

KADAMOS

Zeitschrift
für vor- und frühgriechische
Epigraphik

Begründet von Ernst Grumach

fortgeführt von William C. Brice

in Verbindung mit Ekrem Akurgal, Ankara;
William C. Brice, Manchester; Costis Davaras, Athen;
Roberto Gusmani, Udine; Vassos Karageorghis,
Nikosia; Olivier Masson, Paris; Anna Morpurgo
Davies, Oxford; Günter Neumann, Würzburg,

herausgegeben von Wolfgang Blümel, Köln

Sonderdruck

Nicht im Handel



H. CRAIG MELCHERT

SOME REMARKS ON NEW READINGS IN CARIAN*

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 = *l*, and sign 3 = *d*. See now Schürr (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-Schürr system: *š-r-q-#-q | q-t-k-t-e-m-s | w-b-t | s-n-n | o-r-k-n | n-t-r-o | p-t-d-l*. 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 *š-r-q-#-q*, which also appears in text M 36, see Schürr (1992: 141): likewise Adiego (pers. comm.), who for M 36 rightly refers to the photograph and drawing in Masson (1978), plates XXI and XXXVII.

* 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. While 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.

¹ I use the now standard numbering system for Carian signs as in Masson (1978), Ray (1990a) and Adiego (1992). For the sake of consistency, I have adopted Adiego's transliteration system in its entirety and indeed in its very latest form (for which see Schürr 1992: 151, Abb. 6 column A1). For sign 31 as *ö* see Adiego apud Schürr (1992: 140). This usage does not mean that I necessarily accept all of Adiego's assigned values. For the sigla used in referring to Carian texts see Ray (1990a: 54) and Adiego (1992: 25¹).

The patronymic, now to be read, with Adiego and Schürr, as *q-t-b-l-e-m-s*, may be compared directly with *Κυρβεληνις* (Zgusta 1964: 261) and *Κορβεληνις* in I. Mylasa 12.14 (Blümel 1990: 39); see Schürr (1992: 142). The final *-s* is the expected Carian reflex of the Anatolian possessive adjective suffix seen in Cuneiform Luvian *-ašsa/i-*, Milyan *-ase/i-*, etc.: see Ray (1981: 161 and 1990a: 60ff.).² The second element of the name itself, *-e-m-*, may also be identified with the participial suffix seen in Cluvian *-aimma/i-* and Lycian *-etime/i-*, as per Ray (1990a: 71). Adiego (pers. comm.) aptly compares *q-t-b-l-e-m-* directly with the Milyan participle *qetbeltime/i-* (TL 44c, 35.64).

The crucial word, however, is the following *w-b-t*. I follow Adiego in transliterating sign 28 as *w*, but it is clear from his own examples that the sound represented may function as a syllabic peak, i. e. as /w/: *l-w-χ-s-i* = *Λύχης* (Adiego 1990a: 134 and 1992: 26), *k-s-a-t-w-b-r* = *Ἐἰανδύβερις* (Adiego 1992: 31). In our current state of knowledge, it seems unwise to attempt to assign a fixed glide value /w/ to any Carian sign. All signs for /u/ and /i/ can probably also stand for the respective non-syllabic forms.

Carian *w-b-t* = /ubt/ is a perfect match for Lycian preterite third singular *ubete*, which is precisely 'has dedicated', as shown by Laroche (1967: 56f.), based on N311.1: [*Erb*] *birina* = (*j*) *ēne ubete xrwawata Ertēmi* 'Arbinas has dedicated it as an offering to Artemis'.³ 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 (N313m; see Neumann 1979: 35 and Bousquet 1992: 195).

The formal match between Lycian *ubete* and Carian /ubt/ is exact. This verb, which probably contains the preverb **au-* 'hither; to' (Hittite *u-* etc.) was in all likelihood accented on the first syllable. The syncope of the unaccented penultimate vowel in Carian is therefore to be expected, as is the regular apocope of the unaccented final syllable (cf. the possessive adjective

² The doubts expressed by Schürr (1992: 139) are unjustified. The suffix has a *geminate* /-ss-/ in Luvian, and likewise Carian *s* is regularly represented by Greek *-σσ-*. The sound is thus predictably distinct from Carian *j* which in all clear cases thus far matches Luvian *z*, a voiceless affricate (see below). Schürr himself (1992: 138) has provided the best confirmation. With his demonstration that sign 20 is a kind of coronal nasal, the word *p-ḥ-m-n-ḥ-n* in D 10.2 (Sinuri) is shown clearly to be animate accusative singular of a genitive adjective, where *-s-ḥ* matches exactly Milyan *-azḥ* and Lycian *-abḥ* (thus correctly Adiego, pers. comm.). Hence the many patronymics in *-s* must likewise be interpreted not as genitives of nouns but as animate nominative singulars of a genitive adjective equalling Lyc. *-ab(s)*, which also often shows the apocope which is regular in Carian.

