JOHN D. RAY

AN APPROACH TO THE CARIAN SCRIPT

By his admirably clear publication of the inscribed stelae from North Saqqâra, Professor Olivier Masson has now placed students of Carian even more in his debt, and it is obvious that no progress will be made in this subject without constant reference to his volume[1]. The present writer assisted in the excavations at Saqqâra during the period when these Carian inscriptions were discovered, notably the very rich season of 1968–9, and this served to arouse both an interest in these remarkable stelae and a conviction that the Egyptological background would need to be handled with care if the maximum amount of information were to be obtained. For this reason I hope that it will not be thought improper if an Egyptologist, who has no knowledge of the Anatolian languages, offers a contribution to this disputed field.

The Carian language is written with some forty or forty-five signs, many of which bear a close resemblance to letters of the Greek alphabet, and some of which are parallelled in the Cypriot syllabary or in the other Anatolian alphabets. It is on these resemblances that the conventional systems of reading Carian, such as the two used by Masson himself at different periods, are founded. This is understandable, but the approach is clearly limited, as Masson himself implies, and several alternative decipherments have been produced based on the small number of 'bilingual' texts discovered from Egypt, as well as to a lesser extent the few Greek-Carian texts from Asia Minor and Athens[2]. The Egyptian 'bilinguals' clearly fall into two types. On the one hand there is the kind of text in which a Carian inscription is followed by a line or two of

---

1 O. Masson, Carian Inscriptions from North Saqqâra and Buhen, with contributions by G. T. Martin and R. V. Nicholls (= Egypt Exploration Society, Texts from Excavations, Fifth Memoir), London 1978.

2 See for example K.-Th. Zauzich, Einige karischen Inschriften aus Ägypten und Kleinasien und ihre Deutung nach der Entzifferung der karischen Schrift (Wiesbaden 1972), together with his privately circulated Brief zur karischen Frage, Berlin, March 1979; and T. W. Kowalski, Lettres cariennes: essai de déchiffrement de l'écriture carienne, Kadmos 14, 1975, 73–93.

0022-7498/81/2002-00018$2.00
Copyright by Walter de Gruyter & Co.

Egyptian hieroglyphs, in which the Carian is called by a name such as *Psmṯk-ᶜwy-Nìt* 'Psammetichus is in the hands of (the goddess) Neith' son of *W3ḥ-ìb-Rᶜ [. .]*, the latter being the throne-name of Psammetichus I and the personal name of Pharaoh Hophra or Apries (e.g. the Lausanne stele). Another may call himself *P3-dì-Nìt* 'the gift of Neith', as on the bronze statue-base Berlin 13785. Names of this sort, theophorous or basilophorous, were regularly given to foreigners residing in Egypt from the New Kingdom onwards, if not earlier; even Joseph was no exception[3]. The Carians employed such names to show their readiness to adopt the outward forms of Egyptian society, but it is far from certain that they would have used names of this sort among their own community. These texts are not therefore genuine bilinguals, but are closer to being a sort of double epitaph, one for Carian eyes, one for Egyptian. It will appear that there is a partial exception to this, inasmuch as the name Psammetichus seems to have been adopted by the Carians, but by the sixth century this name was almost international, and the Carians, who owed their loyalty to the house of Psammetichus, had every reason to take the name to heart. It had in fact become so naturalized that it never appears on its own in the Egyptian part of the bilingual inscriptions. With this apparent exception, any decipherment which depends on feeding values derived from names such as *W3ḥ-ìb-Rᶜ* or *T3-dì-Wsìr* ('the one (f.) whom Osiris has given') from the Egyptian text into the Carian will create more problems than it solves.

The second type of bilingual is more promising. In this category, the hieroglyphic text itself contains non-Egyptian names which make no obvious sense in any other language – *Š3rkbym, Nrskr, 'Irš3*. The clear assumption is that these are Carian names, and that they are also present in the Carian text. There is no proof of this, but the alternative is to accept either that the Carians had a spare set of outlandish names, quite different from their own, which they used in hieroglyphic inscriptions, or that the Carian texts from Egypt do not contain names at all. As they are almost certainly either funerary epitaphs or graffiti recording a visit, this seems very unlikely. Furthermore, in the absence of names, one would expect a series of standard formulae, and this does not seem to happen. The conclusion must be that *Š3rkbym, Nrskr* and *'Irš3* are the names of Carians, and that these are also spelt out in the corresponding Carian texts.

