

JOHN D. RAY

AN OUTLINE OF CARIAN GRAMMAR

This is a preliminary attempt to create a grammar of the Carian language, based on the principles for reading the script put forward by the author since 1980. Many of the details are tentative, and should be seen as such, and some of the conclusions are almost certainly wrong. They are given here in the hope of stimulating discussion, and in the belief that others, more expert in Anatolian languages, will be able to improve on them.

Abbreviations are those used previously, and are as listed in JEA 68, 1982, 181 n. 1, with the exception of the texts from Masson and Yoyotte's *Objets pharaoniques*, which are given simply as MYA, MYB, etc. Texts are followed by line numbers where appropriate. 'Lion' refers to the inscription on bronze published by Masson in *Kadmos* 15, 1976, 82–3. 'New York' and 'Karlsruhe' are the bowl-inscriptions published by Gusmani in *Kadmos* 17, 1978, 67–75; the former is now the subject of C. G. Bastis, D. von Bothmer et al., *Antiquities from the collection of Christos G. Bastis*, New York, 1987, no. 89, pp. 174–5. 'Halicarnassus' is the similar text discussed by M. Meier-Brügger in *Museum Helveticum* 35, 1978, 109–15. 'Athens bilingual' (Deroy no. 19) is treated most recently in *Proc. Camb. Philol. Soc.* 208 n.s. 28, 1982, 83–4 and fig. 4; note the excellent discussions by O. Masson in *BSLP* 68, 1973, 198–205 and by M. Meier-Brügger in *Kadmos* 18, 1979, 87–8. 'Žába (no. 196)' is the graffito from near Dendûr published by Z. Žába in his *The Rock Inscriptions of Lower Nubia*, Prague 1974, 193–4, and re-discussed in JEA 68, 1982, 196–7. Mainland inscriptions are once again given D(eroy) numbers after the article by L. Deroy in *L'Antiquité classique* 24, 1955, 305–335. Later discoveries are listed by standard journal references.

Greek transcriptions of Carian and other Anatolian names are quoted from L. Zgusta, *Kleinasiatische Personennamen*, Prague 1964; abbreviated Zgusta. Luvian parallels are quoted in the main from E. Laroche, *Dictionnaire de la langue louvite*, Paris 1959; abbreviated Laroche.

In general, all examples of a particular word or usage are listed. The principal exceptions are in cases when a word cannot be read (this is especially the case with inscriptions from the Carian mainland), or when a feature is so common that to list all the incidences would be fruitless. In the latter case, a representative selection is given; thus, with the genitive ending -ś (§ 1.1), an example is given whenever it occurs after a letter not previously listed. Even here, extra examples have sometimes been included for the sake of clarity.

The following system of transliteration is used, following the numbering system given in O. Masson, *Carian Inscriptions from North Saqqâra and Buhen*, London 1978, 9–16.

Egypt

1	Α	a	12	Ο	o	24	Μ	p	32	Π	ü
3	ϸ	g	13	⋈	b	25	⊕	ś	33	Σ	33
4	Δ	d	14	Ϸ	q	26	ϥ	e	35	Ϻ	35
5	Ϸ	é	15	ϥ	ś	27	□	j	37	Χ	37
6	Ϸ	r	17	Μ	s	28	ϣ	ju	38	Η	ê
7	Ι	λ	19	Υ	u	28*	ϣ	ju	40	↑	c
8	⊖	ae	20	ϥ	20	29	∇	k	42	ϸ	42
9	⊗	t	21	Χ	h	30	∇	k	43	Ϸ	43
11	∩	m	22	Υ	22	31	∧	t	44	∩	44

(On the sign 10 = b/l see JEA 68, 1982, 182, and for the sign 22 see Appendix at the end of this Grammar.)

Caria

On sign 16 at Caunus see § 0.8 below; it may be a variant of 14 = q.

Sign 18, which occurs at Halicarnassus and is also found in M19 from Egypt, is discussed by O. Masson in *Carian Inscriptions from North Saqqâra and Buhen*, London 1978, 14, with n. 12. Note especially the use of an identical sign (T) in Greek inscriptions from Halicarnassus, where it is employed in place of σσ; Zgusta, § 1378, n. 35. J. Chadwick, in personal correspondence (Dec. 1982–Jan. 1983), has discussed this sign, and its possible connection with the sampi of several early Greek alphabets.

Sign 20 in mainland inscriptions may be a variant of 38 = ê (see § 6.1 below), or may be some variant of the sounds *n* or *ñ* (see Appendix).

Sign 23, which resembles a Greek omega, is represented by Ω. Its value is unknown, but it shows a preference for the pattern o-Ω-o.

Sign 39, attested only at Caunus, is transliterated *h*; see § 5.6.

A sign identical in form with no. 40 in Egypt is to be read λ in mainland inscriptions (Kadmos 27, 1988, 150–4).

On the variations in the Carian alphabets of the mainland see ZPE 39, 1980, 208 and J. Faucounau, *Klio* 62, 1980, 289–305; compare also M. Meier-Brügger, *Labraunda II/4: Die karischen Inschriften*, Stockholm 1983, 12–14. In general the inscriptions from Asia Minor are some two centuries later than those found in Egypt, and some variations, such as the changes in the form of the letter 6 = *r*, should be seen diachronically. Others may be genuine regional differences.

The Carian writing-system is alphabetic, not a mixture of alphabet and syllabary as has sometimes been thought. At present about forty-five signs are attested, which seems too many for normal purposes; few ancient (or indeed modern) alphabets have more than thirty or thirty-two characters. It is therefore likely that several of the known signs are variants of each other: this is certainly true of the two forms of the sign 21 = *h*, and of the variant writings of sign 22. The latter is closely paralleled by the signs 29 and 30, which both seem to have the value *k* (see most recently Kadmos 24, 1985, 87–8). Signs 28 and 28* may also be identical, and it is more than likely that the ‘trailer’ signs numbered 42–44 are merely cursive variants of better-known letters. In short, it is unlikely that a Carian alphabet from any one time or place employed more than about twenty-five signs. (The record may be held by the long inscription from Caunus, which uses twenty-nine.) Yet within this system there was room for complexity: there is at least one diphthong (*æ*, and perhaps *ê*), and among the consonants, apart from simple *l* — whichever sign was used to convey it — there existed a separate letter for the ‘dark’ sound (λ). There may have been a sign for *nn/nd* as well, and perhaps the combination *mn*. The character transliterated *j* was a consonant or semi-vowel (*y*), but on occasions it may have functioned as a vowel (*ī* or perhaps *ai*, since there is an affinity between this sign and the vowel *a*). The relationship between this sign and no. 28, here transcribed *ju*, is hard to determine. Something similar may have been true of the sign 19 = *u*, which from time to time seems to have been heard by the Greeks as *w* and rendered by consonantal *ou* in the corresponding transcriptions; see § 0.1 below. On the analogy of Lydian and Lycian, there may well have been nasal

vowels in the language, and possibly also in the script; sign 38, here transcribed ê, may have been one such. Secure identification of the sign for n would certainly help here.

0. Orthography

The spelling of Carian is rather arbitrary. In general, vowels may be omitted; this is noticeably true in Egypt, perhaps as a reflection of the Egyptian writing-systems. However, the stressed vowel is usually written, as are initial and probably final vowels (see JEA 68, 1982, 183). Occasionally, words such as s-22-22 (New York, Halicarnassus) are found which seem to have no vowels at all; the answer to this may lie in the nature of the sign 22 (see Appendix). Mainland texts are more generous in their use of vowels, possibly, but not necessarily, under Greek influence. The phonetic structure is probably similar to that of the other Hittite-Luvian languages of western Anatolia, as can be seen from V. Ševoroškin's *Issledovanija po dešifrovke karijskih nadpisej*, Moscow 1965, as well as from the proper names listed on pp. 539–558 of Zgusta. One notable feature is that no Carian word seems to begin with the letter r (see for example Kadmos 26, 1987, 102); this, as it happens, is an additional argument for the value of sign no. 6 = r, which is never found in an initial position. Alternations in the vowels are fairly common, either because of the stress accent, or because of small dialectical variations; the latter are to be expected, in view of the geography of Caria and the marked regional variety of the mainland alphabets. Changes in the consonants are harder to explain, although some of these are almost certainly dialectical; however, uniform spelling is not likely in informal texts, such as graffiti, which form the majority of the surviving examples. Another feature of the language is a degree of palatalisation, as sounds such as *t̥* and *č* seem to attest. This may well account for some of the observed changes. On the usefulness, and limitations, of sign-alternations as a means to deciphering the script see Proc. Camb. Philol. Soc. 208, 1982, 83. A useful guide to the sound-changes revealed in Greek transcriptions of Carian names can be found in W. Brandenstein, PW suppl. 6, 1935, 140–1.

