PHRYGIAN & GREEK[*]

(*Supplementum Epigraphicum Mediterraneum* 33)

FRED C. WOUDHUIZEN

INTRODUCTION

The following survey of the Phrygian language elaborates on Woudhuizen 1993, with the noted difference that here alongside material from Old Phrygian inscriptions, dated to the late 8th to early 5th century BC, also evidence from their New Phrygian counterparts, predominantly dating to the first 3 centuries AD, is included. The exclusion of New Phrygian forms from the demonstration of the intimate relationship of Phrygian with Greek in the aforesaid work was intentional because I believed at that time that New Phrygian was influenced by the *lingua franca* in the east-Mediterranean region from the Hellenistic period onwards, *i.c.* Greek, to the extent that it actually was well on its way to become a provincial dialectal variant of Greek. I now hold this to be an error of judgment: Phrygian retained its authentic character until its latest attestations! The Old Phrygian texts are, of course, numbered and transliterated in accordance with the corpus by Brixhe & Lejeune (1984). Still indispensable aids for the study of especially the New Phrygian texts are Haas 1966 and Diakonoff & Neroznak 1985, to which may be added to fruition Orel 1997, but numerous improvements as to their understanding as well as newly published texts or improved editions of texts already incorporated in the aforesaid works can be found in the proceedings of the conference on Phrygians and Phrygian of 1997, see especially the contributions by Brixhe & Drew-Bear, Neumann, and Lubotsky in this publication. Very helpful, too, were the articles in *Kadmos* 28 of 1989 by Lubotsky (1989a-b) and the handsome and highly informative grammatical sketch by Blažek 2005, 16-22 (= section IA).

---

[*] My thanks are due to the expert Mycenologist Frits Waanders for proofreading the manuscript and, in doing so, saving me from some grave errors as well as providing me with numerous suggestions as to its improvement (see also his appendix to this contribution). It must be admitted, though, that this contribution is focussing on the elucidation of Phrygian texts on the basis of the etymological relationship of the Phrygian language with Greek and that the task to systematically account for every phonological development implied remains a *desideratum*.

In my treatment of a selection of Old Phrygian texts of 1993 I referred several times to Brixhe & Lejeune's suggestion that the *yod*-sign for the glide [y] constitutes an early 6th century BC innovation as a possible dating criterion for the inscriptions in question. In doing so, I did not fully realize the implications of the fact that this sign is already found in M-01b from Midas City, which, as duly stressed by Brixhe in 1991, cannot be dissociated from the inscription on the Tyana black stone (T-02), and like the latter may hence safely be assigned to the reign of king Midas during the second half of the 8th century BC (according to Eusebios: 742-696 BC). It naturally follows from this observation that the *yod*-sign for the glide [y] formed part and parcel of the Phrygian alphabet from its earliest attestation onwards. The latter inference can further be supported by the fact that corroborative evidence for variation in form of the *yod* is provided by the Phrygian dedicatory inscriptions on bronze and silver omphalos bowls, small silver cauldrons, and a silver ladle from a tumulus burial near Bayındır in Lycia of a female person (Wittke 2004, 304-306), who during her lifetime probably performed a cultic function (priestess according to Vassileva 2001, 60), dated to the late 8th century BC. One of these (on the bronze omphalos bowl no. 7) reads *at$_i$ies* with the secondary [t]-sign in form of an arrow, paralleled for the Lydian alphabet and ultimately originating from the Cyprian syllabic sign for *ti* (Woudhuizen 1982-3, 108-111; Woudhuizen 1984-5, 97-100), followed by a five-stroked variant of the crooked *iota*, and cannot be interpreted otherwise than as a reference to the Phrygian GN Ἄττις (NPhr *Attie* (D sg.)) as attested for one of the variants of the apodosis of the damnation-formula, where he acts as dispenser of divine retribution, see New Phrygian nos. 45, 26, 86, and 62 (in the latter instance he occurs in combination with *deωs*, i.e. the gods in general, with which he is expressly paired by the double use of the enclitic conjunction *-ke* "and") below (Varinlioğlu 1992).

It is interesting to note in this connection that Vassileva 1997 identifies the various legends as a reference to male initiates of the mystery cult *representing* the Son (or *paredros*) of the Phrygian Magna Mater Kybela, i.e. Attis, which comes tantalizingly close to the correct interpretation. However, her basic tenet that the legends on the bowls cannot have a bearing on the *divine* name Attis is ultimately based on Lynn Roller's rather influential study on the Phrygian Mother Goddess Kybela of 1999 according to which the deification of Attis is a 4th century BC Hellenic innovation and male deities in general were entirely absent in early Phrygian religion (which is even seriously suggested to be in fact monotheistic!)–a thesis flatly refuted by the evidence from the Old Phrygian inscriptions, note especially the mention of Attis in form of *Atoi* (D sg.) in the apodosis of the damnation-formula of the inscription from Uyučik (= B-04), where, in like manner as in the aforesaid New Phrygian variant, he acts as dispenser of divine retribution, be it this time in combination with the Good Goddess, likely to be interpreted as the daughter of the Mother goddess or the Phrygian equivalent of the Eleusian Persephone, and Bas!

LIST OF LEXICAL CORRESPONDENCES BETWEEN PHRYGIAN AND GREEK

	Phrygian	**Greek**
1.	*a(-)*	ἀ- "un-" (privative alpha)
2.	Ἄδρηστος (MN)	ἄ-δραστος or ἄ-δρηστος "failing to run away or escape (from fate)" (cf. Ἄδραστος (MN))
3.	*adikesai* (2nd pers. sg., imp., middle)	ἀδικέομαι "to undergo injustice"
4.	*aey*, *ay*	ἤ, ἠέ "or" (conjuction)
5.	*agaritoi* (D sg.)	ἀ-χάριτος "ungracious"
6.	*aglavoy*	ἀγλαός (< *aglawos*) "shining"
7.	*(-)agtaei* (D sg.)	ἄγω "to lead"
8.	*akara(-)*	ἐσχάρα (cf. Myc. *e-ka-ra*) "hearth, altar"
9.	*akkalos* "water"	Ἀχελῶος (river name in the province of Phthia)
10.	*Akrisias* (GN)	ἄκρα, ἄκρος "high" (cf. Ἀκρίσιος (MN))
11.	*an*	ἄν (modal particle)
12.	*an(-)*	ἀν- "up" (preverb)
13.	*ananka* "fate, necessity"	ἀνάγκη "force, constraint"
14.	*anar*	ἀνήρ "man, husband"
15.	*anegertoy* (3rd pers. sg., past tense, middle)	ἀν-εγείρω (*c*. δόμον, δώματα) "to build"
16.	*aωrω* (G sg.)	ἀώρως "prematurely"
17.	*Apelan* (GN)	Ἀπόλλων, cf. esp. Doric Ἀπέλλων and Cyprian Ἀπείλων (cf. Myc. *[a]-pe-ro₂-ne* (D sg.)) (GN)
18.	*ap<o>(-)*	ἀπό "away" (preverb)
19.	*apnekroiun* (3rd pers. pl., opt., pres. tense (?))	ἀπο-νεκρόομαι "to die, be killed"
20.	*areyastin* (A(m/f) sg.)	ἄριστος "best, bravest"
21.	*argo-* (*argou* (G sg.))	ἀρχή "beginning, origin"
22.	*Artimitos* (GN)	Ἄρτεμις (cf. Myc. *a-te-mi-to* (G sg.), *a-ti-mi-te* (D sg.)) (GN)
23.	*Atanies* (MN) (*Ataniyen* (N-A(n)	Ἀθηναῖος (MN)[1]

---

[1] Cf. also Hittite *Attaniya*, see Laroche 1966, 48, no. 199.

sg. in -*n* of adjectival derivative
in -*y*-))

24.	*Ates* (MN), Ἄττις (GN)	ἄττα "daddy"
25.	*avtos*, *avtay* (D sg.)	αὐτός "him- or herself"
26.	Ἀζανία (TN), *Azanoi* (ethnonym)	Ἀζάν, *Azeus* (MNs)
27.	*ber-* (*beret*, *abberet* or *asperet*, *abberetor*)	φέρω "to carry, bring"
28.	*bonok*, *banekos*	βανά (Aiolic), βονά (Cyprian) "wife"
29.	*brater-* (*bratere* (D sg.)), *brateraiś* (D pl.))	φράτηρ, βρὰ (Eleian) "brother"
30.	*da-* (*daχet* or *daket*, *dakaren*, *egdaes*, *edaes*, *edatoy*)	τίθημι (cf. Myc. *te-ke*) "to place, put"
31.	*Das* (G sg.)	*Da-* "Earth" (< **gda-*) as in the GNs of ultimate Pelasgian origin Δαμάτηρ (cf. Lin. A *da-ma-te*) "Mother Earth" and Ποσείδον (cf. Myc. *po-se-da-o-ne* (D sg.), *po-se-da-o-no* (G sg.)) "Lord of the Earth"
32.	*de*	δέ (adversative particle)
33.	*dekmoutais* (D pl.)	δεκάτη "tithe"
34.	*deto-* (*deton* (A(m/f) sg.), *detoi* (D sg.))	θετός "placed, set" (verbal adjective of τίθημι)
35.	*devos* (D pl.), *deωs* (D pl.)	Ζεύς, Διός (G) (cf. Myc. *di-wi-jo*) (GN)
36.	*die*	διά "through, by means of, during" (preposition)
37.	*diθur-* (as in διθύραμβος "Vierschritt")	τέσσαρες (cf. Myc. *qe-to-ro-* < PIE **kʷetwor-*) "four"[2]

---

[2] Note, however, that the development of the PIE labiovelar **kʷ* into dental *d* (or *t* as in the exceptional form of the enclitic conjunction -*te* < PIE **-kʷe*, corresponding to Greek -τε, which occurs alongside more regular -*k* in an Old Phrygian inscription from Uyučik in Mysia (B-04), as well as in the composite *o-te* (cf. Greek οὔτε < Myc. *o-u-qe* "and not"; cf. also *tele(-)* < **kʷēle*) as attested for Old Phrygian inscriptions from Bithynia (B-01) in the west and Pteria (P-04) in the east) is, contrary to the opinion of Haas 1970, 47 ff., exceptional for Phrygian, the regular outcome of this labiovelar development being velar *k*, as in, the relative *kos* < PIE **kʷo-*, the aforesaid enclitic conjunction -*ka*, -*ke*, -*k* "and" < PIE **-kʷe*, the numeral *pinke* "five" < **penkʷe-*, *Moxo-* < Myc. *mo-qo-so*, and *akkalos* "water" < PIE **akʷā-* or **egʷʰ-*. As it seems, then, the labiovelar development which, amongst others, affected Greek sometime during the Early Iron Age and the Luwian dialects Lydian and Lycian in western and southwestern Anatolia after *ca.* 700 BC, either did not, or, insofar it could be argued to have done, did only incidentally, radiate to the highlands of Phrygia in the interior of the latter peninsula.

38.	(-)dike-	δίκη "justice"
39.	Diounsin (= Dionusin) (A(m/f) sg.)	Διόνυσος (cf. Myc. di-wo-nu-so) (GN)
40.	(-)dos(-) (as in sit₁idosakor: container for grain offerings)	δόσις "the act of giving, dose" (< *dó-ti-; cf. Myc. do-so-mo /dosmōi/ "as a present")
41.	duma, doum(e) (D sg.) (cf. Δύμας (MN))	Myc. du-ma- (title of official) (cf. Δύμας (MN))
42.	*duoi (cf. GN Δοιάς (twin-brother of Ákmōn), geographic name Δοίοντος πεδίον "two lowlands")	δυοῖν (D-G) (cf. Myc. du-wo-) "two"; cf. esp. Greek gloss δοιάς "duality"[3]
43.	δουρῖται (pl.)	θύρα "door"
44.	eg- (egdaes: 3rd pers. sg., pres. tense)	ἐκ-, ἐξ- "out, from, away" (preverb)
45.	eitou (3rd pers. sg., imp.)	εἴτω (Doric) < εἰμί "to be" < PIE *esmi
46.	ekey	ἐκεῖ "there"
47.	en- (enstarna: 3rd pers. pl., pres. tense, middle-pass.; eneparkes: 3rd pers. sg., past tense, act.)	ἐν- "in" (ἐν-ίστημι "to place inside > to see to it, supervise")
48.	eti, ηti	ἔτι "moreover"
49.	eugi(-), eukin (A(m/f) sg.)	εὐχή "vow"
50.	Eugixarnan (A (m/f) sg.) "Fulfilling Prayer"	εὐχη + ἐξ-αρνέομαι
51.	ev(-), eve(-)	εὐ- (cf. Myc. e-u-, e-wa- or e-we- < *esu) "good"[4]
52.	-ev(a)is/-ivais (patronymic)	υἱός or υἱύς "son" (cf. Myc. (-)i-je-we (D sg.))
53.	eveteksetey (D sg.)	εὐ-τοκέω "to give birth successfully"
54.	evtevey (D sg.)	cf. Myc. *ew(e)-diwija "good goddess"
55.	eixa	ἑξῆς "in a row, following, successively"
56.	(-)ixarnan (A(m/f) sg.) "fulfilling, realizing"	ἐξ-αρνέομαι "to deny, refuse"
57.	θalamei (D sg.)	θάλαμος, θαλάμη "chamber"
58.	θri- (as in θρίαμβος "Dreischritt")	τρεῖς (cf. Myc. ti-ri-) "three"
59.	garit(o)- (agaritoi (D sg.),	χάριτος "gracious"

---

[3] Blažek 1999, 166.