³ For the complete text see now Neumann (1979: 28) and Bousquet (1992: 159). Contra Neumann, the beginning sequence is not problematic: *Erbbirina* is nominative singular, *-ḥne* is a common form of the enclitic accusative singular pronoun 'it', and the *-j-* is merely a hiatus-filler, as often.

suffix *-s* < **-asso/iš* above).⁴ The equation of *w-b-t* /ubt/ with Lycian *ubete* is of particular interest, since this word represents the first securely identifiable finite verb in Carian (none of the alleged examples of Ray (1990a: 69ff.) is remotely persuasive). Furthermore, the verb is clearly an (Indo-European) Anatolian word (compare also Cuneiform Luvian *upa-*), confirming the long-suspected affinity of Carian with the family of Hittite, Luvian and Lycian.

The finite verb /ubt/ 'has dedicated' calls for a direct object, and thanks to Adiego's value *n* for sign 22 (cf. already Schürr apud Ray 1990a: 80ff.) we may reasonably find this in the following *s-n-n o-r-k-n*. The inherited Anatolian animate accusative singular ending **-om* owes its preservation here as *-n* to syncope of the preceding unaccented vowel. Compare Lycian animate accusative singular *-abḥ* < **-ássom* or *-iḥ* < **-i(s)kom*.

We would expect one of these two accusatives to be the demonstrative 'this', and I suggest that *s-n-n* contains the same stem /s(a)n-/ found in neuter nom.-acc. singular *s-a-n* 'this', as brilliantly identified by Adiego (1992: 32f.) in the Athens bilingual: *s-i-a-s* : *s-a-n t-u-r* [] ΣΕΜΑ ΤΟΔΕ : ΤΥΠ[]. Adiego correctly compares /sa-/ to the Cuneiform Luvian demonstrative *za-* 'this'. The Carian form with initial /s-/ is of interest in showing that Carian shares with Luvian and Lycian the development of PIE voiceless palatal stop **k* to a dental affricate /ts/ (Luvian *z*) and eventual fricative (Lycian and Carian *s*): see Melchert (1989: 23ff.).

The stem /s(a)n-/ with an /-n-/ is at first glance surprising, but I would compare Carian nt. nom.-acc. singular *s-a-n* directly with the rare Hittite *kāni(i)*, attested as an adverb 'look here, lo!': see Otten (1973: 27ff.). For a pronominal form in *-ni* as nt. nom.-acc. singular compare Hittite *eni* 'this, the aforementioned', as established by Pedersen (1938: 61f.) and Laroche (1979a: 149f.). As shown by the corresponding animate nominative and accusative forms *aš* and *uni*, the ending of *eni* (and *kāni*) was originally an indeclinable particle. However, it is commonplace that such forms are re-analyzed as stems and become the basis for paradigms with end-inflection. Note Hittite anim. acc. plural *uniuš* and *eniuš* to *uni/eni* or Lycian anim. acc.

⁴ Günter Neumann (pers. comm.) raises the valid question of whether the non-appearance of the penultimate and ultimate vowels in Carian is linguistically real or merely (ortho)graphic. I would not wish to be dogmatic about any feature of Carian phonology at this stage, but I would point out that the attested consonant clusters are hardly more formidable than those of Lydian, which also shows massive syncope and apocope. I also must doubt that an orthographic system which writes *p-a-r-a-t-ḥ-m-* in one case would omit full "underlying" vowels in another. I do not, of course, mean to deny that some sequence of consonants in Carian may have actually been pronounced with inserted "schwa"-like vowels (likewise in Lydian!), but this is fundamentally different from saying that the writing of vowels is optional.

singular *tisn* 'any', secondary to *tise* 'any(one)' < **k^wis/n-ke*. I therefore suggest that in similar fashion Carian neuter /san/ (or its preform **sani* = Hitt. *kāni* < **kōni*) became the basis of a new paradigm of which *s-n-n* is the regular animate accusative singular.⁵