A cautious application of this technique to other inscriptions yields at least some names which are parallelled in classical texts such as the

[3] Cf. J. Vergote, Joseph en Égypte, Louvain 1959, 141 ff.

lengthy SIG 46 from Halicarnassus; a convenient list of certain of these names is contained in the index to Ševoroškin's book[4]. Where no obvious bilingual equivalent or corresponding classical name exists for a group, it is better to leave the disputed letters unidentified, as Masson himself does in his second system of transliteration. Progress is likely to be slow, at least until enough has been transliterated to enable the linguistic affinities of Carian to be determined. It may be that Ševoroškin's analysis of Carian as an Asianic language will prove to be correct, especially as much of his argument rests on comparisons with known classical transcriptions, but at the moment the writer must say that his tentative values agree more with some of Kowalski's than with those of any other. Time may tell.

The following abbreviations are used:
M (followed by number) = O. Masson, Carian Inscriptions from North Saqqâra and Buhen.[1] Following numbers indicate lines of the published text.
MY (followed by text letter and a museum identification) = O. Masson and J. Yoyotte, Objets pharaoniques à inscription carienne, Cairo 1956. Šev. (followed by number) = Ševoroškin, Issledovanija, handcopies on pp. 313–9.

The numbers of the letters are those currently used by Masson.

1.	A	a	22.	Ψ	k (?)
3.	)	g	24.	ᐃᐃ	p
4.	Δ	d (dr?)	25.	Φ	see note
5.	ɉ	é (?)	26.	θ	e
6.	ɿ	r	27.	▯	j (= y)
7.	Ɪ	ld (ll)	28, 28 a.	Ϙ, Ϭ	etc. see note
8.	B	*ae (?)	29.	∇	k
9.	⊗	ṭ (θ)	30.	Ƴ	ř (?)
11.	И	m	31.	⩓	t (?)
12.	O	o	32.	Ⲙ, Ш	(vowel)
13.	1, 1	b (see note)	33.	⧗	z (ss) ?
14.	ϙ	q (?)	35.	ƆC	unidentified
15.	þ	š	38.	Ⱨ	ê (?)
17.	Μ	s	40.	↑	č (ts)
19.	Y, V	u (?)	43–4.	Ɔ, (	see note
21.	X, +	h (χ)			

[4] V. V. Ševoroškin, Issledovanija po dešifrovke karijskih nadpisej, Moscow 1965, index, pp. 351–7.

Notes

3.) = g. This is based on the form of the letter, and on Masson's observation that the common Saqqâra word m-𐊫-g-o-𐊰-𐊩(-h-e) is once (M36, 1) apparently spelt m-𐊫-q-o-𐊰-𐊩-h-e; · Carian Inscriptions, pp. 17 (§ 12, 1) and 42.

4. 𐊴 = d. The form of the letter is again standard, but there are one or two problems. In M7, 1 Carian a-r-d-e-š-𐊩 corresponds to hieroglyphic *'Irš3*, and in M1, 1 the same group corresponds to Egyptian *'Iwrš3* (not *Mrš3* as suggested in passing in the publication). Also in M1, 1 there occurs a group a-r-d-ê-o(?)-[, which I take to correspond to the hieroglyphic *'Iwry.3* (not *Mrym3*). The suggestion that the damaged letter in the hieroglyphic may be *m*, however, makes me suggest the reading *'Iwrym3*, and it is tempting to identify this with the name a-r-d-e-o-m-𐊩 which occurs in M35, 1. Whatever the truth of this, the Egyptian nowhere has a sign corresponding to the Carian -d-. One explanation for this is that Egyptian had long lost the *d*-sound, which became *t* in speech, and the scribe may have been reluctant to write **'Irtš3* or the like. Another possibility is that the Carian sound itself may have been softer, closer to [dr]. This may well have happened in conjunction with certain sounds, such as an aspirate or another dental. The group in M7, 2 seems to read u-r-s-h-d-j-𐊩; this is rendered in the Egyptian by *Nrsḳr*, with 𐊴 = r. It is also interesting to speculate on the personal name ṭ-d-a-ld-e-𐊩 in M29, 1, and to wonder whether this is not based on the name for the city of Tralles, which lay just over the Maeander but which could sometimes be reckoned as part of Caria. Here too the sound would have been heard by non-Carians as *r*.

