one possibility, but the importance of a following yod that could have conditioned palatalization remains. Finally, Adiego 1995b and 1996b, 71 also notes that on occasion Carian I is rendered by Greek "αμυπ."14

12 Much more speculatively, I now we should consider the possibility that Carian, like Lydian, likewise turned genuine *s- into a dative locative. By the now reading of Frei-Marck 1969, 2, the last word of the Bilgilioglu reads khdora. Contrary Adiego 1996a, 12, the preservation of the first I vowel I is attested in other [b] and the lack of any case ending [i] (if [i] it takes as part of the suffix) suggest decisively that we are dealing with the name of the city. Since a plural form for the city name would be perfectly in order (cf. such as Hajnal 1997, 149, Lydian [ka]: '[ka]:, which probably is plural form) and I find it plausible that this: may be simply 'Kasdai'. Only further investigation will decide whether any other examples of final -s- in Carian lend themselves to such an interpretation.15

13 Whether the former became s directly with the loss of *n- or via *n- with epenthesis cannot be determined. Hajnal 1998, 107 correctly rejects Schiirr’s direct comparison (1991-93, 171 f.) of Carian (e.g., with Lydian ones which do not resemble Carian Internal[isation] of the open country), Schiirr rejects derivation of the place-name 'Imaia from *p- open country'. I am not persuaded, but if he is right, this only strengthens the argument against his equation of Carian ethnos and the Lydian-Lycian word meaning 'of the open country'. In addition to Hajnal’s declaration of *n- from *(e-) seen in 'Imaia close form (p-), one should also consider connection with Lydian *-pl, which likewise forms ethnis and reflects another case of epenthesis [n], in this case from *p- (see Usener 1965). If the Aramaic KROSY of the Lihken Tigraymen represented Carian Caris (Adiego 1995, 18 ff.), it would complete the picture. I am far from persuaded, however, that the Aramaic of a Lycian inscription reflects Carian. Compare now Schiirr 1998, 152, note 4, who considers Lydian a possible source instead. I believe we must give more weight to this case to the direct Egyptian and Greek renderings of assumed Carian names.16

14 For the notion of inscriptions see Stark 1980, 54 ff. For its possible appearance in Carian see Schiirr 1996b, 96.

15 The quality of the aytopalatal vowel will thus be due to the following nasal, which in pre-Carian could concurrently even have still been *m- (cf. Melchert 1994, 185).17
However, if what stood in the Bilingual were patromyconics ending in -en (NB with -en), these could continue directly *-asom wanting -s-mutation, just like Lycian patromyconics in -a:s (e derivation continue to insist upon the reasons given in Melchert 1994, 324 f.). The quality of the final nasal, and hence the preceding anaptyctic vowel, in -en would then be analogical to that in -en < *-asom. In any case, I do not see -esn as a serious obstacle to the otherwise attractive analysis of -en as a second palatal sibilant beside *-a. A three-way contrast of /a:s/ /a:s/ and /a:s/ (or similar) would be typologically unremarkable. Distributing the values /a:s/ and /a:s/ between the letters *-a and *-a (cf. Adiego 1998a, 9) is probably beyond our capability.8

References

ADEGEO, Ignacio-Javier. 1990a. Storia Caria, Barcelona: PPU.


1 I utterly fail to understand the reasoning of Adiego 1995a, 278 or that of Haaland, 1995, 11 according to which the development of *-asom wanting -s-mutation, just like Lycian patromyconics in -a:s (e derivation continue to insist upon the reasons given in Melchert 1994, 324 f.). The quality of the final nasal, and hence the preceding anaptyctic vowel, in -en would then be analogical to that in -en < *-asom. In any case, I do not see -esn as a serious obstacle to the otherwise attractive analysis of -en as a second palatal sibilant beside *-a. A three-way contrast of /a:s/ /a:s/ and /a:s/ (or similar) would be typologically unremarkable. Distributing the values /a:s/ and /a:s/ between the letters *-a and *-a (cf. Adiego 1998a, 9) is probably beyond our capability.8
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- 1998. Carian ma'di (we have established). Kadmos 37, 33-41.


- 1996d. Karisch 'mošer' and 'senei'. Sprache 38/1, 93-98.
