

CRITICA

Ignacio J. ADIEGO: *The Carian Language. With an Appendix by Koray Konuk* [Handbuch der Orientalistik 86]. Leiden–Boston, Brill, 2007. xiv + 518 pages with 2 maps & 4 plates.

The field of Anatolian languages is one of the liveliest branches of Comparative Indo-European Linguistics and needless to say, one of the most important. Nowadays it is fairly rare to discover a new Indo-European language, but this is exactly what happened in the eighties and early nineties, when after some hundred years of vain research since the pioneering paper of Archibald Henry Sayce,¹ three scholars, John D. Ray, Diether Schürr and Ignacio J. Adiego managed to decipher the Carian script and to recognise Carian language as an Anatolian Indo-European language.²

Though our knowledge about Carian has remained and still remains very limited – on the one hand because of brevity of most of the inscriptions, and on the other hand because of the impenetrable texts of the longer ones –, the results of the last one and a half decade have reached the point when Carian research grew out of its infancy. Thus it seemed appropriate to summarise our knowledge of this language in a handbook available for a wider audience and for the purposes of scientific education, too.³ This volume written by I. J. Adiego, one of the decipherers, who publishes extensively on Carian, intends to fill this purpose.

¹ SAYCE, A. H.: The Karian Inscriptions. *Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature*. Second series, 10 (1874) 546–564.

² The majority of scholars accepted their transcription system already at the symposium in Rome in 1993 (cf. GIANNOTTA, M. E. ET AL. (a cura di): *La decifrazione del Cario. Atti del 1° Simposio Internazionale. Roma, 3–4 maggio 1993*. Roma 1994), but the Carian–Greek bilingual text discovered in 1997 in Kaunos definitely proved their system (for the edition of the text see FREI, P. – MAREK, C.: Die karisch-griechische Bilingue von Kaunos. Eine zweisprachige Staatsurkunde des 4. Jh.s v. Chr. *Kadmos* 36 [1997] 1–89 and Die karisch-griechische Bilingue von Kaunos. Ein neues Textfragment. *Kadmos* 37 [1998] 1–18; for the first discussion of the text see the acts of the *Colloquium Caricum* in *Kadmos* 37 [1998]).

³ It must be noted that there is an earlier, but very short presentation of Carian by MELCHERT, H. CR.: Carian. In WOODARD, R. D. (ed.): *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages*. Cambridge 2004, 609–613.

The book has been edited in the renowned series *Handbuch der Orientalistik* and accordingly, it is of high standard, including the type-setting especially problematic in this case because of the Carian signs. Some misprints are inevitable in such a case,⁴ however, there are also editorial errors⁵ and some disturbing ones where e.g. the Carian signs were not transcribed correctly.⁶

The book consists of eleven chapters, five appendices⁷ and closes with a bibliography and indices.⁸ The first chapter (pp. 1–6) is a general introduction,⁹ the second chapter (pp. 7–16) discusses the indirect sources of Carian (i.e. the glosses and the proper names)¹⁰ and the third one (pp. 17–165) contains – after an introduction and the so-called Para-Carian inscriptions – the Carian inscriptions themselves, grouped according to their provenance, where the author has introduced a new, clear-cut system of sigla for identifying the inscriptions (followed in this review, too). In the case of each inscription a drawing, the transcription, a short commentary and the bibliographical details of earlier editions can be found. Chapter Four (pp. 166–204) tells the history of the decipherment, with detailed methodological analyses and transcription tables.

Chapter Five (pp. 205–233) is devoted to the Carian alphabet and its varieties, including the much vexed question of its origins. It discusses all the regional varieties of the Carian alphabet in detail, again with tables of the original Carian signs (a general overview of all the varieties in one table would have also been useful). As to the origins, as it is well known, the Carian alphabet seems to have undergone

⁴ *acknowledges* (p. 95); E.(Me 12) instead of (E.Me 12) (p. 271); *annarai-* instead of *annara/-* (p. 387); *ers. comm.* (p. 431); *sancutary* (p. 452); *Agais* instead of *Āgais* (p. 492); “Zu der [*recte* den] Ilias-Scholien” (p. 497); *anataolia* (p. 495); “Jahrbuch der kleinasiatische [*recte* kleinasiatischen] Forschung” (p. 506).

