

## Sibilants in Carian

H. Craig Melchert, Chapel Hill

Our honorand has a long-standing interest in the "minor" Indo-European languages of Anatolia, to whose understanding he has made so many contributions. Professor Neumann has always exemplified, both in his own work and in his generous reception and facilitation of the work of others, the collaborative and incremental nature of our discipline. In this spirit, and in gratitude for the many personal kindnesses he has shown to me, I offer him what I hope is one more small step in elucidating one of the more difficult puzzles that Carian presents us.

The Carian alphabet has at least three letters that appear to represent sibilants, and probably a fourth.<sup>1</sup> Despite the efforts of a number of scholars (e.g. Schürr 1991-93, 171 f., Adiego 1993b, and Hajnal 1998), there is still no consensus on the approximate phonetic value of these sounds nor on their prehistoric sources. In sorting out this tangle of conflicting claims, I will try to adhere to two basic principles. First, I give priority to synchronic evidence, in the form of alternations between sounds (or lack thereof) and equivalences in other writing systems (notably Egyptian and Greek). I then try to reconcile *presumed* prehistoric developments based on comparison with related languages with *this* evidence (*not* vice-versa!). Second, I apply "Occam's razor" and seek the simplest account consistent with the data.

For letter number 15 (outside Kaunos) the synchronic evidence points clearly to a voiceless palatal (or at least palatalized) sibilant. Ray 1981, 155 cites the equivalence in MY L of the Carian name *šarkbeom* (now read *šarkbiom*) with Egyptian *šrkbyṃ* (see for the essentials already Kowalski 1975, 90). As per Adiego 1993a, 152 ff., this value is confirmed by additional name equations such as *arliš*

<sup>1</sup> With the confirmation of the new Carian-Greek Bilingual from Kaunos, I now take for granted the essential validity of the Adiego-Ray-Schürr interpretation of the Carian alphabet (see most recently Adiego 1998a). The system naturally remains open to revision of details. I use what is now the conventional numbering of the Carian letters and of the Carian texts, for which see Schürr 1992 or Adiego 1993a. Based on the equation of the name *ṭamou* with Egyptian *T-i'm-w* (Adiego 1993a, 146ff. with references), it seems likely that letter 40 (now transliterated τ) is some kind of affricate, [č] or [ts]. The letter is rare in Carian appellatives, but occurs notably as an ending in D 7 from Hylarima and in 39\*\*. The suggestion of Hajnal 1995, 15, note 9 that the ending represents a genitive in *\*-ts* (cf. already Adiego 1993a, 214) is possible, but anim. nom. plural must also be considered. I will have no more to say about this sound here.

= 'Irš(Ξ) = 'Αρλίσσις. The evidence from Egyptian, which distinguishes /s/ and /š/, is unequivocal. We must in view of this reject the proposal of Hajnal 1998, 90 ff. that <š> is a voiced dental sibilant, based entirely on plausible but quite unprovable parallels with Lycian and Milyan.