If the preceding analysis be correct, the following *o-r-k-n* 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 paradigm: Grk. ὕψη and Lat. *orca*, 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 weighty 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 dedicatee, and it is tempting to compare *n-t-r-o* with the Lycian name for Apollo: *natr(i)*-, surely attested in the name *Natrbbijēmi* = Ἀπολλόδοτος and probably in Milyan *natri* (see Laroché 1979b: 61). Indeed, we now have in I. Mylasa 11.19 and 12.6 a Carian name *Nereββίμος* (Blümel 1990: 40). According to W. Blümel (pers. comm.), O. Carruba has already identified this with Lycian *Natrbbijēmi*. Without denying this obvious parallel, one may now wonder with Blümel if we should not view the *Nerep*-element as genuine Carian, directly attested in *n-t-r-o*.⁶ If the comparison be correct, the context demands a dative singular.

As shown by the Lycian text N311 cited above, such a dedicatory formula can also contain a word for 'gift, offering' in apposition to the named object itself. The final word, which now reads as *p-f-d-l'*, is certainly reminiscent of the Anatolian stem 'to give' seen in Hieroglyphic Luvian /*piya-*/ and Lycian *pje-*. The final *-l* may seem surprising, but such a noun formation is quite possible in Anatolian. Čop (1966: 54f.) argues persuasively that Hittite deverbative nouns in *-lli-* reflect **-d'li-*, with the same connective *-#-* seen in Hitt. *-uzzi-* < **-#-ti-*. Čop compares directly Lat. *volūbilis*, but for the *-i-* in

⁵ Günter Neumann (pers. comm.) suggests as an alternative, comparing the ending of *s-n-n* with Lycian *ebēnē*, which appears to be a doubly characterized anim. acc. singular. The nt. nom.-acc. sg. *s-a-n* could then be compared with Lycian *ebē*, which is neuter at least once (TL 149, 13 *ebē hrēmā*). This suggestion is very attractive in its simplicity, but I must harbor some doubt as to whether the original final **-m* in the neuter would be preserved in Carian after a vowel.

⁶ Diether Schürr, who had independently arrived at the comparison of *n-t-r-o* with *natr(i)*-, will soon discuss this name in more detail elsewhere.

⁷ Gusmani (1978: 70) reads the sideways triangle in this text as *a*, but freely admits that this reading is uncertain. The reading *l* is required by the equation of *q-i-b-l-t-m-(š)* with *Kur-βελιμυκ/Κορβελιμυκος* cited above. The sign is the same in both words.

-lli- I would compare rather than in Hitt. *ēdri-* 'food' from a virtual adjective *(*h*)*ed-ro-* *'eaten' (type of Grk. ἄχορις 'peak' beside ἄχος 'pointed'). The Lycian denominative verb *uli-/tuli-* 'pay' (a penalty) may also be derived from a noun **tille-* *'payment' from a virtual **k^wi-d^hlo-*. The putative noun may be directly attested in Milyan *kille* 'payment': see Melchert (1993: 77 and 118). A Carian noun /pidl/ 'gift' < virtual **pyod^hlom* is therefore quite thinkable.

We may thus tentatively translate the inscription as: 'S., (son) of Q., has dedicated this vessel to "Apollo" as a gift.' In offering this apparently coherent translation, however, I must stress that I consider only the verb *w-b-t* = Lycian *ubete* '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 supported, however, by the 'Halicarnassus' text, an inscription on a bronze bowl published by Jucker and Meier-Brügger (1978): *s-m-δ-w-b-r-s* | *p-s-n-λ-o* | *m-δ-o-r-k-n* | *t-w-n* | *s-n-n*. It cannot be coincidental that the words *o-r-k-n* and *s-n-n* occur in all of Carian just on 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. Lycian text N312, as per Neumann 1979: 29f. and Bousquet 1992: 190f.).

However, the name of the giver, *s-m-δ-w-b-r-s*, clearly belongs to the group in /-dubr/ established by Adiego (1992: 30), following already Ray (1990a: 60). Blümel (1990: 38f.) makes an attractive comparison with the name *Zep-μδυβερως* in I. Mylasa 12.6. The omission of the pre-consonantal /r/ in the Carian version is not surprising. If the comparison be correct, we would have another example of Luvian *z* (< PIE palatal **k*) appearing in Carian as *s* (for the source of *Zal/rma* = Carian *Zepμe-/s-m-* see Neumann 1976: 139ff. and Melchert 1988: 241ff.). That the final /-s/ represents an animate nominative singular ending is doubtful, but possible (cf. Ray 1990a: 64). An enclitic particle attached to the first word of the sentence would also be quite in order. The next word *p-s-n-λ-o* must be the recipient or dedicatee, and it is probably not an accident that it shows the same rare ending *-o* as *n-t-r-o* in our other dedicatory text. W. Blümel (pers. comm.) plausibly interprets the name as *Πισ.βολδος*, comparing *Πισ[.]ω* in an inscription from Pladasa (see Varrinlioglu et al. 1990: 71).

