

## Carian *ś(j)as* and *σοῦα(v)*

Zsolt SIMON\*


### 1. The problem

The Carian word *śjas* is attested in the Greek-Carian bilingual of G 1.<sup>1</sup> It has a by-form *śas* in C.Eu 1, which was convincingly explained by D. Schürr with the simplification of the initial cluster.<sup>2</sup> There is a general and justified agreement that this word means ‘funerary monument’ (or similar) based on *σεμα* (= *σημα*) in the Greek version of G 1, as already established by M. Meier-Brügger<sup>3</sup> and followed by almost all scholars.<sup>4</sup>

The similarity of *śjas* to *σοῦα(v)*, a Carian word meaning ‘tomb’ preserved by Stephan of Byzantium s.v. *Σουάγγελα*<sup>5</sup> was recognised long ago,<sup>6</sup> but their relationship has remained unclear.<sup>7</sup> We have the following possibilities:

1. Their similarity is due to chance. This is the implicit view of M. Meier-Brügger and H. C. Melchert, who provided etymologies only for *ś(j)as*, which (*\*tasá-* < *\*d<sup>h</sup>h<sub>1</sub>só-* / *\*d<sup>h</sup>h<sub>1</sub>siyóm*, resp.<sup>8</sup>) are, furthermore, incompatible with *σοῦα(v)*. Such a view cannot *a priori* be excluded, but the words’ formal and semantic closeness is remarkable. Therefore, if a regular explanation can be found to explain their differences, it will be superior to the assumption of chance.
2. Setting aside the final consonant, they are different (Carian and Greek) spellings of the same word. Considering the shape of the words this can be excluded.

---

\* Zsolt Simon, PhD, Hungarian Research Centre for Linguistics, Budapest (zsltsimon@gmail.com;  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6839-7070>).

<sup>1</sup> Carian transcription and sigla follow Adiego 2007. For the attestations of this word see Adiego 2007, 414-415 and Simon 2022, both with refs. Melchert 2010, 181 added the unclear sequence *śas<sup>o</sup>* from C.Hy 1, but this is not possible phonologically (Simon 2022).

<sup>2</sup> Schürr 2001, 117; 2010b, 192, cf. the critical remarks in Simon 2022, especially that there is no evidence for Schürr’s alternative explanation, a “pleonastische Schreibung” <śj> for ś.

<sup>3</sup> Meier-Brügger 1979, 84-85, 88.

<sup>4</sup> Adiego 1992, 33; 1993, 169-170; 2007, 414-415; 2010, 154 [adding ‘tomb’]; Duhoux 2007, 81-83; Melchert 2010, 180-181 [‘cult stele, memorial’]; Simon 2022). The translation ‘der Verstorbene’ proposed by Schürr 2010b, 192 with a question mark is not supported by the bilingual (Simon 2022, cf. also below).

<sup>5</sup> Billerbeck – Neumann-Hartmann 2006, 210-211; not included yet in *eDiAna* as of November 2022.

<sup>6</sup> Meier-Brügger 1979, 88. Stephanus of Byzantium used this word to provide the etymological explanation of a Carian toponym, but it does not mean that the Carian word itself is non-existent (cf. Brandenstein 1936, 33 and Adiego 2007, 11-12). For outdated literature on the Carian word see the references in Laumonier 1958, 642 fn. 3.

<sup>7</sup> Adiego 2007, 10, 415.

<sup>8</sup> Meier-Brügger 2006, 122 and Melchert 2010, 181-182.

3. They go back to the same underlying word, but they represent different outcomes of regular phonological and morphological processes. Adiego argued that “in order to connect all these forms, a lot of non-trivial sound changes are needed ( $*/swa/- > */sqa/- > */sja-/ > \acute{s}ja-$  ( $> \acute{s}a-$ ), for instance” and that the different Auslauts ( $-s$  vs.  $-n$  /  $-\emptyset$ ) remain unexplained.<sup>9</sup> Nevertheless, in the following I will argue that a morphologically and phonologically regular connection between the two words can be established.