[4] Note that Phrygian in this particular case, as well as that of ir- < *iser- presented below, shares with Greek the phonetic development of *[s] > [h] > ø in between vowels.

	gegaritmenos: part. perf., middle-pass.)	(ἐγκεχαρισμένος "at the mercy of")[5]
60.	*(-)gav-, (-)gay-* (as in the religious title *akenanogavos* (N sg.) and the indications of an altar for fire offerings *akinanogavan* (N-A(n) sg.) and *akaragayun* (A sg.))	κοίης or κόης "priest of the mysteries of Samothrace" (corresponding to Lydian *kave*ś "priest" and Sanskrit *kaví* "poet-seer, priest")
61.	*gdan-* (as in *Gdanmaa* (TN))	χθών "earth"
62.	*glouros*	χλωρός "yellow (< gold)" (cf. Χλωρίς "Goldy (FN)")
63.	Γόρδιον (TN), Γορδίης (MN)	Γόρτυν (cf. Myc. *ko-tu-we* (D sg.)), Γυρτώνη (TNs); note that the typical Greek reflex of the same PIE root is χόρτος "fenced courtyard"
64.	*grei-* (*gegreimenan*: part. perf., middle-pass.)	χρίω "to scratch, inscribe"
65.	ὕδωρ	ὕδωρ "water"
66.	*ios, yos*	ὅς (cf. Myc. *jo-*) "who" (relative pronoun)
67.	*irter* (3rd pers. sg., pres. tense, pass.)	ἱ(ε)ρεύω (< *iser-*) "to sacrifice"
68.	*is-* (as in *isnou* (G sg.)	εἰς "in" (preposition)
69.	*isgei-* (*isgeiket*: 3rd pers. sg., pres. tense or fut.)	ἴσχω (< *siskhō*), reduplicated form of ἔχω "to have, hold"
70.	*(-)itavos*	εἶμι "to go"
71.	*itovo, ituv, eitou* (3rd pers. sg., imp.)	εἰμί "to be" < PIE *esmi*
72.	*-ka, -ke, -k*	-τε (cf. Myc. *-qe*) "and" (enclitic conjunction)
73.	*kakos*	κακός "bad"
74.	*kakuioi* (D sg.)	*kakoios* (adjectival derivative of κακός "bad")
75.	*Kanutie-* (MN)	Lin. A *ka-nu-ti* (MN)
76.	*kenannou* (3rd pers. sg., imp.)	κενός "empty, devoid of"
77.	Κελαιναί (TN)	Κελαινός (MN) (cf. Myc. *ke-ra-no* "black")
78.	*key*	κα (Doric), κε (Aiolic,

---

[5] For parallels of Phrygian [g] corresponding to Greek [χ], cf. Phryg. *argo-, eugi-, gdan-, glouros*, Γόρδιον, and *grei-* being related to Gr. ἀρχή, εὐχή, χθών, χλωρός, χόρτυς, and χρίω, which, however, does not exclude the use in Phrygian of [k] alongside [g] as in *kton*.

		Cyprian), κεν (Hom.) (modal particle)
79.	*kinumais* (D pl.)	γυνή, γυναικός (G) "woman, wife"
80.	*(-)kiti*, *seiti* (3rd pers. sg., pres. tense, act.)	κεῖμαι "to lay, place"
81.	*knaiko*, *knaikan* (A(m/f) sg.)	γυνή, γυναικός (G) (cf. Myc. *ku-na-ki-si* (D pl.)) "woman, wife"
82.	*kos*, *kou* (G sg.), *kin* (A sg.) (relative pronoun, occurring alongside regular *ios* or *yos*)	τίς "who" (interrogative pronoun) and τις "someone" (indefinite pronoun), cf. Myc. *qi-* as in the indefinite relative *jo-qi* < PIE *k^wi-
83.	*kovis*	κοίης or κόης "priest of the mysteries of Samothrace"[6]
84.	*kte-* (*ektetoy*: 3rd pers. sg., past tense, middle)	κτάομαι, κτέομαι (Ion.) "to possess, be master of"
85.	*kton*	χθών "earth"
86.	κύνας (A(m/f) pl.)	κύων, κυνός (G) "dog"
87.	*lake-* (*lakedo*: 3rd pers. sg., imp., middle)	λακέω (Doric), λάσκω "to cry, utter, ordain"
88.	*latomeion* (A sg.)	λατομεῖον "slab"
89.	*lav<a>-*, *lava-*	λαός (cf. Myc. *ra-wo-/lāwos/*) "host, people"
90.	*lavagtaei* (D sg.)	λαγέτας (cf. Myc. *ra-wa-ke-ta /lāwāgetās/*) "leader of the host"
91.	*Ma* (as in *Gdanmaa* (TN))	μᾶ "mother", *c.* γᾶ "Mother Earth" (cf. Myc. *ma-ka* (GN))
92.	*maimarŋan*	μαρμάρεος "of marble"
93.	*manka* (D sg.)	μνημεῖον "grave stone, memorial"
94.	*matar*, *mater(-)* (*materan* (A(m/f) sg.), *materey* (D sg.))	μάτηρ (Doric), μήτηρ (cf. Myc. *ma-te /mātēr/*) "mother"
95.	*me*	μή "not" (negative adverb, prohibitive)
96.	*mekas* (D sg. or pl.)	μέγας "great"

---

[6] Cf. Gorbachov 2008, 101; see also no. 60 above.

97.	*merous*, *meroun* (A(m/f) sg.)	μερίς, μέρος, μοῖρα (cf. Myc. *me-ro*) "part, fate, destiny"
98.	*me(t)*	μετά "with, by" (adverb)
99.	*meyon*	μείων (cf. Myc. *me-wi-jo*) "smaller, less"
100.	Μίδας (MN)	Lin. A *mi-da* (MN); cf. Μιδέα (TN)
101.	*moikran* (A sg.)	μικρός "small"
102.	*Moxoupolis* (TN), *Moxolanoi* (ethnonym)	Μοψοπία (= Attica) (cf. Myc. *mo-qo-so* (MN))
103.	*mros* (G sg.) "funerary monument"	βροτός < *μροτός "mortal"
104.	*(-)nekro-*	νεκρόω "to kill, to let die off"
105.	*(-)nou* (G sg.) (as in *isnou*)	νόος, νοῦς "spirit, mind"
106.	*nun*	νῦν "now" (conjunction)
107.	*o, u*	οὐ (cf. Myc. *o-u-*) "not" (negative adverb)
108.	*Olumpos* (mountain name)	Ὀλυμπία (TN) (cf. Myc. *u-ru-pi-ja-*)
109.	*onoman* (A(m/f) sg.)	ὄνομα "name"
110.	*oouite-* (*oouitetou*: 3rd pers. sg., imp.)	(Ϝ)ιδ- "to see, know" (cf. Myc. *wi-de* "he saw")
111.	*op<i>-*	ἐπί- (cf. Myc. *o-pi-*) "with, over" (preverb, preposition)
112.	*oporo(-)*	προσ- "with" (preverb)
113.	*oporokiti* (3rd pers. sg., pres. tense)	πρόσ-κειμαι "to lay with, add"
114.	*orouan*, *orouenos* (G sg.)	οὖρος "watcher, guardian"
115.	*o-te* (appears also in form of *u-ke*)	οὔτε (cf. Myc. *o-u-qe*) "and not, nor"
116.	Ὄτρευς (MN)	Ἀτρεύς (MN)
117.	*otuvo*	ὄγδοος (< *oktowos*) "eighth"[7]
118.	*Ouelas* (G sg.) (GN)	βελα "sun; eye"
119.	*ouranion* (A(m/f) sg.)	οὐράνιος "of the heaven, heavenly"

---

[7] Note that the loss of the velar in Phrygian *otuvo-* "eighth" < PIE *oktō(u)-* "eight" is exceptional, and goes unexplained in like manner as the similarly incidental loss of the velar in Luwian hieroglyphic *tinita* and Messapic *dehata* "tithe" < PIE *dekṃt-* "10", or Celtiberian *tua[t]ere-* "daughter" < PIE *dʰugh₂tr-* and *-bria*, which occurs in toponyms alongside regular *-briga*, < PIE *bʰr̥ǵʰ(i)-* "high", see Woudhuizen *forthc.*1 on Luwian hieroglyphic and Indo-European.

120. *ovevin* (A(m/f) sg.)	ὅς (< *swo-) "his own", cf. Doric Ϝός (possessive pronoun)[8]
121. *oyvos* (cf. ἴαμβος "Einschritt")	οἶος "alone", cf. esp. Lesbian and Thessalian ἴα "one and the same (f)"[9]
122. *panta*	πάντα (N-A(n) pl.) "all"
123. *pater* (*paterηs* (N(m/f) pl.))	πατήρ "father"
124. *patrio-* (*patriyioiś* (D pl.))	πάτριος "fatherly"
125. *pinke*	πέντε (< PIE *penkʷe-) "five"
126. *podas* (A(m/f) pl.)	πούς, ποδός (G) "foot"
127. *podaska* (N-A(n) pl.)	πεδίσκη, "small fetter" (< PIE *ped-/pod- "foot")
128. *Pountas*	πόντος "sea"
129. *pragmatikon* (A(m/f) sg.) "suitable, for sale"	πραγματικός "experienced, expert"
130. *pro-*	πρό- "in front, before" (preverb)
131. *proitavos* (honorific title)	πρό-ειμι "to go in front, precede" (cf. Προῖτος (MN))
132. *protu-* (preverb)	προτί (variant of πρός) "with" (adverb)
133. πῦρ, *pour* (N-A(n) sg.)	πῦρ "fire"
134. *seiti* < *(-)kiti* (3rd pers. sg., pres. tense, act.)	κεῖμαι "to lay, place"
135. *sit₁o-* (*sit₁idosakor*: container for grain offerings, *sit₁eto*: 3rd pers. sg., imp., middle)	σῖτος (cf. Myc. *si-to*) "grain, food"
136. *skeledriai* (D sg.), *skeredrias* (G sg.) "ossuary"	σκελετός, σκελετόν "skeleton, mummy"
137. *so-*	ὅ "the" (< PIE demonstrative pronoun *so-)
138. *sorω*, *soron* (D sg.)	σορός "funerary urn, sarcophagus"
139. *sta-* (*estaes*, *enstarna*, *opestamena*, *protussestamenan*)	ἵστημι "to place, put"
140. *-te* (used alongside more regular *-k* in B-04)	-τε "and" (enclitic conjunction)

141. *(-)tek-* (*eveteksetey*)	τίκτω "to give birth, bear"
142. *tele(-)*	τῆλε "far (away)" (< PIE *$k^w\bar{e}le$)
143. *tekmor, tekmar*	τέκμωρ, τέκμαρ "pledge, vow, token; border, boundary, edge"
144. *(-)tevey* (D sg.), *tve-*	Myc. *di-wi-ja* /Diwija/, /Diwijai/ (D sg.) (GN)
145. *tia, tiyes* (G(f) sg.), *tian* (A(f) sg.)	θεά (cf. Myc. *te-i-ja* < PIE *d^hh_1s-) "goddess" (cf. Myc. *ma-te-re te-i-ja* /mātrei theiāi/ "to the Divine Mother")
146. *t(e)ios* (G(m) sg.),	θεός (cf. Myc. *te-o-* < PIE *d^hh_1s-) "god"
147. *tik-* (*tetikmenos*: part. perf., middle-pass.)	δείκνυμι "to show, accuse" (< PIE *$dei\breve{k}$-)[10]
148. *timena-, t₁emene-*	τέμενος "precinct" (cf. Myc. *te-me-no*)[11]
149. *to-*	τό (N-A(n) sg.) "the" (< PIE demonstrative pronoun *to-*)
150. *topon* (A(m/f) sg.)	τόπος "place"
151. *totos, teutous* (A(m/f) pl.)	Myc. *te-u-ta-* (onomastic element), *te-u-to* (MN) < PIE *teutā-* "society, folk, people"
152. *trapezη* (D sg.)	τράπεζα "table"
153. *tounbon* (A(m/f) sg.)	τύμβος "tomb, sepulchral mound"

---

[10] As Phrygian *d* normally corresponds to Greek *d*, one would have expected the voiced dental in the verbal root *tik-*, but note that this same observation also applies to *tevey* corresponding to Mycenaean *Diwija* and *oouite-* to Greek (Ϝ)ιδ- (cf. Myc. *wi-de*).