A voiceless palatal š also makes just as much sense historically. The frequent first element of names š(a)r- surely reflects \*ser- 'above, hyper-' (see Adiego 1993a, 278 or Neumann 1994, 21), and we may assume the same palatalization as seen in Lydian *serli-/selli-* 'supreme'. Furthermore, by the elegant solution of Adiego 1998a, 14 sign 15 having been employed at Kaunos for /t/, the value š was displaced there to sign 16, merely a modified variant of 15.<sup>2</sup> The new Carian-Greek Bilingual shows that as a grammatical ending sign 16 represents animate accusative plural. If we assume the same generalization of animate nominative plural to accusative plural seen in Hieroglyphic Luvian and perhaps also in Lydian (see for the latter Melchert 1991, 137 f.), we may straightforwardly derive the Carian ending: \*-Vnsi > \*-Vnši > Vši > \*-(V)š (the order of the first two changes is indeterminate).<sup>3</sup> I therefore take the transliteration of letter 15 (respectively sign 16 in Kaunos) as š as accurate and not merely conventional.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>2</sup> I find Adiego's account superior to the more complicated scenario sketched by Hajnal 1998, 99 ff. The alleged use of letter 16 in inscription 38\*\*a from Iasos, where it would stand *beside* both letters 15 and 14 (t), remains a separate problem. Pugliese Carratelli 1985, 150 reads the letter in question as a. Gusmani 1988, 147 f. correctly indicates that the shape differs from the clear a that is the first preserved letter of the inscription and suggests letter 16 instead. But as the excellent photograph following Pugliese Carratelli's article shows, the letter also bears little resemblance to the shape of letter 16 as attested in Kaunos D 16, 30\*, and 44\* (the Bilingual), where it has a quite long horizontal stroke, or to that in Kaunos 28\* (see Schürr 1996a, 158) or D 15 (Taşyaka). To be sure, Schürr 1996b interprets the shape in 38\*\*a as transitional between what he claims is the oldest form of the letter in Si. 62 F and those of Taşyaka and Kaunos. However, I find his identification of the letter in Si. 62 F anything but certain (see his own sketch of the letter as it actually appears, Schürr 1996b, 150!). Adiego (pers. comm.) reminds me that 38\*\*a uses two quite different forms of r. At present I am quite prepared to entertain that the inscription also uses two forms of a (one in which the upper right stroke is curved instead of straight): cf. the second variant for <a> in the third column of the table in Masson 1978, 10! In any case, I find current evidence quite insufficient for positing *another* sibilant in Carian (Hajnal 1998, 102).

<sup>3</sup> See Hajnal 1997, 148, with notes 10-11, who plausibly suggests that *kdušolš* in text 41\* (š = letter 16) may show an animate *nominative* plural ending and considers derivation from \*V(i)nsi.

<sup>4</sup> I am now willing to concede (contra Melchert 1994, 314 f.) that <z> in Milyan (and Lycian) at least sometimes represents a voiced dental fricative [z], as long advocated by Gusmani and others (see the references, loc. cit., and Hajnal 1998, 93). In the animate accusative plural \*-Vns and the nominative plural \*-Vnsi built upon it, voicing to [nz] is just as likely as epenthesis to [nts]. Lycian, however, shows that voicing here is *not* preordained, since it has anim. acc. plural -Vs and anim. nom. plural \*-Vi < \*-Vnhi < \*-Vnsi. We are thus under no obligation to assume voicing for Carian either, pace

Letter 17 has long been assigned a value *s* based on the shape of the sign (= Greek "san"). The rendering of the Carian name *n'rskle-* by *Nrskr* in M 7 brought confirmation (see Ray 1981, 158 and for the emendation of the first letter Schürr 1992, 136, as did the consistent rendering of Egyptian *Psmṯk* as *psma-*. Of special significance is the use of this letter in the new bilingual to render Greek *s* in personal names: *lūsikla-* for Λουσικλ°, *lūsikrata-* for Λουσικρατ°. Note also the equivalences *u/úksmu* = Ουαξαμως/Ουαξαμοας (Neumann apud Adiego 1993a, 236) and *p/biks-* = Πιξ-ωδαρος etc. (Adiego 1994b, 42 f. and 46; 1995, 25 ff.; Schürr 1996b, 151 ff.). All evidence thus points to a synchronic value of a voiceless dental/alveolar sibilant. It is also worth noting that there are no assured examples of alternation between *s* and either *ś* or *š*.<sup>6</sup>

This value also is consistent with the likely prehistoric sources of Carian *s*. As per Adiego 1993a, 169 (following already Georgiev), we can isolate a Carian demonstrative stem *s(a)n-* 'this' cognate with Luvian *za-* < \*ke/o-. See further Melchert 1993a, 79 f. and Hajnal 1998, 86. This comparison suggests that Carian, like Lycian, developed the affricate [ts] (or similar) further to a simple dental sibilant [s]. Support for this assumption comes from the equation of Carian *sb* 'and' with Milyan *sebe* (Neumann 1993, 296), a reinforced form of Lycian *se* 'and', which Adiego 1995, 31 f. has plausibly derived from *ke*, comparing Venetic *ke*. Other sources for *s* are controversial. What has been lacking is an incontrovertible example of Carian *s* reflecting prehistoric simple \*s.

