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) 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 unsatisfactory 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...ã.m.² noy : akenanogavos / aey
   ← II materan : areyastín
   ← III bonok : akenanogavos

   ← kedokey : venavtun : avtay : materey

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

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 aey, 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 / aey

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 / aey;
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. μοταρ (18)) and dat.sg. materey (W-01b twice, see below). The word undoubtedly applies to Kybele.


bonok, nom.sg. of dedicator's name. For the zero-ending cf. nom.sg. vanak in M-04 and probably mοnok 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-
The name of a Phrygian town then `priest'. The meaning of *ag- said' < augm. derived occurs in a frequent NPhr. Malediction Haas (1966: 67) `er soll das g- ...-chief < augm. < *agm-< *-ag- which in Greek often denotes a profession or a social function: βασιλεύς 'king', βροδεύς `arbiter', ἵππευς `chariot-driver', etc. (Chantraine 1933: 125ff.). In Phrygian we may find the same suffix in a title protavos (M-01b; M-02), which is characterized in these inscriptions by an adjective καθηγεύεται (M-01b), κθηγεύεται (M-02) derived with the suffix -eyo- also from a noun in -av.- ...]olgiavos (G-150a), adoikavoi (G-02a) and [a]doikavos (G-146) are probably proper nouns.

The word akenanogavos is a compound, as can be seen from akena§ (W-07) and the protasis formula ios-ni-äkenan-egeseti (P-04a). The verbal form egeseti can be compared with oti...seti (P-04a), ervotsati (P-04b), ...kesiti (B-01.8), NPhr. εγεσίτ (58). These forms are probably 3 sg. subjunctives in -(e)se-ti. The sentence ios-ni-äkenan-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.

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 γεγριμένον εγέδον τιος where it stands in the 3 sg. imperative middle (<- *dhd-, see below) and in a variant of this formula τιμον εγεσίτ γεγριμένον (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). If this root developed semantically in the direction `to foretell, predict', the direction found in Latin (pridigium 'omen', Aius Lquiēns or Aius Locūtius 'the God announcing the approaching of the Gauls') and in Umbrian (aiu 'oracle'), 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 Tieuon to which Steph. Byz. remarks: Δημοσθένης ὄν τι φησί καταυρία πόλεως γενέσθαι Πάταρον ἐλέντειιν Πάρθλαγινοι, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ τιμάν τοῦ Δία Tiuon προσαγορεύονται (cf. on this passage Haas 1966: 67). The name Tieuon contains the suffix -e-, which is frequently used in Phrygian for the formation of adjectives. The same adjective occurs in NPhr. inscription 58 τιμον εγεσίτ γεγριμένον, translated by Haas (1966: 67) `er soll das göttliche Wort bestimmt haben'. The gen.sg. of the god's name from which Tieuon is derived occurs in a frequent NPhr. Malediction γεγριμένον εγέδον τος ωτον. It is tempting to see in this a regular gen.sg. of the i-stems: nom.sg. tiyes (< *H₁e-), gen.sg. tios (< *H₁e-s) (for *s > *h > -h- see below, s.v. aey). For the acc.sg. of the same paradigm τίον (< *H₁- (e)s-) and dat.sg. τίον τιον (< *H₁-s) see fn. 13.

4 This root is glossed by Pokorny as ḡg-/ ḡg-/-ugu-, but for Greek and Armenian eg-/ og- would suffice, e.g. Gr. ἦ 'he said' < augm. ἵ- + H₁eg-t; perf. ᾅναγα 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 ōδικηρτο[...]tekmoř. The last word is most probably identical with Gr. τε κυμωρ `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 βρεκν-τόν βερεκυντα, τόν βρίγα. Βρίγες γάρ οἱ Φρύγες. This gloss is connected by most scholars with other glosses in Hesychius where the words βερεκύντα, βερεκύνδαι are explained as a name of one of the Phrygian tribes (cf., e.g., βερεκύνται Φρυγόν τι γένος, καὶ πρότερον βερεκυντία ἡ 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 kθίyanaveyos (M-01b), proitavo[s] kφίyanaveyos (M-02). The word ῥεκυν 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.

tedadtoy has been interpreted by all scholars as a verb meaning `fecit' uel sim. and derived from the root *d'H₁-. 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. γεγορίτμενος, γεγρείμενον). Besides, the other OPhr. forms in -toy (W-01c tanegertoy, B-01,3 ektetoy, B-01,8 anepakttoy, G-144 estatoi) 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 mekastevano... 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 eda(to) was reconstructed by most scholars as *dʰH₁- (*dʰʷ-), i.e. the zero grade of the root *dʰeH₁-. 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. *H₁ > e, *H₂ > a, *H₃ > 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), ονομαντα- (116)5 < *H₂nH₁₃-mη, 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 (< *-mn₁) like the above-mentioned onoman. The root is thus disyllabic and must be reconstructed *kenH₁-. The current etymology connects this root with the Sanskrit set-root kha-`to dig'.

3. For H₂ > a cf. NPhr. ανορ (15) (= Gr. ἀνήρ), πατερς (98) (= Gr. πατήρ).

4. The NPhr. suffix of the medial participle -μενο-: (ετ)τετικμενος, γεγαριμενος, γεγρειμεναν, οπεσταμεναν (9), εσταμεναν (15), νιομενος (48), αργμενα(. ) (116). This suffix was shown by Klingenschmitt (1975: 159ff.) to continue PIE *-mH₁₁ο-. Borrowing of this suffix from Greek is improbable, so that we must assume the development *H₁ > Phr. e.