5. 𐊵 = é (?). Note the use in MY text K (= Cairo 49061), where p-a-r-a-j-é-m corresponds to Egyptian *Prim*. The relationship of this sign to the other *e*-vowels remains to be decided.

6. 𐊱 = r. This is a surprising identification, but the apparent *digamma* may be an adaptation of *rho*. The reading is strongly suggested by the following:

M7, 1 a-r-d-e-š-𐊩 = Egn. *'Irš3*
M1, 1 a-r-d-e-š-𐊩 = *'Iwrš3*
M1, 1 a-r-d-ê-o-[= *'Iwry[m]3* (see notes to 𐊴 = d above)
MY text L (= Cairo 30837) š-a-r-k(?)-b-e-o-m = *Š3rkbym*
MY text K (= Cairo 49061) p-a-r-a-j-é-m = *Prim*
M7, 2 u-r-s-h-d-j-𐊩 = *Nrsḳr*.

The combination 𐊱𐊠 = a-r is common.

7. 𐊗 = ld. This value is based on Kowalski's observation (Kadmos 14, 1975, 76) that a group 𐊖𐊇𐊗A appears in the Greek-Carian bilingual D11 (Šev. 104) and may correspond to part of the name of the town Kildara. The reading would then be K-e-ld-a. I take the sign to correspond to the sound, whatever its true nature, which is rendered in Greek by λλ or λδ. The combination -𐊍-o-ld or -o-ld-𐊍 is common at the end of names (M11, 1; M13, 1; M16, 1; M22; M36, end; Šev. 21, first word, and Šev. 85, 1) and it is possible that this represents the ending -σωλλος or -σωλδος. It may even be that the second word of M39, which may be read p-a-r-a-e-𐊒-r-j-ld-𐊍 may correspond to the Greek Παραῦσσωλλος, but this is speculative. For the possibility of a name based on Tralles see the notes to 𐊃 = d above. A final identification is that of the name in Šev. 22 and 77: p-ld-a-q, which could well be Πέλληκος or Πέλδηκος, with Ionic η for ᾱ. If true, this would confirm Masson's restatement of the evidence that 𐊒 is merely *qoppa* (Kadmos 16, 1977, 91–4).

8. 𐊇 = *ae. The sign occurs once in MY text K (= Cairo 49061), as a variant for the second -a- in p-a-r-a-j-é-m (var. p-a-r-ae-j-é-m (Masson and Yoyotte, p. 48). The reading is purely conventional.

9. 𐊏 = ṭ or θ. This is an obvious correlation with the Semitic alphabets. It would be pleasant to think that the name q-r-e-ṭ-𐊍 in MY text G (= Sydney 1141), first word, is derived from the name of Crete, but there are serious problems in the way of such an identification.

11. 𐊐 = m. This may also be surprising, but it could be a modification of an original *m*, if for some reason the sign for *n* were not required. The reading is confirmed by the following:

MY text L (= Cairo 30837), as final sign in word corresponding to *Š3rkbym*

MY text K (= Cairo 49061), twice as final sign in word corresponding to *Prìm*.

MY text F (= Lausanne stele), 1 uses the same sign in P-s-m-š-k(?), which with P-e-s-m-a-š-k(?) and other variants may well be a writing of the name *Psmṭk* 'Psammetichus'. The form is in fact close to the Aramaic (Kadmos 14, 1975, 91; W. Kornfeld, Onomastica Aramaica aus Ägypten, 91-2). Finally, the sign occurs in the Carian name for Kaunos; the group is 𐊲𐊐A𐊃𐊇 (Masson, Carian Inscriptions, 11). The reading X-b-a-d-e is generally proposed, but X-m-a-d-e is at least a possibility worth considering.

