POSTSCRIPT: NEW VALUES IN CARIAN

by JOHN D. RAY

The present writer has read with great interest the above article by I.-J. Adiego in which he accepts the system of reading Carian which is based on the hieroglyphic equivalents found in inscriptions from Egypt, and shows that they lead to useful and convincing results. The arguments in favour of the hieroglyphic system have been rehearsed elsewhere, particularly in this journal, and need not be repeated here. However, the most interesting feature of Adiego's article is that its author goes beyond the limits of the hieroglyphic equivalents, and suggests several other readings for Carian signs. These readings are based mainly on Carian names appearing in Greek and other transcriptions, although Egyptian evidence is also used. One of the most reassuring features of these new values is that, over the past few years, other scholars have separately reached the same conclusions. These ideas have been sent to me from time to time by their authors, and I would like to list the main ones here, so that (belated) credit can be given to them. This may also help an impartial reader to judge for himself whether they are correct, or at least whether the underlying system is consistent. It need hardly be emphasised that these conclusions were reached independently, and are original in each case. As a general rule I refrained from including them in my own discussions, because they were not primarily based on Egyptian evidence, and because these ideas were for their authors to publish. However, the appearance of Adiego's important work means that these suggestions are now in the public domain, and can be discussed openly.

Four of the most interesting equations in Adiego's article were suggested by Diether Schürr of Gründau (Germany), in a letter dated 11 May 1982. These are as follows: sign no. 4  , read by me as *d*, should be read *l*; sign no. 22  to be read *n*; sign 31  , read by me as *t*, to be re-read as *d*; and sign 14  , read by me as *q*, to be seen as *t*. The first equation ($d = l$) seems very plausible. It has also been suggested by others, notably J. Faucounau (see, for example, his article in BSL 79, 1984, 229–238), and it yields some remarkably good equivalences. Carian, to judge from Greek transcriptions of proper names, certainly possessed an *l*-sound, and sign no. 4 is an excellent candidate for it. Even though it cannot be proved from Egyptian evidence (Egyptian always had difficulty with the rendering of the *l*-sound), it should probably be adopted. Carian, however, must also have

possessed a sign for *d*, and if this is not sign no. 4, it could well be the one heretofore read as *t̲*. This seems to have been a dental of some sort, and *d* is a good enough candidate for it. Again, there is no proof of this from the hieroglyphic equivalents, since the sound *d* is largely absent from contemporary Egyptian, but it has a reasonable chance of being correct.

The other two proposals are more difficult. There is no doubt that the lack of a secure sign for *n* is one of the greatest omissions from the scheme. This was first pointed out to me in correspondence by Yves Duhoux, and others have made the same observation. The equation 22 = *n* was discussed in the appendix to my 'Outline of Carian Grammar' (Kadmos 29, 1990, 80–83); there it was left open. On balance, it still seems preferable to leave the value of this sign undecided. It is of course a great misfortune that there is no hieroglyphic evidence to settle the question. The last equation, 14 (read by most authorities as *q*) = *t*, is the most radical, and it does give some interesting results, but it flies in the face of a hieroglyphic bilingual, MYM, where Carian *q-t-w-r* (*-e-ś-h-e*) corresponds to {qpr}qtr in the Egyptian. Unless this equation can be explained away, we must abandon the attempt to read 14 as *t*, and with it we must forego the admittedly attractive possibility that names such as *p-s-m-š-k-ü-22-j-e-14* should be read **p-s-m-š-k-ü-n-j-e-t* = Psmṯk-ʿwy-Nît, a compound name which contains that of the Egyptian goddess Neith. It may well be that the texts from the Tomb of Montuemḥat at Thebes, which are being edited by V. Ševoroškin, will give us the answer to this, and to other problems. Let us hope so.

The identification of the name *u-k-s-m-u* with Ουαξαμοας was suggested by Günter Neumann in a letter dated 4 May 1985 (cf. his article on several other names of this type, which appeared in Würzburger Jahrbücher für Altertumswissenschaft, N. F. 10, 1984, 41–43). It has also been suggested by J. Faucounau, and it has every chance of being right. This of course raises the fact that *u* is here doing duty for a semivowel (*w*), and this must be borne in mind in future identifications. Meanwhile, H. Craig Melchert of Chapel Hill, NC, has suggested that the sign read by me as *j* is better seen as a vocalic *i* or *ī* (letter of 18 February 1991). There are certainly cases where this must be true, but there are others where the letter in question seems to be closer to a semi-vocalic *y*. Here a similar shift seems to apply to that between *u* and *w*. Variations of this sort are likely to occur.

A point which has been made by several authorities is that sign 26 𐊆, here read *e*, is closer to a short *i*, and is transcribed as such in Greek renderings of Carian. It may well be better to transliterate this sign as

i; the decision in 'Grammar' to keep the symbol *e* for this letter was influenced by the sound-alternation *e* ~ *a*, which seems to be well attested. Fortunately, the choice is not a major one at this stage. Finally, it is worth mentioning again that it was Diether Schürr who first proposed the idea that the longer text from Sinuri contains a mention of the names Idrieus and Ada; see the treatment of this text in Kadmos 29, 1990, 126–132.

No idea can be proved merely by listing names of those who agree with it, but it is interesting to note that similar ideas have occurred to people working independently on the same problem. This increases the likelihood that the underlying system is essentially correct. In the meanwhile, a Göttingen dissertation by Frank Kammerzell has also reached me. Kammerzell reworks the evidence from the Carian inscriptions found in Egypt, and concludes that the hieroglyphic equivalents are trustworthy. He also makes many valuable observations of his own, which are extremely encouraging. Let us hope that this dissertation will soon be published.

Recently, on a visit to Egypt, I was able to examine some of the graffiti from the Osiris-temple at Abydos. One in particular is interesting. The graffito is on the north wall of the exit-stairway which runs west out of the main temple towards the Osireion. (The text is no. 364 in the catalogue of P. Perdrizet and G. Lefebvre, Les graffites grecs du Memnonion d'Abydos, Nancy 1919, p. 71.) It consists of a short, unfinished, Greek inscription with a Carian name next to it written retrograde, as commonly in Egypt. The text runs as follows:

Λητοδωρος
ο θεος
αρισσ (←) a-r-d-e-š.

The editors suggest ω(?)ρισσ in the final line, but the α is clear in the original. The Carian text is given separately, as part of text 359 in the same corpus (op. cit., 70), but autopsy strongly suggests that it is connected with the nearby Greek inscription. The coincidence between Greek and Carian names in the third line is certainly worth noting, especially if we adopt two of the new values suggested above, and read the Carian name as *a-r-l-i-ś*. Further comparisons with similar Greek and Carian graffiti may prove illuminating, since there has been a tendency to edit such texts independently of each other, without regard to their positions on the wall. There may well be other bilingual pointers of this sort to be found. Perhaps Egypt has more things still to teach us.