⁵ Meier-Brügger 1979 instead of 1979a (p. 10); Goetze 1951 instead of 1954 (p. 14); in case of E.Sa 1 & 2 the arrow showing the direction of the writing is missing (pp. 32–33); Schürr 2003 instead of 2003a (p. 34); Brandenstein 1935a and 1934b instead of 1934, 1935 (pp. 174 & 497); Adiego 1990 instead of 1990a (pp. 197 & 279); *Thebas* instead of Thebes (p. 243); Adiego 1994 instead of 1994a (pp. 369 & 398); Schürr 1996 instead of 1996a (p. 409); on p. 188 read Egyptian instead of Greek; E.Sa 1 instead of 2 and E.AS 5 instead of 6 on the whole p. 266; Irou is a wife and not a husband cf. the discussion there (pp. 272 & 273); Ada is not the son, but the daughter of Hekatomnos (p. 303); “Einleitung in der [*recte* die] Geschichte der griech. Sprachen [*recte* Sprache]” (p. 500). – Reference has been made to two papers (Carruba 1965 [p. 10] and Carruba 2002 [p. 389]) that do not appear in the bibliography.

⁶ *kdušis* instead of *kdušis* in the transcription (E.Ab 35, p. 93); *kḃous* instead of *kḃous* in the last line in the transcription (E.Bu 1, p. 120); second *qlališ* is *qlališ* (p. 244); read *š* instead of *š* in the second and third paragraphs of p. 261; *yiš k̄ biks kiš* instead of *yiš {k̄} biks ki* (p. 268, cf. p. 69); *šas* instead of *šas* (C.Eu 1, p. 288); *býš* instead of *býš* in E.AS 7 (p. 293); *mdorjun* instead of *mdorjun* (thrice, p. 298); *pḃa k̄m̄uñ* instead of *pḃa k̄m̄uñ* (p. 304); *akymuḃu* instead of *akymyḃu* (p. 350); *esa² kḃowš* instead of *esak² ḃowš* (p. 372); *psmškwneit* instead of *psmškwneit* (twice, p. 387).

⁷ All of them are very useful: an *editio minor* of the Carian inscriptions (pp. 443–454), the Carian glosses (p. 455), the Carian names in Greek sources (pp. 456–463), concordances to the earlier editions of Carian inscriptions (pp. 464–470) and the coin legends in Carian (pp. 471–492, written by Koray Konuk).

⁸ Between them (pp. 508–509) there is a general table of the Carian alphabet and the Carian signs in coin legends and finally two maps (the provenance of Carian inscriptions in Caria and Egypt, resp.) and four plates of Carian coins.

⁹ Mentioning the Karkiša-problem and the Late Bronze Age forerunners of the Carians, a reference is missing to SCHÜRR, D.: Karische Parallelen zu zwei Arzawa-Namen. *Kadmos* 41 (2002) 163–177, who suggested linguistic isoglosses between the Carians and the Arzawa-population(s). This topic was recently discussed in detail by YAKUBOVICH, I.: *Sociolinguistics of the Luvian Language*. PhD-dissertation. Chicago 2008, ch. 3.3.

¹⁰ For an inventory of Anatolian place names see rather DEL MONTE, G. F. – TISCHLER, J.: *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte* [RGTC 6]. Wiesbaden 1978 and DEL MONTE, G. F.: *Supplement* [RGTC 6/2]. Wiesbaden 1992 next to the papers of E. LAROCHE (Notes de toponymie anatolienne. In KRONASSER, H. [Hg.]: *MNHMHΞ XAPIN. Gedenkschrift für Paul Kretschmer II*. Wien 1957, 1–7; Études de toponymie anatolienne. *RHA* 19/69 [1961] 57–98) suggested by the author (p. 15), since the last two are not real inventories but linguistic analyses.