13. 𐊁, 𐊂 = b. This is suggested by the occurrence in š-ą-r-k(?)-b-e-o-m = *Š3rkbym* (MY text L = Cairo 30837, 1). A similar ending, perhaps also involving an Anatolian word meaning 'give' is seen in the

word m-j-ṭ-u-b-j-m (Šev. 78, from Abu Simbel). It therefore looks as if some at least of the occurrences of this sign should be read as *b*.

This however raises a problem concerning /l/. There is a sign Λ, like a Greek *lambda*, which appears occasionally in the Abydos and Silsileh graffiti (Ševoroškin, pp. 314–5), but graffiti on stone surfaces are notoriously difficult to record accurately even when the script is well known; certainly the published copies need to be rechecked. The main objection to the *lambda*-sign, however, is that it is not really common enough for /l/, at least to judge from the occurrence of this letter in the Greek and Latin transcriptions. The existence of a separate sign for –ld– goes some way towards meeting the deficiency, and it is always possible that the disputed sign Φ may have to bear some share of the blame (see notes below). But the near-absence of /l/ remains a difficulty, and at the moment I am not sure whether the intermediate form 1,1 should be ascribed to /b/ or /l/.

14. ♀ = q. See the judicious summary by Masson, Kadmos 16, 1977, 91–4. For q-r-e-ṭ-Φ see notes to ๆ = r, and for p-ld-a-q = Πέλδηκος see notes to ⌶ = ld.

15. Þ = š. This is rendered very likely by the following equivalences:
M7, 1 a-r-d-e-š-Φ = Egn. *'Irš3*
M1, 1 a-r-d-e-š-Φ = *'Iwrš3*
MY text L (= Cairo 30837), 1 š-a-r-k(?)-b-e-o-m = *Š3rkbym*.

For occurrences in the name *Psmšk* and variants, see notes to И = m above. M47 gives another name beginning with š-a-r-k[(rather than e-a-r-k as in the publication) and Šev. 85 has š-a-r-u-Φ-o-ld, which may correspond to Σαρύσσωλλος (See appendix below). Some names end in -š; the short form a-r-d-e-š probably appears in M50 and M51 (both from Buhen), and the same texts give us a name a-Y-k-Ɣ-u-š var. a-Y-k-϶-u-š. The termination at first sight suggests Achaemenid influence; it may however turn out to be a purely Carian ending.

Discussion of this sign is complicated by the existence of a very similar one resembling the Greek *rho*, notably on the Lycian coin from Erbinna (Masson, Kadmos 13, 1974, 127–31). The sign however is not quite like the Þ which appears in Egypt, and indeed the two, used quite distinctly, appear in the same inscription in Šev. 105 (= D12, which also comes from Asia Minor). We may therefore be able to accept Masson's reading e-r for the coin without rejecting Þ = š.

17. Ϻ = s. This is a standard form (*san*), confirmed by its appearance in M7, 2 u-r-s-h-d-j-Φ = Egn. *Nrskr*.

19. Y,V = u. The form V may readily be accepted as -u-. The difficulty arises with the sign Y, which occurs at the beginning of M7, 2

u-r-s-h-d-j-𓂋 = *Nrskr*. The Egyptian *n* is unexplained; the word *nr(t)* 'dread', which may have been in the Egyptian writer's mind when he chose his rather unusual equivalent was in all likelihood pronounced *nūri*[5]; hence *Nur-*skr*. The initial *n* may conceivably be a possessive particle after *s3* 'son', but this is not very probable. Unless some nasalisation is at work, we should admit ignorance here, but the possibility that 𓅱 may be something like -nu- could be borne in mind. The lack of a sign for /n/ is a related puzzle, and is remarked upon by Kowalski, Kadmos 14, 1975, 84. Here too a possible link with /u/ or /w/ is considered. A similar commencement is found in M55, 3: u-r-s-j-a-h-𓄡-h-e and perhaps in MY text B, 1: u-r-s-m-u.

21. 𓐍 = h. The sign is identical with Greek *chi*, and as such the Egyptians render it by unaspirate *k* rather than their own *ḫ*. Hence the form *Nrskr* in M7, 2. It may however have been a rather faint sound. In two graffiti from Abydos (Šev. 30 and 32) we find q-r-m-o-s-e e-𓅱-u-q-𓂋 and h-e-𓅱-u-q q-r-m-o-s-e-𓂋. It is worth considering whether these persons are not father and son, with names alternating according to the practice of papponymy; if so, e-𓅱-u-q and h-e-𓅱-u-q are the same name. In another related graffito, Šev. 31, the name seems to appear as q-𓅱-u-q. There we may leave it[6].

