

The Old Phrygian Areyastis-inscription

ALEXANDER LUBOTSKY

The Old Phrygian (OPhr.) corpus comprises almost 240 inscriptions, of which only two contain more than ten words: the Germanos inscription (B-01)¹ and the so-called Areyastis-inscription from Yazılıkaya (W-01). The former, however, is rather worn and contains no word divisions. The Areyastis-inscription thus appears to be of paramount importance for the study of OPhr. Dating from the first half of the sixth century B.C. (Haspels 1971: 105), it is engraved with utmost care and is perfectly legible except for a few mutilated letters. The inscription has been edited and treated several times, but as the proposed interpretations are unsatisfactory² and as there is not even a consensus about the direction in which it must be read, it seems justified to look at this inscription once more.

The Areyastis-inscription is engraved on a façade dedicated to Kybele (there is a niche for the statue of the goddess in the middle of the façade) and consists of three parts: (a) on the band around the pediment, (b) on the rugged rock surface above the façade, and (c) on the inner right-hand side below turning onto the façade (see Fig. 1). Brixhe and Lejeune in their standard work on the OPhr. inscriptions (1984: 38ff.) give the following text:

W-01a. → I *vrekun : tedatoy : yostutut...ā.m.[?]noy : akenanogavos / aey*
← II *materan : areyastin*
← III *bonok : akenanogavos*

W-01b. → *yosesait : materey : eveteksetey : ovevin : onoman : daΨet : la/*
← *kedokey : venavtun : avtay : materey*

W-01c. ← *ataniyen : kuryaneyon : ta/negertoy*

10

¹ Unless stated to the contrary, the numbers and readings of OPhr. inscriptions are given in accordance with Brixhe – Lejeune 1984. The only difference is the function of the hyphen: Brixhe and Lejeune sometimes use the hyphen as a sign for an illegible character, whereas in the present article the hyphen indicates a proposed word division. An illegible character is indicated with a point.

² Most recently, the Areyastis-inscription was treated by Diakonoff and Neroznak (1985), who give the following, rather ununderstandable, translation (p. 63): "Bonok the dedicator keeps (his) vow, wherefore (the god) healed her for me, the dedicator (and) for herself (?), (my) mother Areyastis since he laid (the vow upon himself) for his mother: she bore him, he/she made his own name, and he has made (= dedicated) himself for his own mother. (But) Atanis, his... (= beloved servant, or next of kin, etc.?), (s)he (the god[dess]) took then (?) (for her/himself)".

There are two remaining questions about the text:

1. How many inscriptions are here: one, two, or three?
2. In which order must (a) be read: I-II-III, III-I-II, or II-III-I?

Let us start with the second question. There are several epigraphic arguments in favour of the order II-III-I. First, it is natural for a scribe to start an inscription on the akroterion because it is easier thereby to predict which words would fit in the room available. Second, part I continues on the protruding side of the rock beside the façade with the word *aei*, which would have been incomprehensible if there had been free space around the akroterion (cf. Brixhe – Lejeune 1984: 38). Moreover, the only order which makes sense is II-III-I (see below). It follows that (a) must be read

(II) *materan* : *areyastin* (akroterion) (III) *bonok* : *akenanogavos*
 (I) *vrekun* : *tedatoy* : *yostutut...a.m.[?]noy* : *akenanogavos* / *aei*

As to the first question, it seems reasonable to divide (a) into two sentences, sentence 2 starting with the relative pronoun *yos*. Assuming that (b) and (c) contain one sentence each, we arrive at four sentences:

Sentence 1: *materan* : *areyastin* / *bonok* : *akenanogavos* / *vrekun* : *tedatoy*;

Sentence 2: *yostutut...a.m.[?]noy* : *akenanogavos* / *aei*;

Sentence 3: *yosesait* : *materey* : *eveteksetey* : *ovevin* : *onoman* : *daΨet* : *la/kedokey* : *venavtun* :
avtay : *materey*;

Sentence 4: *ataniyen* : *kuryaneyon* : *ta/negertoy*

Sentence 1

(*materan* : *areyastin* / *bonok* : *akenanogavos* / *vrekun* : *tedatoy*)

materan, acc.sg. of the word for 'mother'. The same case occurs also in W-03 and M-01d. The other attested cases are nom.sg. *matar* (B-01.3,7; W-04; W-06; cf. also NPhr. $\mu\alpha\tau\alpha\rho$ (18)) and dat.sg. *materey* (W-01b twice, see below). The word undoubtedly applies to Kybele.

areyastin, acc.sg. of Kybele's epithet, probably a toponym (Brixhe 1979b: 42, n.17). For the suffix cf. other epithets of Kybele: *Acdestis*, $A(v)\gamma\delta\iota\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$, Gusmani 1958: 849f.

bonok, nom.sg. of dedicator's name. For the zero-ending cf. nom.sg. *vanak* in M-04 and probably *monok* in M-01c.

akenanogavos is most probably Bonok's title. Bearer of the same title is Ates in M-01a (*ates* : *arkiaevais* : *akenanogavos* : *midai* : *lavagtaei* : *vanaktei* : *edaes*). The fact that Ates dedicates a Kybele façade to the great king Midas becomes comprehensible if we assume that Ates had a religious function and not a secular one.

From our inscription and from M-01a it follows that *akenanogavos* is the nom.sg. of an *o-*

stem. Therefore, *akinanogavan* of the inscription M-04 (*akinanogavan* : *tiyes* / *modrovanak* : *[?javara(?)]*)³ can only be the acc.sg. of an *ā*-stem, a feminine variant of the same word (for the variation of *i* and *e* cf. B-01 *kubeleya* vs. W-04 *kubileya*, Brixhe 1983: 115). The inscription M-04 is engraved on Kybele's throne and the title applies most probably to the Goddess herself. This seems quite appropriate since Kybele is often mentioned as a bearer of a religious title (an oracle or a high priestess) in Phrygia (RE XI: 2255).

The suffix of *akenanogavos* / **akenanogava* is a thematicization of the suffix *-av-* < **-ēu-* which in Greek often denotes a profession or a social function: βασιλεύς 'king', βραβεύς 'arbiter', ἵππεύς 'chariot-driver', etc. (Chantraine 1933: 125ff.). In Phrygian we may find the same suffix in a title *proitavos* (M-01b; M-02), which is characterized in these inscriptions by an adjective *kΦiyanaveyos* (M-01b), *k/ʔanaveyos* (M-02) derived with the suffix *-eyo-* also from a noun in *-av-*. ...*]olgiavos* (G-150a), *adoikavoi* (G-02a) and *[a]ḍoikavos* (G-146) are probably proper nouns.