“metacharakterismós” (a term coined by R. Gusmani),¹¹ i.e. most of the Carian signs of Greek origin have unexpected, non-Greek values, which clearly contradicts the “stability principle” present in the alphabets of the region (Lycian, Lydian, Phrygian).¹² Since the Carian alphabet shares the exclusively Greek innovation of the notation of vowels with the same set of Phoenician characters, its Greek origin is beyond doubt. The history of the signs themselves is, however, unclear; Adiego’s suggestion (first, a cursive form, then a remodelling – but only formally – after the capital forms, pp. 230–233¹³) is not impossible. However, it is perhaps worth noting some characteristics of the Carian alphabet that help to determine its position among the Greek alphabets: first, the usage of san for /s/ is a common trait with the green, western dark blue and some red alphabets. Since the signs Φ Ψ X were also known in the Carian alphabet, the borrower alphabet must have been a dark blue or a red one, but the usage of Ω clearly points to the former type (which was, among others, the alphabet of the Ionian cities of Anatolia).

Chapter Six is devoted to the phonology of Carian (pp. 234–263) and splits into two subchapters, one about synchronic, the other about historical phonology. Since the notation of Carian vowels is notably defective, both parts are necessarily very preliminary, but some complementary remarks may be added.

Adiego suggests that only stressed vowels were noted (pp. 240–242). However, these stressed vowels seem to be phonetically long – this would explain the strange facts that, on the one hand, the Carian signs for <e> and <i> come from Greek long vowels, Η [ē] and ΕΙ [ē] respectively, and, on the other hand, the Greeks always transcribed Carian <o> with an omega (p. 237). This is further supported by etymological evidence, where Carian <o> goes back to stressed/long *a (p. 258) and the case of <i> seems to be similar (cf. *pik-* < PIE *b^héh₂o- or the -si- “ethnic” suffix with levelled /i/, see below).

As to the consonants, since there are two graphemes for the Carian reflexes of the laryngeals, <k> and <q>, the view that Carian had only one “laryngeal”, namely a tectal voiceless stop (p. 260) seems to be hasty, except if they are allographs (such as e.g. the so-called C/K/Q-convention in Archaic Latin inscriptions).¹⁴

Another problem is the Carian reflex of *k^w. Adiego chooses to transcribe this sound as <ḱ> instead of the former <χ> since he assumes a palatal value of this phoneme.¹⁵ However, this is very doubtful: There is only one sure transcription, namely the Egyptian form *3rskr* for Carian *urskleš*. Besides, there Adiego suggests to interpret *alos karnos* as Halikarnassos, which is actually impossible (see below), and the ambiguous *ktmno* (Thebes) vs. *ḱtmñoš* (Sinuri). Furthermore, there is a possibility that *pksimts* is the Carian rendering of Egyptian *Potasimto* (*P3-dj-sm3-t3wy*),¹⁶ but Adiego himself draws attention to the fact that Egyptian names containing the verb *dj* ‘to give’ have been adapted by Carian with *d* or *t* (p. 399). So there is only one sure synchronic transcription that clearly shows a value /k/ and only one sure diachronic example (*k^wi- > *ḱi*, p. 259) that clearly shows an etymological value /k^w/. Though a palatalised value of this phoneme cannot be excluded *a priori*, there is only one argument for it, namely *k^wi- > *ḱi*, since it stood here before an /i/. The other arguments for a palatal value are not convincing: whether /t/ could cause the palatalisation of a preceding consonant (*ktmno* → *ḱtmñoš*, p. 243) seem highly dubious to me.¹⁷ In my view, the simplest explanation of these variants is offered by

¹¹ Kritisches und Autokritisches zu den Entzifferungsversuchen. In GIANNOTTA ET AL. (n. 2) 120.

¹² Cf. BOISSON, C.: Conséquences phonétiques de certaines hypothèses de déchiffrement du carien. In GIANNOTTA ET AL. (n. 2) 207–232.

¹³ See already: Die neue Bilingue von Kaunos und das Problem des karischen Alphabets. *Kadmos* 37 (1988) 57–79.