The last three words again refer to the bowl itself, with the same animate accusative ending *-n*. The placement of the demonstrative *s-n-n* 'this' after the noun presents no difficulty: cf. *s-f-a-s* : *s-a-n* in the bilingual cited above or the frequent postpositioning of *ebe-* 'this' in Lycian. In the present case the final position of *s-n-n* may be for emphasis. The word *o-r-k-(n)* 'bowl, vessel'

here has *m-δ* attached to the front of it. Given the likely use of the bowl for either drinking or pouring (see Jucker 1978: 108), one is tempted to compare *m-δ* with the Luvian word *maddu-* 'wine' and to suppose a compound 'wine-bowl/cup'. However, this is no more than a guess. The remaining accusative *t-w-n* must by its position be an adjective, but we can only speculate on its meaning.⁸ The parallel structure and partially shared vocabulary of this text do strengthen the analysis offered above for the 'New York' inscription containing *w-b-t*.

2. 11-32-3-12-22-25-(21-26) = *m-ú-d-o-n-š-(χ-i)*
 11-3-1-5-22-(21-26) = *m-d-a-ú-n-(χ-i)*

The first word above is among the most frequently occurring in the Carian tomb inscriptions from Egypt. Based on its frequency and pattern of occurrence, Meriggi (1980: 35) had already suggested that the word was an ethnicon, specifically the designation of the Caromemphites for themselves.

We may now confirm this interpretation, thanks to Adiego's new value of *n* for sign 22. Removing the problematic particle *χ-i* and the *-š* of the possessive adjective suffix (see above), we are left with a stem *m-ú-d-o-n*. The final *-o-n* is the unsurprising Carian reflex of the Western Anatolian suffix **-weno/i* seen in CLuvian *-wanni(t)*, Milyan *-wīne/i-* and Lycian *-ñne/i* (see among others Laroche, 1960: 171 ff.). For its use to form ethnica, compare CLuvian URU *Nimwawanni(t)*- 'of Niniveh' or Milyan *Xbidwīne/i-* = Lycian *Xbidāñne/i-* 'of Kaunos'. The phonetically unremarkable contraction of **(V)wV-* to *-o-* may be compared to a similar change in Lydian: *(fa)-do-* 'put' < **d(ú)wV-* (see Gusmani, 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 *m-d-a-ú-n-(χ-i)* and in M3 as *m-d-a-w-n*. The position of the word in the texts already suggests that it is a variant of *m-ú-d-o-n*, and Adiego's values now confirm this. It cannot be accidental that in the less frequent variant we find a diphthong /aw-/ and deletion of the /-u-/ of the first syllable seen in /mudon-/. We are facing two forms of the same word conditioned by different placement of the accent: (1) **múdawen(V)*- (with accent of the base) > **múdawen-* with syncope and then attested /múdon-/ with contraction of the unaccented diphthong /aw/ to /o/; (2) **múdawen(V)*- (with accent displaced to the

⁸ In purely formal terms, the Carian stem *t-w-* recalls the stem **dwi-*, attested in Milyan *tbi-* and Lycian *kbi-* 'two', but also 'second, other'. However, 'X (has given) this second/other bowl to Y' seems an odd sentiment for a dedicatory inscription.

right by addition of the suffix) > **múdawen-* with syncope of the post-tonic vowel and then attested /mdawn-/ with syncope of the pre-tonic vowel and preservation of the accented diphthong /aw/. The positing of two different accentual types is not ad hoc: cf. Lycian *labðe/i-* 'of the wife' < **ladðhe/i-* with accent of the base *lada-* vs. *mahanáhe/i-* 'of the god' = /mahanáhe/i-/ where the shift of accent rightward is shown by loss of the nasalization in the second vowel versus its preservation under the accent in the base *mabána-*.⁹

Having confirmed the interpretation of *m-ú-d-o-n-* as an ethnicon, we can perhaps go a step further and identify the base word. It is well known that /-n-/ was unstable before a following stop already in the second millennium Anatolian languages Hittite and Cuneiform Luvian: see e.g. Kronasser (1966: 89 ff.). In the first millennium Lycian and Lydian /n/ is regularly lost in this position, resulting in a nasalized vowel, which may then lose its nasalization: cf. Lydian *zē-* 'into' < **éndo* (= Hitt. *anda*) or Lycian present third plural ending *-Vti/-Vti* < **-Vnti* (*hāti/hhati* 'they let go'). Equations such as Lycian *Trijēzi* = *Τριενδασις* also show that the following stop in such cases was regularly voiced.