## 2. The proposal

As for the morphology, the Greek text has σοῦαν in acc. sg. (“καλοῦσι γὰρ οἱ Κᾶρες σοῦαν τὸν τάφον” ‘since the Carians call the tomb σοῦαν’<sup>10</sup>), and therefore it is not clear whether its  $\acute{o}n$  is the Greek acc. sg. ending or part of the Carian word.<sup>11</sup> Nevertheless, Stephan of Byzantium used this word to explain the toponym Σουάγγελα (the second member of which he explained as being from Carian γέλα ‘king’), in other words, he needed a word that contained a Carian  $-n$ . Therefore, it is σοῦαν that is to be compared with  $\acute{s}jas$  and thus, we have the problem of  $-s$  vs.  $-n$  (or  $-\emptyset$ , if the above analysis is not accepted), as already pointed out by I.-X. Adiego.<sup>12</sup> However,  $\acute{s}jas$  (nom. sg. c.<sup>13</sup>) can regularly be a derivative of  $\acute{s}ja-$  with the well-attested Carian genitival adjective suffix  $-s$ ,<sup>14</sup> which also provides a semantically fitting solution if  $\acute{s}ja-$  and σοῦαν ‘tomb’ represent the same word: ‘\*pertaining to the tomb > funerary monument’ (note that  $\acute{s}jas$  of G 1 is written on the base of a statue<sup>15</sup>). If this underlying word was neuter, we would regularly get  $*\acute{s}jan$  / σοῦαν as the nom.-acc. sg. form,<sup>16</sup> perfectly explaining the form and usage of σοῦαν.

The phonological side is more complicated. σοῦαν can phonetically reflect either [suan] or [swan]. The latter is only possible if  $*sw-$  is secondary, e.g., by syncope from  $*sVw-$ , since the pre-Carian cluster  $*Cw$  (including  $*sw$ ) became  $Cb$  in Carian.<sup>17</sup> A secondary re-syllabification

<sup>9</sup> Adiego 2007, 10.

<sup>10</sup> Billerbeck – Neumann-Hartmann 2006, 210.

<sup>11</sup> Dorsi 1979, 29; Adiego 2007, 8 fn. 2.

<sup>12</sup> Adiego 2007, 10.

<sup>13</sup> As discussed in Simon 2022,  $\acute{s}as$  of C.Eu 1 is in nominative and this is fully in agreement with the grammatical analysis of the phrase  $\acute{s}jas san$  ‘this tomb’ of G 1 as nom. sg. c. and not as nom.-acc. sg. n. (Simon 2020, *contra* Melchert 2010, 181). Therefore, the analysis of  $\acute{s}(j)as$  by Melchert 2010, 181 as a form with the postposed particle  $*-so(d)$  mirroring Luwian  $-š/za$ , cannot be upheld. In general, it is unclear why an ending that came about during the independent history of *Luwian* (Jasanoff 2010), a related but completely different language, is expected in *Carian*. Neither of the two varieties of Lycian, the third certain member of this Anatolian branch (the Luwic languages), show this particle either. Melchert’s other Carian example for this particle, a demonstrative “*as*”, is based on a demonstrably false segmentation and grammatical interpretation (see most recently the detailed discussion in Simon 2019, 3-6). Finally, Schürr 2010b, 192 suggests that  $\acute{s}as ktais$  of C.Eu 1 is in dat. sg. as ‘Dem verstorbenen Hekataios’ or ‘Dem Verstorbenen’ (in which case  $-s$  of  $\acute{s}as$  could be a dat. sg. ending). This is formally possible, but excluded by the meaning ‘tomb’ assured by  $\acute{s}jas$  of G 1.

<sup>14</sup> On this suffix see Adiego 2007, 392 with refs. and the *Paradebeispiel otono-s-* ‘Athenian’.

<sup>15</sup> See the discussion in Duhoux 2007, 81-82.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Melchert 2010, 179-180, 182.

<sup>17</sup> Schürr 2006, 118-119; 2019, 12; Simon 2008, 460, both with examples.

[suan] > [swan] can also not be excluded. The question is whether [suan] / \*sVwan can regularly be connected to śja-. The “interchange” ø/w/j is, however, not unknown in the history of Carian, since the word for ‘sheep’ provides an exact parallel. The Proto-Indo-European word for ‘sheep’, \*h<sub>2</sub>ówi-/ \*h<sub>2</sub>éwi-,<sup>18</sup> lost its -w- in Carian and became (with secondary thematization) κóov (Eustathius, *Commentarii ad Iliadem* 318, 41 [ad II, 677], 983, 33 [ad XIV, 255]) as well as κοῖov (*Scholia Vetera ad Iliadem* XIV, 255). Although κοῖov was taken to be corrupted, it can easily be explained as a secondary form from κóov with a hiatus filler -j-,<sup>19</sup> which can be supported by *kojoλ*, a profession, perhaps ‘shepherd’, from the same word.<sup>20</sup> In other words, śja- is a secondary form from \*śVja- < \*śVa- < \*śVwa- (with the loss of the unaccented vowel<sup>21</sup>), of which \*śVa- / \*śVwa- provide an almost perfect match to [suan] / \*sVwa-.