The word *akenanogavos* is a compound, as can be seen from *akenaş/* (W-07) and the protasis formula *ios-ni-ākēnan-egeseti* (P-04a). The verbal form *egeseti* can be compared with *ot[...]/seti* (P-04a), *ervotsati* (P-04b), ...*kesiti* (B-01.8), NPhr. εγεσιτ (58). These forms are probably 3 sg. subjunctives in *-(e)se-ti*. The sentence *ios-ni-akenan-egeseti* is not necessarily a protasis of a malediction formula, but can introduce a wish of the type 'whoever may become a king, ... (let him protect this monument)' *uel sim*.

13

It is just possible that the root of *egeseti* may be found in the element *-og-* of *akenanogavos*, so that we would have to do with a verbal root with the ablaut *eg-* / *og-*. The same verb occurs in a frequent NPhr. apodosis formula γεγρειμεναν εγεδου τιος where it stands in the 3 sg. imperative middle (< **dʰō*, see below) and in a variant of this formula τητιον εγεσιτ γεγριμενον (58) where the verb stands in the subjunctive.

It is tempting to see in the root *eg-* / *og-* the PIE root for 'to speak', **H₁eg-* (Pok. 290)⁴. If this root developed semantically in the direction 'to foretell, predict', the direction found in Latin (*prōdigium* 'omen', *Aius Loquēns* or *Aius Locūtius* 'the God announcing the approaching of the Gauls') and in Umbrian (*aiu* 'oracula'), this would explain the title *akenanogavos* as 'oracle', then 'priest'. The meaning of *akenas*, *-an* remains obscure. An indication that *eg-* / *og-* is

³ *Tiyes* of this inscription is probably a theonym bearing the title *modrovanak* 'the great king' *uel sim*., cf. the name of a Phrygian town Τίειον to which Steph. Byz. remarks: Δημοσθένης δ' ἐν βιθυνιακοῖς φησὶ κτιστὴν τῆς πόλεως γενέσθαι Πάταρον ἐλόντα Παφλαγονίαν, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ τιμᾶν τὸν Δία Τίον προσαγορεύσαι (cf. on this passage Haas 1966: 67). The name Τίειον contains the suffix *-eio-*, which is frequently used in Phrygian for the formation of adjectives. The same adjective occurs in NPhr. inscription 58 τητιον εγεσιτ γεγριμενον, translated by Haas (1966: 67) 'er soll das göttliche Vorbestimmte tragen'. The gen.sg. of the god's name from which Τίειον is derived occurs in a frequent NPhr. Malediction γεγρειμεναν εγεδου τιος ουταν. It is tempting to see in τιος a regular gen.sg. of the *s*-stems: nom.sg. *tiyes* (< **tiH-es*), gen.sg. *tios* (< **tiH-s-os*) (for *-s-* > *-h-* > *-∅-* see below, s.v. *aey*). For the acc.sg. of the same paradigm *τιαν* (< **tiH-(e)s-m̄*) and dat.sg. *τι/τιε/τιη* (< **tiH-s-ei*) see fn. 13.

⁴ This root is glossed by Pokorny as *ēg-/ōg-/əg-*, but for Greek and Armenian *eg-/og-* would suffice, e.g. Gr. ἦ 'he said' < augm. *e-* + *H₁eg-t*; perf. ἄνωγα with reduplication; Arm. *asem*, if from **acem*, can go back to **H₁og-*. Lat. *ag-* probably represents a secondary zero-grade.

somehow related to the semantic sphere of foretelling is provided by inscription P-04. After the above-mentioned protasis, *ios-ni-akenan-egeseti*, meaning 'whoever may become *akenanogavos*' *uel sim.*, we find *okirterko[...]/tekmor*. The last word is most probably identical with Gr. τέκμωρ 'sign, omen', and as it belongs to the apodosis of the same sentence, we may assume that it is semantically related to *akenan-egeseti*. As to the NPhr. formulas, I believe that they can also be explained in this way, but to demonstrate this would require a separate treatment.

vrekun. As the sentence starts with an object in the acc., it is improbable that *vrekun* is an accusative too. This word was long ago recognized as a nom.sg. of an adjective / participle in *-ont-s (with the regular development *-ont-s > *-on > *-un, cf. below on *kuryaneyon*) and identified with Hesychius' gloss βρέκυντὸν Βερέκυντα, τὸν Βρίγα. Βρίγες γὰρ οἱ Φρύγες. This gloss is connected by most scholars with other glosses in Hesychius where the words βερεκύνται, βερεκύνδαι are explained as a name of one of the Phrygian tribes (cf., e.g., βερεκύνται Φρυγῶν τι γένος, καὶ πρότερον Βερεκυντία ἢ Φρυγία; for a discussion of these glosses cf. Gusmani 1958: 857ff. and Neroznak 1978: 142ff.).

It seems therefore reasonable to assume that we have here an ethnicon (translated below as "of the Βρίγες") specifying the title *akenanogavos*. A comparable pair of title + ethnicon may be *proitavos kPhiyanaveyos* (M-01b), *proitavo[s] k/tanaveyos* (M-02). The word *rekun* which stands at the beginning of inscription M-06 may be identical with *vrekun*, but as there is no trace of the *v-*, this is doubtful. 14

tedatoy has been interpreted by all scholars as a verb meaning 'fecit' *uel sim.* and derived from the root **d^heH₁-*. In order to account for the initial *te-*, reduplication was assumed, but since Phrygian had no *Lautverschiebung* (Lejeune 1979), such a reduplication is impossible (cf. also NPhr. γεγαριτμενος, γεγρειμεναν). Besides, the other OPhr. forms in *-toy* (W-01c *tanegertoy*, B-01,3 *ektetoy*, B-01,8 *anepaktoy*, G-144 *estatoï*) do not show reduplication, but instead all of them have an *e-* before the root, which is probably an augment. This means that we must analyze *tedatoy* as *t-edatoy*.