[11] Gorbachov 2008 on the inscription from Vezirhan (B-05) cogently argues that, on account of the correspondence in the protasis of the damnation formula of this bilingual text between Phrygian *sin-t imenan kaka oskavos kakey kan dedapitiy tubeti* to Greek ὅστις περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν κακουργετήσαι, ἢ δρῦν ἐκκόψαι, what must be read in Phrygian as *sin timenan* (lines 1 and 8) corresponds to τὸ ἱερὸν in the Greek version and that both terms refer to a sacred grove for Artemis (line 3: *Artimitos*; note that the top side of the stele is decorated with an image of the goddess in her capacity of πότνια θηρῶν). Against this backdrop, the identification of the Phrygian form with Greek τέμενος lies at hand and receives further emphasis from the writing variant *t₁emeney* (D sg.) in the apodosis of the damnation formula (line 13), which, by the way, confirms the dental value of the sign in form of an arrow corresponding to the Cypro-Minoan *ti*-sign as argued by me since 1982-3.

154. *tov-* (*etoves*: 3rd pers. sg., past tense)	θύω "to make a sacrifice"[12] (cf. Myc. *tu-wo* /*thuwos*/ "burnt offering")
155. *u-ke* (occurring alongside *o-te*)	οὔτε "and not, nor"
156. *upsodan*	ὑψόθεν "from above"
157. *(-)vanak* (*Modrovanak*), *vanaktei* (D sg.)	ἄναξ (< Myc. *wa-na-ka* /*wanaks*/, *wa-na-ka-te* /*wanaktei*/ (D sg.)) "king"
158. *vebru* (A(n)) "reverence"	ὕβρις "recklesness"
159. *vekro-* (*vekrω* (D sg.))	ἑκυρός "father-in-law"
160. *ven(-)*, *vin(-)*, *vis*	cf. Gortyn dialectal variant of ἑαυτόν (< *s(e)we awtun*) "him- or herself", Ϝιν αὐτῷ (D sg.)
161. *venavtun*	ἑαυτόν (< *s(e)we awtun*) "him- or herself" (reflexive pronoun)
162. *verktevoys* (D pl.)	ἔργον "work" (cf. Myc. *we-ke* as in *ke-re-si-jo we-ke* /*Krēsiowergēs*/ "of Cretan workmanship")
163. *vetei* (D sg.)	ἔτος (cf. Myc. *we-to* /*wetos*/, *we-te-i* /*wete(h)i*/ (D sg.) "year"
164. *voine(s)*, *oinis*	οἶνος (cf. Myc. *wo-no(-)* /*woinos*/) "wine"
165. *vrekun*	Βρίγες, Φρύγες (ethnonym)[13]
166. *Xeuna*, *Xeuneos*	ξένος "host, stranger" (cf. Myc. *ke-se-nu-wo* /*Xenwōn*/ (MN))
167. *zωs*	ζως "living"

---

[12] For parallels of the Phrygian [t] corresponding to Greek [θ], cf. *Ataniye-*, *kton*, and *tia-* as well as *tio-* being related to Greek Ἀθηναῖος, χθών, and θεά alongside θεός, respectively.

[13] The Phrygian ethnonym Βρίγες or Βρύγοι or Φρύγες or *Phrugoi* (< PIE *$b^hr\hat{g}^h(i)$-* "high" in like manner as its Celtic equivalent *Brigantes*), which appears in epichoric variant as *vrekun-*, is related to the Cretan personal name *(W)rakios* and its Luwian hieroglyphic counterpart *Awarkus* (as per Forlanini 1996); as duly observed by Jasink & Marino 2008, 408-409, the latter name is, in variant form characterized by *a/o*-vowel change, further exemplified by the pair Ἀτρεύς/Ὀτρεύς, already attested in Linear B of Pylos in form of *wo-ro-ko-jo* [PY Sa 763]).

(Pro)nominal Declension & Verbal Conjugation

nomen

	sg.	pl.
N(m/f)	—, -s	-ηs
A(m/f)	-n	-ous, -as
N-A(n)	—, -n	-a
D	-e, -i, -y	-oiś, -ais, -os, -as
G	-os, -as, -s, -ou, -ω	

pronomen

	sg.	pl.
N(m/f)	tos, ios/yos	
A(m/f)	sa(n), tan, ion, yen, ian	
N-A(n)	si	oua
D	s(o)i, sa(i), semoun, tω, toi, tai, ti	tais, iais
	ioi/yoi, oi, ai	
G	sas, tivo, tou, iou, ias	
Loc.-Instr.	-esait	

verbum

		active	middle	passive
pres. tense	3rd pers. sg.,	-t, -ti, -ś		-ter, -tor
	3rd pers. pl.			-ren, -rna
past tense	3rd pers. sg.	-s		
past tense	3rd pers. sg.		-toy	
imperative	2nd pers. sg.		-sai	
imperative	3rd pers. sg.	-tovo, -tou	-do, -dou	
participle				-meno-

SELECTED TEXTS

M-01 Rock monument in Midas town, dated *ca*. 750-700 BC; the first two sections are in left-to-right direction of writing, while the third runs in retrograde direction of writing

a. *Ates Arkiaevais*   "Ates, the son of Arkias,
   akenanogavos   priest of the cultic fire, has
   Midai lavagtaei   dedicated during the kingship
   vanaktei edaes   and military leadership of Midas."

b. *Baba Memevais*   "Baba, the son of Meme,
    proitavos Kt₁iyanaveyos   governor of Tyana,
    si keneman edaes   has dedicated this holy place."

d. *Midas s materan tvemes*   "Midas has dedicated (from his own
    eneparkes   resources) this Mother of the Goddess
                                           (and) Mas."

Note that the *temporal* dative in the dating-formula of M-01a is quite commonly mistaken for a *dativus commodi* indicative of the indirect object, which leads to the otherwise unsupported assumption that king Midas was deified postmortem. At any rate, other inscriptions directly associated with the niche of the monument (M-01c: *mater*, M-01d: *matera(n)*, M-01e: *materey*) clearly point out that it constituted a dedication to the Phrygian Mother Goddess, Kybela, and that its niche was intended as a shelter for her image. If we realize that the inscriptions by Ates (M-01a) and Baba (M-01b) are located at the upper side of the façade in association with *two* different decorative motifs, whereas Midas is mentioned as subject of the verb *eneparkes* in one of the two inscriptions inside the niche (M-01d), it is even possible to go one step further and to deduce that the monument has been set up by king Midas personally and subsequently embellished by two of his subordinates, Ates and Baba, the latter of which, considering the fact that the name of Midas is associated with the same patronymic in the inscription on the Tyana black stone (T-02), actually was his brother. Note that the verb *eneparkes* of M-01d is paralleled for the New Phrygian funerary inscription from Ilgın, no. 31, where it likewise expresses the responsibility of the person who set up the monument, Poukros, as expressed by the suggested translation "he bought", in this particular case on behalf of a female who had a direct interest in the matter, Xeuna, and is most probably to be identified as the daughter or granddaughter of the former's deceased brother, Xeuneos. Furthermore, it deserves our attention that the element *s* preceding the object *materan* (= the statue of the Mother for which the niche was originally intended) in this inscription clearly constitutes an abbreviated variant of the A(m/f) sg. of the demonstrative pronoun, *sa* or *san*. Accordingly, we are left with only one residual element, *tvemes*, which remains to be explained if we want to understand the contents of the inscription in its entirety. Within the frame of the context as established thus far, it may plausibly be suggested that this form serves as an adjunct to the object *materan* and renders the G sg. in -*s*. If this is correct, it next might be argued that the first part of the root *tveme*- consists of a shorthand rendering in like manner as that of the demonstrative of the indication of a female deity, *teve*-, which in combination with the prefixed adjective *ev*- "good" is attested for the apodosis of the damnation-formula of the Old Phrygian inscription from Uyučik in Mysia in the dative form *evtevey* "by the Good Goddess" as one of the dispensers of divine retribution in case of a violation of the monument. Now, as this female divinity is intimately associated

with the dative *Atoi* of the male divine name Ἄττις in the latter text, it subsequently becomes extremely tempting to analyze *tveme-* as a divine *dvandva* or a compound of *two* divine names, one female and the other male (note in this connection that the first element *tve-* lacks the ending of the G sg. and as such is clearly not individually declined), in which case the second element *me-* only comes into consideration as a reflex of the divine name *Mas* as recorded for the New Phrygian inscription no. 48 from Dorylaion, which is qualified in this particular text by a masculine form of the adjective in *-io-*, *Temrogeios*. All this boils down to the conclusion that the female divinity, whose image once filled the niche, is staged by the *dvandva* in the G sg. *tvemes* as the mother *of* two other divinities, one also female and the other male, who, from a comparative point of view, are likely to be identified as the couple performing the ἱερὸς γάμος in the Eleusian mysteries, *i.c.* Persephone and Dionysos. For further evidence on the identification of Phrygian religion as an Aegean type of mystery cult, see the discussion of the Old Phrygian inscription P-03 from Höyük in Pteria, below.

M-02 Stone altar from Midas town, dated *ca*. 750-700 BC; written boustrophedon, starting in left-to-right direction of writing

1. *Bba Memevais proitavo[s]*   "Baba, the son of Meme, governor of
2. *Kt₁ianaveyos akaragayun*   Tyana, has dedicated (this) altar stone
3. *edaes*   for cultic fire offerings."

In view of the fact that the inscription is written on an altar stone for fire offerings, it seems likely to assume that the indication of the object, *akaragayun* (A(m/f) sg.), or a constituent component of it, renders the meaning "altar" or "hearth", which in effect appears to be the case if the first element *akara-* may indeed be identified as a Phrygian reflex of the same root from which Greek ἐσχάρα "hearth, altar" as already attested for Mycenaean in form of *e-ka-ra* originates. Whatever the merits of this suggestion, it seems not merely coincidental that the first element of yet another indication of the object in an inscription on an altar from Midas City (M-04), *akinanogavan*, which recurs in variant form in the indication of the object or something related to it in an inscription on a block of andesite possibly to be identified as an altar stone from Höyük in the province of Pteria (P-04), *akenan*, bears a striking resemblance to one of the PIE roots for "fire" as represented by Sanskrit *agní-* or deified *Agní-*, Latin *ignis*, Old Church Slavic *ognĭ*, Lithuanian *ugnìs*, and Latvian *ugnus* (Gamkrelidze & Ivanov 1995, 225, note 28; 238). In line with this latter observation, the related titular expression *akenanogavos* (N(m/f) sg.) as recorded for a well-preserved Old Phrygian inscription on a rock monument near Midas town (W-01) turns out to be of religious nature indeed, as has often been assumed, referring to an official whose relationship to the use of fire in the official cult is expressed by the second element *-gav-*, the meaning of which may perhaps be recovered from oblivion

owing to its formal resemblance to the root of Lydian *kaveś* "priest" and Sanskrit *kaví* "poet-seer, priest", which would lead us to the interpretation of the entire formation as "priest of the cultic fire". If, however, the suggestion by Calvert Watkins (1995, 88) applies, that Lydian *kaveś* and Sanskrit *kaví*, in like manner as its Greek equivalent κοίης or κόης bearing reference to the priest of the mysteries of Samothrace (which form, by the way, shows the loss of *wau* and its replacement by the glide [y] which characterizes the second element of *akaragayun* if it is indeed a reflex of the same root from which -*gav*- is suggested here to stem), originates from PIE *(s)kowh_x-ey-* "to show (German: schauen)", we might even go one step further and identify the titular expression *akenanogavos* and the related indication of an altar stone for fire offerings *akinanogavan* as a fire expert and fire displayer, respectively!