0.1 u alternating with ü

u-ś-o-λ (Šev. 46) ~ ü-ś-o-λ-ś (M4, etc)

u-k-s-m-u (MYB,1) ~ ü-k-s-m-u (M28)

u-p-j (M1,1 and passim) ~ ü-p-j (M28)

p-22-u-ś-o-λ (M11,1) ~ p-u-22-ü-ś-o-λ-ś (M13,1)

Greek Ούσσωλλος similarly appears alongside Ὑσσωλλος (Zgusta, §§ 445–2, 1629). If Faucounau (BSLP 79, 1984, 236) and G. Neumann (letter of 9 May 1985) are right in seeing u-k-s-m-u and variants as the equivalent of Greek Ὑαξαμοας, we must reckon with the possibility of the Carian sign u also having consonantal value, at least when in initial position; see further § 5.12 below. Whether this is also true of the vowel ü is difficult to say.

0.2 initial a- alternating with e-

a-r-t-u-t (M35, M36) ~ e-r-t-u-t (New York)

This may be a phenomenon caused by the accent falling on the second syllable. For other treatment of unaccented vowels see §§ 5.4 and 5.11 below. The short vowel e was regularly heard by the Greeks as i, but alternations such as the present example suggest that it is wise to keep the standard transliteration.

0.2.1 é alternating with ê

a-r-q-a-é-ś (M14) ~ a-r-22-a-ê-s (Šev. 4)

0.2.2 é alternating with ju

m-g-a-é-22 (M10b) ~ m-g-a-ju-22 (M9,3–4, etc)

0.2.3 ê alternating with e

a-r-d-ê-o-m-ś-h-e (M1,1–2) ~ a-r-d-e-o-m-ś (M35)

k-b-ê-o-m-ś (M4,2; M24) ~ š-a-r-k-b-e-o-m (MYL,1)

q-e-a-r-ê-a-ś (Šev. 18) ~ 22-a-r-e-a-ś (MYF)

ê-ê (M1,2) ~ é-e (M17). See § 4.3 below.

Note particularly d-k-o-r-ś-h-ê (M28, end), where the final letters must be seen as a variant of the common ending -ś-h-e; see also § 1.3 below.

0.2.4 ae alternating with a

p-a-r-a-j-é-m (MYK,2) ~ p-a-r-ae-j-é-m (MYK,3)

The presence of the following j is doubtless a factor here.

0.2.5 final -j alternating with -a

u-p-j (M1,1 and *passim*) ~ u-p-a (M5)

Note that this is in a final position, and could therefore be a grammatical inflection. See further §§ 2.4.3 and 4.1.1.

0.3 sibilant ś in Egypt alternating with s in mainland

The common element -u-ś-o-λ (Šev. 46 and elsewhere) is written -u-s-o-λ in p-u-s-u-s-o-λ and m-o-d-a(?)-m-s-o-λ, which both occur in the inscription from Hyllarima (D7, a1 and a2). In Šev. 44 there occurs a name p-ś-u-ś-, which may be a variant of p-s-u-ś-o-λ-ś (D14,2, from Caunus). But the text is not certain, and the name is incomplete. Note that this sound change does not seem to apply to the genitive ending,

which is always written as -ś. A similar change on the Anatolian coast can be seen in the name of the island Iasos, which is occasionally spelt Ἰασσος (Brandenstein, PW suppl. 6, 1935, 141).

0.4 In the proper name p-e-s-m-a-š-k and variants, which are writings of the Egyptian dynastic name Psammetichus, the -ś- alternates in several examples with -š- (M50,2—3; M53,1; Šev. 61,1; Šev. 63), but this is surely an attempt to express the Egyptian sound *t*, a palatalised *t* which was probably foreign to Carian. See further § 5.4 below.

0.5.1 q alternating with 22 (?)

a-r-q-a-é-ś (M14) ~ a-r-22-a-ê-s (Šev. 4)

22-a-r-e-a-ś (MYF) ~ q-e-a-r-ê-a-ś (Šev. 18)

See further R. Gusmani, *Incontri linguistici* 5, 1979, 195.

0.5.2 q alternating with g

ü-d-e-a-q (MYI) ~ u-d-e-a-g-j-.....(?) (Stratoniceia, 4)

m-ü-q-o-22-ś-h-e (M36,2) ~ m-ü-g-o-22-ś-h-e (M38,2 etc). For the word-division in Stratoniceia, 4 see § 1.10. For both these changes see also Appendix at the end of this Grammar. The presence of a following vowel in each case may be significant.

0.5.3 k alternates with g in the prefix p-e-k/g- (on which see § 5.3 below).

0.6 Initial q weakening and disappearing

q-e-22-u-q (Šev. 31) ~ h-e-22-u-q (Šev. 32) and e-22-u-q (Šev. 30).

Loss of initial *κ* in Greek transcriptions is remarked upon by A. Laumonier, *Les cultes indigènes en Carie*, Paris 1958, 26; note especially the variants Ὑδα alongside Κυδαίεις and Κυρωμος for Εὐρωμος; see also E. Varinlioğlu, *Die Inschriften von Keramos*, Bonn 1986, 12, where Idryma and variants appear alongside Kedramos. A rough parallel can be seen in the weakening of *q* in the Arabic dialect of modern Cairo and Lower Egypt.

0.6.1 The preceding sound-change seems at first sight to be paralleled in the Biblical name Goliath. This is generally believed to be Philistine, and is sometimes equated with the Lydian name Ἄλυαττης (see for example L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, *Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexikon zum alten Testament I*, Leiden 1967, 186, quoting F. Willeson, *JSS* 3, 1958, 330 n. 2). This is tempting, but it is not good evidence for the loss of an initial guttural; it is more likely that the underlying name was something like *Waliwatta, and that the Hebrew spelling is merely an approximation to this.

0.7 Loss of \bar{t} after s is seen in $a-d-o-s-\bar{t}-h-a-r-22-o-s-\bar{t}$ (Karlsruhe), which appears as $a-d-o-s-h-a-r-22-o-s$ in M37,3. In the latter case it is most likely nominative; the Karlsruhe example is harder to interpret, but the repetition of \bar{t} would be unusual in an inflected form. The explanation is probably phonetic.

0.8 A possible alternation between \bar{t} and d , as well as between d (which may correspond to l) and r , can be seen in the long name $s-o-m-22-j-\bar{t}-ju-b-d-s-e-\acute{s}-h-e$ in M13,2. Here the second element of the word could well be the same as that in 'Halicarnassus' where the dedicator is named $s-m-\bar{t}-ju-b-r-s$. This element is very probably the one contained in Greek Ἄρδυβερρος (Zgusta, § 86-6), and it reappears in D15,2, in the name $16-o-\bar{t}-u-b-r-\acute{s}$. (Şahin, ZPE 39, 1980, 213, suggests that the sign 16 is merely a variant of 14 = q .) Whether the name $s-m-\bar{t}-ju-b-r-s$ is the same as the Lycian Ἐανδυβερῖς remains to be decided.

0.8.1 \bar{t} may alternate with t in $t-u-\bar{t}-[.]s-e-\acute{s}$ (Šev. 46), compared with the name $t-u-t-\acute{s}$ in M9,2; but this is not certain.

0.9 Sign 37 seems to alternate with m on occasions, the clearest being $p-a-r-m-a-\acute{s}-\acute{s}-h-e$ (MYG,1), which could be the same name as $p-a-r-37-a-\acute{s}$ in D2,3. It is possible, but by no means certain, that sign 37 is to be read mn or something similar. Note also the form $p-r-37-e-g-a-s$ (Lion,1), which may be relevant here.

1. Nouns

Nouns are undoubtedly the single most important category in the surviving inscriptions, which consist almost entirely of funerary stelae, dedications on stone or bronze, and graffiti. However, the inflections of these nouns are sufficient to show the Indo-European, and specifically Hittite-Luvian nature of the language. For a useful analysis of the structure of the Saqqâra stelae see Masson, Carian Inscriptions, 18–9, and P. Meriggi, BiOr 37, 1980, 33–7.

1.1 Genitive in $-\acute{s}$ (cf. the adjectival form Hittite *-assi*, Lycian *-abbi*; and perhaps Etruscan genitives in *-s*). Examples include

$a-r-d-e-\acute{s}-\acute{s}$	(M1,1; M7,1; M43,1)
$\ddot{u}-\acute{s}-o-\lambda-\acute{s}$	(M4, and <i>passim</i>)
$u-r-s-h-d-j-\acute{s}$	(M7,2)
$s-j-m-\ddot{u}-\acute{s}$	(M8,2)
$e-r-o-\ddot{u}-\acute{s}$	(M19,1)
$\acute{s}-ju-e-22-\acute{s}$	(M30,1)

q-42-h-a-q-a-r-ś	(M33)
m-ü-s-a-q-ś	(M34,1)
a-r-t-u-t-ś	(M36,1)
ju-a-s-t-ś	(M38,1)
e-o-22-j-λ-ś	(MYa)
q-j-r-ju-j-35-ś	(MYE)
q-r-e-t-ś	(MYG,1)
22-a-r-e-a-ś	(MYF)
q-e-a-r-ê-a-ś	(Šev. 18)
m-e-h-ś	(Šev. 46)
p-s-m-a-ś-k-ś	(Šev. 61,1)
t-q-b-a-j-m-ś	(New York)
u-k-s-e-ü-r-m-ś	(Lion,3)
m-22-o-ś	(M8,2, etc)
h-q-m-n-o-ś	(D10,1)

Extremely common. See the remarks in JEA 68, 1982, 197. Note also the form q-b-r-e-g-b-t-ś in M34,2, which is followed by the element h-e written as a separate word (see § 1.4.1 below). The formation is probably the same as that found in Luvian *immarassi* from *immari* 'countryside', a form which appears in Caria in the name Ἰμβρασσις (Zgusta, § 469-3/4); see also Laroche, 51. It is possible that the well-known -ασσις ending, which is common in classical place-names from western Anatolia and the Greek mainland, is in some way connected with this.