Schürr has now provided this desideratum. Already in Schürr 1992, 153 f. he proposes that the ending -s marks dative singular in Carian. In Schürr 1996c, 66 he explicitly interprets MY L *šarkbiom : židks mδane* : as 'Šarkbiom dem Stidk gab-ihn'. Apud Adiego 1998a, 19, Schürr further argues that the Carian portion of 4 Š, which he now reads as *šarnais | sb taqbos*, means 'to Š. and T.' and forms a "complementary" bilingual with the formulaic Egyptian text 'Isis, give life'. Adiego himself doubts that the two texts are integrated in this fashion, but admits the possibility that

Hajnal. Since neither Egyptian nor Greek has a [z] or [ž], we obviously cannot prove that voicing did not take place, but I find this a gratuitous assumption in the absence of positive evidence.

<sup>5</sup> It is the direction of the equivalence that is crucial. Since Greek has only one sibilant fricative, its use of σ(σ) to render Carian *s*, *ś* and *š* is predictable. It is quite noteworthy that Carian *s*, not *ś* or *š*, was chosen to represent Greek /s/.

<sup>6</sup> Contra Adiego 1993a, 195 there is no sound basis for assuming that *u-s-o-τ* (sic!) in D 7 and 39\*\* is related to the onomastic element -u-ś-o-λ-. See the objections raised by Hajnal 1995, 15, note 9.

the Carian means independently 'for Š and T.'. I see no reason why the author could not have had the sophistication to intend that the Egyptian and Carian could be read both independently (the former as a banal wish formula and the latter as dedicatory) and together, as per Schürr.

Adiego protests that in all instances *-s* can be taken as marking the genitive (possession) rather than dative (recipient). In 4 Š just cited the Carian would mean 'belonging to Š and T.'. Likewise in the Lion (*ntros* : *pr37idas* / *orša* / *nu mδane* : *uksi urmš*) Adiego takes the opening phrase as a genitive depending on *orša*, which he plausibly interprets as referring to the object. However, given the presence of the verb *mδa(-ne)*, it is more likely that one should take *ntros pr37idas* as the recipient (Schürr, per letter), which has been fronted for prominence, while the subject has been relegated to the end, thus: 'Uksi, (son) of Ur(o)m, has now given it, the *orša*, to the priest of Apollo, the Branchid'.<sup>7</sup>

It is true that *-s* also appears to function as a genitive.<sup>8</sup> In the Bilingual, lines 1-2 *i[poč]inis-δ rual* surely means 'under/in the *r.* of Hipposthenes', a dating formula equivalent to the Greek *ἐπι δημ[ο]υ[ρ]γοῦ Ἰπποσθένους*: see independently Hajnal 1997, 150 and Melchert 1998, 37. One may also concede that several examples are ambiguous, permitting a reading as either genitive or dative.<sup>9</sup> These points, however, argue for Schürr's proposal, not against it. A shift in function from genitive to dative is trivial: compare within Anatolian Lydian dative-locative plural *-av* < genitive plural *\*-ōm*, as well as the use of the genitive to indicate recipient in Tocharian, Sanskrit, and elsewhere. Ambiguous cases such as that in 4 Š cited above form precisely the "conduit" for the shift in meaning. Coexistence of both functions is likewise unproblematic: while Lydian *-av* for the most part marks dative-locative, in at least one example (*šfarda(v)-k artimuλ* in 11,9) the synchronic meaning must still be possessive: 'to Artemis of the Sardians' (see Gusmani 1964, 202, with reference to at

<sup>7</sup> For the interpretation of *ntro-* and *pr37ida-* see Schürr 1998, 158 and further below. I must make clear that only the interpretation of *ntros pr37idas* as the recipient in the dative and *mδa-ne* as the verb are due to Schürr, who interprets the rest of the text quite differently from me. Hajnal 1997, 154 gives essentially the same syntactic analysis as mine, except for *-ne*. I will soon discuss elsewhere the problem of *mδa(ne)* and similar forms, but I am at last convinced that these are verbs, as per Schürr and others.