M-04 Stepped altar carved in the rock and decorated with the outline of a niche in the form of what is referred to in the relevant literature as a double-idol, supposedly representing the Phrygian Mater and her male paredros, dated to the 7th or 6th century BC; written boustrophedon, starting in left-to-right direction of writing

1. *akinanogavan tiyes*	"(This) altar stone for cultic fire
2. *Modrovanak [.]avara[?]*	offerings of the Goddess (and) the
	King of Modra: (MN in N sg.?)."

Note that the form *tiyes*, in the light of the closest comparative evidence as provided by the Greek inflection of female *a*-stems, more likely renders the G sg. of female *tia*- than that of its male counterpart *tio*-, which in New Phrygian inscriptions appears in form of *tios*. For the cultic title *Modrovanak* (undeclined), which is a compound of the TN Μοδρα as attested for Bithynia in ancient sources with the titular expression *vanak*- "king" and presumably refers to a male divinity, compare formations like Λεσβώναξ and ΚυπροϜάναξ (cf. Orel 1997, 26).

W-01 Rock monument near Midas town, dated to the 7th or 6th century BC; written boustrophedon, starting in retrograde direction of writing

1. *materan areyastin*	"The Phrygian priest of the cultic fire
bonok akenanogavos	has dedicated (the image of) the
vrekun t(-)edatoy	Bravest Mother (for/on behalf of) (his) wife;
2. *yos-tutut[…]a[.]mnoy*	who(ever) as priest of the cultic fire
akenanogavos aey	[brings damage?] to [the monument?] or
3. *yos-esait*	who(ever) (as <honorific title>)
materey eveteksetey	puts his own name on this (monument)
ovevin onoman daχet	for the Mother of Good Birth,
4. *lakedo-key*	let him (herewith)

venavtun <meroun>	ordain (his own destiny)
avtay materey	from the Mother Herself!
5. *Ataniyen Kuryaneyon*	The (workshop) of Atanies the
t-anegertoy	Kurianian has built it."

For the identification of *vrekun* as the Phrygian self-designation, cf. the Hesykhian gloss Βρέκυν τὸν Βρέκυντα, τὸν Βρίγα. Βρίγες γὰρ οἱ Φρύγες. Furthermore, it deserves our attention that *-esait* is likely to be analyzed as the locative-instrumental singular of an enclitic variant of the demonstrative pronoun, thus providing our only secure instance of this particular case so far. In addition, the two elements forming the subject of the maker-formula in the final phrase to all probability render the nominative-accusative neuter singular of adjectival derivatives of a personal name in combination with an ethnic, referring to the company responsible for the building of the monument. For the apparent legal incapacity of female persons to act on their own behalf in official matters like the erection of religious and funerary monuments, cf. the New Phrygian inscription from Ilgın, no. 31. Note that Roller's (1999, 6; 318) denial of maternal qualities or a fertility function to the Phrygian Mother Goddess, Kybela, is straightforwardly refuted by the nature of this inscription (dedication by an official on behalf of his wife (= *bonok* (undeclined), the meaning of which receives further emphasis from the fact that its derivative Βονοκιᾶτις functions as an epithet of another form of address of the Phrygian Mater Kybela, Ανγδισση) probably to thank the Mother in her capacity as protectress of women in labor for successfully having given birth to a child) in general and by the epithet *eveteksetey* "of good birth (D sg.)" attributed in phrase 3 to her cultic form of address *Mater* "Mother" in particular.

W-08/10 Rock inscriptions from the region near Midas town, dated to the late 8th or 7th century BC; variously written in left-to-right (W-08) and retrograde (W-10) direction of writing in boustrophedon inscriptions

3. *Alus sit₁eto (Das)*	"Let Alys, ((the son) of Mother Earth) be nourished!"

The root of the verb *sit₁eto*, which likely renders the 3rd pers. sg. of the imperative of the middle otherwise occurring in form of *-do*, recurs as first element in the compound *sit₁idosakor* as attested for a bronze bowl from the inventory of tumulus MM at Gordion (G-105), which, in view of the apparent etymological relationship of this element to Greek σῖτος "grain", may reasonably be suggested to bear reference to the function of the bronze bowl as a container for grain offerings (cf. Greek *dos-* as in δόσις (< *dó-ti-) and Mycenaean *do-so-mo* /*dosmōi*/ "as a gift" for the second element of this formation). In addition, it is worth noting that the MN *Alys* in form of *Aluś* and its adjectival derivation in *-li-* is represented in epichoric Lydian inscriptions. In view of the evident religious nature of

the inscriptions in general and the mention of the GN *Da-* (< **gda-*) "(Mother) Earth" (cf. the Pelasgian GNs Δαμάτηρ (cf. Lin. A *da-ma-te*) "Mother Earth" and Ποσείδον (cf. Myc. *po-se-da-o-ne* (D sg.) or *po-se-da-o-no* (G sg.)) "Lord of the Earth") in G sg. in the variant of the formulaic phrase of W-10 in particular, one cannot help but wonder whether the MN *Alys* refers to the new born child (cf. Latin *alu-mnus* "fosterling"?). In that case, the Lydian royal name *Alyattes*, consisting of the combination of *Alys* with *Attes*[14], would turn out to belong to the category of double-deity names, exemplified in Luwian by *Tarkukuruntis*, *Sauskakuruntis*, and *Armatarḫuntas* during the Middle and Late Bronze Age, and still traceable until well into the Hellenistic period, as may be illustrated by Ρωζαρμας, Αρμαρωνζας, Τροκοζαρμας, and Ιαζαρμας (note that this type of naming is likely to be rooted in the cult of divine *dvandva*'s, like, for example, Ḫurritic *Ḫepat-Šarruma*).

G-02 Stone pedestal from Gordion, reused for the reconstruction of a canal in the Hellenistic period, but probably stemming from the 7th or 6th century BC; written in left-to-right direction of writing

1. *agaritoi:Iktes:Adoikavoi*	"Iktes: for the Ungracious Adoikavos;
2. *ios oporokiti si kakoio*	who(ever) brings (any) damage to this,
3. *itovo podaska/*	let him be (like) feet-bound (objects)!"

The inscribed upper surface of the stone is decorated with two incised feet, wearing pointed shoes, which no doubt graphically underlines the curse from the apodosis of the damnation-formula. It may reasonably be argued that the recipient deity, Adoikavos, for his epithet *agaritoi* "ungracious (D sg.)", is likely to be identified as a, or the, god of the underworld. If this is correct, the punishment awaiting violators of the monument according to the damnation-formula, characterized by the binding of the feet, may well have connotations as to religious views about the underworld current at the time of the dedication. For the MN *Iktes*, cf. *Iketaios* in W-02, which no doubt corresponds to Greek Ἑκαταῖος.

P-03 Stone object from Höyük in Pteria (east-Phrygia), possibly assignable to the 7th century BC; written boustrophedon, starting in retrograde direction of writing

1. *Vasous Iman mekas*	"Vasous, the son of Kanuties:
2. *Kanutieivais*	to the great (god Zeus-)Iman
3. *devos-ke mekas*	and to the Great Gods."

---

[14] Cf. also *Sadyattes* and, for the Late Bronze Age already, *Madduwattas* (with first element *maddu-*, corresponding to Luwian hieroglyphic *matu-* "wine" < PIE **medʰu-* "honey (alcoholic liquid)"). For the first element, cf. Hittite or Luwian *Aluluwa*, *Alluwa*, *Alluwamna*, and *Aluwazi*, see Laroche 1966, 28, nos. 38-41.

Note that the inscription runs boustrophedon in such a manner that the patronymic which, in the light of the parallels (cf. *Arkiaevais* in M-01a and *Memevais* or *Memevis* in M-01b from Midas town and T-02 from Tyana, respectively)[15], one would have expected to follow directly after the personal name of the dedicator, is positioned in between the indications of the recipient deities. Among the recipients of the dedication, the *mekas devos* "great gods (D pl.)", which are also honored in another inscription from Höyük in Pteria (P-04), are likely to be identified with the Θεοὶ Μεγάλοι of Samothrace. At any rate, according to the literary sources the cult of the Great Gods was introduced by Dardanos from Samothrace to Phrygia (Macrobius, *Saturnalia* III, 4, 7), in like manner as that of Dionysos by the mythical king Midas, specified as the son of the Great Goddess of Ida, i.e. one of the forms of address of the later Kybela, from the region of Mount Bermion in the borderland between northern Thessaly and Macedonia to Asia (Graves 1990, 281-283); the relation of the Phrygian Kabeiroi or Great Gods with the Dionysos cult is exemplified by the story of the formers' miraculous rescue of Assessos near Miletos when under siege by bringing the *cista mystica* with the phallos of Dionysos, which is further reported to have been brought by the, this time ethnically not further specified, Kabeiroi to the Etruscans in Italy (Hemberg 1950, 139; Pfiffig 1975, 293 with reference to Clemens of Alexandria, *Protreptikós prós Héllēnas* II, 19, 1). In view of this evidence, Phrygian religion is likely to be characterized as an Aegean type of mystery cult, with Attis as the son of Kybela and lover of her daughter being nothing but another cultic form of address of Dionysos (note especially the prominent role played by their severed genitals in the cult of both these gods, caused by automutilation in the first case and resulting from a cruel assault by the Titans in the second case. This is reflected in the Kybela cult in the role of the *kernos* (cf. Old Phrygian *kerno[* as attested for inscription G-104 from Gordion), which holds the genitals of sacrificial bulls and rams as a special dedication to the goddess in like manner as the severed genitals of her priests, eunuchs addressed to as Galli after the incursions of the Galatians from the early 3rd century BC, were consecrated to her during the great spring festival (de Vries 1991, 90). Cf. Vassileva 2001, 56 on the intimate relationship between the rites of the Great Mother cult and those of the Dionysos cult in both Thrace and Phrygia).

---

[15] Note that the patronymic element *-ev(a)is* or *-ivais* corresponds to Mycenaean *i-je-we* υἱεῖ "to the son", which in PY Cn 3 *di-wi-je-we* "to the son of Zeus" even appears attached to the noun it is lined with in like manner as its Phrygian equivalent, cf. Puhvel 1964. Note furthermore that the MN *Kanutie-* is paralleled in form of *ka-nu-ti* for a Linear A inscription from Hagia Triada (HT 97a.3)–as also happens to be the case, by the way, with the typical Phrygian royal name Midas in form of *mi-da* (HT 41.4).

P-04 Stone object from Höyük in Pteria (east-Phrygia), dated to the 6th century BC; written boustrophedon, starting in retrograde direction of writing

1. *otuvoi vetei Etenaie*	"In the eighth year of Etena's (reign);
2. *ios ni akenan egeseti*	who(ever) kindles the fire,
o-t irter ko[s as] tekmor	and who(ever) does not sacrifice for himself accompanied by a libation,
o-t[e ege]seti vebru	and does not express (the proper) reverence,
3. *ios ervotsati kakuioi*	who(ever) causes? (any) damage,
4. *Imanolo itovo*	let him be (a prey) of (Zeus-)Iman!
5. *edae[s] mekas <devos>*	Dedicated to the Great (Gods)."