1.1.1 In one case this termination follows simple -s

e-g-é-j-s-ś	(M48d; note § 1.2.3 below)
-------------	----------------------------

1.2 Genitive (?) in -e-ś.

Possibly gentilic, cf. JEA 68, 1982, 197.

k-e-t-b-s-e-ś	(M7,3)
m-r-s-e-ś	(M18, end; MYB,2)
t-d-a-λ-e-ś	(M29,1; cf. M37,1)
q-k-r-a-44-e-ś	(M29,2)
s-u-33-λ-e-ś	(M22,2; MYC; MYF)
e-é-r-s-e-ś	(M53,2)
č-a-22-a-e-ś t-a-r-s-e-ś	(MYH, end)
p-g-u-b-e-ś	(Šev. 21)
ś-u-22-e-ś	(AS8)

The form a-r-e-š/d(?) -m-a-o-λ-é-ś in D12,4 is probably unconnected; the word-division here presumably lies between the λ and the following é. The ending -e-ś is common at the end of inscriptions, or as third element after a name and patronymic; in some ways it is reminiscent

of the Greek ending -εύς. But it is possible that the ending is not uniform; note for example ü-22-u-q-e-ś, which is the first word in M23, and t-a-r-p-s-e-ś at the beginning of M28. Are these the genitives of nouns ending in -e, as listed in the next sections? In addition to these examples, M35 begins with d-ju-h-s-e-ś; if Dieter Schurr (personal communication) is right in seeing in this the well-known name Lyxes = Bab. *luḫṣu*, this too may be the genitive of a name which ends with a vowel.

1.2.1 R. Gusmani, *Incontri linguistici* 5, 1979, 194 raises the interesting possibility that the form p-g-u-b-e-ś (Šev. 21) could be the genitive of the p-g-u-b-a in MYb = Šev. 8; if this is correct, some at least of the genitives in -e-ś will be from nominatives in -a.

1.2.2 Note particularly q-r-m-o-s-e-ś in Šev. 32, which must be genitive of q-r-m-o-s-e, as is clear from Šev. 30. See the discussion in *Kadmos* 20, 1981, 156 and n. 6.

1.2.3 The ending -s-e-ś may conceivably be a separate formation. The examples are

k-t-b-s-e-ś	(M7,3)
t-a-r-p-s-e-ś	(M28)
d-ju-h-s-e-ś	(M35)
e-é-r-s-e-ś	(M53,2)
m-r-s-e-ś	(MYB,2)
t-a-r-s-e-ś	(MYH)
e-r-a-r-s-e-ś	(Šev. 19)
q-r-m-o-s-e-ś	(Šev. 32)
t-u-t-s-e-ś	(Šev. 46)

Note also p-a-d-s-ś in Šev. 22 and l(?)s-e-s in Šev. 42,2, as well as s-o-m-22-j-t-ju-b-d-s-e-ś-h-e (!) in M13,2. The latter may mean 'of the family of Som(.idyberos'; see also § 0.8 above. The name t-a-r-p-s-e-ś might be derived from Luvian *tarpa* 'heel (?)' (Laroche, 93), perhaps in the sense 'fleet-footed'.

1.3 Genitive or similar in -ś-h-e. This is perhaps a secondary genitive; compare the discussion in *JEA* 68, 1982, 197–8.

p-a-r-m-a-ś-ś-h-e	(MYG,1)
p-a-r-p-j-é-m-ś-h-e	(M17)
m-r-j-ś-h-e	(M25a,b)
d-k-o-r-ś-h-ê	(M28, end). (See § 0.2.3 above).
p-e-d-r-m-ś-h-e	(M32)
a-r-t-u-t-ś-h-e	(M35)

p-a-r-e-43-r-j-λ-ś-h-e	(M39)
p-h-s-e-m-q-ś-h-e	(M42,2)
e-s-o-r-ś-h-e	(MYC)
č-s-d-a-ju-ś-h-e	(AS6,1–2)

Again common, but with the exception of the last example, the ending seems to be confined to the Saqqâra inscriptions published by Masson, and to the Grenoble stela (MYC), which possibly comes from Saqqâra as well (Masson and Yoyotte, *Objets pharaoniques*, 7–8, give several reasons for thinking that the text comes from Zagazîg in the Delta, but this is not certain; cf. RHA 55, 1953, 34–6). The form p-a-r-m-a-ś-ś-h-e is interesting, in that it shows this termination added to a stem which already ends in -ś; indeed, it looks like the typically Anatolian ending -assa or -ασσος. See JEA 68, 1982, 191.

1.3.1 A similar ending also occurs in the form -e-ś-h-e

q-t-ju-r-e-ś-h-e	(MYM, end; female name)
š-r-ü-d-e-ś-h-e	(M12)
s-o-m-22-j-t-ju-b-d-s-e-ś-h-e	(M13,1–2)

See the notes to § 1.2 above.

1.3.2 Note the strange termination]-ś-h-e-o-j-g in M30,2. This defies analysis.

1.3.3 In M38,1 (é-e-ś-h-b-e-d-s-h-e-ś) there is an example where the ending -ś appears to follow -h-e-; but this is unparalleled, and the word may be wrongly divided.

1.4 Genitive (?) ending in -h-e.

m-g-a-é-22-h-e	(M10b,2–3; M25a)
k-o-ê-o-λ-h-e	(M36,1)
22-u-o-λ-h-e(?)	(MYE)
p-a-r-m-r-o-λ-h-e	(MYE)
k-d-o-r-u-λ-h-e	(MYG,2)
a-r-m-o-22-h-e	(MYK,2) (See § 5.5 below.)

A further example may occur in D8,1, first word. The ending -h-e has a predilection for following -λ- and -22-; see further Appendix below on the sign 22. The only example known where -λ- is followed by -ś-h-e is p-a-r-a-e-43-r-j-λ-ś-h-e (M39).

1.4.1 Is -h-e a separate particle, as appears often in Lycian? Note the spacing in M34:

1. a-r-ê-o-m-ś u-j m-ü-s-a-q-ś h-e m-ü-g-o-22-ś h-e
2. q-b-r-e-g-b-t-ś h-e.

Note that -š-h-e hardly ever follows the sign 22 (see Appendix). Are there phonetic reasons for its appearance? Or could the answer be regional, with the termination prevailing among the texts from Memphis and Saqqâra, but not elsewhere? Certainly the element -h-e seems to be absent from the texts from Abydos and Silsileh published by Ševoroškin. See also the discussion in JEA 68, 1982, 197–8.

1.4.2 In M55,3 occurs the form u-r-s-j-a-h-33-h-e (the seventh sign is 33, not 29 as given in the publications). If sign 33 contains a sibilant (z or x), the word will probably fall into the -š-h-e group; if not, the termination must be simple -h-e. On the sign 33 see O. Masson in *Hommages à Serge Sauneron II*, Cairo 1979, 48.

1.4.3 An identical group appears in the inscription from Sinuri (D10), near the beginning of the third line; but this text uses word-dividers in an irregular way, to indicate words of some importance, and it is impossible to be sure that we are dealing with the same genitive(?) particle that appears so frequently in Egypt.

1.5 Nominative in -a-s or -s

š-ê-a-s	(Athens bilingual, first word)
s-20-e-s s-t-e-s-a-s	(D14,1–2)
22-e-g-š-k-u-s-a-s	(AS8)
q-k-q-j-s	(M39)
a-p-[]-ü-s	(M15,1)
e-g-m-22-s	(M25a,b)

1.5.1 For a possible nominative of the -e-š formations in -e-s see JEA 68, 1982, 188, 197. Note also the form 22-q-o-d(?) -r-e-s in M27. The form]-a-d-λ-e-a (Šev. 42,2) may be a product of the same declension.

1.5.2 For other epithets or titles (?) ending in -s see § 2.2 below. The form p-a-d-s-š (Šev. 22) ‘of Pēdasa’ may contain a similar formation.