An element *-t-* can also be singled out in inscription M-05 *apelan mekastevanos...* because *mekas* occurs twice in P-03 and *evanos* in P-02. Moreover, the same *t-* can be found in the recently discovered inscription W-08, the first part of which is analyzed by Brixhe (Brixhe – Drew-Bear 1982: 72) as *ates agomoi sa.ta t-edaes*. He regards *t-edaes* as a compound with a preverb corresponding to OIr. *to-* (*do-*). I would propose to see the same preverb in *t-edatoy*, which is derived from the same root as *t-edaes*.

Accordingly, if we put aside the initial *t-*, we arrive at the verbal form *edatoy*. The ending is most probably 3 sg. middle *-toi found in Greek dialects (Rix 1976: 254) and in Indo-Iranian. Its primary character seems to be contradicted by the augment and the past tense required by the context of the inscription. However, the opposition between primary and secondary endings in the middle originated in the separate languages (cf. Kortlandt 1981: passim), and we know too

little about the verb morphology of Phrygian to speculate about this problem.

The root of *edatoy* was reconstructed by most scholars as $*d^hH_1-$ ($*d^h\vartheta-$), i.e. the zero grade of the root $*d^heH_1-$. This reconstruction is untenable, however, as there are strong indications that Phrygian shows the same treatment of interconsonantal and initial laryngeals (prothetic vowels) as does Greek (and, probably, also Armenian), viz. $*H_1 > e$, $*H_2 > a$, $*H_3 > o$. This development was already considered probable by Dressler 1968: 47 and Beekes 1969: 20ff. on the basis of the following material:

1. OPhr. *onoman* (W-01), NPhr. ονομα[...] (30), ονομανια- (116)⁵ < $*H_3nH_3-m\eta$, Gr. ὄνομα (for the IE reconstruction cf. now Beekes forthc.).

2. OPhr. *keneman* (M-01b), which probably designates a monument or a part of it, contains the suffix *-man* (< $*-m\eta$) like the above-mentioned *onoman*. The root is thus disyllabic and must be reconstructed $*kenH_1-$. The current etymology connects this root with the Sanskrit set-root *khanⁱ*- 'to dig'.

3. For $H_2 > a$ cf. NPhr. αναρ (15) (= Gr. ἀνήρ), πατερης (98) (= Gr. πατήρ).

To this evidence we can now add:

4. The NPhr. suffix of the medial participle *-μενο-*: (ετι)ττετικμενος, γεγαριτμενος, γεγρειμεναν, οπεσταμεναν (9), εσταμεναν (15), νιουμενος (48), αργμενα(.) (116).⁶ This suffix was shown by Klingenschmitt (1975: 159ff.) to continue PIE $*-mH_1no-$. Borrowing of this suffix from Greek is improbable, so that we must assume the development $*H_1 > Phr. e$.

5. NPhr. δεως in the formula δεως ζεμελωσ 'by gods and men' is mostly derived from PIE $*diu-$. One reconstructs $*dejuo-$ (Gusmani 1958: 893, Brixhe 1983: 120) and postulates the development $*dejuo- > *dēyo-$ with subsequent loss of intervocalic *-u-*. This loss is unknown in Phrygian, however. Intervocalic *-u-* is preserved in OPhr. (*akenanogavos*, *proitavos*, *avun*, etc.) and in NPhr. δεουειας (69, on the reading cf. Dressler 1968: 45), ουσιτετου (2), νιοισιος (48, if read with Haas 1966: 72 as */niuisios/*). Initial *u-* is also preserved in NPhr., cf. ουανακταν (88), ουεκρω (69), ουα (2, 33-36), οεαυται (116), as are both initial and intervocalic *-j-*. Gusmani and Brixhe see in OPhr. *devos* (P-03) the protoform of NPhr. δεως, but the meaning and construction of the OPhr. inscription are unclear, which makes this identification of *devos* and δεως unfounded.

On the other hand, if we identify NPhr. δεως with Gr. θεοῖς, which continues $*d^hH_1so-$ (Rix 1969: 179f.), we do not get involved in phonetic difficulties: the vocalized $*H_1$ yields *e* while the intervocalic *-s-* most probably gave *-h-* (> \emptyset) in Phrygian (see below on *aey* and *esait*). The ending *-ως* reflects PIE $*-ōis$ (cf. Brixhe 1983: 119).

6. On the OPhr. *ev-* < $*H_1su-$ see below, s.v. *eveteksetey*.

⁵ I assign the number 116 to the inscription recently found and published by Brixhe (Brixhe – Neumann 1985).

⁶ In OPhr. this suffix is most probably found in B-01.6 *evememesmeneya*, a feminine form of the participle (prefix *eve-* + redupl. *me* + root *mes* + suff. *men-eya-*). For the prefix cf. below, sub *eveteksetey*.

In view of this evidence, we cannot reconstruct zero-grade in *-edatoy*: we would expect an *e* in the root. We must assume the full grade $*d^h eH_1- > *d^h \bar{e}-$, which yields regularly Phr. *da-* (for the development $*\bar{e} > a$ cf. *matar*, $\alpha\nu\alpha\rho$, Brixhe 1983: 115). The other forms in *-toy* also point to the full grade of the root: *egertoy* and, possibly, *ektetoy*; *estatoy* and *epaktoy* are ambiguous.

In a similar way, we must reconstruct full grade of the root in NPhr. $(\alpha\delta)\delta\alpha\kappa\epsilon\tau$, $\alpha\delta\delta\alpha\kappa\epsilon\tau\omicron\rho$, which is in accordance with the full grade in the synonymous $(\alpha\beta)\beta\epsilon\rho\epsilon\tau(\omicron\rho) < *b^h er-$ and probably $\gamma\epsilon\rho\epsilon[v]$ (71). On these forms cf. also Brixhe 1979a: 177ff., who hesitates between full and zero grade.

The first sentence of our inscription (*materan : areyastin / bonok : akenanogavos : vrekun : tedatoy*) is thus a dedication: 'Bonok, the high priest (?) of the $\text{Bp}\acute{\iota}\gamma\epsilon\varsigma$, placed / dedicated (this) Mother Areyastis'. The syntactic structure of this sentence, viz. Obj.-Subj.-Verb, is not unknown in Phrygian, cf.

M-04. *ākinanogavaṇ : tiyes / mođroyanak : avara* and, probably,

M-05. *apelan mekas-t-evano*[...

