The Carian Language. By IGNACIO J. ADIEGO. Handbook of Oriental Studies, Section One, The Near East and Middle East, vol. 86. Leiden: Brill, 2007. Pp. xiv + 526, 8 illus. $236.00.

If one needs proof that positive discoveries in the field of Indo-European studies are still possible in our times, the decipherment of the Carian language provides such proof. Although philological studies of Carian inscriptions began in the nineteenth century, it was only in 1981 that a Cambridge Egyptologist John Ray promulgated the correct methodological approach to identifying the phonetic values of Carian alphabetic signs. The initial values suggested by Ray were only partially correct, as was promptly seen by a German high school teacher Dieter Schürr. Schürr initially abstained from publishing his corrections, but merely communicated them privately to Ray, who remained unconvinced. Thus the definite decipherment of Carian had to wait for another decade, till the author of the book under review, then a PhD student in Barcelona, independently arrived to roughly the same conclusions as had Schürr and presented them in his doctoral dissertation and in a journal article (1990).

Carian is an Indo-European language belonging to the Luvic group of the Anatolian subfamily and used for writing in the mid-first millennium B.C.E. The Carian alphabet is genetically related to its Lycian, Lydian, Phrygian, and Greek counterparts, but displays a larger number of idiosyncratic features than the other four with respect to each other. Although the homeland of the Carians was situated in the southwestern part of Asia Minor, the majority of inscriptions come from Egypt, where Carians were employed as mercenaries by the Saitic dynasty and in the Achaemenid period. Several quasi-bilinguals containing the Carian and Egyptian renderings of the same personal names provided a key to Ray's initial discoveries. Carian inscriptions from Anatolia proper, while fewer in number, appear to be more diverse with respect to their content. The Carian and Greek bilingual proxeny unearthed in Kaunos in 1996 convinced the few remaining skeptics about the validity of the transliteration system of Ray-Schürr-Adiego.

It is fair to say that the book under review contains all the information about the Carian language available to date. Its main components are a corpus of Carian inscriptions reproduced in hand copies and transliteration (pp. 17-165), a detailed account of the history of their decipherment (pp. 166-204), a discussion of the Carian alphabet with an emphasis on regional variation (pp. 205-233), a synchronic and diachronic presentation of Carian phonology (pp. 234-263), a combinatory analysis of the available Carian texts (pp. 264-311), a survey of what we can glean about its inflectional morphology (pp. 312-325) and vocabulary (pp. 326-44), and a glossary (pp. 348-441). An important appendix written by Koray Konuk is devoted to Carian coin legends (pp. 471-92). The book is written with exemplary clarity and its target audience is not limited to Anatolianists. Everyone interested in learning about the Carian language may use it without any supplementary materials and has a chance to eventually become as competent in the subject as the leading scholars in the field.

The academic lifetime of individual parts of the volume will probably not be identical. For example, the inventory of Carian graphemes, their regional variants, and their phonetic values are now well established, but the study of Carian morphosyntax is at its initial stage. It is enough to say that only one (!) Carian verbal form is reasonably assured (3 sg. pret. ýbt ~ Lyc. ubete 'he dedicated'). The situation with nominal forms is

marginally better, but a long and inconclusive discussion about possible Carian dative markers (p. 314-318) shows that, here too, our understanding is far from being perfect. The stereotypical character of the better-understood inscriptions from Egypt, which consist mostly of personal names, and the paucity of bilingual fragments are responsible for these lacunae. There is hope that the discovery of even one fully preserved Carian and Greek bilingual may drastically advance our understanding of the grammar of Carian.

Yet, even the fragmentary information at our disposal may be helpful in determining more precisely the place of Carian within the Anatolian family. The Lycian and Milyan languages appear to share with Carian some innovations that are absent in Luvian proper. Thus all the three languages make use of a coordinative conjunction beginning with /s/ (p. 411) and show aphaeresis in the reflexes of IH. *endo 'in' (cf. p. 363, δen). Their likely common archaism is a shortened stem *massa- 'god' alongside *massana- 'id.' (p. 385). It appears furthermore that Milyan occupied an intermediate position between Lycian and Carian. An innovation that unites Lycian B with Carian is the extended connector Lyc. B sebe ~ Car. sb 'and', contrasted with se in Lycian. If Adiego is right about Car. -š appearing in both nom. pl. c. and acc. pl. c (p. 318), then the merger of the two cases in some nominal forms represents another common innovation of Milyan and Carian (cf. Mil. nom./acc. pl. c. xbadiz 'river-valleys(?)'). The generalization of the medial pronominal stem ebe- *'that' at the expense of its proximal counterpart 'this' appears to group Lycian with Milyan against Carian, where the proximal stem s(an)- 'this' is preserved (p. 410).

Another topic that deserves immediate discussion is the possible attestation of Proto-Carian forms in Bronze Age sources. Hittite texts preserve to us about thirty personal names connected with the western Anatolian kingdom of Arzawa and with its successor states that continued their existence under the supreme sovereignty of the Hittite Empire. The scholarly *communis opinio* endorsed the Luvian character of Arzawa personal names some fifty years ago, at the time when Carian had not been deciphered. Now that we are ready to make consistent distinction between the extended Luvic family and Luvian proper, this issue can be revisited. Schürr (Kadmos 51: 163-177) has suggested that the Carian proper noun msn-ord, also attested as Μασανωραδο- in a Greek transmission, contains the same second component as western Anatolian personal names Piyam-aradu and Tarhunt-aradu known from Hittite sources. Pace Adiego (p. 333), I believe that -aradu is not a nominal stem, but rather a 3sg. impv. verbal form 'let him exalt(?)'. This form may represent a Carian innovation. The earlier form of Carian mno- 'son' may have been preserved as the first component of Mana-pa-ᵈU 'Storm-god, protect (my) son', name of a king of the Seha River Land.