1.6 Words terminating in -a

s-a-r-a	(MYF, end)
o-r-š-a	(Lion,2)
p-ê-g-a	(New York, end)
p-g-u-b-a	(MYb)
] -a-d-λ-e-a	(Šev. 42,2)
a-d(?) -a	(D10,1; probably feminine name)
k-e-λ-a-r-a	(D11,3)

For u-p-a (M5) see § 4.1 below, and for č-a see § 4.2. o-r-š-a may have some connection with the form o-r-k-22 (New York); see § 3.5 below. For p-g-u-b-e-š as a possible genitive of p-g-u-b-a see § 1.2.1.

1.7 The ending -s-a

u-p-j-s-a (M18, second word)

b/l-e-t-ś-d-j-m-s-a (Šev. 42,1, first word)

This looks like an inflectional ending. For u-p-j-s-a, see also § 4.1.2 below. The second example resembles a participle. Whether there is any link with the verbal (?) ending -s-a-d discussed in § 3.2 remains to be decided.

1.8 In D10, the longer inscription from Sinuri, there occur two cases of words ending with a sign resembling no. 20, which ought to read something like n. These words are immediately preceded by forms which could well be verbal (see § 3.1.1 below). This raises the suspicion that the following words are nouns in the accusative case; the ending -n or -ñ would certainly be appropriate to an Anatolian Indo-European language.

1.9 The ending -d (?).

Names in]-s-o-λ or]-s-j-λ occur in D12, lines 5,6. In each case they are followed by a sign identical to one read d in the long inscription from Sinuri (D10). This might also be an inflection of some sort. It is always possible that the verbal(?) ending -s-a-d which appears in § 3.2 should really be analysed as the nominal ending -s-a followed by an ablative/instrumental element -d, but this is on balance less likely.

1.10 The line Stratoniceia, 4 reads u-d-e-a-g-j-p-e-t-a-r-u- (ZPE 39, 1980, 206). The first name looks like a variant of -ü-d-e-a-q in MYI; if the second element is also a proper name, it might be better to divide the line as u-d-e-a-g-j p-e-t-a-r-u-. The termination -j would then be an inflection, possibly a dative ending as in Luvian (Laroche, 137). But at the moment this is unparalleled in our corpus.

1.11 Summary of noun endings

nominative	-s	(§ 1.5)
	-a	(§ 1.6)
accusative	-n or ñ	(§ 1.8)
genitive	-ś	(§ 1.1)
	-e-ś (?)	(§ 1.2.1)
	-ś-h-e	(§ 1.3)
	-h-e	(§ 1.4)
unidentified	-d (?)	(§ 1.9)
	-s-a	(§ 1.7)
	*-j	(§ 1.10)
	-e-s	(§ 1.5)
generic nominative		

generic genitive	-e-ś	(§ 1.2)
	-e-ś-h-e	(§ 1.3.1)
generic unidentified	-e-a	(§ 1.5.1)

Some of this is badly attested, and must be seen as tentative, but compare closely the table of Luvian endings given in Laroche, 137, and the general forms from the Anatolian languages listed in B. Rosenkranz, *Vergleichende Untersuchungen der anatolischen Sprachen* (Trends in Linguistics 8, The Hague, 1978), 54–65.

2. Titles, adjectives and similar epithets

In the present state of our knowledge, it is always possible that words classified as adjectives will turn out to be nouns, and *vice versa*. This should be borne in mind in the following sections.

2.1 The termination -ó-s

k-b-o-s	(M16,2)
s-a-b-š/q-a-t-b-o-s	(Šev. 4)
ju-22-s-m-s-o-s	(AS3; Žába no. 196,1; MYL,1–2?)
a-d-o-s-h-a-r-22-o-s	(M37,3)

For the last word note the variant given in § 0.7 above, and for the meaning see § 6.4 below. These may be titles of some sort, and therefore should be seen as nouns in apposition. See also the remarks in JEA 68, 1982, 196. The termination -o-s may be the one which appears in the Greek transcription Ἐκατόμνω; the use of omega in this word, and the absence of a vowel immediately before the final syllable in the Carian examples, suggest that this termination was accented, contrary to the usual practice of the Carian language, which seems to have been to stress the penultimate syllable of the word.

2.1.1 m-22-o-s (M8,2; D14,3 and *passim*).

This is probably a noun of relationship, as is the derived form s-b-m-22-o-s, which also appears in D15,3 from Taşyaka. Do the words denote son and grandson? See the discussion in JEA 68, 1982, 184–5, as well as §§ 4.5, 5.8 and 6.2 below. If sign 22 is really to be read n, the word may correspond to the final element in the name Ἐκατόμνω; but see Appendix at the end of this Grammar.

2.1.2 If the form h-q-m-n-o-ś which appears twice in the first line of D10 is really the genitive of the name Ἐκατόμνω, then it is likely that the ending -o-s formed its genitive in -o-ś, much as -e-ś was the possessive ending for nouns in -e-s (§ 1.5.1 above).

2.2 A similar termination -s also occurs

22-o-r-e-d-a-m-s (D15,3)

a-d-t-s 22-u-b-e-m-u-d-t-s (Šev. 63)

Is this a mere (unaccented) variant of -o-s? Or is it a nominative ending?
For other words in -s see § 1.5 above.

2.3 The termination -e-λ

é-d-a-r-m-e-λ (D7,a2) 'of Hyllarima'. See the note in Kadmos 27, 1988, 151–2. The origin of this ending may lie in the formation *im(ma)ralli* from Luvian *immari* 'steppe'; Laroche, 51. Note that a name Ἰμβραρηλδος is attested from Caria (Zgusta, § 467); a similar ending may occur in the place-name Tralles. The common termination -o-λ, which is frequent in Carian proper names, might be connected with this. The formation may be cognate with the Lydian genitive in -li, the -ilis ending in Latin, and perhaps the Etruscan genitives in -li. It is probably adjectival in origin. A close parallel may be seen in the name Πισινδηλῖς, which according to Brandenstein (PW suppl. 6, 1935, 143) is an ethnicon from the town Pisinda.

2.3.1 The ending -λ

ü-ś-o-λ etc	(see § 6.3)
k-o-ê-o-λ-h-e	(M36,1)
22-u-o-λ-h-e(?)	(MYE)
p-a-r-m-r-o-λ-h-e	(MYE)
a-r-e-š/d(?) -m-a-o-λ	(D12,4)
k-d-o-r-u-λ-h-e	(MYG,2)
p-a-r-a-e-43-r-j-λ-ś-h-e	(M39)
e-o-22-j-λ-ś	(MYa)
j-s-j-λ-	(D12,5,6)
t-d-a-λ-e-ś	(M29;1; cf. M37,1)
ś-u-33-e-λ-e-ś	(M22,2)
p-s-22-λ-ś	(Halicarnassus)
j-a-d-λ-e-a	(Šev. 42,2)

With the exception of the last two examples the ending always follows a (stressed?) vowel; in the final word the accent may have remained on the penultimate syllable, and the writing would correspond to an original *-(e)-λ-é-a. Another interesting form is j-a-r-o-m-λ, which occurs in the additional fragment from Caunus published by Masson (Anadolu 17, 1973, 125). It is a pity that the word is incomplete, and that no word-divisions are shown in this inscription.

2.3.2 For further discussion see the remarks in § 2.3 above. The various vowels which can precede the dark l sound are interesting, and might repay further study. There is a certain resemblance to the different verbal classes or conjugations in Lydian, on which see R. Gusmani, *Lydisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg, 1964, 43. It is also interesting to compare the list of Anatolian and Greek place-names with an ending in -l- given by J. B. Haley in *AJA* 32, 1928, 143.

2.4 Names ending in -(a)q

ü-d-e-a-q	(MYI)
m-ü-s-a-q-ś	(M34,1)
p-λ-a-q	(Šev. 22)
š-a-r-ü-k-ê-a-q-ś	(MYD,2)
q-a-š-u-b-q-ś	(M10a,1)
š-j-22-u-r-q	(M42,1)

This may be another adjectival or generic ending; cf. *JEA* 68, 1982, 198.

2.4.1 Other words exist ending in -q which may or may not fall into the above pattern. These occur notably in the graffiti published by Ševoroškin, which are very lightly incised, and it is always possible that some of the examples end, not in -q, but in a badly written -ś.

š-a-m-o-ü-d-q	(Šev. 20; but word-division may be wrong)
h-e-22-u-q	(Šev. 22, and variants)
š-a-r-p-q-ś	(Šev. 44)
q-22-ae-l-j-l-q	(Šev. 63)
e-s-j-r-ê-j-q	(Šev. 61,2)

The final example is reminiscent of the verbal endings in -(j)-22 given in § 3.5. If these examples are genuine, it seems that the ending -(a)-q was sometimes accented, sometimes not.