B-01,7-8. *kavarmoyun-matar-otekonov*[.] / *kesiti*.

Sentence 2

(*yostutut...ā.m.[?]noy : akenanogavos / aey*)

yostutut...ā.mnoy. The sentence starts with *yos-*, the relative pronoun known from numerous NPhr. malediction formulas and the OPhr. inscriptions W-01b (*yos-esait*), B-01,4 (*yos-tivo*[.]*āšperet*), G-02,B (*ios-oporokotis*), P-04a (*ios-ni-ākenan-egeset*), P-04b (*ios-ervoṭṣati-kakuioi*), B-03 (*yos-yos-yeṇ*).

This relative pronoun is possibly followed by a particle *tu*, cf. M-01f. *[-]as : tuayeniy*. A variant of this particle may occur in B-01,4 *yos-ti-vo*[.]*āš*. The particle *tu* (cf. Skt. *tū* 'now, then') is here probably used in the function of the particle *ni* (*yos ni* meaning 'whoever').

Speculations about the remaining part are rather useless since the reading is uncertain. Brixhe – Lejeune (1984: 38) give *tututey : ā.mnoy* as the most probable reading. If this is correct, we may assume here two datives, the former of a consonant stem, the latter of an *o*-stem.

For the syntactic function of this group see below.

akenanogavos. See above. The case is nom.sg. here, too.

*ae*y. This word occurs also in B-01,8 (*kesiti(-)oy-vos-ae-y-apaktneni*). Moreover, in two other inscriptions we find the word *ae*: M-01f. (*[..]as : tuave/niy : ae : esuryoyoy : totin : eḡae[s]*) and W-02 (*si/ḡto-ae / alus*). Before we discuss these words, let us look at the combinations *-ae-* in the texts. It appears that in all clear cases the *a* and the *e* are divided by a morpheme boundary. Apart from *ae(y)*, this combination occurs in the following words:

1. *edaes* (M-01a, M-01b, B-01,2), *edae[s]* (M-01f, W-10, P-04c), *ed[a]es* (W-02), *[e]daes* (W-05b), εδαεε (2x in 116), εσταεε (31), εγδαεε (18) are verbal forms consisting of the root in the full (or lengthened) grade and the ending *-es*, as can be seen from forms like *eneparkes* (M-01d, G-01c, G-125) = ενεπαρκεε (31), and, probably, εκανεε (116), αδικεε (31, cf. Kowal 1984: 182), *etoves* (B-01,2).

2. *arkiaevais* (M-01a) is a patronymicon in *-evais*, cf. *memevais* (M-01b, M-02) (= *memevis* T-02b?), *kanutieivais* (P-03) with a scribal error, if this patronymicon is identical with P-02 *kanutiivanos*. It is tempting to see in *arkia-* the Greek name Ἄρχιός (cf. Neroznak 1978: 71f).

3. *lavagtaei* (M-01a) is dat.sg. of a title borrowed from Mycenaean Greek (*ra-wa-ke-ta /lāwāgetā(s)/*, Pind. λᾱγέτᾱς), cf. Lejeune 1969a. It seems significant that this word is inflected in Phrygian as a consonant stem and not as the *ā*-stems, which have *-ai* in the dat.sg. of both masc. and fem. (*midai* M-01a, *avtay* W-01b). Lejeune (o.c., p.189) explained the ending *-aei* as being due to the fact that Phrygian did not have this inflectional type. But as there were masc. *ā*-stems (*Mida* T-02b, cf. also *dumas* G-131, G-245, *duman* B-01,3), this explanation does not seem plausible. The same holds for Brixhe's suggestion that *-aei* is an historical notation (Brixhe – Drew-Bear 1982: 81). The most probable solution is that this word was borrowed from Greek in the nominative form *lāwāgetās* and inflected as an *s*-stem, the intervocalic *-s-* becoming *-h-* in the oblique cases (cf. notes 3 and 13 on *tīyes* and below on *esai*).

4. The other occurrences of *-ae-* are unclear: G-131 *dumastaeia[...]* (= *dumas-t' -aei-a...?*), G-163 *...]sāes[...]*, G-149 *...]āes*.

As *-ae-* did not belong to a single morpheme in the clear instances, it was most probably pronounced with a hiatus. This hiatus occurs both in OPhr. and NPhr. texts (εδαεε, εσταεε, εγδαεε), so that it must have been preserved for a period of a thousand years, which is not likely. I would therefore propose to interpret *-ae-* as the representation of *-ahe-* (< **-ase-*), the *-h-* being unwritten. For *ae(y)* this would mean that we must reconstruct **ahe(y)* < **ase(i)*.

What is the syntactic function of *aei* in our inscription? Most probably, *aei* is the last word of the relative clause introduced by *yos*, since part (b) starts with a relative clause in *yos*, too, and part c is likely to be a separate inscription. Relative clauses with *yos* have the verb in final position (cf. P-04a *ios-ni-akenan-egeseti*, W-03b *yos-esai-t materey eveteksetey ovevin onoman daΨet*, NPhr. ιος νι σεμουν κνουμανει κακουν αδδακετ *passim*, etc.), so that we may

conclude that *ae* is a verbal form. Since both *yos* and *akenanogavos* are in the nominative singular, *ae* can only mean 'to be' or 'to become'. I think that *ae* reflects **ēs-e-i*, 3 sg. of the reduplicated perfect of **H₁es-* 'to be' with a secondary *-i*. The perfect of **H₁es-* is attested in Sanskrit (*āsā*), Greek, and Slavic (Kortlandt 1986). Another reduplicated perfect in Phrygian is probably *eti-tevtevey* of the inscription B-03.

The syntactic function of *ae* in M-01f and W-02 is different, and for the time being we must conclude that *ae* and *ae* are unrelated.

The second sentence is thus a relative clause meaning 'whoever ... may become an *akenanogavos*'. The mutilated piece may contain adverbs 'here, later' *uel sim*. If the second word of the mutilated part is to be read *anmnoy*, it is tempting to translate it as 'after me'.

Formulas of the type 'whoever may become king, (let him keep these laws, etc.)' are fairly common in Asia Minor. A protasis with the same meaning is probably found in P-04c *ios-ni-akenan-egeseti*.