The equation *k-š-a-t-w-b-r* = *Κανδοβεργς*, cited by Adiego (1992: 31), suggests that Carian shares this development, as he correctly points out. We may therefore interpret the base *m-ú-d-* (1 x *m-ú-t-* in M36) as /mūd-/. This permits identification with the Carian coastal city Μυυδοῦς west of Halicarnassus, for which see Zgusta (1984: 408). While such an equation can hardly be regarded as certain, I find it particularly apt that the Carian emigrants in Egypt would identify themselves as belonging at least in the first instance to a port city in Caria, a likely point of departure for those going overseas.

Whether or not one accepts the identification of *m-ú-d-* as /mūd-/ with Μυυδοῦς, I believe that the shape of the suffix in *m-ú-d-o-n-/m-d-a-ú-n-* does confirm its status as an ethnicon containing the Carian reflex of a Western Anatolian formant well-established in this function.¹⁰

3. 11-10-24-12-4-12 = *s-b-p-o-l-o*

This phrase occurs in text MY K, an inscription on the base of a bronze bull. One side reads *p-a-r-a-t-ú-m : a-r-m-o-n-χ-i* and the other *p-a-r-á-t-ú-m : s-b-p-o-l-o*. The first word in both phrases is a personal name which also appears in the matching Egyptian text (Ray 1982: 192). Ray interprets *a-r-m-o-*

⁹ As pointed out to me by H. Eichner, one may compare this loss of nasalization in an unaccented vowel to that in Lydian, for which see Eichner (1986).

¹⁰ I.-J. Adiego has kindly informed me that he had reached the same conclusion regarding both the suffix and base of *m-ú-d-o-n-* in his unpublished doctoral thesis: see Adiego (1990b: 501 f.). The independent convergence of views is heartening.

n-(*χ*-*i*) as a patronymic, but the absence of the possessive suffix -*ś* makes this quite unlikely. It is most likely an ethnicon in /-on-/ (see above), but a title 'herald' is also possible (see also now Schürr 1992: 152).

Ray (1982: 192) offers several alternatives for the word *s-b-p-o-l-o* (*s-b-p-o-d-o* by his reading). Two of these are now eliminated by the presence of the element *s-b*. As noted by Ray (1990a: 77), the proclitic sequence *s-b* appears to function as a connective 'and' (see also Ray, 1990b: 130). Ray's own comparison of *s-b* with Hittite *šwāa*- 'fill' is not credible. As pointed out to me by G. Neumann (pers. comm.), the correct comparandum is rather Milyan *šebe* 'and', see also Schürr 1992: 133 and 153. The loss of both vowels in Carian in a word which is consistently proclitic is hardly surprising. We may with Neumann add *s-b* = *šebe* to the small but growing list of Carian words with assumed Anatolian cognates.

The presence of *s-b*- 'and', linking *p-o-l-o* to the preceding personal name, is incompatible with taking *p-o-l-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-l-o*: that it is a term of relationship such as 'descendant'. Compare with him *s-b-m-n-o-ś* in D 15, line 3. Already Masson and Yoyotte (1956: 45f.) had raised the possibility that the word *puwlm* in the Egyptian text is not 'herald', but a personal name, that of a second dedicator. In the second part of the Carian text this person would be designated by his relationship to *p-a-r-a-t-ē-m*.

I would not hazard any further analysis had I not recently learned of the claim of Hoffmann (1992) that *pulla-* is the Hittite word for 'child, son' (a reference I owe to H. Hoffner). The evidence for Hoffmann's equation of Hittite *pulla-* (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 her, Latin *pullus* 'young' of animals, etc.). A Carian hapax added to a Hittite hapax is still very far from proof, but the resemblance of *p-o-l-o* (now thus in Adiego's reading) to *pulla-* is at the very least intriguing. Without further evidence I forego as pointless any discussion of the possible phonological or morphological relationship of the two words.