2.4.2 The ending also occurs in inscriptions from other areas

l-ju-l-e-q	(AS7)
ju-b-q	(New York)
ju-ś-b-e-k-s-22-o-q	(Karlsruhe)
ü-d-e-o/a-q-ś	(Žába,1; but see § 2.4 above)
ü-j-q-ś-h-e	(M5)

For p-s-m-š-k-ü-22-j-e-q-ś (MYF) see Appendix.

2.4.3 A secondary formation from a name in -aq can be seen in p-λ-j-t-ś-h-e (M22,2), which ought to be related to p-λ-a-q (Šev. 22). Or are these in fact writings of the same name? For the alternation between a

and j, see § 0.2.5 above, while for the admittedly distant possibility that q is really to be read t, see Appendix at the end of this Grammar.

2.5 Names ending in -š

a-r-d-e-š-š	(M1,1; M7,1; M43,1)
a-r-d-e-š	(M50,1–2; M51,2)
a-22-k-43-u-š	(M50,3–4; M51,4–5)
l(?) -ju-š(?)	(AS7)
j-s-a-33-t-o-ü-š	(AS7)

Greek transcriptions, such as Ἀρλίσσις for a-r-d-e-š, show that the Carian š in the middle of a word was rendered by -σσ-, as was the genitive ending -ś.

2.6 Formations from Luvian *immari*: summary

-ś	(§ 1.1)	Ἰμβρασσις	(Zgusta, § 469-2)
-eλ	(§ 2.3)	Ἰμβαρηλδος	(Zgusta, § 467)
-ajm	(§ 3.4)	Ἰμβραιμης	(Zgusta, § 469-1)
-om	(§ 5.11)	Ἐμβρομος	(Zgusta, § 332-1).

The last two names are Lycian, but on links between Lycian and Carian see Proc. Camb. Philol. Soc. 208 (n. s. 28, 1982), 84. On the family see further O. Carruba, SMEA 22, 1980, 281. Ἰμβρασσος ('he of the steppeland') is also attested as a Carian name of Hermes.

3. Verbs

The verbal tenses and other forms which can be identified from the rather stereotyped graffiti and funerary inscriptions which survive are obviously limited. The absence of bilingual formulae also means that the precise function of a particular form is often hard to define.

3.1. Preterite or perfect, first or third person singular in -m-t-a-22-j

ê-35-p-j-m-t-a-22-j	(Karlsruhe, end)
35-e-g-k-s-m-t-a-22-j	(MYL,1)
22-u-m-t-a-22-j	(Lion,3)

See the notes in JEA 68, 1982, 196, and Proc. Camb. Philol. Soc. 208, 1982, 84. For the first example, possibly a prefix ('in' or similar, before part of the verb 'to give'), see § 5.10 below. In the first and third cases, the verb is the last word in the inscription, a feature which is characteristic of Luvian (Laroche, 144). This is not true of the second example, where the verb directly follows its subject; this may be a form of emphasis, or be due to the fact that a long adjunct is envisaged.

The element -m- which is seen in this ending is also found in Luvian roots such as *piya*(*ma*) 'give' and *aya*(*ma*) 'make'. Note also the form]-m-s-a-d, the third example in the following section.

See further the Appendix on the sign 22.

3.1.1 A very similar ending appears in the long inscription from Sinuri, and at Hyllarima:

p-e-s-n-o-e-m-t-a	(D10,2)
..... m-a-e-λ-o-m-t-a	(D10,4)
..... s-e-m-t-a	(D10,5)
]m-t-a	(D7,b1)

The second and third examples have no word divisions, and it is impossible to be sure where they begin. A similar formation may occur at Kildara, in D11, where line 2 ends in -o-m-t-[, and possibly in the shorter inscription from Sinuri, D9, where the first word seems to read]a-r-i-m-t-(?); but it is difficult to reconcile the final sign with the form of the letter a which appears elsewhere in the same text.

If we are right in seeing the Sinuri inscription as the text of a decree put up by Idrieus and Ada (see § 5.9 below), these verbs may well be third person forms (singular, plural, or even dual!) of the preterite tense dealt with in the previous section. In Luvian the third person singular ending is -*ta* (Laroche, 142). This is also true of the Carian examples, and this strengthens the impression that the longer form -m-t-a-22-j described above is a first person ending. Note also that the first two forms in the Sinuri text are followed immediately by words which end with a sign which could well be a form of n. Is this an accusative marker? See § 1.8 above.

3.1.2 The formation m-a-e-λ-o-m-t-a (D10,4) looks like a verbal ending derived from a substantive in -e-λ; see § 2.3 above.

3.2 Third person ending in -s-a-d

j-é-p-s-a-d	(M55,1)
j-u-m-a-..-22-a-s-a-d	(M51,1-2)
]m-s-a-d	(M50,1)

cf. JEA 68, 1982, 189-90. For the nominal (?) ending -s-a see § 1.7 above. An alternative explanation can be found in § 1.9.

3.3 Third person imperative or optative in -o-d-o

s-b-p-o-d-o	(MYK,3)
-------------	---------

This word corresponds to (*Hp*) *d'ı' nḥ* '(Apis) preserve' in the Egyptian text. Compare JEA 68, 1982, 192 and Kadmos 26, 1987, 103. In Hittite-Luvian the corresponding ending is -*du* or -*tu* (Laroche, 142).

For the indicative ending -od in Lydian see Gusmani, *Lydisches Wb.*, 43.

Further examples may occur in the mainland inscriptions. D8,3 ends in -o-d-o, while a group -o-Ω-o- is found in D16 (the Caunus text), lines 5,9. However, this text does not divide words. The first word of D15 is t-o-Ω-o-m-u, but this is as much as can be said about it.

3.4 Passive participle in a-j-m, -é-m

t-q-b-a-j-m-ś	(New York)
p-a-r-a-j-é-m	(MYK,2)
p-a-r-ae-j-é-m	(MYK,3)
p-a-r-p-j-é-m	(M17)
m-j-t-u-b-j-m	(AS7)
b/l-e-t-ś-d-j-m-s-a	(Šev. 42,1); cf. § 1.7 above.

This ending is generally found in proper names, the first being in the genitive. Compare Lycian passive participles in -*aimi* or -*eimi*. See JEA 68, 1982, 196, and *Proc. Camb. Philol. Soc.* 208, 1982, 84. A related (?) form from Luvian *immari* 'steppe' may be seen in the Carian proper name 'λυβραιμῖς (Zgusta, § 469-1), where it is presumably nominal. See also § 2.6 above. An interesting Luvian example from a nominal formation is *mitgaimi* 'sweetened', based on the Semitic root *mtq* (Laroche, 71). In the examples p-a-r-a-j-é-m and p-a-r-p-j-é-m, we have the past participles of 'to give' (p-j-é-m) and 'to make' (a-j-é-m or ae-j-é-m), while the final word quoted above, b/l-e-t-ś-d-j-m-s-a, may contain the same participle from Luvian *da-* 'to take' (?) (Laroche, 88). The presence of two endings, one containing the vowel a, and the other some form of e, suggests the presence of rudimentary 'conjugations', as in Lycian.

3.5 Verbal (?) ending in -22

t-j-22 q-u-m-22	(MYL,2)
r-ü-22	(AS5, end)
s-22-22	(Halicarnassus, end)
s-22-22 o-r-k-22	(New York)
s-j-22	(M10a,3)
h-e-j-22	(M24)
s-`a-ś-ü-o-22	(Žába,2)

Common at the end of inscriptions. See the remarks in JEA 68, 1982, 196—7; similarly *ibid.*, 184, for the word m-g-a-ju-22 (var. m-g-a-é-22, which occurs in M10b). The ending of s-a-ś-ü-o-22 resembles that of the common m-ü-g-o-22 and variants at Saqqâra. See also Appendix

on the sign 22 below. The word r-ü-22 at the end of AS5 looks like an exception to the rule that no Carian word begins with r, but the text is very doubtful, as the original editor himself notes. If sign 22 is really to be read n, which is far from certain, these forms may not be verbal at all, but the accusative case of nouns; see § 1.8 above.

3.6 Other forms exist which may or may not be verbal. These include

é-ê	(M1,2). See § 4.3 below.
]-d-a-é-r-e-t	(M17)
a-p-m-j-22	(M36,1)
ju-r-s-l(?) -j	(Šev. 21, second word)
]-a-d-λ-e-a	(Šev. 42,2). See § 2.3.1 above.
]-b-j-h-a-t	(Šev. 61,1)
]-u-22-e-č-o-k q-d-t-k 22-a-t e-s-j-r-ê-j-q	(Šev. 61,2)
q-22-ae-l-j-l-q	(Šev. 63)
]-o-j	(AS1,2)
22-a-35-h-e-h	(AS7, first word)
ju-b-q 22-q-r-o p-ê-g-a	(New York, end).