A further confirmation of the high status of Proto-Carian in western Anatolia comes from the analysis of Carian loanwords in Lydian onomastics. The name Κανδάυλης, allegedly carried by the last Lydian ruler of the Heraclid dynasty, has been reinterpreted as a borrowed title eventually related to Luv. hantawata/i- 'king'. Yet, the hypothesis that this name was directly borrowed from Luvian requires one to assume a sound change t>l, which is otherwise unattested in loanwords in Lydian. Adiego's (pp. 10, 364, 372) reconstruction of the Carian noun kδou- < (virtual) *hantawa-, meaning 'king', opens now a possibility that Lyd. Κανδάυλης represents a Lydian adjectival derivative of this noun. Γύγης, the alleged murderer of Candaules and the first king of the Mermnad dynasty, had a name that was ostensibly related to Luvian huhha- 'grandfather'

and characterized by the "non-Lydian" fortition of the initial h-. Adiego (pp. 384-85 with ref.) suggested that the name of Gyges has an immediate Carian origin, alluding to Car. PN. quq ~ Gk. Γυγος and Car. PN. dquq ~ Gk. Ιδαγυγος. The reflection of the initial "laryngeal" as a voiced stop /g/ in this root indeed appears to be restricted to Carian and Lydian, while the cognate Lycian name is Κουγας. Fynally, one must compare Lyd. PN. Μουσατης with Car. PN. mwsat-. If both names are related to Luv. PN. Muwaziti- "macho-man", then the Lydian name must have been borrowed from Carian, since the components of this compound are unmistakably Luvic. A different form of the same name Μο(υ)σητα is attested in Pisidian.

Going a step further, one may wonder whether the name Sarpedon, born by the legendary founder of Miletus and a legendary "Lycian" ally of the Trojans, may likewise have a Carian origin. Adiego (p. 261) has argued for the uniquely Carian character of the prefix šar-, corresponding to Lyc. hri-, Mil. zri- and Luv. sarri 'up, above'. The second part of the name may correspond to Hitt. peda- and Lyc. pddēn- 'place' (cf. pp. 336-337) and thus the whole of it can be approximately rendered in English as "Uphill" or "Hyland". It may well be that the Homeric theme of "Trojan Lycians" reflects the raids and the subsequent settlement of Lukka freebooters in northwestern Anatolia on the wake of the collapse of pax hethitica, and furthermore that the marauding Lukka tribes could also have incorporated those more adventurous among their Carian neighbors. But here we are already approaching an area of speculations.

I would like to conclude my review with a series of minor suggestions. It goes without saying they are not made in the spirit of disparagement, and most of them must be taken as a discussion of difficult and sometimes controversial issues, rather than corrections of mistakes.

Pp. 41, 355: If Car. armon in E Me. 8a indeed corresponds to p3 whm 'dragoman' in the Egyptian version of the same inscription, it is tempting to see it as in some way related to Gk. ἑρμηνεύς 'dragoman, interpreter', which otherwise lacks convincing etymology. The divergent vocalism precludes the analysis of the Greek noun as a Carian loanword, but the two words may have been borrowed from a third source.

P 261: Correct š to ś (2x) in the last paragraph of Section 2 (Consonants), and also xuwasaz to xruwasaz in the preceding paragraph.

Pp. 267, 429: The most likely Lycian cognate of Car. upe- ~ ue- ~ wpe- ~ upa- 'stele' is not χupa 'tomb' but rather acc. sg. ubu (TL 44 c 4), a noun probably used with reference to the same objects as sttala 'stele' in the following line of the Kaunos trilingual. A further cognate of the same Carian word is. Luv. (SCALPRUM.CAPERE₂) u-pa-ni- (KARKAMIŠ A1a §13, A2 §10). Hawkins suggested a plausible translation 'trophy' for this Luvian word, but its determinative indicates that 'trophy' should be understood here not as booty, but rather as an architectural installation commemorating victory. All the discussed nouns are probably derived from Luvic */uba-/ 'to found, dedicate', which is reflected as ýbt in Carian.

Pp. 307, 319: The interpretation of -(o)τ as a genitive plural ending is extremely unlikely on comparative grounds. Melchert's analysis of the same ending as a dative plural marker, to be published in the forthcoming proceedings of the Hellenistic Caria conference, not only has the merit of formally relating it to the Luvian dat. pl. in -anz(a) but also yields markedly Anatolian case syntax in the Carian part of the Hyllarima bilingual. While Melchert's interpretation of molš msoτ ylarmiτ (C.Hy 1) as 'priests to all

the gods' renders the Carian construction syntactically different from 'priests of all the gods' in the parallel Greek passage, the dative marking finds a close analogy in KUB 14.10 i 10-11 <u>ANA</u> DINGIR.MEŠ ^{LÚ}SANGA 'priest to the gods' and many similar Hittite phrases.

.