<sup>8</sup> See Neumann apud Adiego 1994c, 250, note 6!

<sup>9</sup> In addition to the other instances cited see also *ntokris dúsołs múdonš-xi* 'of/for N., (son) of D., the *m.*' in M27. As Schürr points out (per letter), it is quite *ad hoc* to assume that just in this case Carian preserved a nominative singular *\*-s*.

least one other likely example). Possessive use of the genitive also continues in Tocharian and Sanskrit alongside the use to mark recipient.

I thus see no reason to deny that the ending *-s* marks the recipient at least in those cases where it cooccurs with *mδa(-ne)* and variants meaning 'give' (or similar). The use to mark possession, however, betrays its origin as a genitive, and that is its significance for our problem of defining the sibilants. As opposed to *ś*, which inflects in Carian (anim. acc. sg. *-ś(u)n*), there is no evidence that *-s* is anything but an ending.

This fact argues that it should be identified with the Lycian genitive singular in *-a/ehe*, which does *not* agree in gender and case with its possessed noun and which continues a PIE *\*-e/oso* seen e.g. in Germanic (Gothic *-is*, Old English *-æs*, etc.): see Bader 1991, 139 f. and in detail Adiego 1994a. We thus have in genitive-dative *-s* our desired example of Carian *s* from prehistoric simple *\*s*.<sup>10</sup>

Identification of *-s* as a dative singular ending seems to contradict the notion that forms such as *ntro* (34\*) and *trquδe* (38\*a) are dative singulars (for the former see Melchert, 1993a, 80, and for the latter Adiego, 1994b, 38 and 54). I must now follow Schürr in seriously doubting the existence of the datives ending in a vowel. In Melchert 1993a I offered a tentative coherent analysis of text 34\*, the "New York bronze bowl": *šrquq qtlebełmš wbt snn orkn ntro pídl* 'Šrquq, (son) of Qetbelem, dedicated this bowl to Apollo as a gift'. I emphasized at the time that I was far less confident about my interpretation of the last two words than about the rest, and my caution now seems fully justified.

I termed *pídl* an apposition to the direct object *snn orkn*, but it can hardly be a true apposition, since it is separated from the direct object by *ntro*. If *pídl* means 'gift' or the like and is coreferential with *snn orkn*, which I still think it is, it would be more accurate to say that it is epexegetic, an add-on phrase further defining the direct object. If that is true for *pídl*, then the same can be true for *ntro*. As per Schürr 1998, 158, it is more likely that *ntro* is a *derivative* of the name for Apollo than the direct reflex of the divine name in Carian. One may thus interpret 34\* as: 'Šrquq, (son) of Q., dedicated this bowl – the priest of Apollo as a gift'.<sup>11</sup> Given the specification of

<sup>10</sup> The Lycian endings *-ahe* and *ihe* represent merely a trivial analogy from *-ehe* reflecting *o*-stem *\*-e/oso*, as per Adiego 1994a, 18. I must reject the derivation of Lycian *-e/ahe* from a recharacterized genitive *\*-o/ās-os* by Hajnal 1998, 84, note 11, et aliter.

<sup>11</sup> Once again I must emphasize that this is my own syntactic interpretation. Schürr himself takes *ntro pídl* quite differently.

the giver as a priest of Apollo, the recipient would hardly need to be named explicitly. The context of *trqude* is far too obscure to assure any particular morphosyntactic analysis (the inscription is incomplete at beginning and end). In sum, I see nothing that stands in the way of Schürr's synchronic dative singular ending *-s*.<sup>12</sup>

Confirmation that Carian *s* continues prehistoric simple *\*s*, combined with the synchronic evidence for [s], supports the idea cited above that Carian, like Lycian, also simplified prehistoric *\*ts* < *\*k* to simple *s*. This lends credence to the claim of Hajnal 1998, 86 ff. that Carian *s* also reflects *\*-ns-* and *\*-nts*.<sup>13</sup>