3.7 Summary of verbal forms

preterite tense, first (?) person	-m-t-a-22-j	(§ 3.1)
third person	-m-t-a	(§ 3.1.1)
present tense, third person (?)	-s-a-d	(§ 3.2)
imperative, third person	-o-d-o	(§ 3.3)
passive participle	-a-j-m	
	-é-m	(§ 3.4)
unidentified	-22	(§ 3.5)

4. Particles and similar words

4.1 u-p-j

This is common in the funerary stelae, as second element after a noun in the genitive. The one Ionic parallel which survives from Egypt suggests that it corresponds to εἰμί 'I am' (for the most recent treatment of this stele see G. Lacaze, O. Masson, and J. Yoyotte, RdÉ 35, 1984, 132–7; cf. the remarks of Goodspeed in *Mélanges Nicole*, Paris 1905, 186–7). On the other hand, the word could be a demonstrative of some sort (cf. Luvian *apa* 'that one', Laroche, 28). See also the discussion in JEA 68, 1982, 184 ff., and R. Gusmani in *Paideia* 34, 1979, 222–3. Note the variants ü-p-j (M28) and u-p-a (M5). There is also the unusual form u-j, which is clearly attested in M43,2 (where it is third word), MYD,1 and MYF, and is therefore unlikely to be a simple mistake.

Another possibility is that u-p-j and its variant u-p-a are connected with Luvian *upa* 'bring, present' (Laroche, 101–2); but on balance this is less convincing, in view of the genitive which always precedes; it is hard to see how a stele can be the 'offering' of its owner.

4.1.1 The variant u-p-a in M5 is interesting. The stele in question is the funerary monument of a woman, and it is tempting to see in the variation in spelling some evidence of grammatical gender. This cannot be ruled out *a priori*, but none of the other Anatolian languages shows any trace of a separate feminine. Either Carian is anomalous in this, or the writing u-p-a is merely a phonetic variant, as is presumably the form ü-p-j. For further evidence of j alternating with a see §§ 0.2.5 and 2.4.3.

4.1.2 Note the variant u-p-j-s-a in M18. Compare the discussion in Masson, *Carian Inscriptions*, 18. See also § 1.7 above, where the nominal ending -s-a is discussed.

4.2 A particle (?) č-a occurs in Šev. 61,1. This might be related to a group š-a in Šev. 42,1, although the latter is more likely to be badly divided, and merely part of the proper name which follows. See JEA 68, 1982, 194.

4.3 An unusual word é-ê (M1,2) ~ é-e (M17) is also attested. In the second example it is the opening word, unless it is merely part of the name which follows, and therefore irrelevant.

4.4 For the element or particle -h-e which follows nouns see §§ 1.3, 1.4 above.

4.5 A connecting particle -k?

D15, a tomb-inscription from Taşyaka, on the west of the Gulf of Telmessus, runs as follows:

1. t-o-Ω-o-m-u-s-t-e-s-a
2. m-22-ś-16-o-t-u-b-r-ś
3. s-b-m-22-o-ś-k-22-o-r
4. 22-o-r-e-d-a-m-s

The first line refers in some way to the funerary monument (§ 6.1 below). The second and third lines contain a name ending in the element -δυβερος (§ 0.8), and two nouns of relationship, m-22-(o)-ś and s-b-m-22-o-ś (§ 6.2). What is the connection between these two words? It may consist of the particle s-b, which is known to have such a function elsewhere (§ 5.9); but if the word s-b-m-22-o-ś in fact means 'grandson', as has been conjectured by Meriggi and others, then the

connection may lie in the -k which follows. A similar particle exists in Lycian, and is probably cognate with τε in Greek and *-que* in Latin. The repeated syllable 22-o-r- is strange, and one suspects dittography. The final line seems to be an epithet or title (§ 2.2).

4.6 An ending -r?

This occurs only in one example: M10a, 2—3 has k-u-a-r-e-ś-b-a-r as the second word of the text. This is so unusual that it is tempting to see the word as a genitive in -e-ś (§ 1.2) followed by a particle of some kind. Note also the word m-a-r-a-r-ś in Šev. 71, which is probably a patronymic.

5. Elements of vocabulary

Luvian etymologies are given where possible, following Laroche.

5.1 p-a-r-a- 'front, foremost' (Luvian *pari*; hier. Luvian *para*)

p-a-r-a-e-43-r-j-λ-ś-h-e	(M39)
p-a-r-m-r-o-λ-h-e	(MYE)
p-a-r-m-a-ś-ś-h-e	(MYG,1)
p-a-r-ś-o(?)-d(?)-o-u	(AS1)
p-a-r-37-a-ś	(D2,3)
p-r-37-e-g-a-s	(Lion,1)
p-a-r-p-j-é-m	(M17)
p-a-r-a-j-é-m	(MYK,2)
p-a-r-ae-j-é-m	(MYK,3)

The last three examples probably consist of p-a-r-a followed by the past participles of Luvian *aya* 'make' and *piya* 'give'. See § 3.4 above and the remarks in Proc. Camb. Philol. Soc. 208, 1982, 84. Note also the incomplete]p-a-r-j-ju(?)-s[in D6,3. For names beginning with the prefix Para — see Zgusta, § 1203. On this prefix see also V. Ševoroškin, JIES 7, 1979, 180—1.

5.2 š-a-r- 'upwards' (Luvian *šarri*)

š-a-r-22-a-e-ś	(M9,1)
š-a-r-u-ś-o-λ	(M22,1; Šev. 42?)
š-a-r-ü-k-ê-a-q-ś	(MYD,2)
š-a-r-k-b-e-o-m	(MYL,1)
š-r-ü-d-e-ś-h-e	(M12)
š-a-r-p-q-ś	(Šev. 44)
š-a-r-22-ü-ś(?)	(AS3)
š-a-r-k [(M47)

For a discussion see JEA 68, 1982, 198. For the prefix compare Zgusta, §§ 1374–1378. š-a-r-u-ś-o-λ is undoubtedly the Greek Σαρυσωλλος (Zgusta, § 1378).

5.3 p-e-k/g/q- as prefix (Luvian *piḫa* = Πικ-, Πιγ-, or Πιξ- in Greek transcriptions; Zgusta, §§ 1252, 1263)

p-e-k-a-r-m-ś	(M6)
p(?)-e-k-r-a-ś-h-e	(M8,1)
p-q-22-u-p-e	(M10a,5)
p-q-q-u-ś	(M19,2)
p-g-q-o-m-ś	(M51,3) cf. Lycian Πιγομος?
p-g-u-b-a (?)	(MY b)
p-g-u-b-e-ś	(Šev. 21)
p-e-k-r-j-ś	(MYD,1)
p-e-k-s-.-[(D12,5)

For the Anatolian name Phicol in Genesis xxi 22 and xxvi 26 see Vetus Testamentum 37, 1986, 358–9 and nn. 23, 24.

5.3.1 For p-g-22-ju-ê and variants (p-a-22-j-ê, p-q-22-e-j, etc.) = Πακ-της (?) see Kadmos 20, 1981, 156.

5.4 The prefix p-(e)-s- (Zgusta, § 1268; Πισ- in Greek transcriptions)

p-u-s-u-s-o-λ	(D7,a1)
p-s-u-ś-o-λ-ś	(D14,2; Šev. 44?)
p-s-22-λ-ś	(Halicarnassus)
p-e-s-e-r-e	(Šev. 17)
p-s-18-ju-m-[]-ś	(M19,1)
p-s-e-k-r-o-22-[(M43,1)
p-s-ju-[s]-a-e-[(AS7)
p-e-s-n-o-e-m-ṭ-a	(D10,2)
p-e-s-.-[(D10,9)

The form p-e-s-n-o-e-m-ṭ-a in D10,2 may be a verb; see § 3.1.1 above.

The Egyptian name *Psm̄tk*, which is written p-e-s-m-a-š-k (AS3) and variants, was probably assimilated to this pattern by the Carians resident in Egypt. See § 7 below, and also § 0.4 above. The spelling p-u-s-u-s-o-λ is interesting: the first u is presumably unaccented, and must correspond to a neutral vowel, like a Hebrew shewa; compare the alternative p-s-u-ś-o-λ-ś, where the vowel is omitted. The same state of affairs can be seen in p-22-u-ś-o-λ (M11,1) and its variant p-u-22-ü-ś-o-λ-ś (M13,1); this prefix may be a variant of p-e-k (etc), or, if the sign 22 is really a form of n, the group may correspond to the prefix seen in Πονυσωλλος or Πανυσσις. See further Appendix.

5.5 The prefix a-r-

a-r-d-e-š-š	(M1,1; M7,1; M43,1)
a-r-d-e-š	(M50,1–2; M51,2)
a-r-d-ê-o-m-š-h-e	(M1,1–2)
a-r-d-e-o-m-š	(M35)
a-r-ê-o-m-š	(M34,1)
a-r-q-a-ê-š	(M14)
a-r-22-a-ê-s	(Šev. 4)
a-r-e-š/d/?)-m-a-o-λ	(D12,4)
a-r-e-[(M30,2)
a-r-t-u-t-š-(h-e)	(M35; M36,2) cf. t-u-t-š in M9,2.
a-r-g-ê-b-ê-r-š	(M44)
a-r-e-š (?)	(Šev. 20). See JEA 68, 1982, 193.
a-r-m-o-22-h-e	(MYK,2; cf. D8,3)

For names from Caria beginning with 'Ap — in Greek transcription see L. Zgusta, *Kleinasiatische Personennamen*, p. 541. On the variant e-r-t-u-t in New York, first word, see § 0.2 above.