¹⁴ Adiego’s view that the case is parallel to that of Lycian is at least problematic, since KLOEKHORST, A.: Initial Laryngeals in Anatolian. *HS* 119 (2006) 96–105 provided a convincing explanation for the difference between Lycian <χ> and <q>.

¹⁵ Followed by KLOEKHORST, A.: Studies in Lycian and Carian Phonology and Morphology. *Kadmos* (forthcoming). I am very grateful to the author for providing me with a copy of his manuscript.

¹⁶ Suggested by D. Schürr *apud* RAY, J. D.: New Egyptian Names in Carian. In GIANNOTTA ET AL. (n. 2) 205.

¹⁷ Thus it is not relevant whether this contact was original (per Adiego and the Greek rendering, Hekatomnos would be remodelled after the name of Hekate, p. 243) or secondary, after the syncope of a velar (!) vowel (as per TREMBLAY, X.: Controversa Carica. *Kadmos* 37 [1998] 115, and the Greek rendering would reflect this earlier stage). – The phonetic value of Lycian <k> is too obscure to be used as a positive argument (*contra* p. 244).

Neumann, who pointed out that Hekatomnos can plausibly be seen as a pure Greek name¹⁸ and then *ktmno* and *ktmñōs* would be the different Carian renderings of a foreign name. The by-form *yriq* of *ša-yriq* among the *yriḱ* names is also against a palatal interpretation, as Adiego himself admits (p. 245). The main problem of the palatal interpretation is the case of *ursḱle*, since it contains the Greek element *-κλῆς* (p. 431) where palatalisation is hardly possible. Since <ḱ> must be different from <k> (except the case of allography, of which there seems to be no evidence), and there was neither a palatalised [k], nor a labialised [k^w] in Egyptian, both our only synchronic and our only diachronic evidence allow for the suggestion of both a palatal [ḱ] and of [k^w]. Thus, since the palatalised value of <ḱ> cannot be assured, it is highly misleading to use the sign of PIE palatal **ḱ* to transcribe this phoneme – which, according to the observations above, could rather have been /k^w/.

On the other hand, some minor details can already be added, that are not discussed by the author:

1. A sound law PA **w* > Carian *b* / *C* can be established on the basis of the following examples: *ksbo-* ‘PN’ <**haswā*- (p. 334, cf. Hieroglyphic Luwian *hasu-*, Lycian *ḫahba-* ‘grandson’), *kiḏb-* ‘city of Kindyē’ <*Hinduwa*-.¹⁹

2. Adiego assumes (p. 258) that Carian *otr-* ‘self’ points to an **á* > *o* change (cf. Hieroglyphic Luwian (VAS/COR) *ātara/i-*, Lycian *atra-*). However, as Hajnal has demonstrated, they can be explained from PIE **h₁éh₁t-*.²⁰ Since its PA reflex is **h₁āēd₁*, Carian *otr-* shows rather a change PA **ā* > Carian *o*, most probably via Luwic **ā* (as in Luwian, Lycian and even in Lydian²¹).

3. A change Proto-Luwic **mr* > *mbr* can be posited by (i) *βr-* < Proto-Luwic **imro-* < PA **gemro-* ‘steppe’ (cf. p. 259).

4. Adiego explains the form *šar-* <**sri-* as a palatalisation caused by the /r/ and with an anaptyctic vowel (p. 261). However, palatalisation by /r/ seems to be very dubious from a phonetic point of view, and Anatolian data (Hitt. *šēr*, CLuw. *šarri*) points to a PA form **ser-*,²² and palatalisation by **e/* is a very common phenomenon. Since **s/* was also palatalised before **i/* (as in *-š* ‘nom-acc. pl. ending’ <**nsi*²³), a general rule the palatalisation of PA **s/* in Carian before front vowels can be deduced.²⁴

5. If Adiego’s suggestion (p. 270) comparing the Carian “ethnic” suffix *-si-* with Lycian *-ze/i-* is correct, then we have evidence for the Carian reflex of PA **[ts]* (then both from PA **tsyo-*²⁵). However, an alternative explanation is also possible, namely a relationship with Lycian *-is(e)-* from **-i(s)ḱo-*,²⁶

¹⁸ NEUMANN, G.: Zur Nebenüberlieferung des Karischen. In GIANNOTTA ET AL. (n. 2) 17.