Two questions remain to be answered: the precise value of the initial sibilant and of the first vowel. The palatal nature of ś is clear;<sup>22</sup> the question is the precise condition(s) of the palatalization of \*s. Melchert proposed that it was caused by a following [i].<sup>23</sup> This is, however, dubious. First, the only example, the gen. sg. ending may continue not only \*-assī as originally proposed by Melchert, but also \*-osyo, as he later argued himself.<sup>24</sup> Second, the nom.-acc. pl. c. -š continues \*-nsi,<sup>25</sup> but the result is not †-ś. Considering that \*s followed by \*e leads to š,<sup>26</sup> it is more probable that \*s became š if followed by a palatal vowel<sup>27</sup> and \*s became ś if followed by [j].<sup>28</sup> Therefore, śja- originates from \*sjā-, which can easily go back to \*sVja- (with the loss of a back vowel in the first syllable), fitting perfectly in the phonological chain sketched above.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> See Steer 2016 for a discussion of this reconstruction; the precise value of the laryngeal is debated, but it is irrelevant here.

<sup>19</sup> See the discussion with refs. in Simon 2016b.

<sup>20</sup> See already Schürr 1992, 155 and now the detailed discussion in Simon 2016a with refs.

<sup>21</sup> Carian is famous for its dearth of vowels, the rules of which still elude us (see Adiego 2019 on the point that this loss is phonologically real, not only an orthographic practice, *contra* Starke 1999). Nevertheless, it is assumed by several scholars that the loss affected the unaccented vowels (see, e.g., the very different accounts of Hajnal 1995, 17-21 and Simon forthcoming).

<sup>22</sup> Adiego 2007, 250-251.

<sup>23</sup> Melchert 2002, 310-312 (followed by Adiego 2007, 261 [misprinted as š]); the Carian spelling with ⟨j⟩ allows both [i] and [j] (cf. Adiego 2007, 235 with discussion and ref.).

<sup>24</sup> Melchert 2012, 279, following Schürr 2001, 117; 2010a, 122.

<sup>25</sup> Melchert 2002, 306; 2010, 178 and therefore, Melchert 2012, 276 implicitly claimed that \*si leads to š.

<sup>26</sup> Melchert 2002, 306, Simon 2008, 460, correcting Adiego 2007, 261.

<sup>27</sup> As already proposed in Simon 2008, 460.

<sup>28</sup> As already proposed by Schürr 1998, 146; 2001, 117.

<sup>29</sup> If someone wants to maintain the change \*s > ś / \_i, it does not lead to an unproblematic alternative regarding the present issue: If śja- goes back to \*siwa- (via > \*siwa- > \*sia- > \*sija-, the palatalization of \*s could have happened at any stage), [suan] obviously cannot reflect any of these forms and while \*sVwa- could originate in \*s/siwa-, it would require that \*s/siwa- and \*sija- existed alongside each other at least until the first vowel was syncopated, leading to the attested forms. This is not impossible, but a solution without parallel forms would be superior.

In other words, the phonological changes were as follows: *\*sVwa-* > *\*sVa-* > *\*sVja-* > *\*sja-* > *śja-* (in which V is a back vowel). This has the advantage that it can regularly explain all attested forms: while *\*sVwa-* would have the problem of coexistence of two parallel forms (*\*sVwa-* and *\*sVja-* at the time of the loss of the unaccented vowel), the reading [suan] can simply reflect the stage *\*sVa-* (with a back vowel in the first syllable). This would mean that the underlying Carian form of *śjas* and *σοῦαν* was *\*sua-*.

### 3. Conclusions

It can be concluded that *śjas* and *σοῦαν* regularly reflect the same underlying word meaning ‘tomb’, with *śjas* as its nominalized genitival adjective. The precise form of the underlying word depends on how much synchronic variation is allowed. An underlying form *\*sua-* leads straightforwardly to the attested forms (*σοῦαν* should be read in this case as [suan]), and it is therefore preferred here. The other possibility, *\*sVwa-* (with a back vowel in the first syllable) requires the parallel existence of *\*sVwa-* / *\*sVja-* and therefore, it is considered here as less probable.<sup>30</sup>