The final example, a-r-m-o-22, probably contains the name of the Anatolian moon-god, which can be found in names such as the Lycian *Armapiya*; Laroche, 31 and Zgusta, § 97, esp. § 97-3. If this is the case, the prefix itself may not be uniform, and the initial a-r-m- must be considered separately.

5.6 Names based on place of origin

t-d-a-λ-e-š	(M29,1)	'of Tralles'
u-r-o-m-š	(M51,3)	'of Euromus'
u-r-m-š	(M50,3)	<i>ditto</i>
q-j-r-ju-j-35-š	(MYE)	'of Caryanda' (?)
q-r-e-t-š	(MYG,1)	'of Crete' (?)
p-a-d-s-š	(Šev. 22)	'of Pēdasa'
ê-d-a-r-m-e-λ	(D7,a2)	'of Hyllarima' (See § 2.3 above)

The city-name k-e-λ-a-r-a appears in D11,1(?) and 3, where it may also do duty for the inhabitants of the place. The Greek equivalent is Κίλλαρρα. For h-m-a-d-e, which seems to be the native name of Caunus, see D16,8,12. This was first recognised by M. Meier-Brügger, *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 34, 1976, 95–100; cf. also *Kadmos* 20, 1981, 154, although the phonetic similarity between the Greek and the Anatolian name is far from obvious.

5.7 'To give' (Luvian *piya*)

ê-35-p-j-m-t-a-22-j	(Karlsruhe, end; see § 3.1 above)
p-a-r-p-j-ê-m	(M17; see § 3.4 above)

In the second example -p-j-é-m is a participial formation (Luvian *piyammi*). The form p-e-u-m-ju-35-ś (Šev. 23) may be relevant here.

5.8 'To make' (Luvian *aya*)

p-a-r-a-j-é-m (MYK,2)

p-a-r-ae-j-é-m (MYK,3)

A participial form, corresponding to Luvian *ayammi*. See § 5.1 above.

5.9 The element s-(a)-b-

s-b-m-22-o-ś (D15,3)

s-a-b-š/q-a-t-b-o-s (Šev. 4)

s-b-p-o-d-o (MYK,3)

For the first word see also § 2.1.1 above, and for the imperative (?) s-b-p-o-d-o see § 3.3. It is possible, to judge from these contexts alone, that the prefix means something like 'great, grand'. However, an identical word occurs in the long inscription from Caunus (D16), lines 2, 5, 11, where it seems to behave as a connecting particle: 'and' or 'together with'.

If s-b is truly a connecting word it may be derived from Luvian *šwa* 'fill' (Laroche, 88), perhaps in the sense of 'completing'.

5.10 The prefix ê-35

ê-35-p-j-m-t-a-22-j (Karlsruhe, end; see § 3.1 above)

If sign 35 is to be read nd (on which see JEA 68, 1982, 183), this prefix will resemble Indo-European forms of the preposition 'in'; Luvian *anda*, Lycian *ñte*. The main element which follows is probably the verb 'to give' (Luvian *piya*; see § 5.7 above), and the whole will therefore mean something like 'has donated'. A similar prefix may occur in the preterite form 35-e-g-k-s-m-t-a-22-j (MYL,1). See further JEA 68, 1982, 196.

5.11 The extension -o-m-

a-r-d-ê-o-m-ś-h-e (M1,1-2) = Ἀρλιωμος (Zgusta, § 95-3)

a-r-d-e-o-m-ś (M35) *ditto*

a-r-ê-o-m-ś (M34,1) *ditto* ?

k-b-ê-o-m-ś (M4,2; M24)

p-g-q-o-m-ś (M51,3) cf. Lycian Πιγομος?

u-r-o-m-ś (M51,4; written u-r-m-ś in M50,3)

u-k-s-e-ü-r-m-ś (Lion,3)

š-a-r-k-b-e-o-m (MYL,1)

]o-m-ś (D12,1)

The clearest example of this extension is the name Ὑσσελδωμος or Ὑσσαλδωμος alongside Ὑσσωλδος (Zgusta, § 1629); note the different spellings of the unstressed vowel caused by the accent remaining on

the penultimate syllable. Whether this element is related to that which appears in a name such as Ἐκατόμνωσ is difficult to say. For other names ending in -ωμος see the reverse index in Zgusta, p. 673. The formation seems also to be the one contained in Lycian Πιγομος and Ἐμβρομος (Zgusta, § 332); see § 2.6 above. In Carian, the termination seems normally to be accented, although the variant spelling u-r-m-ś should be noted. There may be a connection with the participial endings -a-j-m and -é-m, and possibly with the element -m- which is seen in the preterite (?) endings of the verb (§ 3.1 above).

5.12 The element u-k-s-(m)-

u-k-s-m-u (MYB,1)

ü-k-s-m-u-ś (M28)

u-k-s-e-ü-r-m-ś (Lion,3)

A similar element may appear in ju-22-s-m-s-o-s (AS3; Žába,1); see Appendix on the sign 22. The group may correspond to part or whole of the name Οὐάξαμοος (Zgusta, § 1141), although this is not attested in Caria proper. The final element, -m-u, may correspond to the earlier Anatolian termination -*mua*, on which see G. Neumann, *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft* 10, 1984, 41–3. A similar termination appears in t-o-Ω-o-m-u (D15, first word).

6. Individual words

6.1 To judge from context alone the following refer to funerary monuments or related notions

s-a-r-a (MYF, end)

ś-ê-a-s (Athens bilingual, first word; cf. the gloss on *σουα ‘tomb’ in Stephanus Byzantinus, together with the comments of A. H. Sayce, *TSBA* 9, 1893, 117, and W. Brandenstein, *PW* suppl. 6, 1935, 143. Note, however, the caution of O. Masson, *BSLP* 68, 1973, 190.)

s-20-c-s (D14,1; perhaps a variant of the above, or a demonstrative governing the following?)

s-t-e-s-a-s (D14,1–2). On this word see also P. Meriggi, *Annali scuola normale Pisa*, serie III, 8, 1978, 797.

6.2 Similarly, the following could well be words of family relationship:

m-22-o-ś (M8,2; D14,3 and *passim*)

s-b-m-22-o-ś (D15,3)

m-g-a-ju-22 (M3; M9,3–4)

m-g-a-é-22-h-e (M10b,2–3)

See §§ 2.1.1, 4.5 and 5.8 above.

6.3 The ü-ś-o-λ family

ü-ś-o-λ-ś	(M4) = Ὑσσωλλος
u-ś-o-λ	(Šev. 46) = Οὐσσωλλος
u-ś-o-λ-ś	(Stratoniceia,1)
p-22-u-ś-o-λ	(M11,1) see Appendix
p-u-22-ü-ś-o-λ-ś	(M13,1)
q-g-u-ś-o-λ	(M16,1)
g-ü-ś-o-λ-ś	(M27)
š-a-r-u-ś-o-λ	(M22,1; Šev. 21?; Šev. 42) = Σαρυσσωλλος
p-s-u-ś-o-λ-ś	(D14,2; Šev. 44?)
p-u-s-u-s-o-λ	(D7,a1)
m-o-d-a(?)m-s-o-λ	(D7,a2)
]j-ś-o-λ	(Šev. 35)

According to Brandenstein (PW Suppl. 6, 1935, 143), Ὑσσωλλος is a derivation from *ὑσσοσ ‘spear’. In this case, the name Παραυσσωλλος, which is well known from Greek inscriptions, will mean something like ‘foremost spearman’ (cf. Ševoroškin, JIES 7, 1979, 180–1). The well-known Μα-υσσωλλος (which is not yet attested in Carian) is presumably part of the same family, for which see also the reverse index in Zgusta, p. 672. For the abbreviations u-ś and o-λ as monograms on fifth-century coins from Caria (published in L’Ant. class. 24, 1955, 328–9), see most recently Kadmos 27, 1988, 154. These may well correspond to the name of a local dynast or magistrate.

6.3.1 For adjectival endings in -λ see § 2.3 above.

6.4 The title a-d-o-s-h-a-r-22-o-s (M37,3; cf. Karlsruhe).

For the first element compare the Luvian *ali-*, ‘sea’ (Laroche, 25–6, following Meriggi), which is more convincing in this context than the Stephanus Byzantinus gloss ἄλα, ‘horse’ (Brandenstein, PW Suppl. 6, 1935, 142); for the second, the Hittite *ḫark-*, ‘hold, grasp’. The combination might then convey the meaning, appropriate to Caria, of ‘admiral’, or the like.