There can be no doubt that letter 25 (now conventionally *ś*) represents a further voiceless sibilant: note the equivalence of *šaruśoλ-* and *Σαρυσοωλλος* (Ray 1981, 161, following Meier-Brügger). The alternation of *ś* and *š* in the Carian rendering of Egyptian *Psmṯk* (usually *psmašk-* but at least once *psmašk-*) suggests a second sibilant with a palatal(ized) quality. Adiego 1993b offers as further support the observed alternation *śias/śas* (a word referring to the tomb), and Schürr 1998, 146 has added the further example of *kduśo-/kduśio-*. The first word has no etymology, and Schürr's suggestion for the second is merely one possibility, but the importance of a following yod that could have conditioned palatalization remains. Finally, Adiego 1993b and 1998b, 71 also notes that on occasion Carian *ś* is rendered by Greek "sampi":

<sup>12</sup> Much more speculatively, I think we should consider the possibility that Carian, like Lydian, likewise turned genitive plural *\*-ōm* into a dative-locative. By the new reading of Frei-Marek 1998, 2, the first word of the Bilingual reads *kbidn*. Contra Adiego 1998a, 12, the preservation of the first *-i-* vowel (vs. adjectival ethnicon *kbdün-*) and the lack of any case ending (if the *-n-* is taken as part of the suffix) argue decisively that we are dealing with the name of the city. Since a plurale tantum for the city-name would be perfectly in order (cf. with Hajnal 1997, 149, Lycian *Xbide-*, which probably is plurale tantum), I find it plausible that *kbidn* may be simply 'in Kaunos'. Only further investigation will decide whether any other examples of final *-n-* in Carian lend themselves to such an interpretation.

<sup>13</sup> Whether the former became *s* directly with the loss of *\*n* or via *\*nts* with epenthesis cannot be determined. Hajnal 1998, 89 f. correctly rejects Schürr's direct comparison (1991-93, 171 f.) of Carian *īβ(a)rsi-* with Lycian *īprehi* (which in turn matches CLuvian *im(ma)rašša/i* 'of the open country'). Schürr rejects derivation of the place-name *Imbros* from *\*imr-* 'open country'. I am not persuaded, but if he is right, this only clinches the argument against his equation of Carian ethnicon *īβrsi-* and the Luvo-Lycian word meaning 'of the open country'. In addition to Hajnal's derivation of *-si-* from *\*(i)Ro-* seen in CLuvian *-izza-* (+ *\*iyo-*), one should also consider comparison with Lycian *-ze/i-*, which likewise forms ethnica and reflects another case of affricate [ts], in this case from *\*-tyo-* (see Gusmani 1961). If the Aramaic KBYDŠY of the Létōon Trilingual represented Carian *-s-* (see Adiego 1995, 18 ff.), it would confuse the picture. I am far from persuaded, however, that the Aramaic of a Lycian inscription reflects Carian. Compare now Schürr 1996b, 152, note 4, who considers Lydian a possible source instead. I believe we must give more weight in this case to the direct Egyptian and Greek renderings of assured Carian names.

ΟαΤαΤιος (gen.) beside Οασσασσας. This suggests something other than an ordinary dental [s].

Diachronic confirmation of a palatal(ized) value for *ś* would be forthcoming if we could demonstrate independently that the possessive suffix *-ś* reflects the well-known Anatolian suffix *\*-asso-* in its form *\*-assī* with "i-mutation".<sup>14</sup> We do have solid evidence for "i-mutation" elsewhere in Carian. As per Schürr 1996d, 96, *ted* 'father' and *en* 'mother' with their *e*-vocalism must represent *\*tedi* and *\*eni* with umlaut like Lycian *tedi* and *ēni*, while Carian names in *eλ-* likewise match CLuvian *-alli-* and Milyan *-eli-* (vs. those in *-oλ-* = CLuvian *-alla-*). Adiego 1998a, 15 f. has also made a strong case for Carian *ū* and *ü* as fronted [ū], including the ethnic suffix *-ūn-* specifically from *\*-wVnū* (= CLuvian *-wanni-*).