Where is the apodosis of this sentence? Part (c) contains a past tense verb form *-egertoy* with an augment (see below), which is unlikely to be the verb of the apodosis. Furthermore, if (c) were a continuation of (a), it would have been written directly after it. It is therefore probable that (a) is continued by (b).

Sentence 3

(*yosesait* : *materey* : *eveteksetey* : *ovevin* : *onoman* : *daΨet* : *la/*
kedokey : *venavtun* : *avtay* : *materey*)

yosesait must be divided *yos-esait*, *yos* introducing a relative clause. As to *esait*, I believe that this form can be analyzed as *esai* dat.sg.f. of the demonstrative pronoun *e-* (< **esyāi*, cf. Skt. *asyāi*) plus a particle *-t* which occurs also in NPhr. texts after the demonstrative pronoun, cf. 19
σεμιν τ κνουμανει (76).⁷ This particle has mostly the shape τo(υ) or τi in NPhr. (Brixhe 1978b: 20f.): σεμουν του κνουμανει (10, 61), σεμιν το κακον (27), σας του σκελεδριας (56), σα τι σκελεδριαι (67), σα του μανκα (82), σεμον τι κνουμανι (103).

This *esai* correlates with the following *materey* (dat.sg.f.), the syntagm meaning 'to this (here) Mother'. The only problem is the intervocalic *-s-*. There are reasons to believe that an intervocalic *-s-* became *-h-* (which was not written) in Phrygian, cf. above on *tedatoy* (in connection with NPhr. δεως and OPhr. *lavagtaey*), *ae*, and fn. 13 on *tīyes*. It seems significant that there are no certain examples of a Phrygian inherited intervocalic *-s-*. The apparent cases either occur in texts without word divisions (so that the *s* may stand in initial or final position) or

⁷ When the article was already written, I saw that the same analysis of *esait* is now proposed by Neumann (1986: 81).

are proper nouns. To the former category belong:

OPhr.: *Jabas-imaṇ-akio* [(M-03, cf. Brixhe 1974: 245);

vasous-iman-mekas (P-03; for the first -s- see below; Brixhe 1974: 240f.);

si/ḥdo-sakor (G-105; see below on *lakedokey*);

ios-oporokitis.[?] (G-02B);

voineios-uriienoisku... (G-145; or rather *voineio-suriienoisku...*, cf. Lejeune 1969b: 292);

ates-agomoi (W-08; Brixhe – Drew-Bear 1982: 70);

NPhr.: βα-σιοι (86, 111; cf. Brixhe 1978b: 10f; the analysis βας-ιοι seems also possible);

βεο-σιοι ? (18);

δικες-ειαν (31; cf. Kowal 1984: 182);

ονομανιας-εναρκε (116);

εκατηας-ομουσας ? (116);

αιπος-εκανεες-ακα... ? (116);

νουταις-εδαες (116);

δ.κερης-ονομανιας (116);

εδαες-ις-αργμενα. (116).

Proper nouns are probably OPhr. *vasous* (P-03), *ise* (G-114), *iosais* (G-117), *asakas* (G-150c); NPhr. Ευγισαρναν (18), which is likely to be the same name as Ευγεξαρνοι (ibidem), Μανισου (31), Ιοσος (116). Sometimes the division or construction is unclear: OPhr. *esuryoyoy* (M-01f), *Jesagas* (W-07), *tesan* (T-02b); NPhr. ασιανιοι (15), προτοσου (31), νιοισιος (48), ουρνκυσαε (69), εντοις-ινιοι (116).

Finally, there are several instances where the intervocalic -s- seems to be analogically restored. This is probably the case with the suffix of the subjunctive -*Vseti* (*egeseti*, *εγεσιτ*, etc.; cf. above on *akenanogavos*) and the dat.pl. ending -σι found in οκαυγοσι (18), διισιν (55), τευτωσι (116), and, possibly, ζεμελωσι (75, 92; cf. Brixhe 1978a: 10f). Note that a similar restoration of -s- took place in Greek. 20

For *esai* the restoration of *s* is less probable, however, as there was no model. I therefore suggest that the intervocalic *s* is the phonetic development of the group -*sy-* (note that the subjunctive in -*se-* may also continue -*ṣie-*, cf. the Sanskrit future in -*sya-*).

materey is dat.sg. of the word for 'mother'.

eveteksetey. This word was mostly read as *eveteksetiy*, but a photograph taken with a telens (Brixhe – Lejeune 1984: 40) reveals a horizontal stroke at the top of the *i*, which means that the correct reading is *e*.

The form *eveteksetey* seems to be an epitheton of Kybele, correlated with the preceding *materey* (for the word order cf. *materan areyastin* of our inscription, B-01.3 *matar kubeleya*, etc.). The form is dat.sg. of a consonant (-*t* ?) stem. The meaning and formation of the word remain obscure. Here I would like to discuss only the prefix *ev(e)-*, which seems to be present in *eveteksetey*. The initial sequence *ev(e)-* occurs several times in OPhr. feminine nouns (B-01.9 *evkobeyan*, B-01.6 *evememesmeneya*) where we can think of Kybele's epitheta. It seems plausible to assume that *ev-* is identical with Greek εὖ- 'well-' and reflects PIE **H₁su-* (for **H₁* > *e* see s.v. *tedatoy*, for *-s-* > \emptyset see s.v. *esait*).

ovevin has always been regarded as a pronominal complex, but the exact structure of this word remains unclear. As *ovevin* is followed by *onoman*, it is likely that the two words are coreferential, both being acc.sg.n. For *ovevin* I suggest the meaning 'his own', but it may also have some negative notion.

onoman acc.sg. of the word for 'name', PIE **H₃nH₃-mn*. For the development of the vocalized laryngeals in Phrygian see above on *tedatoy*. Vocalic η yields *-an* in Phrygian as can be seen from *materan* (acc.sg.).

daΨet (/dakset/, cf. Lejeune 1978) will be the verb of the relative clause. Forms in *-et* are well-known from NPhr. (αδδακετ, αββερετ) and represent most probably 3 sg. middle, which follows from the parallel forms αδδακετορ, αββερετορ without any difference in use and meaning (Kortlandt 1981: 135; differently about these forms Lejeune apud Brixhe 1979a: 182f.). The ending *-set* is thus the middle variant of the subjunctive in *-seti*.