Owing to the improvements of the reading of the damaged middle section with the protasis of the damnation-formula as suggested by Orel 1997, 294-299, it is even possible to present a coherent interpretation of this particular section. After the verb of the first phrase of the protasis of the damnation-formula, *egeseti*, there follows a bipartite construction each section of which is headed by the element *ot* or *ote*, which, in line with *u-ke* from the New Phrygian inscription no. 2 from Üç Üyük, may be identified as a combination of the negative adverb *o* "not", corresponding to Greek οὐ, and an enclitic conjunction, be it this time in form of *-t(e)*, corresponding to Greek -τε, instead of regular *-k(e)* "and" as paralleled for the Old Phrygian inscription from Uyučik in Mysia (B-04), whereas the entire combination, corresponding to Greek οὔτε (cf. Myc. *o-u-qe*) "and not, nor", is paralleled already for an Old Phrygian inscription from Bithynia (B-01). As a consequence, the second section headed by the negative adverb turns out to be of a transparent nature, with a verb, *egeseti*, which renders the 3rd pers. sg. of the present tense of the active of the verbal root *ege-* otherwise encountered in the 3rd pers. sg. of the imperative of the middle *egedou* in the apodosis of the damnation-formula of the New Phrygian inscriptions nos. 33 and 76 from Sınanlı and Kelhasan, respectively, and the object *vebru* in the endingless variant of the neuter. Now, the form *vebru* strikingly recalls Greek ὕβρις, but in the given context the latter's negative meaning "recklessness" seems less fitting than a more positive state of mind like "respect" or "reverence", which nevertheless entails the aspect of fear as suggested by the relevant Hesykhian gloss βεβρός· ψυχρός, τετυφωμένος (with β corresponding to epichoric Phrygian *v* or *ou* in like manner as in case of the gloss concerning *vrekun* presented above and the one concerning the GN *Ouela* cited in the following). If in addition we transpose the middle meaning of the verb *ege-*, "to undergo, suffer", into active terms, we arrive at the translation of the phrase in its entirety as "and does not express the proper reverence". Next, in the preceding section we may distinguish the relative *kos* (N(m/f) sg.), the preposition *as* "by, through", and the noun *tekmor* (endingless variant of the A(n) sg.) on the basis of the parallels (for *kos*, see NPhr-18, where it likewise refers back to

ios; for *as* in combination with an inanimate notion like *knouman* "grave" or, perhaps less evidently as it can be imagined in personified form, *anakai* "fate", see NPhr-31 and NPhr-35, respectively; for *tekmor*, see NPhr-116, where, in distinction from its Greek equivalent "pledge, vow, token", it expresses the meaning "offering, dedication"). This leaves us with the residual *irter*, which only comes into consideration as a verb, and hence may reasonably be suggested to constitute a 3rd pers. sg. of the present tense of the middle-passive in *-ter* as paralleled in form of *-tor* for *abberetor* and *addaketor* of the verbal root *ir-* corresponding to Greek ἱρ- or ἱερ- as in ἱερεύω (< *iser-*) "to sacrifice". The exact meaning of the phrase becomes clear if we realize that according to current religious practices as illustrated, for example, in an Etruscan offering scene on a black figured amphora dated to the early 5th century BC it is customary to bring a libation offering by pouring wine into the fire on the altar at the moment the sacrificial animal is killed (Woudhuizen 2008, 321, Fig. 26).

B-01 Rock monument from the village of Bolu near Göynük in Bithynia, unspecified date; written in retrograde direction of writing

1. *soi Bevdos adioi[-ke] kavarmoyoi mroy edaes etoves*

   "Bevdos has dedicated (unspecified object) for this (..?..) monument (and) made (it) as a sacrifice,

2. *ni yoi matar Kubeleya ibeya duman ektetoy*

   during which (event) Mother Kybela *ibeya* (= cultic epithet?) presided over the religious community.

3. *yos tivo t-asperet d-ayni kin telemin*

   Who(ever) brings damage (to) (something) of this (monument) or what(ever) distant part (of it),

4. *istoyo vis verktevoys ekey dakati*

   (or) dedicates (something) of this (monument) for his (own) constructions at another (place),"

5. *opito ke yoy evememes meneya anatoy kavarmoyun matar o-te kanovo-ke siti oyvos aey apaktne ni pakray evkobeyan epaktoy*

   (apodosis of the damnation-formula, the apparent positive elements of which, like *eve-* corresponding to Greek εὐ- (cf. Myc. *e-u-*, *e-wa-* or *e-we-* < *esu-*) "good", are changed into the expected opposite meaning by means of the negative *o-te* corresponding to Greek οὔτε "and not, nor".)

As guidelines for the given interpretation, the forms *edaes*, *etoves*, *ektetoy*, *asperet*, and *dakati* are taken as verbs, rendering the past tense when augmented and the present tense when not augmented, the roots of which correspond to Greek τίθημι, θύω, κτέομαι, and φέρω (cf. New Phrygian *abberet* < *ad-bʰer-*), respectively. Furthermore, the etymological relationship with Greek may provide

a useful clue as to the interpretation in case of *tele-*, *verktevo-*, and, *ekey*, recalling Greek τῆλε (< *kʷēle), ἔργον, and ἐκεῖ.

B-03 Stone object from Fıranlar in Bithynia, unspecified date; written in left-to-right direction of writing

1. *esk[..]ia[*	"? […
2. *] evtevey ay*	…] for the Good Goddess or
3. *yosyos yen vraetit*	whoever does? something wrong?,
4. *evtevey meroun*	let him ordain (his own) destiny from
<venavtun> lakedo	the Good Goddess!"

B-04 Stone object from Uyučik in Mysia, dated to the 5th century BC or later; written in retrograde direction of writing (note that Brixhe 2004, 32-42 considers the readings of Bayun & Orel 1988 as followed here uncertain in many respects)

1. *e[ ]y[*	"?[
2. *ka[ ]ane[ ]a[*	[whoever] will put
3. *lamn lavay dokseś Aśioi*	(his) name [on this] for the Asian people,
4. *[?]adlevasiy aglavoy ie*	?
5. *[.]epaviyi[.]ś an evtevey*	? let them (?) be killed
6. *Atoi apnekroiun Batan-te*	by the Good Goddess, Attis, and Bas!
7. *likeś brateraiś patriyioiś-k*	(The use of the object) is permitted to the brothers and (the) Fatherly (relative)s (only)."

In the light of the evidence from New Phrygian inscriptions, the form *batante* is likely to be analyzed as a combination of the A(m/f) sg. of the GN *Bas*, *Batan* (A), as attested for the New Phrygian inscription no. 36 from Sınanlı, with an additional element *te* which bears a striking resemblance to the Greek enclitic conjunction -τε "and". Note, however, that a variant of the regular Phrygian reflex of the PIE enclitic conjunction **-kʷe*, *-k* "and", appears in the next line of the text and that, for its alignment with *evtevey* "the Good Goddess (D sg.)" and *Atoi* "Attis (D sg.)", we would rather have expected the D sg. instead of the A sg. of the GN *Bas*. The closest comparative evidence for the ending in the verbal form *apnekroiun* from Greek suggests that this renders the 3rd person plural of the optative of the present tense, which tallies with the identification of the element *an* in the preceding line as a modal particle paralleled for the New Phrygian inscription no. 31 from Ilgın, where, however, it occurs in combination with the imperative instead of the optative, but it must be admitted that the vowel *u* in the verbal ending is unexpected against the background of Greek *e*. With respect to the final phrase, one cannot help to be reminded of Latin *licet*

"it is permitted", whereas the use of *pater* in the New Phrygian inscription no. 48 from Dorylaion as a reference to the god Asklepios suggests a religious connotation for the adjectival derivative of this kinship term here–which, by the way, may likewise apply to the kinship term *brater* (corresponding to Greek φράτηρ, or, considering the Hesykhian gloss βρὰ·ἀδελφοί, ὑπὸ Ἠλείων, in the Eleian dialect, βρὰ), so that we appear to be rather dealing with brothers in the metaphorical sense as members of a particular religious community dedicated to the heavenly Father than with actual kinship relations.

NPhr-?? Protasis of damnation-formula of an inscription on a stone block belonging to a grave monument from the territory of Antioch in Pisidia (= Brixhe & Drew-Bear 1997, 74-80)

a. *ios ni [s]emoun*   "Who(ever) brings (something) of
   kn[ou]manη kakou   damage to this grave, (including) the
   abberet atnou (= autou) ground of this monument itself,"
   kton mros sas

NPhr-62 Apodosis of damnation-formula of an inscription from east of the street Bolvadin-Çay

b. *Attiη-ke deωs-ke*   "Let him be damned by both Attis
   tit-tetikmenos eitou   and the gods for it!"

NPhr-14 Apodosis of damnation-formula in inscription from Hüsrevpaşa

b. *tit-tetikmenos as tian eitou* "Let him be damned by the goddess for
                               it!"

This particular variant of the apodosis of the damnation-formula is further attested for the New Phrygian inscriptions nos. 53 and 99 from Sarayönü and Erten Jayla, respectively. Note with respect to the A(m/f) sg. form *tian* that, considering the vowel being *a*, we are obviously dealing with the female counterpart of *tio-* "god", viz. *tia-* "goddess".

NPhr-67 Damnation-formula of an inscription from Kestel near Laodicea Combusta

a. *ios sa skeledriai kakoun*   "Who(ever) brings damage to this
   [d]aket a[i   ]   ossuary, or [….],
b. *tetikmenos Atti adeitou*   let him be damned by Attis!"

NPhr-56 Damnation-formula of an inscription from Küçük Beşkavak

a. *ios sas tou skeredrias*   "Who(ever) brings damage to this
    kakoun [d]aket   ossuary of him,
b. *e<t>it-tetikmenos [   ] Attie*   let him be forever damned by Attis!"
    eitou

In the light of the parallels, the use of the G sg. in the indication of the funerary monument in question, *sas skeredrias* "this ossuary", appears to be erroneous as in all other instances we are confronted with the D sg. in this particular position. Note that the pronominal form *tou* renders the G sg. in like manner as in the New Phrygian inscription no. 82 from Piribeyli, or the reflexive *autou* in the inscription from the region of Antioch in Pisidia following below.

NPhr-45 Damnation-formula of an inscription from Mahmudhisar near Ilgın

a. *ios semou knoumanei*   "Who(ever) brings damage to this
    kakeun adaket   grave,
b. *tit-tetikmenos Attie adeitou*   let him be damned by Attis for it!"

NPhr-12 Damnation-formula of an inscription from Ilgın

a. *eios ni semoun knoumani*   "Who(ever) brings damage to this
    kakon addaket   grave,
b. *zeira-ke oi peies-ke*   (let there be) for him death as well as
                                     pain,
    tit-tetikmena Attie adeittnou   let him be damned by Attis for it!"

Note that the ending -*a* of the participle of the middle-passive, which otherwise occurs in form of *tetikmenos*, appears to be the result of an anticipation error. Furthermore, the writing of the verbal form *adeitou* as *adeittnou* appears to be corrupt: one wonders whether it is influenced by the ending -*nou* as in *kenannou* from the New Phrygian inscription no. 35 from Sınanlı.

NPhr-87 Damnation formula of an inscription from Beyköy

a. *ios ni semoun knoumanei*   "Who(ever) brings harm to this grave
    kakoun adaket aini tiamas   or (something) of the burial plot,
b. *a ti adeitou Ouelas-ke*   let him because of it be victims of the
    tou-ke isnou as toi partηs   Sun-god and of the working of his
                                     own conscience!"

The last element of the protasis of the damnation-formula, *tiamas*, renders the G sg. of *tiama*, plausibly suggested to originate from Late Bronze Age

cuneiform Luwian *tiyammi-* "earth", of which the use can be shown to have continued into the Early Iron Age in form of, for example, the Lydian GN *Tiamou*. Crucial for our understanding of the apodosis of the damnation-formula is the word *partηs*, which renders the N(m/f) pl. in *-ηs* (cf. *paterηs*) in like manner as its closest cognate Latin *partes* and accordingly might, as a proper part or fate assigned to a perpetrator, most adequately be translated as "victims". The plural nature of *partηs* depends from the duality of the possessive genitives associated with it as stipulated by the repetition of the enclitic conjunction *-ke* "and": he should be a victim of the god *Ouela* (whose identification as the sun-god may be inferred from the Hesykhian gloss βέλα·ἥλιος καὶ αὐγὴ ὑπὸ Λακώνων) on the one hand and a victim of his own conscience (with *isnou* being related to Greek εἰσνοέω "to perceive, remark") on the other hand.

NPhr-26 Damnation-formula of an inscription from Şarkıkaraağaç

a. *ios ni semoun knoumanni*	"Who(ever) does harm to this grave or
kakoun daket aini manka	the memorial (stone),
b. *etit-tetikmenos eitou*	let him be forever damned!"