22. 𓅱 = k (?). This sign really deserves a study of its own. Some support for Masson's reading may be found in names such as P-a-𓅱-j-ê (Šev. 18), P-q-𓅱-e-j (Šev. 19), P-q-𓅱-u-o-e (?) (Šev. 38) and P-g-𓅱-j-ê (MY text M = Berlin 13785; see commentary below on this text). The identity of this name with Παγτύης or Πακτύης, and the relationship of 𓈙 with the sound /t/, are matters worth exploring.

24. 𓊪 = p. This is rendered likely by the equation p-a-r-a-j-é-m = *Prim* in MY text K (= Cairo 49061), by the possible name P-ld-a-q (see notes on 𓏏 = ld), and by its extreme frequency in initial positions, corresponding to *pi* or *p* in the classical transcriptions. For Psammetichus and its variants see notes on 𓅓 = m above.

25. 𓂋. See Appendix, p. 160, where this sign is discussed along with No. 32.

---

[5] Coptic has the form NOYPE for a similar word; cf. J. Černý, Coptic Etymological Dictionary, 110.

[6] The name q-r-m-o-s-e is full of interest. To an Egyptologist it looks like the common element – mose, preceded by *qr* with a reduced vowel. It is at least amusing to think that this is a hybrid meaning 'a Carian is born'. But the word will probably turn out to have a respectable meaning in Carian. In Šev. 33 the name appears as q-r-m-o-s- 𓅱, but perhaps a final -u is meant.

27. 𐊫 = j. This is confirmed by the equation p-a-r-a-j-é-m = *Prìm* mentioned above (MY text K). It occurs in some sort of grammatical ending in M7, 2 u-r-s-h-d-j-𐊰. Cases such as M26, first word, or M8, 2 (s-j-m-𐊬-𐊰), where it is wedged between consonants, suggest that it can also do duty for the vowel /i/. This may also apply at the end of a word, as in the common element u-p-j (Masson, Carian Inscriptions, 18, § 12, 2).

28. 𐊯, 𐊭 *etc.* These may be mere variants of the preceding sign, but it is at least conceivable that they are syllabic, and represent ja, ju *etc.* The writing P-g-𐊹-𐊭-ê in MY text M, first word, may be the equivalent of Παγτύης. If so, 𐊭 could be ju, but this is no more than a guess.

29. 𐊻 = k (?). This sign regularly occurs at the end of P-s-m-š-k and its variants (see notes to 𐊦 = m above), and is found at the beginning of the name Kildara (see 𐊵 = ld). The relationship of this sign to 𐊯 = q and 𐊹, if it is also k, remains a problem.

30. 𐊺 = r̆ (?). This reading is based solely on M7, 3, where 𐊺-e-t(?)-b-s-e-𐊰 corresponds to an unfinished word in the Egyptian. Indeed, only one sign is written, which may be an attempt at hieroglyphic *r*. The alternatives suggested in Masson, Carian Inscriptions, p. 87 are less convincing. It is, however, equally possible that the sign is a variant of 𐊻. The fourth letter in MY text L (= Cairo 30837) š-a-r-𐊽-b-e-o-m may be a badly formed *k*-sign; and in this case the third name in M7 would read k-e-t(?)-b-s-e-𐊰. The Egyptian would then be unexplained.

31. 𐊾 = t(?). This is another recalcitrant sign. The best clue is that provided by Gusmani, Kadmos 17, 1978, 71 text 2, where the name which is also found in M37, 3 as a-d-o-s-h-a-r-𐊹-o-s is written with the sign 𐊾 after the two *-s*. Gusmani, like Ševoroškin, takes the sign as /t/. A similar phenomenon occurs in M38, second word: j̆-a-s-t-𐊰. The relationship of this word with Ševoroškin's Uassas, Uasis could well be investigated.

32. 𐊩, 𐊬. See Appendix, p. 160, where this sign is discussed together with No. 25.