¹⁹ Identification with *Hinduwa* with FREU, J.: Problèmes de chronologie et de géographie hittites. Madduwatta et les débuts de l’empire. *Hethitica* 8 (1987) 150. Perhaps the Carian name of the city of Kaunos, *kbid-* is somehow also related to this phenomenon.

²⁰ HAJNAL, I.: *Der lykische Vokalismus. Methode und Erkenntnisse der vergleichenden anatolischen Sprachwissenschaft, angewandt auf das Vokalsystem einer Kleincorpusssprache*. Graz 1995, 244–245. I posit **h₁* for the laryngeal in the PIE form because of the Hieroglyphic Luwian form following the interpretation of <*ā*> by KLOEKHORST, A.: The Preservation of **h₁* in Hieroglyphic Luwian. Two Separate *a*-Signs. *HS* 117 (2004) 26–49. Note however, that this view has recently been challenged (MELCHERT, H. CR.: Spelling of Initial /a-/ in Hieroglyphic Luwian. To appear in a *Festschrift*. I am very grateful to Professor Melchert for providing me with a copy of his manuscript).

²¹ Cf. MELCHERT, H. CR.: *Anatolian Historical Phonology* [LSIE 3]. Amsterdam–Atlanta 1994, 56.

²² For the details and the full paradigm see KLOEKHORST, A.: *The Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. PhD-dissertation. University of Leiden 2007, 841–842.

²³ See MELCHERT, H. CR.: Further Thoughts on Carian Nominal Inflection. In VAN BREMEN, P. – CARBON, M. (eds.): *Acts of the Conference HKC Hellenistic Caria 2006* (forthcoming, <http://www.linguistics.ucla.edu/people/Melchert/cariannoun.pdf>). N. 3. *contra* Adiego (p. 261).

²⁴ Based on this rule I would tentatively suggest that the *ša-* element, a frequent first part of compound names (e. g. *ša-ydiq-*, *ša-yriq-*) is not a by-form of *šar-* (as Adiego suggests, p. 340), but an independent word probably meaning ‘one’, cf. Hittite *šya-* (for the Hittite word see GOEDEGEBUURE, P. M.: A New Proposal for the Reading of the Hittite Numeral ‘1’: *šia-*. In VAN DEN HOUT, TH. P. J. (ed.): *The Life and Times of Hattušili III and Tuthaliya IV. Proceedings of a Symposium Held in Honour of J. de Roos*, 12–13 December 2003. Leiden 2006, 165–185).

²⁵ Cf. MELCHERT: Anatolian (n. 21) 286.

²⁶ MELCHERT: Anatolian (n. 21) 288.

since Carian /s/ can reflect PA **k̂*, too²⁷ (one needs to assume in both cases a levelling of /i/ from the *i*-mutation).

6. The Carian name of the god Tarhunta, *trquδ-* <**Tḗh̥unt-*²⁸ also provides an example for the Carian reflex of PA **ṣ*.

Chapter Seven (pp. 264–311) is an introductory analysis of Carian inscriptions. Though this contradicts the accustomed structure of grammars (where phonology is followed by morphology), it is not only methodologically more accurate in this case, but also very useful from the point of view of students, since this is the basis of our (very restricted) knowledge of Carian, without which it would not be possible to understand the following (and actually, the preceding) chapters. During this chapter, the reader starts out from the basic and more complex onomastic formulae and the brief inscriptions, only to be confronted with our inability to translate the longer inscriptions. Some short notes may be added here, too, first to the inscription of Šarkbiom (E.Sa 1):

¹šarkbiom : zidks mðane : ýn[-?] ²mo | ðen : tumn

Based on the accompanying Egyptian inscription (“Atum, the great god may give life and health to Š3rkbym”), Adiego interprets the last two words as a preposition (*ðen*) plus the name of Atum in the accusative required by it (*tum-n*), though the overall structure and the meaning of this inscription remain unclear also in this case (p. 287). However, its structure closely resembles two dedicatory inscriptions, C.xx 1 and C.Ha 1:

C.xx 1: šrqūq | qtbłeṃś | ýbt | snn | orkn | ntro | pjdł²⁹
 “Šrqūq, (son) of Qtbleṃ has offered this bowl (*ork*) to Ntr as a gift”
 C.Ha 1: smðýbrs | psnło | mð orkn týn | snn
 “Smðýbrs has given³⁰ this *t*. bowl (*ork*) to Psnło”

The Šarkbiom-inscription may similarly show a direct object in accusative (*-n*) and an indirect object (*-o*), so that its structure and overall meaning may be the following: “Šarkbiom, the *z*. has given to Ýn[-?]mo a *ð*. *t*.” I am fully aware of the hot debate surrounding the dative in Carian,²⁹ thus my aim is only to point to an alternative possibility to translate E.Sa 1. The accompanying Egyptian blessing formula does not need to be the translation of the Carian text (or vice versa), it is only a continuation of it, such a case is known from the inscription E.Me 8.

The so-called Tarhunta-inscription of Iasos (C.Ia 3) also deserves some notes:

?] areš | šanne młne | siykłoš | šann | trquðe | kłmuðe³⁰

Since the inscription appears on a cratera and the name of Tarhunta is in the dative, the inscription is treated as an offering inscription (p. 286), but Adiego was able to recognise only a genitive (*siykłoš*) and the resemblance of *młne* to other suspected verb forms. He was also looking for the possessum of Siykłō, but his candidate (?]areš) is surprisingly discontinuous with its assumed possessor. However, since it is a dedicatory inscription we shall also find an accusative (the object of the offering) and the verb of the act, too. In fact, there is only one word that has an accusative ending (*šann-n*), which appears exactly next to a genitive, so it could be a possessive phrase in accusative, ‘the *šann* (perhaps the cratera itself) of Siykłō’. Since °ne° is a frequently recurring sequence in potentially verbal forms (see e.g. *mðane/mlane*, pp. 321–324), both *šanne* and *młne* can be identified as verbs, and then the only remaining word, ?]areš would be the subject. So, in my view, the inscription can be translated as: “?]areš has *šann*-ed and has dedicated³¹ (*młne*) the cratera³² (*šann*) of Siykłō to *kłmuð* Tarhunta”.

²⁷ If the Carian demonstrative pronoun *sa-* had nothing to do with **k̂o-* (as H. Cr. Melchert has suggested: Deictic Pronouns in Anatolian. In YOSHIDA, K. [ed.]: *East and West. Papers in Indo-European Studies*. Kyoto, forthcoming, <http://www.linguistics.ucla.edu/people/Melchert/kyoto.pdf>, 12–13), *sb* ‘and’ from PIE **ke* (see already ADIEGO, I. J.: Contribuciones al descriframiento del cario. *Kadmos* 34 [1995] 31–32) and the interpretation of *siði* as ‘they lie’ <**key-nt-o-y* by KLOEKHORST: *Studies* (n. 15) provide enough evidence for this sound law.

²⁸ KLOEKHORST: Initial Laryngeals (n. 14) 98.

²⁹ See most recently MELCHERT: Some Thoughts (n. 23).

³⁰ I follow GUSMANI, R.: Karische Beiträge. *Kadmos* 27 (1988) 145–149 in the restoration.

³¹ For *młne* see the unpublished paper of Melchert cited in detail by Adiego, pp. 322–325.

Chapter Eight (pp. 312–325) is devoted to Carian morphology both from the synchronic and the diachronic perspective.³² Some points may be added here, too.