NPhr-82 Damnation-formula of an inscription from Piribeyli

a. *ios ni sa tou manka kakoun*	"Who(ever) brings harm to this
addaket	monument of him,
b. *ti tetikmenos eitou*	let him be damned for it!"

NPhr-?? Damnation formula of an inscription from Afyon (= Brixhe & Drew-Bear 1997, 83-86)

a. *ios ni sem[oun] to* (= *tou*)	"Who(ever) brings damage to
knoumane kaken addaket	this grave of him,
b. *me zemelωs-ke deωs-ke*	let him be damned for it by both
ti tetikmenos eitou	mortals and gods!"

NPhr-97 Damnation formula of an inscription from Çavdia Hisar (= Aizanoi)

a. *ios ni semou knoumane*	"Who(ever) brings damage to
kaken adaket aini manka	this grave or the memorial (stone),
b. *me ze[me]lωs-ke deωs-ke*	let him be forever damned for it among
ti eti tetikm[enos eitou]	both mortals and gods!"

For the interpretation of the combination of *zemelωs* with *deωs* in the apodosis of the damnation-formula, cf. the Gallic dvandva *teuoχtonion* /dēvogdonion/ "deis et hominibus" as attested for an inscription from Vercelli (Meid 1997; Delamarre 2003, s.v. *deuogdonioi*), whereas the human nature of *zemel-* may

receive further emphasis from the Hesykhian gloss ζέμελεν·βάρβαρον ἀν-δράποδον. Φρύγες, and its etymological relationship to Slavic *zemla* "earth". The suggestion by Lubotsky (1989a) to reconstruct here the D sg. *tie* of the indication of a male divinity otherwise attested in G sg. form *tios* fails to explain the absence of a third instance of the enclitic conjunction *-ke* "and", to be expected in the light of the New Phrygian inscription no. 48 from Dorylaion. Note that the element *me* at the start of the apodosis of the damnation-formula bears testimony of the adverb *me(t)* "among", corresponding to Greek μετά (< **me-t-*), also attested for the New Phrygian inscriptions nos. 6 and 21 from Sülmenli and Aşaği Piribeyli, respectively, and needs to be carefully distinguished from the negative adverb *me* "not", corresponding to Greek μή, as assured for the New Phrygian inscriptions nos. 86 and 99 from Geinik and Erten Jayla, respectively. The residual element *ti* is paralleled for the New Phrygian inscription no. 6 from Sülmenli and most likely to be explained as a pronominal form, if not, on the analogy of the appearance of *si* alongside *soi*, actually a variant of the D sg. of the article *to-*, viz. *toi* (m) or *tai* (f)—is it possible to be even more precise and suggest a *neuter* variant for which the distinction between the vowels *o* and *a* is irrelevant?

NPhr-6 Damnation-formula of an inscription from Sülmenli

a. *ios ni semoun knoumane*   "Who(ever) brings damage to this
   [kakon] abberet   grave, or the memorial (stone),
   a[i]nou[m] mon[ka]n
b. *tos ni me zemelω<s>-ke*   let him be forever damned for it among
   deωs[-ke] ti ηtit-   both mortals and gods!"
   tetikmenos e[i]tou

NPhr-21 Damnation-formula of an inscription from Aşaği Piribeyli

a. *ios sa sorou kake adaket*   "Who(ever) brings damage to this
                                     sarcophagus,
b. *me zemelωs tit-tetikmenos*   let him be damned for it among
   eitou   mortals!"

NPhr-4 Damnation-formula of an inscription from Sülmenli

a. *ios ni semoun knoumani*   "Who(ever) brings damage to this
   kakoun adaket aini oi   grave or the chamber for him,
   θalamei
b. *dη diωs zemelωs tit-*   let him be damned for it
   tetikmenos eitou   (among) gods (and) mortals!"

NPhr-86 Damnation-formula of an inscription from Geinik

a. *ios ni k[nou]mani kakoun* "Who(ever) brings damage to the grave
 add[a]ket aini mankης or the memorial (stone),
b. *Bas ioi bekos me bere[t]* Bas will not bring bread for him,
 Attiη-ke ti tetikm[e]nos and let him be damned for it by Attis!"
 eitou

This inscription presents a clear instance of the negative adverb *me* "not", corresponding to Greek μή, the occurrence of which is also assured for the New Phrygian inscription no. 99 from Erten Jayla, whereas it is further possibly encountered in the New Phrygian inscriptions nos. 18 and 42 from Bayat and Fileli, respectively (cf. Haas 1966, 236). As duly observed in the discussion of the New Phrygian inscription no. 97 from Çavdia Hisar above, this negative adverb needs to be carefully distinguished from the formally identical adverb *me(t)* "among", corresponding to Greek μετά (< *me-t-). The verbal form *beret* shows the simplex of the verbal root *ber-* "to carry, bring" otherwise encountered in composite variant, like in case of *abberet* from the protasis of the damnation-formula of the New Phrygian inscription no. 6 from Sülmenli and the unnumbered one from the region of Antioch in Pisidia, characterized by the preverb *ab-* < *ad-*.

NPhr-99 Damnation-formula of an inscription from Erten Jayla

a. *ios ni [s]emon knoumanei* "Who(ever) brings damage to this
 k[a]k[e] adaket grave,
b. *ti tikmenos as tian [e]itou* let him be damned for it by the
        goddess,

 me-ke oi totos seiti Bas and the people (and) Bas will not
 bekos   lay bread for him!"

Note that *totos* is the N(m/f) sg. in *-s* of the root *toto-*, which in variant form *teuto-* "people" occurs in the apodosis of the damnation-formula of the New Phrygian inscription no. 36 from Sınanlı, where it is in like manner paired with the GN Bas, so that we can be reasonably sure that it here, too, refers to this particular administrative organization. It further deserves our attention that the enclitic conjunction *-ke* "and" does not coordinate, as usually, two elements within a particular phrase, but two separate phrases in their entirety, as paralleled, for example, for the protasis of the damnation-formula of the aforesaid New Phrygian inscription no. 36 from Sınanlı, again.

NPhr-18 Damnation-formula of an inscription from Bayat

a. *ios moikran latomeion* "Who(ever) desecrates the little slab
 egdaes moursa   as a funereal memorial,

aini kos semoun	or who(ever) brings damage to this
knoumanei kakoun addaket	grave,
b. *bekos ioi me totos s<eiti>*	the people will not lay bread for him
Eugixarnan	insofar as (the cult of the Mother)
	Fulfilling Prayer is concerned!"

The verbal form *egdaes* is likely to be analyzed as a compound of the 3rd pers. sg. of the present tense of *da-* "to dedicate", *daes*, no doubt formed after the pattern of the past tense *edaes*, with the preverb *eg-*, corresponding to Greek ἐκ- or ἐξ-, which appears to change the meaning of the verb into its opposite, hence "to desecrate". In the present case, the verb governs a double accusative construction, the root of the second one being paralleled for *mros* (G sg.) in the New Phrygian inscription from the territory of Antioch in Pisidia presented in the above and likewise testifying to a reflex of PIE *mer- "to die" (cf. Latin *morior*). The apodosis of the damnation-formula is of similar type as the one from the New Phrygian inscription no. 99 from Erten Jayla, which leads us to the inference that the *s* following *totos* functions as an abbreviation of the verb *seiti*. As the punishment for which the possible violator of the grave is warned consists in his exclusion from the local cult procedures, there is no need to assume that the cultic title of the Mother goddess, which occurs in the accusative in order to specify the cultic procedures in question (i.e. *accusativus respectus*), renders a negative meaning notwithstanding its attractive analysis in line with Greek εὐχή "prayer, wish" and ἐξ-αρνέομαι "to deny, refuse": the local community is indeed more likely to worship a goddess who will fulfill their prayers than one who will refuse to do so, from which it apparently follows that the connotation of Phrygian *(e)x-arna-*, whatever the merits of its formal resemblance to the Greek equivalent in question, is something like "to execute, realize".

NPhr-36 Damnation-formula of an inscription from Sınanlı

a. *ios-ke semoun knoumani*	"And who(ever) will bring damage to
kakoun adaket	this grave,
b. (…)	(…)
autos-ke oua-k oraka	and may he himself and his
gegaritmenos a<s> Batan	offspring be at the mercy of Bas (and)
teutous	the people (pl.)!"

The reconstruction of the adverb *as* "by, through" is based on the recurrence of the entire expression in the New Phrygian inscription no. 33 from Sınanlı. The adverb in question clearly rules the accusative, as further deducible from *as tian* "by the goddess" in the apodosis of the damnatin-formula of the New Phrygian inscriptions nos. 14 and 99 from Hüsrevpasa and Erten Jayla, respectively, so that the form *teutous*, which is lined here with the GN Bas in like manner as in the

inscription from Erten Jayla just mentioned, by means of deduction can only come into consideration as an A(m/f) pl.

NPhr-2 Damnation-formula of an inscription from Üç Üyük, dated to the 2nd century AD

a. *ios ta mankai kakoun*	"Who(ever) brings damage to this
addaket	grave,
b. *ti etit-tetikmenos eitou*	let him be forever damned for it,
u-ke akala oouitetou oua	and let he not perceive his waters!"

Note the use of the negative adverb *u* "not", corresponding to Greek οὐ, where, for its occurrence in combination with the imperative, we would rather have expected the prohibitive variant *me*, corresponding to Greek μή. The root of the verb form *oouitetou* strikingly recalls that of Greek (Ϝ)ιδ- "to see, know", from which relationship it might well be inferred that the initial vowel *o* results from a writing error by dittography. The grammatically related couple *akala oua* renders the N-A(n) pl.

NPhr-33 Damnation-formula of an inscription from Sınanlı

a. *ios ni semoun knoumanei*	"Who(ever) brings damage to this
kakoun addaket	grave,
b. *gegreimenan egedou tios*	let him suffer the ordained curse of
outan	god,
akke oi bekos akkalos	and let him be deprived of bread
tidregroun eitou	(and) water for him,
autos-ke oua-k eroka	and (let him) and his offspring
gegaritmenos as Batan	(be) at the mercy of Bas (and) the
teutous	people (pl.)!"

The root of the participle of the perfect *gegreimenan* has been shown by Haas (1966, 87) to be related with that of Greek χρίω "to scratch, incise" on the basis of its recurrence in the first element of the geographic name Γρυμενο-δουρῖται, which according to a gloss by Ptolemaios is reported to express the meaning "inscribed doors" after the local Phrygian funerary monuments (for the second element, cf. Greek θύρα "door"). Furthermore, on the basis of the context it may safely be inferred that the root *ge-* of the verbal form *egedou* renders the meaning "to suffer, undergo" or the like. In line with this suggestion, the ending of the 3rd person singular in *-dou* appears to be that of the middle (< PIE *-$d^h\bar{o}$) rather than of the active (< PIE *-$t\bar{o}$) and to correspond to Old Phrygian *-do* as in *lake-do* from the inscription W-01 of a rock monument near Midas town. The coordinative conjunction *akke* is commonly analyzed as a formation similar to Latin *atque*, in which case its final syllable renders the common enclitic *-ke* "and".

Although its meaning is easily deducible from the context, the verbal form *tidregroun* remains unclear for the apparent lack of comparative data (participle of the perfect of the active instead of the usual ones of the middle-passive?).

NPhr-76 Damnation-formula of an inscription from Kelhasan

a. *ios ni semin t knoumanei addaket* | "Who(ever) will bring damage to this grave of him,
b. *tit-tetikmenos Atti adeitou akke oi bekos akkalos tidregroun eitou gegreimenan-k egedou tios outan* | let him be damned for it by Attis, and let him be deprived of bread (and) water for himself, and let him suffer the ordained curse of god!"

NPhr-35 Damnation-formula of an inscription from Sınanlı

a. *ios ni sai kakoun addakem mankai* | "Who(ever) brings damage to this grave,
b. *as anankai oi panta kenannou* | let him for himself be deprived of all (things) by fate/necessity!"