33. 𐊼 = z (ss)? This is a doubtful case, as the sign is rare. The name appearing in M22, third word, and in MY text C (Grenoble stele), also third word, can be read 𐊰-u-z-ld-e-𐊰. Could this be an oblique case of a name like Ὑσσωλδος? See also the notes to 𐊰 above.

38. 𐊪 = ê (?). Meier-Brügger (Kadmos 18, 1979, 87–8) has argued that this letter is a vowel of some sort, and this is rather confirmed by M28, fourth word, where a group ending in -𐊰-h- 𐊪 stands in a position frequently occupied by words terminating in -𐊰-h-e. This suggests that 𐊪 is a variant of /e/. In Šev. 4 (= Leningrad bronze 1) the

first word is a-r-Υ-a-ê-s, with an apparently Greek termination; and in M45a we find m-r-s-ê[, which Masson takes as a variant of M18 m-r-s-e-Φ.

40. ↑ = č (ts). In MY text H (= Berlin 21615) the group č-a-m-o-u may well correspond to the Egyptian *T3y-n-im.w* (Ταμῶς, Σαμαῦς). The second word in this text is č-a-Υ-a-e-Φ, and the Egyptian text reads 'son of *T3* . . .'. Here a second Egyptian scribe gave up the task, perhaps in emulation of the carver of M7. The third word in this inscription is ṭ-a-r-s-e-o, which may be another name. Whether this has anything to do with Tarsus is doubtful; the city was far from Caria.

Ševoroškin, Issledovanija, 69, suggests a palatalised or fricative /t/ for this sign. The word č-a between apparent names in Šev. 61 (graffito from Silsileh) may correspond to the š-a in Šev. 42; their functions at any rate look similar.

43—4.), ((. The only clue to these signs, which may well be variants of each other, occurs in M50, 3—4 and M51, 4—5, where the name a-Υ-k-) -u-š looks very like one written a-Υ-k-ϡ -u-š, with a sign resembling *sampi*. The possible Carian origin of *sampi* is discussed in L. H. Jeffery, Local Scripts of Archaic Greece, 38. There may well be a link with the preceeding sign.

This is a review of some of the letters of the Carian script, with tentative identifications. There are clearly some important elements still missing, notably the signs for *l* and *n*, and perhaps *w* if this existed. The sign ƆC (35) is common but unidentified. If the character Υ is really *k*, there is rather a plethora of gutturals in the language. But in spite of these limitations, it is the writer's belief that the sign-values given here produce convincing words, with the sort of consonant-clusters which might be expected from the proper names surviving in classical sources. In other words, the language is now unpronounceable in the right way, which is an arguable form of progress.

Since the majority of the inscriptions from Egypt consist of names and filiations, it is difficult to extract much in the way of grammar. The role of -Φ in producing filiations has already been remarked on; the termination -Φ-h-e seems to function similarly. Quite commonly at Saqqâra, names are separated by the word u-p-j, which may also express filiation or some other relationship. In M5, which is the funerary stele of a woman, there occurs the form u-p-a, which may well be the feminine equivalent. If this is so, Carian can be assigned to one of the few language-groups which admit grammatical gender. This phenomenon is not as widespread as is sometimes imagined, being confined to the Indo-European and Hamito-Semitic families.

Three examples of preterite verbs are known to me at present: MY text L (= Cairo 30837), second word; the bronze lion published in Kadmos 15, 1976, 83, line 3; and the bowl inscription published by Gusmani in Kadmos 17, 1978, 71. All three end in -m-t-a-k(?)-j. Is it fanciful to see in the last element, if correctly read, a reminder of Etruscan preterites in -ce? Both languages may turn out to be related to Lydian, however distantly.