As to the root of *dakset*, it seems plausible to reconstruct **d^heH₁k-* 'to put' (see above on *tedatoy*), as the form in *-k-* could easily be generalized (cf. Lat. *faxō*).

The relative sentences with *yos* have the verb in final position (cf. s.v. *aey* above), so that *daΨet* must be the last word of the protasis.

lakedokey thus starts the apodosis. As there are further no candidates for the verb, it is probable that *lakedokey* contains a verbal form. The verb was mostly sought in *-dokey*, but since both *lake-* and the ending *-ey* remain unexplained, the division *lake-dokey* is improbable. In my opinion, the correct division is *lakedo-key*, where *lakedo* is 3 sg. imperative middle. This imperative was assumed for NPhr. εγεδου (for OPhr. *-ō* > NPhr. *-ου* cf. Brixhe – Drew-Bear 1982: 77) in the formula γεγρειμεναν εγεδου τιος ουταν (Haas 1966: 86), and I believe that the same imperative must be assumed for *si/tdo-sakor* (G-104).⁸ Furthermore, the last word of B-03 reads *lakeaō*. The combination of three vowels is hardly possible in Phrygian, and I would

⁸ *sakor* is probably a neuter noun of the type Gr. ὕδωρ (= σκῶρ ?).

suggest that the horizontal haste of the *a* is a mistake of the scribe or a scratch. The word then reads *lakedo* and is identical with our word.

We thus have the ending *-do* (or *-edo* for the thematic verbs), which is parallel to the ending of 3 sg. impv. active *-to* (**-tōd*) found in *si/ēto*⁹ (W-08, W-09, W-10, cf. Brixhe – Drew-Bear 1982: 76) and in NPhr. *-του* (ειτου, ουυιτετου). A comparable situation occurs in Greek, where we find 3 sg. impv. middle ending *-σθω* next to 3 sg. impv. act. *-τω*. This fact is important for the dialectal position of Phrygian, as the ending **-d^hō* is then a common innovation of Greek and Phrygian (for the Greek ending cf. Rix 1976: 265). The medial ending of *lakedo* is supported by the following reflexive pronoun *ven-*.

The meaning of the root *lak-* is uncertain. One would expect something like 'to devote oneself, be cursed', which is rather common in malediction formulas of this kind (cf. Gr. *κατηραμένος* + dat., meaning 'devoted to (a god), cursed by (a god)'). The etymological connection of the root is unclear (~ Gr. *λάσκω* < **λακ-σκω* 'to cry, announce'?).

The verb *lakedo* is followed by a modal particle *-key* which sometimes occurs in the apodosis of OPhr. formulas. In B-01.6 we find *opitokey*,¹⁰ which may also stand in the apodosis.¹¹ The form *opitokey* can be analyzed *op-* (preverb) + *i* (root) + *to* (ending 3 sg. impv.) + *key* (particle). The verb *opito* thus has the same structure as Latin *obitō* and may even have the same meaning.

22

The modal particle *key* can be compared with the Greek particle *κεν*, Aeol. and Cypr. *κε*, Dor. *κα*, Russ. *-ka*, and Lith. *-k(i)*, mostly used after imperatives.

venavtun was long ago recognized as *ven*, acc.sg. of the reflexive pronoun **sve-* (acc. **sve* + a secondary *-m*), and *avtun*, acc.sg. of the pronoun *avtos* 'self', the whole complex meaning 'himself, ἐαυτόν'. In NPhr. inscription 116 we find *οεαυται*, which seems to represent the dat.sg.f. of the same pronominal complex.

avtay dat.sg.f. of the pronoun *avtos* 'self'.

materey see above.

The second and the third sentences thus constitute a curse: 'whoever may become *akenanogavos* (...) and may put his own name on this (...) Mother (=on the monument dedicated to the Mother), let he himself be cursed by the Mother herself'.

⁹ It seems likely that *si/ēto* and *si/ēdo* are 3 sg. impv. forms of the same root, active and middle, respectively.

¹⁰ Brixhe – Lejeune 1984: 64 write *opito[-]ey* and remark about the omitted letter: "k tous les édateurs; mais traces mal identifiables".

¹¹ The preceding word is *dā[-]jati* (probably to be read *dakati*), so that we can assume a constellation similar to our inscription: a relative clause with a verb *dakati* in the final position, followed by a main clause starting with an imperative *opito* plus a particle *key*.

Sentence 4

(ataniyen : kuryaneyon : ta/negertoy)

Sentence 4 seems to constitute a separate inscription. It is engraved below on the façade, unconnected with the other sentences. In view of the fact that the last word, *tanegertoy*, is a past tense verb, we can surmise that this inscription is a dedication of the type 'X made this monument'.

ataniyen. The likely dedicational character of the inscription makes probable that *ataniyen* is a personal name in the nominative. The ending *-en* is scarcely attested in Phrygian: we find only W-01c *ven*, B-03 *yosyosyen*, and some broken pieces (M-10 .../]gen or .../]ten, T-01b .../]len, T-02b .../]oitumen, and W-04 .../]toyen). In *ven* this ending probably reflects the pronominal acc.sg. ending *-e + -m* (see above). The same ending can be proposed for *-yen*. Elsewhere this origin is implausible, however.

The problem is that in Indo-European the nom.sg.m. of the *n*-stems was *-ēn* or *-ōn*, which would yield in Phrygian **-an* or **-on/un*, respectively. The ending *-en* is therefore unexpected, but the name *Ataniyen* may be of non-IE origin.

kuryaneyon has not yet been explained (the earlier explanations based on the reading *kurzanezon* are of course useless). I believe that we can identify the word with Gr. κοίρανόων 'giving orders, ruling'. As Phrygian borrowed the titles ἄναξ and λαῖψαῖγάτας from Mycenaean Greek (cf. Lejeune 1969a), it is probable that *kuryaneyon* is a loan, too. The family of κοίρανόων is not attested in Mycenaean, but as in this dialect the metathesis of *-ry-* to *-yr-* did not take place (cf. Lejeune 1972: 156), our word looked like **koryaneyōn* at the time of borrowing.