In the light of the parallels, the form *addakem* no doubt results from an anticipation error induced by the following *mankai* and should be emended as *addaket*. As we have just noted in connection with the preceding discussion of the New Phrygian inscription no. 36 from Sınanlı, the adverb *as* "by, through" rules the accusative, whereas here it occurs in combination with the D sg. For a similar inconsistency, compare the apparently erroneous use of the G sg. instead of the D sg. in connection with the indication of the funerary monument, *sas skeredrias* "to this ossuary", in the protasis of the damnation-formula of the New Phrygian inscription no. 56 from Küçük Beşkavak as opposed to the regular *sa skeledriai* in the analogous New Phrygian inscription no. 67 from Kestel near Laodicea Combusta. The form *kenannou* is, on the analogy of *eitou* "let him be", likely to be analyzed as a 3rd pers. sg. of the imperative in *-*tou* (< *kenantou with -*nt*- > -*nn*- by assimilation) of a verbal root *kena*- or *kenan*-, plausibly suggested to render the meaning "to deprive" or something like that— in which case a relationship with Greek κενός "empty, devoid of" suggests itself. The pronominal form *oi*, which is also attested for the New Phrygian inscription no. 48 from Dorylaion, on the analogy of the pronominal series *soi*, *sai*, *toi*, *tai*, and *ioi*, obviously renders D sg.

NPhr-88 Damnation-formula of an inscription from Bağlica in west-Phrygia, 3rd century AD

a. *ios ni semoun knoumanei* | "Who(ever) brings harm to this

kake addaket aωrω Ouenaouias	grave of prematurely (died) Venavia,
b. *tig-gegaritmeno<s> eitou Pour ouanakton-ke ouranion isgeiket Diounsin* (= *Dionusin*)	let him be at the mercy (of god) for it: he will have to cope with (the divine) Fire and the heavenly king, Dionysos!"

Note that the enclitic conjunction *-ke* "and" lines *pour* with *ouanakton ouranion Dionusin*, which indicates its divine nature. Against the background of our characterization of Phrygian religion as an Aegean type of mystery cult, the attestation of Dionysos in combination with fire of divine nature allows us to draw a direct parallel with the cult of the Eleusinian mysteries, in which Dionysos and the nightly fire at the Anaktoron play a prominent role. But it must be admitted that this inscription is of a very late date and that therefore the possibility cannot be excluded out of hand that these Eleusinian elements are the result of secondary Hellenic religious influences on the region in question. The element *tig* at the start of the apodosis of the damnation-formula appears to be an instance of the pronoun *ti*, analyzed as a D sg. of the neuter of the article *to-* in the above, which is in effect considered by the scribe as a prefix to the participle *gegaritmenos*, as a result of which the initial consonant of the latter form became subject to gemination in like manner as in case of *ti* in *tit-tetik-menos*. The validity of analysis of the root of the verbal form *isgeiket* from the final section of the apodosis of the damnation-formula as a reflex of the same PIE root from which also Greek ἴσχω "to have, hold" originates, which we owe to the merit of Lubotsky 1989b, receives, as the latter duly stressed, further emphasis from the close correspondence of the entire expression to the Greek variant of the apodosis of the damnation-formula ἕξει πρὸς οὐράνιον Διόνυσον. For the additional element *-ke-* in it which results from this analysis, compare *daket*, *addaket*, etc. alongside *edaes*, indicating that the root of this verb is *da-*, which can be augmented by the element *-ke-*.

NPhr-31 Funerary inscription of a grave from Ilgın

a. *as semoun knouman adiθrera(-?)k Xeuneoi [a]dikesai an mankan*	"Through this grave and (?) (…) for Xeuneos you should experience the memorial (stone) as an injustice,
b. *ian estaes bratere maimarŋan*	which he has placed for (his) brother as a (memorial stone) of marble;
c. *Poukros Mani(s)sou eneparkes de tounbon Xeunai*	Poukros, (the son) of Manis, however, has bought the tomb for/ on behalf of Xeuna."

In the discussion of the Old Phrygian inscription from Uyučik in Mysia (B-04), we have already encountered the modal particle *an*, which occurs there in com-

bination with a verb in the optative. In the present case, however, this particle occurs in combination with the verb *adikesai*, which, in line with the relevant Greek evidence (that is to say as far as the sigmatic aorist is concerned), may reasonably be assumed to render the 2nd person singular of the imperative of the middle-passive in -*sai* of the root *adike-* "to suffer injustice". As noted in the discussion of the Old Phrygian inscription from Midas town M-01, the verbal form *eneparkes* from the final phrase of the present text is paralleled for M-01d. For the apparent inability of women to act on their own in official matters, exemplified here by the fact that Poukros, the brother of the deceased Xeuneos, has arranged the monument (also) on behalf of the latter's female relative Xeuna–probably to be identified as his daughter or granddaughter–, see our remarks in the discussion of the Old Phrygian inscription W-01 from the region of Midas town.

NPhr-9 Funerary inscription of a grave from Işıklar

1. *Kouthos et Roupas*	"Quintus and Rufus, after the graves
2. *dekmoutais knou*	and the memorials having been set
3. *ma eti manka opestam*	up as an annex from the (revenues of
4. *ena daditi Nenueria*	the) tithes, have allotted the upper part
5. *partu soubra*	to Nenueria."

The given interpretation is based on the improved transcription by Orel 1997, 72-76. Accordingly, then, this grave inscription, which is written by or on behalf of the Roman Quintus in cooperation with his father Rufus, bears testimony of secondary influences from Latin in form of *et*, *partu*, *soubra*, and *daditi*, corresponding to Latin *et* "and", *pars* (G *partis*) "part", *supra* "above", and *dedit* "(s)he has given", respectively. The form *dekmoutais* (D pl.) evidently shows a reflex of PIE *$déḱm̥t$- "10" in like manner as its Greek equivalent δεκάτη "tithe", or, more in general, Gallic *dekantem* (A(m/f) sg.) and Luwian hieroglyphic *tinita-* of the same meaning, and, given the guttural expression of the original palatovelar, in this manner provides welcome additional evidence for the *centum*-nature of Phrygian as further exemplified by -*agta-* in *lavagtaei* "leader of the host" (D sg.) < PIE *$h_2eǵ$- "to lead", Ἀκμωνία (place name) < PIE *$h_2eḱmen$-, *kuno-* "dog" < PIE *$ḱ(u)won$-, *ki-* "to lie" < PIE *$ḱei$-, *nekro-* "to kill" < PIE *$neḱ-ro$-, *meka-* "great" < PIE *$meǵ(h_2)$-, *tik-* "to show, accuse" < PIE *$deiḱ$-, *vekro-* "father-in-law" < PIE *$sweḱuro$-, and *verktevo-* "work, contruction" < PIE *$werǵ$- (note that the evidence for a *satem* reflex of palatovelars as represented by *sei-* "to lie" < PIE *$ḱei$-* and Σεμέλη (divine name = "Mother Earth") or *zemel-* "mortal, earthling" < PIE *$dʰeǵʰōm$-* must hence be attributed to secondary *satem*-influences). The participle of the perfect, *opestamena*, the root of which corresponds to Greek ἐφ-ίσταμαι "to place for oneself as an annex" with the noted adjustment that the preverb occurs in a form corresponding to Mycenaean form *o-pi-*, is characterized by the N-A(n)

pl. in *-a*, which *mutatis mutandis* also applies to the indications of the object grammatically lined with it–an inference further underlined by the singular *tan protussestamenan mankan* in the inscription following below. Note that the pre-verb *opi-* may well express the meaning that the funerary monument has been set up as a part of a larger project not necessarily executed at the same spot, but in any case financed from the revenues of the same tithe.

NPhr-15 Funerary inscription of a grave from Seyitgazi

1.	*Xeune tan eixa upso*	"For Xeuna, Amias (has set up), after
2.	*dan protussestam*	having placed this memorial later on
3.	*enan mankan Ami*	top (of the existing monument), which
4.	*as ian ioi anar Doru-*	(her) husband Dorukanos [authorized]
	ka[nos …]	him (to do so)."

The given interpretation is based on the improved transcription by Orel 1997, 76-79. From the context, it seems clear that *Xeune* renders the D sg. of the female personal name *Xeuna*, otherwise occurring in form of *Xeunai* in the New Phrygian inscription no. 31 from Ilgın. The root of this personal name, which, for example in the aforesaid inscription from Ilgın, also occurs in male variant Xeuneos, is plausibly suggested by Orel (1997, 76-77) to be related to Greek ξένος "host, stranger" originating from an earlier *ξένϝος as recorded for the Mycenaean MN *ke-se-nu-wo* /Xenwōn/, in which case the Phrygian form would bear testimony of metathesis of *n* and *w* as compared to its Greek equivalent. The interpretation of the remainder of the text naturally follows from the relationship of *eixa*, *upsodan*, *protu-*, and *anar* to Greek ἐξῆς "in a row, following, successively", ὑψόθεν "from above", προτί (variant of πρός) "with", and ἀνήρ "man, husband", and receives further emphasis from the fact that the personal names Amias and Dorukanos are duly paralleled in Anatolian onomastics from about the period to which the inscription belongs. Note that, after the instances of W-01 and NPhr-31, we are confronted here with a third example for the apparent legal incapacity of female persons to act on their own behalf in official matters.

NPhr-116 Final phrase of a funerary inscription from Gezler Köyü

f.	*tekmar Dii detoi oinis*	"The wine for the memorial (is/serves as) a (libation) offering to Zeus."

NPhr-98 Dedicatory inscription, presently in the Museum of Dorylaion

dakaren paterηs eukin argou	"The Fathers dedicate for themselves because of a vow."

NPhr-48 Apodosis of the damnation-formula of a bilingual inscription on a stone which is now lost and of which the top side already had been missing from Dorylaion in the neighborhood of Eskişehir

(…)	"let him be (….)
3. *eitou Mitraφata*	(…)! Mitrabates and
4. *-ke Mas Temroge-*	Mas Tembrogius (= local river)
5. *ios-ke Pountas*	and the Pontic Bas
6. *Bas-ke enstarna*	will be supervizing (the curse)."
7. [vac.] *doum<e>-ke oi* *ou<e>-*	"And to (the care of) the religious community the Guardian has put
8. *ban addaket orou-*	the memorial for Himself."
9. *an* παρεθέμην τὸ μνημεῖον τοῖς προ- γεγραμμένοις θε- οῖς κὲ τῇ κώμῃ· ταυθ᾽ ὁ πατὴρ Ἀσκληπιός	"Father Asklepios has placed this monument under the protection of the above-mentioned gods and the (religious) community."

The most interesting verbal form in this text is *enstarna* from the final phrase of its damnation-formula, which is convincingly interpreted by Lubotsky 1997 as a 3rd person plural of the present tense of the middle-passive in *-rna* (variant form of *-ren* as encountered in the previous New Phrygian inscription no. 98; note that the ending is characterized by the Indo-European passive marker *-r-*, further represented by forms like Old Phrygian *irter* (P-04) and New Phrygian *abberetor* and *addaketor*, typical of the conservative group of languages among the Indo-European language family, whereas Phrygian otherwise clearly belongs to its innovative group, see Woudhuizen *forthc*. 2 on this matter) of the verb *ensta-*, corresponding to Greek ἐν-ίστημι "to place inside". Also in regard to the interpretation of the remainder of the text I follow the exemplary lead by Lubotsky, with the noted adjustment that the pronominal form *oi*, in like manner as in the New Phrygian inscription no. 35 from Sınanlı, renders the D sg. and that the monument in question is not of funereal, but dedicatory nature.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Blažek, V. 1999: *Numerals, Comparative-Etymological Analyses and their Implications,* Opera Universitatis Masarykianae Brunensis, Facultas Philosophica, čislo 322, Brně.
Blažek, V. 2005: Paleo-Balkanian Languages I: Hellenic Languages, *Sborník Prací Filozofické Fakulty Brněnské Univerzity, Studia Minora Facultatis Philosophicae Universitatis Brunensis* 10, 15-33.
Brixhe, C. 1991: Les inscriptions paléo-phrygiennes de Tyane: leur intérêt linguistique et historique, in: Le Guen-Pollet, B. /O. Pelon (eds.), *La Cappadoce méridionale jusqu'à la fin*

de l'époque romaine, Etat des recherches, Actes du colloque d'Istanbul, Institut Français d'Etudes Anatoliennes, 13-14 avril 1987, Paris, 37-46; Pl. I.

Brixhe, C. 2004: Corpus des inscriptions paléo-phrygiennes, Supplément II, *Kadmos* 43, 1-130.

Brixhe, C./T. Drew-Bear 1997: Huit inscriptions néo-phrygiennes, in: Gusmani, R./M. Salvini/P. Vannicelli (eds.), *Frigi e Frigio, Atti del 1º Simposio Internazionale, Roma, 16-17 ottobre 1995*, Roma, 71-114.