1. Based on the contrast between *alosδ karnosδ* (C.xx 2) and *alos karnos* (E.Me 45) Adiego assumes a case ending (p. 319). Following his own interpretation of C.xx 2 (p. 284 with refs.) he defines it as an ablative ending (comparing Lycian *-adi/-edi*, CLuw. *-ati*, HLuw. *-ati/-ari*). However, he himself emphasises that his interpretation of the inscription is very hypothetical and his suggestion is phonologically problematic, since Carian *δ* reflects **-nd-* (p. 319). In my view, Adiego's explanation of *δ* as a case ending is correct,³³ but the phonological problem excludes his definition as ablative. I know only one Anatolian case ending that contains a sequence of **-nd-*: the ergative ending, cf. Hittite & Luwian *-ant-*. Unfortunately, though this suggestion is phonologically compatible, it does not shed more light on the content of the given inscriptions.

3. In case of the Carian ethnic suffix *-yn/-ýn-* Adiego suggests three scenarios: <y/ý> would denote either /qi/ or /y/ (in both case from **wi*) or /y/ but here from **-uni* with metaphony (p. 257). Note, however, that since it goes back to Proto-Luwic **-wéno/-* (with *i*-mutation) or Common Luwian *-wanna/-*, the palatalisation could have also been triggered by the vowel /e/ (in the second case, through Carian metaphony as in *ted*, *en* from **tádīs*, **annīs*, cf. p. 259).

Chapter Nine (pp. 326–344) – devoted to the vocabulary and the proper names of Carian – and Chapter Ten (pp. 345–347, “Carian as an Indo-European Language”) summarise our recent knowledge of Carian vocabulary and of the isoglosses that enable us to define Carian as an Anatolian Indo-European, more exactly, as a Luwic language.³⁴

The next chapter (Chapter Eleven, pp. 348–441, “Carian Glossary”) contains the list of words preserved in Carian inscriptions with interpretations and bibliographical notes. It is to be noted that in case of inscriptions without interpunction Adiego provides his own segmentation. Some notes shall be added here, too:

1. *β>ol[–]olš* (C.Ka 5) ‘?’ (p. 360). Adiego's tentative suggestion (pp. 299–300) to connect it with the island of *Imbros* can only be upheld if <β> is [br] and the °ol° part is the same as the ethnic suffix *-ol-*. That would explain its nom.-acc. pl. value – but there is no evidence for either of these presuppositions.

2. *kδūsis* (E.Ab 35). According to Adiego (p. 372), it is a PN in genitive containing the lexical element *kδ-*. However, on p. 269 he suggests that it is a by-form of *kiδbsis* ‘of Kindye (gen.)’. If we look at the inscription (E.Ab 35. ušol | mikšš kδūsis) it becomes clear that this is an attribute of the patronym *mikšš* (this is supported by the dividing line) as a toponym with the well-known Carian “ethnic” suffix *-si-*. Moreover, if we consult the edition we can see that it can be read as *kδbsis* without problems. The only remaining difference to *kiδbsis* is the *i*, which, however, sporadically disappears before a nasal consonant, cf. the *(i)βr-* forms.

3. *knor* (C. Kr 1) ‘?’ (p. 374). It can be suggested very tentatively that it could be a regular reflex of PIE **h₂ner-* ‘man, person’. Unfortunately, this suggestion does not shed more light on the inscription.

4. *mwdonš* ‘?’ (gen.) (pp. 385–386). It is one of the well documented adjectives – but of obscure meaning. Suggestions of it being an ethnic name fail to provide an appropriate toponym (Adiego's Myn-

³² It is worth noting that Carian nominal inflection is discussed anew by MELCHERT: *Some Thoughts* (n. 23).

³³ I am not convinced by his alternative suggestion (*-δ* as a preposition as in C.Ka 5 *δ=rual*, p. 319). Not only because the segmentation must be *δrual* (MELCHERT: *Some Thoughts* [n. 23] Fn. 10, see already SCHÜRR, D.: *Karische und lykische Sibilanten*. *IF* 106 [2001] 109), but also because it would be strange from an Anatolian view that a postposition (!) is attached both to the noun and to its adjective, as Adiego's suggestion for *alos=δ karnos=δ* would imply (although Lycian in fact has prepositions instead of postpositions, this cannot be automatically extended to Carian for lack of evidence, *contra* ADIEGO, I. J.: *Contribuciones al desciframiento del cario*. *Kadmos* 34 [1995] 22). A theoretical possibility would be that in C.xx 2 they would mean ‘in X (and) in Y’ but this implies their meaning as a physical object (or perhaps a region) which, however, can be excluded because of E.Me 45 where they are clearly an attribute of the deceased (¹[q⁷]lašis ²[?]iamš ki ³alos karnos).