7. Egyptian names

č-a-m-o-u	(MYH) = * <i>Tʒy-n-’im.w</i>
p-e-s-m-a-š-k	(AS3) and variants = <i>Psmʔk</i>

For these names see particularly JEA 68, 1982, 191 and n. 3; also Kadmos 20, 1981, 158. The Egyptian text of the stele MYH writes the name in the full form *Tʒy-Ḥp-mw*; the standard abbreviation for this

would be $T\mathfrak{y}\text{-}n\text{-}'m.w$, which was pronounced something very like *Tjamôu. This in turn appears in Greek as Θαμῶς or perhaps Σαμαῦς.

7.1 For the name $psmtk$ see §§ 0.4 and 5.4 above. This name, in spite of folk etymologies, is almost certainly not Egyptian (for a useful discussion see H. de Meulenaere, *Herodotos over de 26ste Dynastie*, Leuven, 1951, 16–21). It was perhaps Libyan in origin.

7.2 It is possible that $\check{c}\text{-}a\text{-}22\text{-}a\text{-}e\text{-}\acute{s}$ in MYH is also an Egyptian name (the hieroglyphic version has $T\mathfrak{y}\text{-}[\text{]}$ as the equivalent). If so, it will probably be one of the many names beginning $T\mathfrak{y}\text{-}n\text{-}n^2\text{-}\dots\dots$ ‘offspring of the (sacred animals).’. This is a minor argument for the reading $22 = n$; see Appendix which follows.

7.3 For $q\text{-}r\text{-}m\text{-}o\text{-}s\text{-}e$ (Šev. 30), which may be a hybrid name (‘a Carian is born’) see Kadmos 20, 1981, 156 and n. 6; but the variant $q\text{-}r\text{-}m\text{-}o\text{-}s\text{-}u$ in Šev. 31 is hard to reconcile with this, since the original $-u$ ending of the Egyptian qualitative had disappeared long before. The published copy needs checking.

7.4 The name $p\text{-}t\text{-}a\text{-}h\text{-}m\text{-}\acute{s}$, followed by other letters, occurs in D10, 2–3; its Egyptian origin, although tempting, is unfortunately not certain.

7.5 For the hypothetical name $*p\text{-}s\text{-}m\text{-}\acute{s}\text{-}k\text{-}\ddot{u}\text{-}n\text{-}j\text{-}e\text{-}t$ see Appendix.

Appendix: the sign 22

The sign $\Upsilon = 22$ is one of the commonest letters in the Carian alphabet, and also one of the most difficult. In Kadmos 20, 1981, 156 and in JEA 68, 1982, 182–3, 197 various possibilities were discussed, but without a firm conclusion, and the symbol k^e was adopted as a provisional equivalent. However, the presence of k , g (?), and possibly q in the same alphabet poses a problem: there are enough gutturals in the language already. Other approaches have meanwhile been suggested, notably that of Dieter Schurr of Gründau, West Germany (in personal correspondence), who wishes to see in the sign 22 the missing letter n . This is an attractive idea, and one which it is hard to dismiss. It would account, for example, for the apparent absence of vowels in a word such as $s\text{-}22\text{-}22$ (New York, Halicarnassus). A particularly strong argument in its favour is the common combination $-m\text{-}22\text{-}$, which would then correspond to the consonant-cluster mn , a group which is known to

be frequent in Carian names written in Greek. This suggestion also makes possible the identification of p-22-u-ś-o-λ (M11,1 together with its variant p-u-22-ü-ś-o-λ-ś in M13,1) with the Greek Πονυσσώλλος. Thirdly, it allows us to consider the words ending with this sign, which are listed in § 3.5 above, as direct objects with an Indo-European accusative ending (-n). This is certainly worth considering. It is unfortunate that the additional text from Caunus published in P. Roos, *The Rock-Tombs of Caunus I*, Göteborg 1972, 93 is not more informative. This text, which is a curious mixture of Carian letters and others which are apparently Greek, runs as follows:

1. p-o-r-u-ś
2. a-22-22-e-[.]r-s(?)ś

The doubling of sign 22 is unusual, but Zgusta preserves names both in 'Avvi- and in 'Akk-, which is regrettably inconclusive. It is also far from certain that Carian would have written a doubled consonant in this way.

However, there are other lines of reasoning which should be examined here. Consider the following instances:

ś-a-22-u-t-ś	(M20,1)
e-g-m-22-s	(M25a,b)
a-p-m-j-22	(M36,1)
a-22-k-43-u-ś	(M50,3—4; M51,4—5)
ś-j-22-u-r-q	(M42,1)
m-g-a-é-22-h-e	(M10b,2—3)
k-d-o-r-u-λ-h-e	(MYG,2)
22-u-o-λ-h-e	(MYE)
p-a-r-m-r-o-λ-h-e	(MYE)
a-r-m-o-22-h-e	(MYK,2)
a-d-o-s-h-a-r-22-o-s	(M37,3)
22-o-r-o-s	(Lion, beginning)
22-o-r-e-d-a-m-s	(D15,4)
*i-d-]-r-i-e-22	(D10, first word)
u-22-o-r-e	(Šev. 25)
ś-a-r-22-ü-ś	(AS3)
22-e-g-ś-k-u-s-a-s	(AS8)
ś-u-22-e-ś	(AS8)
s-`a'-ś-ü-o-22	(Žába,2)
p-s-e-k-r-o-22-[(M43,1)
ś-ju-e-22-ś	(M30,1)
22-p-r-o-s-22-ś	(Šev. 28)
e-g-m-u-o-22-ś-h-e	(M10b,2—3)

p-22-q-m-u-22-ś-h-e	(M20,1)
m-ü-q-o-22-ś-h-e	(M36,2)
m-ü-g-o-22-ś-h-e	(M38,2 etc)

It is clear from this table that words ending with -22 show a preference for the genitive (?) in -h-e. However, the last six examples show that this is not an unbreakable rule. It is equally clear that the sign likes to follow vowels, which are presumably stressed, in the final syllable of words. This pattern is also true of -λ, and of sign 35 (for which see JEA 68, 1982, 183). Judging by the patterns revealed in Greek transcriptions of Carian names, the most likely values for such a sign are nd, mn, or single l. Single l has in the meanwhile been suggested for the sign normally read as d (see most recently Kadmos 26, 1987, 103), but there are some reasons for favouring the older reading. The equivalence 22 = l allows us to equate the common ending -o-22 with the Greek transcription -ωλις, and it also permits us to read the title 22-o-r-e-d-a-m-s (D15,3) as *l-o-r-e-d-a-m-s (cf. 22-o-r-o-s, the first word in Lion). This sounds convincingly Anatolian, whereas nd as an initial group does not seem likely. In this context one should also note the compound name p-s-m-ś-k-ü-22-j-e-q-ś in MYF; the first element is clearly the royal name Psammetichus, while the second is reminiscent of ü-d-e-a-q in MYI. An even more radical solution would be to abandon the traditional value of q (on which see Masson, Kadmos 16, 1977, 91–4), and to adopt the value t. In this extreme case, the name p-s-m-ś-k-ü-22-j-e-q could be read as *p-s-m-ś-k-ü-n-j-e-t, the close equivalent of the Egyptian *Psmṯk-ʿwy-Nʿit*, which is given as the corresponding name in the hieroglyphic part of the same text. Pursuing this idea a little, it is possible to try the equation 22 = nd, and to identify the group p-s-22-λ-ś in the bowl-inscription from Halicarnassus with the ethnicon Πισινδηλις; but other occurrences of the sign do not give such convincing results, unless one assumes that 22 does duty for both single n and its doubled equivalent (nn or nd). This is hard to substantiate at present.

However, a more serious objection to the idea that 22 is a nasal can be found in D12, the shorter text from Stratoniceia. In line 3 of this inscription the sign 22 occurs a few signs away from the sign which in the inscription from Sinuri (D10) appears to stand for n. The only way to avoid this difficulty would be to assume that the two signs stood for similar but distinct sounds, such as n and ñ. On the other hand, the conventional value of q is strongly supported by the equation q-t-ju-r-e-(ś-h-e) = hieroglyphic {qpr}qtr in MYM (on which see Kadmos 20, 1981, 159–60). At the same time, the alternations of sign 22 with

q and g which are given in § 0.5 above are hard to explain if sign 22 is to be read as anything other than a guttural, and it is worth asking whether the preterite or similar ending, -m-t-a-22-j, which is described in § 3.1, is not a first person formation from some descendant of the Hittite *-hi* conjugation. In the latter case, the sign will correspond to *h* or something similar, and we would need to take words such as 22-o-r-o-s and 22-o-r-e-d-a-m-s as *χορος and *χορεδ(α)μ(ο)ς, and regard them as possible loan-words from Doric Greek. In short, it is a pity that the evidence for sign 22 is still inconclusive, but this is as far as can reasonably be gone at present.