Further confirmation that the productive possessive suffix *ś* reflects "i-mutation" and palatalization may be available in the contrasting result in *-p/biks-* cited earlier. As per Melchert 1993b, 176 contra Starke 1990, 103 ff., there is no neuter *s*-stem *\*pīhas-* in Luvian, only a base noun *\*pīha-* 'splendor; might' and a derived adjective *\*pīhassa-* 'luminous; mighty' (> noun 'lightning'). The onomastic element in Lycian and Carian may thus well represent a cognate of *\*pīhassa-* without *i*-mutation, an archaism preserved in names. Carian *s* would once again reflect unpalatalized *\*-s(s)-*.

There is one apparent problem with the otherwise attractive idea that possessive *-ś* continues specifically *\*-assī-*: the apparent anaptyctic *-u-* in the animate accusative singular form *pδaxmśuñ* (D 10) and probably [...] *śun* (Bilingual, line 13). How one solves this depends on whether we restore the patronymics in the Bilingual as *lūsiklas[n]* and *lūsikratas[n]* (so Frei-Marek 1997, 35 with hesitation and Hajnal 1998, 100 f.) or assume that the forms are complete as is, with final *-s* (for recognition of both possibilities see Adiego 1998a, 18). In the latter case, they would represent genitives in *-s* < *\*-Vso* as described above. I then see no solution for anim. acc. sg. *-śun* except to assume (with Adiego 1994a, 18, Schürr 1991-93, 171, Hajnal 1998, 83<sup>10</sup>) that this represents an *accusativus genitivi*, i.e. a new secondary inflection of *-ś*, which despite its origin as an inflected adjective in *\*-assī-*, had previously been reduced to an uninflected ending.<sup>15</sup> This may be the correct solution, despite my earlier vehement protests to the contrary.

<sup>14</sup> For the notion of *i*-mutation see Starke 1990, 54 ff. For its possible appearance in Carian see Schürr 1996d, 96.

<sup>15</sup> The quality of the anaptyctic vowel would then be due to the following nasal, which in pre-Carian could conceivably even have still been *\*-m* (cf. Melchert 1994, 181).

However, if what stood in the Bilingual were patronymics ending in *-sn* (NB with *-s-*!), these could continue directly *\*-assom* without *-i*-mutation, just like Lycian patronymics in *-ahn* (a derivation I continue to insist upon for the reasons given in Melchert 1994, 324 f.). The quality of the final nasal, and hence the preceding anaptyctic vowel, in *-sun* would then be analogical to that in *-sn* < *\*-assom*. In any case, I do not see *-sun* as a serious obstacle to the otherwise attractive analysis of *-ś* as a second palatal sibilant beside *-š*. A three-way contrast of */s/*, */ʃ/*, and */ç/* (or similar) would be typologically unremarkable. Distributing the values */ʃ/* and */ç/* between the letters *ś* and *š* (cf. Adiego 1998a, 9) is probably beyond our capability.<sup>16</sup>