³⁴ A term coined by MELCHERT, H. CR.: *Language*. In ID. (ed.): *The Luwians* [HdO 86]. Leiden–Boston 2003, 176.

dos + Luwian ethnic suffix *-wanna/ī*.³⁵ would give ***mwōdon*, and thus it can be excluded).³⁶ A kind of title would fit very well due to its relatively high frequency, and since until now it has exclusively been attested in Egypt where most of the Carians were mercenaries, I would tentatively suggest the meaning 'mercenary' (**muwatta-wanna/ī* 'the mighty one' ??).

5. *mwsatś* (E.Me 42) 'PN (gen.)' (p. 388). A comparison with Luwian *Muwaziti* is not compelling, since the different vocalism of *sat* vs. *ziti* remains unexplained.

6. *pisiri* (E.Ab 1) 'PN (nom.)'. Adiego emphasises (p. 398 with refs.) that the Egyptian interpretation of this name (as *P3-n-Wsjr* or *P3j-Wsir*) must be preferred to the Anatolian interpretation (Pisiris, king of Karkamiš at least from 738 until 717 BCE), though he does not mention the most important counterargument, namely, that the vocalism was fully noted only in case of foreign, non-Carian names (see e. g. *lysikla*, *lysikrata* in the Kaunian Bilingual).

7. *qarpsiś* (E.Me 36) '<ethnic name> (gen.)' (p. 406). Adiego's suggestion (Karp/basyand(a)) for the underlying toponym is not convincing because it does not explain the lack of *-anda-* in *qarp(s)-*.

8. *šarurś* (E.Ab 37) 'PN (gen.)'. Adiego (p. 417) does not analyse this name, though it can be understood as a compound name from *šar-* and *ura-* 'great'. Compound names with *šar-* as the first part and with *ura-* as the second are well known in Carian and Luwian onomastics (cf. *šarkbiom*, *šarwljatś*, *šaruśol* – *Maššanaura*, *Nattaaura*, cf. Carian *urom-*, *urm-/wrm-*, p. 338, 340).

9. *zmuś* (E.Me 19) 'PN (gen.)'. Adiego does not discuss the name (p. 435), though it can be understood as a compound name with *mu* (cf. Luwian *muwa-* 'might, strength') as its second part, cf. Carian *wksmuluksmu*, perhaps *kbdmu*, too (pp. 335–336).

Of course, these small additions do not change the fact that Ignacio J. Adiego deserves the deepest gratitude of the community of Anatolian scholars (and students) for this well-arranged, extremely useful and thought-provoking handbook.

Zsolt Simon

Research Institute for Linguistics
Hungarian Academy of Sciences

³⁵ Adiego discusses (p. 271, n. 11) whether his interpretation of E.Me 44 (¹apmen šrquqś kojol̄ ki ²mwtonś ki) as 'Apmen of Kōs, son of Šrquq, the *mwdon*' poses problems to the assumed ethnical meaning (since the father of a man from Kōs would be a man from Myndos). However, first, such a meaning cannot be *a priori* excluded; second, the word is *mwton*, not *mwdon*, and thus – though the generally assumed scribal error cannot be again *a priori* excluded – it is not sure that the two words are the same, and third, the interpretation of *kojol̄* as 'of Kōs' is at least problematic since – as Adiego notes – the person bears an Egyptian name (which, of course, may be a secondary, adopted name) and an ethnic meaning of the suffix *-ol-* needs more evidence, so a title (with SCHÜRR, D.: Zur Bestimmung der Lautwerte des karischen Alphabets. *Kadmos* 31 [1992] 155) or perhaps an Egyptian village cannot be excluded (i.e. the meaning of the inscription would be in my view 'Apmen, the shepherd', son of Šrquq, the *mwton*).

³⁶ For criticism of earlier suggestions see p. 381.