Brixhe, C./M. Lejeune 1984: *Corpus des Inscriptions Paleo-Phrygiennes* I-II, "Mémoire" Nº 45, Paris.

Delamarre, X. 2003: *Dictionnaire de la langue gauloise, Une approche linguistique du vieux-celtique continental*, Paris.

Diakonoff, I.M./V.P. Neroznak 1985: *Phrygian*, Delmar/New York.

Forlanini, M. 1996: Awariku, un nom dynastique dans le mythe et l'histoire, *Hethitica* 13, 13-15.

Gamkrelidze, T.V./V.V. Ivanov 1995: *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans, A Reconstruction and Historical Analysis of a Proto-Language and a Proto-Culture*, Part I: The Text, Part II: Bibliography, Indexes, Berlin/New York.

Gorbachov, Y. 2008: Nine Observations on the Old Phrygian Inscription from Vezirhan, *Kadmos* 47, 91-108.

Graves, R. 1990: *The Greek Myths*, Vols. 1-2, London (Reprint of revised edition of 1960).

Haas, O. 1966: *Die Phrygischen Sprachdenkmäler*, Linguistique Balkanique, 10, Sofia.

Haas, O. 1970: Das Problem der Herkunft der Phryger und ihrer Beziehungen zu den Balkanvölker, *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 18, 31-69.

Hemberg, B. 1950: *Die Kabieren*, Uppsala.

Jasink, A.M./M. Marino 2008: The West-Anatolian origins of the Que kingdom dynasty, in: Archi, A./R. Francia (eds.), *VI Congresso Internazionale di Ittitologia, Roma, 5-9 settembre 2005*, Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici 50, Roma, 407-426.

Laroche, E. 1966: *Les Noms des Hittites*, Paris.

Liddell, H.G./R. Scott/H.S. Jones [*LSJ*]: *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Cambridge.

Lubotsky, A. 1989a: New Phrygian ετι and τι, *Kadmos* 28, 79-88.

Lubotsky, A. 1989b: The Syntax of the New Phrygian Inscription No. 88, *Kadmos* 28, 146-154.

Lubotsky, A. 1997: New Phrygian Inscription No. 48: Palaeographic and Linguistic Comments, in: Gusmani, R./M. Salvini/P. Vannicelli (eds.), *Frigi e Frigio*, *Atti del 1º Simposio Internazionale, Roma, 16-17 ottobre 1995*, Roma, 115-130.

Meid, W. 1997: Hoffnung oder Resignation? Vom Umgang mit Texten aus "Trümmersprachen", *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 49, 591-602.

Neumann, G. 1997: Die zwei Inschriften auf der Stele von Vezirhan, in: Gusmani, R./M. Salvini/P. Vannicelli (eds.), *Frigi e Frigio, Atti del 1º Simposio Internazionale, Roma, 16-17 ottobre 1995*, Roma, 13-32.

Orel, V. 1997: *The Language of the Phrygians, Description and Analysis*, Delmar/New York.

Pfiffig, A.J. 1975: *Religio Etrusca*, Graz.

Puhvel, J. 1964: Eleuthḗr and Oinoâtis: Dionysiac Data from Mycenaean Greece, in: Bennett, Jr., E.L. (ed.), *Mycenaean Studies, Proceedings of the Third International Colloquium for Mycenaean Studies held at "Wingspread," 4-8 September 1961*, Madison, 161-169.

Roller, L.E. 1999: *In Search of God the Mother, The Cult of Anatolian Cybele*, Berkeley/Los Angeles/London.

Varinlioğlu, E. 1992: The Phrygian Inscriptions from Bayındır, *Kadmos* 31, 10-20.

Vassileva, M. 1997: A Few Notes on the Recent Phrygian Epigraphic Data, in: Gusmani, R./M. Salvini/P. Vannicelli (eds.), *Frigi e Frigio, Atti del 1º Simposio Internazionale, Roma, 16-17 ottobre 1995*, Roma, 267-270.

Vassileva, M. 2001: Further Considerations on the Cult of Cybele, *Anatolian Studies* 51, 51-63.

Ventris, M./J. Chadwick 1973: *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*, Cambridge (2nd edition).

Vries, N. de 1991: A Thracian Kybele, in: Kaul, F./I. Marazov/J. Best/N. de Vries (eds.), *Thracian Tales on the Gundestrup Cauldron*, Amsterdam, 89-106.

Watkins, C. 1995: *How to Kill a Dragon, Aspects of Indo-European Poetics*, New York/Oxford.

Wittke, A.-M. 2004: *Mušker und Phryger, Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte Anatoliens vom 12. bis zum 7. Jh. v. Chr.*, Beihefte zum Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients, Reihe B, Geisteswissenschaften Nr. 99, Wiesbaden.

Woudhuizen, F.C. 1982-3: Etruscan Origins: The Epigraphic Evidence, *Talanta, Proceedings of the Dutch Archaeological and Historical Society* 14-15, 91-117.

Woudhuizen, F.C. 1984-5: Lydian: Separated from Luwian by three signs, *Talanta, Proceedings of the Dutch Archaeological and Historical Society* 16-17, 91-113.

Woudhuizen, F.C. 1993: Old Phrygian: Some Texts and Relations, *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 21, 1-25.

Woudhuizen, F.C. 2008: *Etruscan as a Colonial Luwian Language, Linguistica Tyrrhenica* III, Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft, Sonderheft 128, Innsbruck.

Woudhuizen, F.C. *forthcoming* 1: Luwian Hieroglyphic & Indo-European, *Res Antiquae* 8 (2011).

Woudhuizen, F.C. *forthcoming* 2: Towards a Chronological Framework for Significant Dialectal Tendencies in Indo-European, *Journal of Indo-European Studies*.

APPENDIX: SOME NOTES ON PHRYGIAN & GREEK

Frits Waanders

Not much is known about the historical phonology of Phrygian. However, some developments from Indo-European to Phrygian appear to be well-established:
(i) PIE *bh, *dh, *gh > Phr. b, d, g; from the LIST OF LEXICAL CORRESPONDENCES one can adduce: 5. *agaritoi* + 59. *garit(o)-*, 21. *argo-*, 27. *ber-*, 29. *brater-*, 30. *da-*, 34. *deto-*, 43. δουρῖται, 49. + 50. *eugi-*, 62. *glouros*, 63. *Gordion, Gordias*, 64. *grei-*, 69. *isgei-*, ...–always provided that the identifications are correct;
(ii) Phrygian is a *kentum* language, cf., sub (i), 5+59, 21, 49+50, 62, 63, 64, 69; the development of the labiovelars is not entirely clear, but there seem to be some indications that in principle, they merged with the (palato)velars (above, n. 2).

I would like to make some remarks on selected entries in the LIST:
29. *brater-* ~ φράτηρ, βρά (Eleian): I would not mention βρά, which is problematic rather than illuminating. Elean is a genuine Greek dialect (with φ, θ, χ from the PIE aspirated stops); therefore, if βρά is really found in Elis, it must be a loanword from an IE language where *bh > b (apart from Phrygian, possible candidates are Macedonian and Thracian; Illyrian has also been proposed, see hereafter). The transmitted text of Hesychius has βρά· ἀδελφοί, ὑπὸ Ιλειων; editors correct Ιλειων into Ἠλείων, or even Ἰλλυρίων. Βρά is like *fra*

in Italian, but that is about all we can say about it.

37. *diθur-* (as in διθύραμβος "Vierschritt"): The etymology of διθύραμβος (and, often mentioned in this connection, ἴαμβος, θρίαμβος) is unclear. One often speculates that ἴαμβος = "Einschritt", θρίαμβος = "Dreischritt", and διθύραμβος = "Vierschritt", without it being clear from which (IE) language Greek took these words (e.g., Thracian, or an IE language in Greece anterior to Greek, would be no worse guess than Phrygian). Anyhow, there is a problem with διθυρ- "4", leaving aside the long ι, as indicated in the dictionaries; cf. E.C. Polomé, "Thraco-Phrygian", in: J. Gvozdanović (ed.), *Indo-European Numerals* (1992), p. 362. Accepting ἰ-, θρι-, and διθυρ- as (IE) numerical elements meaning 1, 3, and 4, I would like to propose an explanation for the *d-* of διθυρ-. As known, numerals tend to influence one another. Thus, in some Greek dialects, ὀκτώ "8" was influenced by ἑπτά "7", giving ὀπτώ or ὁπτώ; in Germanic, Gothic *fidwor* "4" owes its *f-* to *fimf* "5" (likewise English *four* : *five*, etc.); in Latin, *novem* "9" owes its final *-m* to *septem* and *decem*. Therefore, I surmise that διθυρ- took its *d-* from the numeral "2", whatever its exact form in the (unidentified) language of the *-ambos* words. θ (*th*) < PIE *t* seems to be a feature of this language, as suggested by θρι- and διθυρ-; this is not characteristic of Phrygian–or, at least, aspiration of voiceless stops is not indicated. I feel like speculating somewhat further: if language *x* resembles Phrygian/Thracian/Macedonian, the element *-amb-* might be related to Greek ἄμφω, ἀμφί, Latin *ambo*, *ambi-*, and the *-ambos* words may mean "dance in which *both feet* are raised and put down once/three times/four times". As for ἴαμβος, an iambic metron in Greek (˘ ´ ˘ ´) would illustrate the naming principle. (A θρίαμβος should then, originally at least, resemble a Greek iambic trimeter, and a διθύραμβος a tetrameter.)

68. *is-*, 105. (-)*nou*: *isnou* (text **NPhr-87** *l.* b) is explained as follows: *is* ~ εἰς "in" (preposition) + gen. *nou* ~ νόος, νοῦς "spirit, mind" ("(victim) of the working of his own conscience"). Apart from the Greek genitive form *nou* (I cannot make Phrygian of it), εἰς "in*to*" (extended form of ἐν), like Latin *in* "into", does not take the genitive, and this is not to be expected for Phrygian either. Therefore, I wonder whether *is* < *ix* "from" (Gk ἐξ, Lat. *ex*), as found in 50: *Eug-ix-arnan*, if reading and analysis are correct. On the whole, however, I do not feel confident that the correct interpretation of *isnou* has been found; the structure of the sentence remains somewhat obscure to me.

Several words for "woman" are recognized in the LIST:

28. *bonok*, *banekos* ~ βανά (Aiolic), βονά (Cyprian) "wife"

79. *kinumais* (D pl.) ~ γυνή, γυναικός (G) "woman, wife"

81. *knaiko*, *knaikan* (A(m/f) sg.) ~ γυνή, γυναικός (G) (cf. Myc. *ku-na-ki-si* [D pl.]) "woman, wife" (why "m/f"?)

I must confess that the Phrygian women really confuse me; they look like shape-shifters, rather than ordinary women. Starting from PIE *$g^w neh_2(ik)$-*, *knaiko* and *knaikan* may be acceptable results (if we assume a secondary development *gn-* > *kn-* within Phrygian), perhaps also *kinumais* (with metathesis, <

*_kun-im-_?), with the _k-_ of _knaik-_, but a different suffix than _-ik-_; on the other hand, I cannot figure out how we can explain _bonok_, _banekos_—Phrygian is not a Greek dialect like Aeolic or Cyprian.

In text **G-02** _l._ 1, one encounters _agaritoi Adoikavoi_ "for the Ungracious Adoikavos". Dr Woudhuizen remarks that "[i]t may reasonably be argued that the recipient deity, Adoikavos, for his epithet _agaritoi_ "ungracious (D sg.)", is likely to be identified as a, or the, god of the underworld." I would like to propose an etymology for the god's name, viz. _a-doik-avos_, analyzed as _a-_ < *_n̥-_ ("_a_ privans") + _-doik(a)-_: _o_-grade of *_deik-_ "indicate, point out, say" etc. (Gk δεικνύναι, Lat. _dicere_) + a suffix _-(a)vo-_, the entire name meaning something like "The Unshowable" or "The Unspeakable/Unspoken"; cf. Gk Ἀ(Ϝ)ίδ(ᾱ)- "The Unseen".

Fred C. Woudhuizen
Het Hoekstuk 69
NL-1852 KX Heiloo
The Netherlands
fredwoudhuizen@yahoo.com

Frits Waanders
Het Hoogt 310
NL-1025 HJ Amsterdam
The Netherlands
f.waanders1@chello.nl