To conclude this paper, I should like to return to the use of names by the Carians of Egypt. We have seen that in general they did not employ Egyptian names among themselves. Psammetichus and possibly Čamou (Tamôs) may be partial exceptions to this rule. Egyptian names, normally of the honorific type, were reserved for hieroglyphic inscriptions and, presumably, formal contexts or occasions. Thus the Carian of the Sydney stele (MY text G) was named Q-r-e-ṭ-Ⓓ, but he also took the Egyptian name Petiēsi and egyptianised the name of his mother. The Carian of the Lausanne stele (MY text F) was called P-s-m-š-k- with a following unidentified element, and took the Egyptian name Psametikᶜauneith; this may or may not have been influenced by the fact that his original name was Psammetichus. This man's father also has an Egyptian by-name, Waḥibrēᶜ. On the other hand, the dedicator of the reliquary Cairo 30837 (MY text L) was called something like Šarkbeom and kept this name in the Egyptian text, as did others. Finally, the dedicator of Berlin 13785 (MY text M), an elaborate statue-base of the goddess Neith, patroness of the Saite dynasty, bears the appropriate Egyptian name Petineith 'gift of Neith'. His Carian name, however, is P-g-Ⲩ-j̆-ê, which may be the name transcribed in Greek as Παγτύης. His father's name, *Krr*, is given in the Egyptian text but not apparently in the Carian. A female ancestor, however, either mother or grandmother, is called *Kprḳtr* (?) in the Egyptian. A rather similar name appears as the second element in the Carian text: q-ṭ-j̆-r-e-Ⓓ-h-e. The last three signs are a termination, and we are left with the consonants q-ṭ-r, which are also present in the Egyptian. It is possible to argue that the initial *Kpr* of *Kprḳtr* is a miswriting influenced by the preceding title *nb(t) pr* 'lady of the house'. The name would then merely be *ḳtr*, like the Carian. Since this name was important enough to be recorded in the Carian text, it is probably that of his mother[7]. Here it is

[7] I think this is the most natural reading of the hieroglyphic text on the Berlin bronze and its companion-piece 13784; the final name, Nitemḥē daughter of Waḥibrēᶜ, would be that of the maternal grandmother. Her name is certainly Egyptian, but she was presumably married to a Carian; it is otherwise unlikely that she would have had a

best to stop: the Carian texts from Egypt have told us much, and it is rather ungrateful to start emending them.

Appendix

32. 𐊫 = ü, 25 𐊰 = ś

The identification of these two signs is based on a comparison with known Carian names which fall into a single pattern. These are names ending in the element -σσωλλος or -σσωλδος. As it happens, both signs occur in the second word of stele M4 (Masson, Carian Inscriptions, p. 23 and Pls. IV, 1; XXXIII, 1), which is written 𐊫𐊰𐊭𐊰. A transliteration ü-ś-o-ld-ś would correspond closely to the well-attested name Ὑσσωλδος (Zgusta, Kleinasiatische Personennamen, § 1629–7, with variant spellings). Before this identification can be accepted, it must be tested against the other evidence for signs 32 and 25.

The main clue to the nature of 32 𐊫 occurs in M28, third word (Masson, Carian Inscriptions, 37 and Pl. XVII, 1); here 𐊫 -p-j looks very much like a variant of the common u-p-j. Another indication appears in M11 and M13, where the first words of the inscription read P-k-u-ś-o-ld and P-u-k-ü-ś-o-ld-ś respectively. I take these to be forms of the same word, and therefore suspect that there must be a link between 𐊫 and the vowel -u-. If the use of Greek *ypsilon* in Ὑσσωλδος is anything to go by, the vowel may be something like the German *ü*; hence the transliteration. The initial combination 𐊫𐊬 = m-ü- also seems to be quite common.

It is debatable whether this sign is the same as the truncated sign 𐊶 which occurs in Šev. 20: š-a-m-o-𐊶-d and in the first word of the Lausanne stele (MY text F; see below).

The evidence for 𐊰 = ś is more complicated. The sign is used commonly at the end of names, either in filiations ('genitive') or in certain examples as a possible nominative. The available clues point in two directions: one line of thought would be to take the sign as a dark *l* (λ), as does Ševoroškin. The strongest argument in support of this is that the Egyptian transcriptions of Carian names show nothing to correspond with the sign. In other words, it is either classed as a vowel or ignored because there was no obvious Egyptian equivalent. The

---

daughter named *ḳtr*. These dedications, which date from the reign of Psammetichus I, are extremely valuable for the study of the origins of the Carian community in Egypt.

other course is to regard the sign as a variant of -s-; this would allow the combination 𐊫𐊵𐊴𐊫 -ś-o-ld-ś to correspond to Greek -σσωλλος. Thus in M22, line 1 we find š-a-r-u-ś-o-ld, which is a good candidate for the Greek Σαρύσσωλλος (Zgusta, § 1378–1). In this context, the name P-k-u-ś-o-ld (M11, first word) and its variant P-u-k-ü-ś-o-ld-ś (M13, first word) certainly falls into the same pattern and sounds plausible as a Carian name, even though I cannot suggest a Greek equivalent.