It follows that only the raising of *o* to *u* makes the word look different from its Greek prototype. This phonetic development is well-known in Phrygian before final nasals, cf. *-un*, the ending of the acc.sg.m. and nom. acc.sg.n. of the *o*-stems (OPhr. M-02 *akaragayun*, W-01b *avtun*, G-136 *bagun*, G-144 *avun*; NPhr. κακουν *passim*, 33, 76, 108 δρεγρουν, 100 μουρουν, etc.), and the ending of the nom.sg. of the part.pres. (*vrekun*, see above). The same process has been assumed for *o* before non-final nasals (88 διουυστιν, probably 48 Πουυντας), cf. Haas 1966: 203. I suggest that a similar raising occurred in the position before *-ry-* and, possibly, before *-ly-*. Here is the material: M-01f *esuryoyoy*, G-145 *voineiosurienoisku...*; G-101 *kuliyā[...*, G-127 *kūliyas*. The only exception is the unclear G-132 *ploriata[...* (*plori-ata... ?*).

It cannot be excluded that Phrygian borrowed the word κοίρανος 'war-lord', and that *kuryaneyon* is a Phrygian formation in *-eio-*. This approach, however, raises difficulties with the ending *-on*. The ending of the nom.sg. of part.pres. in Phrygian seems to be *-un* < **-ont-s* (cf. above on *vrekun*), so that we must assume that there was another ending in *-on* < **-ōn*. There are

two more examples of final *-on* in OPhr.¹²: W-05a *natimeyon-na*[...] and T-02b *a/ton*. The latter word is most probably an acc.sg. of the *o*-stems in view of the form *a/ton* in the same inscription, which may indicate that the inscriptions of Tyana belong to a different dialect, where **-on* does not yield *-un*. There are no further examples of *-on* or *-un* in the inscriptions from Tyana. The form *natimeyon* is unclear.

tanegertoy. The analysis of *tedatoy* as *t-edatoy* (see above) suggests that the form *tanegertoy* must be divided *tan-egertoy* or *t-an-egertoy* with preverbs *t-* and *an-*. However, the latter division is less probable as there are no certain examples of the prefix *an-*. This prefix has been assumed for B-01.9 *evkobeyanepaktoy* and NPhr. $\alpha\nu\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon$ (14, 53, 99), $\alpha\nu\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon\tau\upsilon\omicron\upsilon$ (30), but in all of these occurrences *an* belongs rather to the previous word. The OPhr. word can be divided *evkobeyan-epaktoy* (cf. on *evkobeyan* s.v. *eveteksetey*). NPhr. $\alpha\nu\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon$ occurs only at the end of the apodosis: $\tau\iota$ (τ) $\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\kappa\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ $\alpha\sigma\tau\iota$ $\alpha\nu\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon$, which can be analyzed also as $\tau\iota$ (τ) $\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\kappa\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ $\alpha\varsigma$ $\tau\iota\alpha\nu$ $\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon$.¹³ The same holds true for inscription 30.

If we divide *tan-egertoy*, we can take *tan* as acc.sg.f. of the demonstrative pronoun or (less probably) as an adverb. The forms in *-toy* always contain the augment (cf. above on *tedatoy*), so that we can analyze *egertoy* as *e-ger-toy*. The root can be compared with NPhr. $\sqrt{\gamma\epsilon\rho}$ - in 71 $\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\kappa\epsilon$ $\gamma\epsilon\rho\epsilon[\nu]$ $[\epsilon]\tau\iota\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\kappa\mu[\epsilon]\nu\omicron\iota$ $\iota\nu\nu\omicron\upsilon$ 'those who ..., let them be cursed', but the meaning of the verb is unclear.

The meaning of the fourth sentence seems to be 'Ataniyen, the commander, ...ed her (the Mother)!'.

Summary and conclusions

25

1. Part (a) of the Areyastis-inscription must be read in the order II-III-I.
2. The inscription consists of three parts. The first is a dedication 'Bonok, the high priest (?) of the $\text{B}\rho\acute{\iota}\gamma\epsilon\varsigma$, placed/dedicated (this) Mother Areyastis'. The second is a malediction: 'whoever may become a high priest (?)... and may put his own name on this (monument of the) ...

¹² In NPhr. final **-on* appears mostly as $-\omicron\upsilon\nu$, but beside e.g. $\kappa\alpha\kappa\omicron\upsilon\nu$ we also find $\kappa\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu$, $\kappa\alpha\kappa\epsilon(\nu)$, $\kappa\alpha\kappa\iota\nu$, $\kappa\alpha\kappa\epsilon\upsilon\nu$, and $\kappa\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu$.

¹³ This analysis may explain the difference between two NPhr. apodosis formulas: $\tau\iota$ (τ) $\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\kappa\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ $\alpha\tau\tau\iota(\epsilon/\eta)$ ($\alpha\delta$) $\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon$ and $\tau\iota$ (τ) $\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\kappa\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ $\alpha\sigma\tau\iota\alpha\nu$ $\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon$. The former represents the preposition $\alpha\delta$ - + dat.sg. $\tau\iota/\tau\iota\epsilon/\tau\iota\eta$ < **tiH-s-ei* (cf. fn. 3) + 3 sg.impv. ($\alpha\delta$) $\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon$, whereas the latter can be analyzed as the preposition $\alpha\varsigma$ (< **ē* < **ens*) + acc.sg. $\tau\iota\alpha\nu$ (< **tiH-s-m*) + 3 sg.impv. $\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon$. Both formulas mean 'let him, cursed, go to (god) Tiyes' or 'let him be cursed by Tiyes'. The difference between the constructions is thus explained by the different prepositions: $\alpha\delta$ - + dat. vs. $\alpha\varsigma$ + acc. This syntax is confirmed by other inscriptions. For $\alpha\varsigma$ + acc. cf. 31 $\alpha\varsigma$ $\sigma\epsilon\mu\omicron\nu\nu$ $\kappa\nu\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\nu$, 33 $\alpha\varsigma$ $\beta\alpha\tau\alpha\nu$, 35 $\alpha\varsigma$ $\alpha\nu\alpha\nu$ (cf. Neumann 1986: 83). The preposition $\alpha\delta/\alpha\tau$ is elsewhere attested only in 14 $[\iota]\omicron\varsigma$ $\nu\iota$ $\sigma\epsilon\mu\omicron\nu\nu$ $\kappa\nu\omicron[\upsilon]\mu\alpha\nu\epsilon\iota$ $\kappa\alpha\kappa\iota\nu$ $\alpha\delta\delta\alpha\kappa\epsilon\tau$ $\alpha\iota\nu$ ' $\alpha\delta$ $\alpha\tau\epsilon\alpha\mu\alpha\varsigma$... 'whoever brings harm to this monument or to this (α) $\tau\epsilon\alpha\mu\alpha\varsigma$...' where it is used in order to emphasize the dative of (α) $\tau\epsilon\alpha\mu\alpha\varsigma$, which is indeclinable, cf. 87 $\iota\omicron\varsigma$ $\nu\iota$ $\sigma\epsilon\mu\omicron\nu\nu$ $\kappa\nu\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\nu\epsilon\iota$ $\kappa\alpha\kappa\omicron\upsilon\nu$ $\alpha\delta\alpha\kappa\epsilon\tau$ $\alpha\iota\nu\iota$ $\tau\iota\alpha\mu\alpha\varsigma$... or 115 $\iota\omicron\varsigma$ $\nu\iota$ $\sigma\epsilon\mu\omicron\nu$ $\kappa\nu\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\nu\epsilon\iota$ $\kappa\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu$ $\alpha\delta\alpha\kappa\epsilon\tau$ $\alpha\iota\nu\iota$ $\sigma\alpha$ $\tau[\omicron]\upsilon$ $\tau\epsilon\alpha\mu\alpha\varsigma$.