## References

- ADIEGO, Ignacio-Javier. 1993a. *Studia Carica*, Barcelona: PPU.  
 – 1993b. Sobre los sibilantes in cario. Unpublished ms.  
 – 1994a. Genitiu singular en lici i protoluvi. *Annuari de Filologia* 17, 11-33.  
 – 1994b. Les identifications onomastiques dans le déchiffrement du carien. In: *La decifrazione del cario* 27-63. Rome: CNRS.  
 – 1994c. El nombre cario Hecatomno. *Cuadernos de Filología Clásica* 4, 247-256.  
 – 1995. Contribuciones al desciframiento del cario. *Kadmos* 34, 18-34.  
 – 1998a. La nueva bilingüe greco-caria de Cauno y el desciframiento del cario. *Aula Orientalis* 16, 5-26.  
 – 1998b. Die neue Bilingue von Kaunos und das Problem des karischen Alphabets. *Kadmos* 37, 57-79.  
 BADER, Françoise 1991. Problématique du génitif thématique sigmatique. *BSL* 86/1, 89-157.  
 FREI, Peter and MAREK, Christian. 1997. Die karisch-griechische Bilingue von Kaunos. *Kadmos* 36, 1-89.  
 – 1998. Die karisch-griechische Bilingue von Kaunos. Ein neues Textfragment. *Kadmos* 37, 1-18.  
 GUSMANI, Roberto. 1961. Il suffisso *-tjo-* di aggettivi "locali" e la sua diffusione nelle lingue indoeuropee. *AION-L* 3, 41-58.  
 – 1964. *Lydisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg: Winter.  
 – 1988. *Karische Beiträge*. *Kadmos* 27, 139-149.  
 HAJNAL, Ivo. 1995. Das Vokalsystem des Karischen. *Sprache* 37/1, 12-30.  
 – 1997. Die karisch-griechische Bilingue 44\* aus Kaunos: ein erster Augenschein. *Kadmos* 36, 141-166.
- 1998. 'Jungluwisches' \*s und die karische Evidenz: Versuch einer dialektologischen Klärung. *Kadmos* 37, 80-108.  
 KOWALSKI, Thomas. 1975. Lettres cariennes: essai de déchiffrement de l'écriture carienne. *Kadmos* 14, 73-93.  
 MASSON, Olivier. 1978. *Carian Inscriptions from North Saqqâra and Buhen*. London: Egypt Exploration Society.  
 MELCHERT, Craig. 1991. The Lydian Emphasizing and Reflexive Particle *-ś/-is*. *Kadmos* 30, 131-142.  
 – 1993a. Some Remarks on New Readings in Carian. *Kadmos* 32, 77-86.  
 – 1993b. *Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon*. Chapel Hill: self-published.  
 – 1994. *Anatolian Historical Phonology*. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.  
 – 1998. Carian *mdoŋun* 'we have established'. *Kadmos* 37, 33-41.  
 NEUMANN, Günter. 1993. Zu den epichorischen Sprachen Kleinasien. In: *Hundert Jahre Kleinasiatische Kommission der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Akten des Symposiums 1990*, 289-296.  
 – 1994. Zur Nebenüberlieferung des Karischen. In: *La decifrazione del cario* (ed. M.L. Giannotta et al.), 15-25. Rome: CNRS.  
 PUGLIESE CARRATELLI. 1985 [86]. Cari in Iasos. *Rendiconti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, classe di scienze morali ecc., Serie VIII, Vol. 40, fasc. 5-6*, 149-155.  
 RAY, John. 1981. An approach to the Carian script. *Kadmos* 20, 150-162.  
 SCHÜRR, Diether. 1992. Zur Bestimmung der Lautwerte des karischen Alphabets 1971-1991. *Kadmos* 31, 127-156.  
 – 1991-93. *Imbr-* in lykischer und karischer Schrift. *Sprache* 35, 163-175.  
 – 1996a. Zur karischen Felsgrabinschrift von Kaunos (28\*). *Kadmos* 35, 157-159.  
 – 1996b. Zur karischen Felsinschrift Si. 62 F. *Kadmos* 35, 149-156.  
 – 1996c. Bastet-Namen in karischen Inschriften Ägyptens. *Kadmos* 35, 55-71.  
 – 1996d. Karisch 'Mutter' und 'Vater'. *Sprache* 38/1, 93-98.  
 – 1998. Kaunos in lykischen Inschriften. *Kadmos* 37, 143-162.  
 STARKE, Frank. 1990. *Untersuchungen zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

<sup>16</sup> I utterly fail to understand the reasoning of Adiego 1993a, 278 or that of Hajnal 1998, 93 according to which the developments of *\*-asso/-i-* in Lycian and Milyan argue for a voiced [z] value for Carian *ś*. If, as discussed above (note 4), <z> in Lycian and Milyan is used for [z], then Milyan *-ase/i-* is surely *not* voiced. Furthermore a voiced [z] makes a bizarre intermediate stage for the change from Proto-Lycian voiceless \*s to Lycian voiceless h. Finally, voicing of a *geminate* *\*-ss-* seems unlikely *a priori*. Once again, it is impossible to disprove voicing in Carian, but I see not a shred of positive evidence for such a change.