The reading of 𐊫 as -ś at the end of both 'genitives' and 'nominatives' can be parallelled in several Indo-European languages, and a similar state of affairs may have once held true for Lydian (Gusmani, Lydisches Wörterbuch, 36–7 seems to regard the genitive in -λ as secondary). It is therefore not unlikely. The remaining problem is the absence of any corresponding sound in the Egyptian versions. A possible explanation for this could be that there also exist short forms of some names; thus P-k-u-ś-o-ld in M11, line 1 and a-r-d-e-š in M50 and M51 exist alongside P-u-k-ü-ś-o-ld-ś in M13, line 1 and a-r-d-e-š-ś in M1, line 1 and M7, line 1. It may then be that for some reason the Egyptian forms are based on these 'uninflected' variants. On balance, I suspect that 𐊫 is a kind of -s, whose exact nature is still unknown. The use of a double letter in the Greek – σσωλδος suggests that it is an emphatic sound.

I note that the same identification (25 = ś) has been made, for quite different reasons, by Meier-Brügger (Kadmos 18, 1979, 88), and that this idea has also occurred to Masson (ibid, n. 36). The reading may therefore be near to the truth.

In conclusion I should like to attempt some identifications in the well-preserved stele M7 (Masson, Carian Inscriptions, 25 and Pl. VI). Here we have the advantage of a corresponding Egyptian text, which runs as follows: *'Irš3* son of *Nrskr* son of *R*(?) . . . . The last sign is unfinished and perhaps was carved in error. If the first sign of the Carian equivalent is in fact a mere variant of 𐊰 = *k*, then the Egyptian *r* would be a mistake for *k*, which is slightly similar in hieroglyphs. The Carian text seems to run:

a-r-d-e-š-ś
u-r-s-h-d-j-ś
k(?)-e-t-b-s-e-ś

'Arrissis son of *Nrskr* son of Ketambissis (?)'. The Greek Ἄρρισσις or Ἄρισσις (Zgusta, § 106) is a possible equivalent of a-r-d-e-š-ś. I have already argued (above, p. 153) that the Carian -d- was heard by foreigners as a kind of *r*, and the phenomenon reappears in u-r-s-h-d-

j-ś = *Nrskr* in the following line. Carian 𐊴 written as *iota* in Greek is parallelled in the form K-e-ld-a*[. .]* for Kildara. This may simply be a peculiarity of the sound in question, and does not mean that we must transliterate 𐊴 as -i- wherever it occurs. Some form of nasalisation is necessary to explain the opening sound of u-r-s-h-d-j-ś = *Nrskr*, and it is with a similar assumption that Κετάμβισσις (Zgusta, § 593) is tentatively offered for k(?)-e-t-b-s-e-ś. But this little more than a guess, and there is some doubt as to whether the name Κετάμβισσις really occurs. The identification is therefore far from certain.

It is now possible to have a clearer idea of the nature of the Carian script. Its forty-odd signs may be almost entirely alphabetic; some sounds may be represented by more than one letter, or there may be subtle differences which we may be able to detect in some cases. The minimum of vowels is often written, sometimes none at all. As the vowels sometimes vary in the Greek transcriptions of Carian names (Ὑσσάλλωμος appears alongside Ὑσσέλδωμος, for example), it is likely that unstressed vowels were reduced to something neutral, and that the Carian script would frequently omit such vowels all together. Nasalisation also may have been regarded as unimportant, and may sometimes have to be supplied. Certain Carian sounds, such as -d- and -e-, were heard slightly differently by Greeks or Egyptians, and equivalents for some names may be nothing more than approximate. This suggests that we must proceed with caution, and that short of a connected bilingual text no quick solution will be found. But this is not in itself grounds for despair, as I hope to have shown.