Mother, let he himself be cursed by the Mother herself'. The third part is probably unconnected with the other two and was added later: "Ataniyen the commander, ...ed her (the Mother)'.

3. The following phonetic developments have been proposed for Phrygian:

* $H_1 > e$; * $H_2 > a$; * $H_3 > o$: see s.v. *tedatoy*;

-VsV- > -h- > -Ø-: see s.v. *esait*;

$o > u / __ri, li$: see s.v. *kuryaneyon*.

4. The following morphological categories have been discussed:

the inflection of the *s*-stems: see fn. 3 and 13;

subjunctive in *-(e)seti*: see s.v. *akenanogavos*;

past tense middle in *-toy*: see s.v. *tedatoy*;

imperative middle in *-do*: see s.v. *lakedokey*.

5. For the following words new explanations have been proposed:

M-04: *akinanogavan*, W-01: *aey*, *akenanogavos*, *esait*, *eveteksetey*, *kuryaneyon*, *lakedokey*, *t-edatoy*; B-01: *evememesmeneya*; B-03: *etitevtevey*; G-105: *si/ḫdosakor*;

NPhr. δεως (passim), τιος (passim), αστιανειτου (14, 53, 99).

References

- Beekes, R.S.P. 1969: *The Development of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Greek*. The Hague.
- Beekes, R.S.P. forthcoming: The PIE word for 'name'. *Die Sprache*.
- Brixhe, Cl. 1974: Réflexions sur phrygien iman, *Mélanges Mansel*, Ankara, 239-250.
- Brixhe, Cl. 1978a: Études neo-phrygiennes I, *Verbum* 1,1, 3-21.
- Brixhe, Cl. 1978b: Études neo-phrygiennes II, *Verbum* 1,2, 1-22.
- Brixhe, Cl. 1979a: Études neo-phrygiennes III, *Verbum* 2,2, 177-192.
- Brixhe, Cl. 1979b: Le nom de Cybèle, *Die Sprache* 25, 40-45.
- Brixhe, Cl. 1983: Épigraphie et grammaire du phrygien: état présent et perspectives. *Le Lingue indoeuropee di frammentaria attestazione / Die indogermanische Restsprachen*, ed. by E. Vineis. Pisa, 109-131.
- Brixhe, Cl. – Drew-Bear, Th. 1982: Trois nouvelles inscriptions paléo-phrygiennes de Çepni, *Kadmos* 21/1, 64-87. 26
- Brixhe, Cl. – Lejeune, M. 1984: *Corpus des inscriptions paléo-phrygiennes*. 2 vols. Paris.
- Brixhe, Cl. – Neumann, G. 1985: Découverte du plus long texte néo-phrygien: l'inscription de Gezler Köyü, *Kadmos* 24/2, 161-184.
- Chantraine, P. 1933: *La formation des noms en grec ancien*, Paris.
- Diakonoff, I.M. – Neroznak, V.P. 1985: *Phrygian*. New York.
- Dressler, W. 1968: Review of Haas 1966, *Die Sprache* 13, 40-49.
- Gusmani, R. 1958: Studi sull'antico frigio, *RIL* 92, 835-69, and Le iscrizioni dell'antico frigio, *RIL* 92, 870-903.
- Haas, O. 1966: *Die Phrygische Sprachdenkmäler*, Sofia.
- Haspels, C.H.E. 1971: *The Highlands of Phrygia*. Princeton.
- Klingenschmitt, G. 1975: Tocharisch und Urindogermanisch, *Flexion und Wortbildung*, Wiesbaden, 148-163.
- Kortlandt, F.H.H. 1981: 1st sg. middle *- H_2 , *IF* 86, 124-136.
- Kortlandt, F.H.H. 1986: The Origin of the Slavic Imperfect, *Fs. H. Bräuer*, Köln-Wien, 253-258.
- Kowal, B. 1984: Zur spätphrygischen Inschrift 31. *Kadmos* 23/2, 180-185.

- Lejeune, M. 1969a: A propos de la titulature de Midas, *Athenaeum* 47, 179-192.
- Lejeune, M. 1969b: Notes paléo-phrygiennes, *REA* 71, 287-300.
- Lejeune, M. 1972: *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien*. Paris.
- Lejeune, M. 1978: Sur l'alphabet paléo-phrygien. *Annali della scuola normale superiore di Pisa, Classe di lettere e filosofia*, Serie III, vol. VIII,3, 783-790.
- Lejeune, M. 1979: Regards sur les sonores i.e. en vieux phrygien. *Florilegium Anatolicum, Mélanges offerts à E. Laroche*. Paris, 219-224.
- Neroznak, V.P. 1978: *Paleobalkanskije jazyki*. Moscow.
- Neumann, G. 1986: Zur Syntax der neuphrygischen Inschrift Nr. 31. *Kadmos* 25/1, 79-84.
- Rix, H. 1969 [1972]: Review of Beekes 1969. *Kratylos* 14, 176-187.
- Rix, H. 1976: *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen*. Darmstadt.




Fig. 1. The Areyastis-inscription (drawing made by Mrs T. Wezel-Ignatova)