### Bibliography

- Adiego 1992 I.-J. Adiego, Recherches cariennes : essai d’amélioration du système de J. D. Ray, *Kadmos* 31, 1992, 25-39.
- Adiego 1993 I.-J. Adiego, *Studia Carica. Investigaciones sobre la escritura y lengua carias*, Barcelona 1993.
- Adiego 2007 I. J. Adiego, *The Carian Language*, *Handbuch der Orientalistik* 86, Leiden-Boston 2007.
- Adiego 2010 I. J. Adiego, Recent Developments in the Decipherment of Carian, in: R. van Bremen – J.-M. Carbon (eds.), *Hellenistic Karia. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Hellenistic Karia - Oxford, 29 June - 2 July 2006*, Bordeaux 2010, 147-176.
- Adiego 2019 I.-X. Adiego, Consonant Clusters, Defective Notation of Vowels and Syllable Structure in Caromemphite, in: R. I. Kim et al. (eds.), *Hrozný and Hittite: The First Hundred Years. Proceedings of the International Conference Held at Charles University, Prague, 11-14 November 2015, Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 107*, Leiden-Boston 2019, 95-119.
- Billerbeck – Neumann-Hartmann 2006 M. Billerbeck – A. Neumann-Hartmann, *Stephani Byzantii Ethnica IV. Π-Υ*, Berlin-Boston 2006.
- Brandenstein 1936 W. Brandenstein, *Streifzüge*, *Glotta* 25, 1936, 27-35.

<sup>30</sup> Accordingly, this is the pool the future etymological discussion should rely upon. The etymology of Meier-Brügger 2006, 122 and Melchert 2010, 181-182 quoted above not only did not explain *σοῦαν* but also required possible, but at the current level of knowledge of Carian, unprovable assumptions: first, the vocalisation of the initial cluster *\*d<sup>h</sup>h<sub>1</sub>s-* > *\*tas-* and, second, the simplification of the syncopated form *\*ts-* > *s-* (which might be incompatible with the existence of Carian <τ>, phonetically [t<sup>s</sup>] or [t<sup>h</sup>], since it reflects *\*ti* and transcribes Egyptian *t̄* [Simon 2021, 56-60]). Note also that the proposed Anatolian continuations of *\*d<sup>h</sup>eh<sub>1</sub>s-* were challenged by Schürr 2016.

- Dorsi 1979 P. Dorsi, Le glosse carie, *ILing* 5, 1979, 27-35.
- Duhoux 2007 Y. Duhoux, Le vocabulaire carien de la “tombe”. À propos d’une possible isoglosse étrusco-carienne (suθi/suθi “tombeau” ~ carien sdi/siði, “tombe”), *Kadmos* 46, 53-107.
- eDiAna O. Hackstein et al. (eds.), *Digital Philological-Etymological Dictionary of the Minor Ancient Anatolian Corpus Languages*, München-Marburg 2015 -, <https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de>
- Hajnal 1995 I. Hajnal, Das Vokalsystem des Karischen. Eine provisorische Bestandsaufnahme, *Die Sprache* 37, 1995, 12-30.
- Jasanoff 2010 J. Jasanoff, The Luvian “Case” in -ša/-za, in: R. Kim et al. (eds.), *Ex Anatolia Lux. Anatolian and Indo-European studies in honor of H. Craig Melchert on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday*, Ann Arbor-New York 2010, 167-179.
- Laumonier 1958 A. Laumonier, *Les cultes indigènes en Carie*, Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d’Athènes et de Rome 188, Paris 1958.
- Meier-Brügger 1979 M. Meier-Brügger, *Karika II-III*, *Kadmos* 18, 1979, 80-88.
- Meier-Brügger 2006 M. Meier-Brügger, Zur Bildung von griechisch θεός, *ILing* 19, 2006, 119-125.
- Melchert 2002 H. C. Melchert, Sibilants in Carian, in: M. Fritz – S. Zeilfelder (eds.), *Novalis indogermanica. Festschrift für Günter Neumann zum 80. Geburtstag*, Graz 2002, 305-313.
- Melchert 2010 H. C. Melchert, Further Thoughts on Carian Nominal Inflection, in: R. van Bremen – J.-M. Carbon (eds.), *Hellenistic Karia. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Hellenistic Karia - Oxford, 29 June - 2 July 2006, Bordeaux 2010*, 177-186.
- Melchert 2012 H. C. Melchert, Genitive case and possessive adjectives in Anatolian, in: V. Orioles (ed.), *Per Roberto Gusmani: Studi in ricordo. Linguistica storica e teorica II/I*, Udine 2012, 273-286.
- Schürr 1992 D. Schürr, Zur Bestimmung der Lautwerte des karischen Alphabets 1971-1991, *Kadmos* 31, 1992, 127-156.
- Schürr 1998 D. Schürr, Kaunos in lykischen Inschriften, *Kadmos* 37, 1998, 143-162.
- Schürr 2001 D. Schürr, Karische und lykische Sibilanten, *IF* 106, 2001, 94-121.
- Schürr 2006 D. Schürr, Karische Berg- und Ortsnamen mit lykischem Anschluß, *HSF* 119, 2006, 117-132.
- Schürr 2010a D. Schürr, Lykische Genitive, *IF* 115, 2010, 118-126.
- Schürr 2010b D. Schürr, Spätkarisch: Regionalisierung und Lautentwicklungen, in: R. van Bremen – J.-M. Carbon (eds.), *Hellenistic Karia. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Hellenistic Karia - Oxford, 29 June- 2 July 2006, Bordeaux 2010*, 187-205.
- Schürr 2016 D. Schürr, Zu lykisch θθē und seiner etymologischen Interpretation,