The case of Carian *p-o-l-o* and Hittite *pulla-* is merely a tantalizing possibility. However, I believe that the equation of Carian *w-b-t* with Lycian *ubete* 'has dedicated' and the interpretation of *-a-w-n/-o-n-* as a reflex of a Western Anatolian suffix forming ethnica are reasonably secure. They thus serve to corroborate the readings of Carian signs established by Adiego, Ray and Schürr on the basis of quite independent evidence.

References

- Adiego, Ignacio-J.
 1990a Deux notes sur l'écriture et la langue cariennes. *Kadmos* 29.133–137.
 1990b *Studia Cartica*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Universitat de Barcelona.
 1992 *Recherches cariennes: Essai d'amélioration du système de J. D. Ray*. *Kadmos* 31.25–39.
 Blümel, Wolfgang
 1990 Zwei neue Inschriften aus Mylasa aus der Zeit des Mausollos. *Epigraphica Anatolica* 16.29–43.
 Bousquet, Jean
 1992 *Les inscriptions gréco-lyciennes*. *Fouilles de Xanthos IX*, éd. Henri Metzger, 155–199. Paris: Klincksieck.
 Čop, Bojan
 1966 Zur hethitischen Schreibung und Lautung. *Linguistica* 8.43–61.
 Eichner, Heiner
 1986 *Neue Wege im Lydischen I: Vokalnassalität vor Nasalkonsonanten*. *KZ* 99.203–219.
 Gusmani, Roberto
 1964 *Lydisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Winter.
 1978 *Zwei neue Gefäßinschriften in karischer Sprache*. *Kadmos* 17.67–75.
 Hoffmann, Inge
 1992 *Das hethitische Wort für 'Sohn': Hittite and Other Anatolian and Near Eastern Studies in Honour of Sedat Alp*, ed. Heinrich Otten et al., 289–293. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
 Jucker, Hans and Michael Meier-Brügger
 1978 *Eine Bronzephiale mit karischer Inschrift*. *Museum Helveticum* 35.104–115.
 Kronasser, Heinz
 1966 *Eymologie der hethitischen Sprache*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
 Laroche, Emmanuel
 1960 *Comparaison du louvite et du lycien*. *BSL* 55.155–185.
 1967 *Comparaison du louvite et du lycien*. *BSL* 62.46–66.
 1979a *Anaphore et deixis en anatolien*. *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch*, edd. E. Neu and W. Meid, 147–152. Innsbruck: Inst. für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
 1979b *L'inscription lycienne*. *Fouilles de Xanthos VI*, éd. Henri Metzger, 49–127. Paris: Klincksieck.
 Masson, Olivier
 1978 *Carian Inscriptions from North Saqqāra and Buhen*. London: Egypt Exploration Society.
 Masson, Olivier and Jean Yoyotte
 1956 *Objets pharaoniques à inscription carienne*. Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale.

- Melchert, H. Craig
 1988 Luvian Lexical Notes. HS 101.211-243.
 1989 New Luvo-Lycian Isoglosses. HS 102.23-45.
 1993 Lycian Lexicon. 2nd Edition. Chapel Hill (self-published).
 Meriggi, Piero
 1980 Review of O. Masson, Carian Inscriptions from North Saqqâra and Buhen. BiOR 37.33-37.
 Neumann, Günter
 1976 Zu einigen hethitisch-luwischen Personennamen. KZ 90.139-143.
 1979 Neufunde lykischer Inschriften seit 1901 (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Denkschriften, phil.-hist. Klasse, Bd. 135). Wien: ÖAW.
 Otten, Heinrich
 1973. Eine althethitische Erzählung um die Stadt Zalpa (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 17). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
 Pedersen, Holger
 1938 Hittitisch und die anderen indoeuropäischen Sprachen. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.
 Ray, John D.
 1981 An Approach to the Carian Script. Kadmos 20.150-162.
 1982 The Carian Inscriptions from Egypt. JEA 68.181-198.
 1990a An Outline of Carian Grammar. Kadmos 29.54-83.
 1990b A Carian Text: the Longer Inscription from Sinuri. Kadmos 29.126-132.
 Schür, Diether
 1992 Zur Bestimmung der Lautwerte des karischen Alphabets 1971-1991. Kadmos 31.127-156.
 Varinlioglu, Ender, Alain Bresson, Patrice Brun, Pierre Debord & Raymond Descat
 1990 Une inscription de Pladasa en Carie. REA 92.59-78.
 Zgusta, Ladislav
 1964 Kleinasiatische Personennamen. Prag: Československá Akademie Věd.
 1984 Kleinasiatische Ortsnamen (Beiträge zur Namenforschung Beiheft 21). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.