- IF 121, 2016, 123-130.
- Schürr 2019 D. Schürr, Zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte des Karischen, in: O. Henry – K. Konuk (eds.), *Karia Arkhaia. La Carie, des origines à la période pré-hekatomnide. 4èmes Rencontres d'archéologie de l'IFÉA*. Istanbul, 14-16 novembre 2013, Istanbul 2019, 1-21.
- Simon 2008 Zs. Simon, Review of Adiego 2007, *AAntHung* 48, 2008, 457-463.
- Simon 2016a Zs. Simon, Carian *kojoλ* '(a profession, perhaps shepherd)', in: eDiAna, <https://www.ediana.gwi.unimuenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=243>.
- Simon 2016b Zs. Simon, Carian *κόον / κοῖον* 'all four-footed cattle, small cattle, sheep', in: eDiAna, <https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=221>.
- Simon 2019 Zs. Simon, Kar. *sδisa* und ein lykischer Ortsname, *Gephyra* 17, 2019, 1-9.
- Simon 2020 Zs. Simon, Carian *san-* 'this', in: eDiAna, <https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=939>.
- Simon 2021 Zs. Simon, Die karische Endung *-τ*, IF 126, 2021, 53-64.
- Simon 2022 Zs. Simon, Carian *śjas > śas* 'funerary monument, tomb', in: eDiAna, <https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=3082>.
- Simon forthcoming Zs. Simon, Egyptian in Carian transmission: Towards a better understanding of Carian vocalism, in: I.-X. Adiego et al. (eds.), 7<sup>th</sup> Luwic Workshop. *The Luwic Dialects of the Anatolian Group: Writing Systems, Grammar, Lexicon and Onomastics*, *Barcino Monographica Orientalia*, Barcelona.
- Starke 1999 F. Starke, Karisch, *Der Neue Pauly* 6, 1999, cols. 279-280.
- Steer 2016 Th. Steer, Proto-Luwic \*HEui- 'sheep'. Proto-Indo-European Etymology, in: eDiAna, <https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=221>.

**Karca  $\acute{s}(j)as$  ve  $\sigma\omicron\upsilon\alpha(v)$   
Özet**

Karia mezar terminolojisinin iki terimi olan  $\acute{s}(j)as$  ‘mezar anıtı’ (Karca yazıtlarda görülür) ve  $\sigma\omicron\upsilon\alpha(v)$  ‘mezar’ (Bizanslı Stephanos tarafından korunmuştur) arasındaki benzerlik uzun zaman önce fark edilmiştir, ancak aralarındaki bağlantı, eğer varsa, belirsizdir. Bu makale, her iki formun da düzenli fonolojik ve morfolojik süreçlerle aynı temel kelimeye geri döndüğünü savunmaktadır.

*Anahtar Sözcükler:* Karca, Karca yorumlar, mezar terminolojisi, Bizanslı Stephanos.

**Carian  $\acute{s}(j)as$  and  $\sigma\omicron\upsilon\alpha(v)$   
Abstract**

The similarity of two terms of Carian funerary terminology,  $\acute{s}(j)as$  ‘funerary monument’ (attested in Carian inscriptions) and  $\sigma\omicron\upsilon\alpha(v)$  ‘tomb’ (preserved by Stephanus of Byzantium) was recognized long ago, but their connection, if it exists at all, is unclear. This paper argues that both forms go back to the same underlying word by regular phonological and morphological processes.

*Keywords:* Carian, Carian glosses, funerary terminology, Stephanus of Byzantium.