5. NPhr. δεως in the formula δεως ζεμελως `by gods and men' is mostly derived from PIE *diu-.. One reconstructs *deiyo- (Gusmani 1958: 893, Brixhe 1983: 120) and postulates the development *deiyo- > *diyo- with subsequent loss of intervocalic -u-. This loss is unknown in Phrygian, however. Intervocalic -u- is preserved in OPhr. (akenogavos, proitavos, avun, etc.) and in NPhr. δεουεις (69, on the reading cf. Dressler 1968: 45), σουιτετου (2), νιοσιος (48, if read with Haas 1966: 72 as /niu-sios/). Initial -u- is also preserved in NPhr., cf. σουανακται (88), σουερω (69), σουα (2, 33-36), σουανται (116), as are both initial and intervocalic -i-. 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. θεοίς, which continues *dʰH₁so- (Rix 1969: 179ff.), we do not get involved in phonetic difficulties: the vocalized *H₁ yields e while the intervocalic -s- most probably gave -h- (> θ) in Phrygian (see below on aey and esait). The ending -ος reflects PIE *-oıs (cf. Brixhe 1983: 119).

6. On the OPhr. ev- < *H₁su- 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 evemememeseneya, 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\(^h\)e, which yields regularly Phr. da-
(for the development *\(\ddot{\varepsilon}\) > 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 epakttoy are ambiguous.

In a similar way, we must reconstruct full grade of the root in NPhr. (\(\alpha\delta\)\(\delta\alpha\kappa\varepsilon\tau\), \(\alpha\delta\delta\alpha\kappa\varepsilon\tau\omega\), which is in accordance with the full grade in the synonymous (\(\alpha\beta\)\(\beta\varepsilon\pi\tau\omega\) < *\(b^h\)er- and probably \(\gamma\varepsilon\pi\varepsilon\)[\(\nu\)] (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 B\(\rho\)\(\gamma\varepsilon\zeta\), placed / dedicated (this) M other A reyastis'. The syntactic structure of this sentence, viz. Obj.-Subj.-Verb, is not unknown in Phrygian, cf.

M-04. \(\alpha\kappa\iota\nu\alpha\gamma\nu\alpha\)an : tiyes / mo\(\emptyset\)rov\(\emptyset\an : a\varphi\varphi\)a and, probably,
M-05. apelan mekas-t-evan\(\emptyset\) ...
B-01,7-8. kavarmoyun-matar-otekonov[\(\emptyset\)] / kesiti.

Sentence 2

(yostutut...a.m.\(\emptyset\)noy : akenanogavos / aey)

yostutut...a.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[\(\emptyset\)]asperet), G-02,B (ios-oporokotis.), P-04a (ios-\(a\kappa\varepsilon\)\(a\kappa\varepsilon\)en-egeseti), P-04b (ios-\(e\varepsilon\)\(\varphi\varepsilon\)\(\sigma\)\(\tau\)\(\alpha\\)\(i\)k\(\alpha\)\(u\)\(i\))o), B-03 (yos-yos-yen).

This relative pronoun is possibly followed by a particle tu, cf. M-01f. [-]as : tu\(\emptyset\)yeniy. A variant of this particle may occur in B-01,4 yos-ti-vo[\(\emptyset\)]as. The particle tu (cf. Skt. tu\(\ddot{\alpha}\) `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 : a.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.
aey. This word occurs also in B-01,8 (kesiti(-)oy-vos-aey-apakteni). Moreover, in two other inscriptions we find the word ae: M-01f. ([..]as : tuave/niy : ae : esuryoyoy : totin : eda[es]) and W-02 (siṭto-aе / 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 aе(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), ἐδακες (2x in 116), ἐστακες (31), ἐγδακες (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) = ἐνεπαρκες (31), and, probably, ἐκκακες (116), ἀδικες (31, cf. Kowal 1984: 182), etoves (B-01,2).

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

3. lavagtaei (M-01a) is dat.sg. of a title borrowed from Mycenaean Greek (ra-wa-ke-ta /lāwāgeta(s)/, Pind. λαγεταί τα, cf. Lejeune 1969a. It seems significant that this word is inflected in Phrygian as a consonant stem and not as the a-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. a-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 -aey 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 lāwāgetas and inflected as an s-stem, the intervocalic s- becoming -h- in the oblique cases (cf. notes 3 and 13 on tiyes and below on esai).

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

A s -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 (ἐδακες, ἐστακες, ἐγδακες), 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 aey in our inscription? Most probably, aey 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 ovemin onoman daṣyet, NPhr. ῥος νι δεμουν κνουμαινε κακουν αδασκετ passim, etc.), so that we may
conclude that aey is a verbal form. Since both yos and akenanogavos are in the nominative singular, aey can only mean 'to be' or 'to become'. I think that aey 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 (āsa), 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 aey 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 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- (<*esyai, cf. Skt. asyá) plus a particle -t which occurs also in NPhr. texts after the demonstrative pronoun, cf. σεμυν τ κνουμανει (76). This particle has mostly the shape το(ν) or τi in NPhr. (Brixhe 1978b: 20f.): σεμυν του κνουμανει (10, 61), σεμυν το κακον (27), σας του σκελεδρας (56), σα τι σκελεδρατια (67), σα του μανκα (82), σεμυν 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), aey, and fn. 13 on tiyes. 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.: ]abas-im-akio[ (M-03, cf. Brixhe 1974: 245);
       vasous-iman-mekas (P-03; for the first -s- see below; Brixhe 1974: 240f.);
       siğiđo-sakor (G-105; see below on lakedokey);
       ios-oporokitis.? (G-02B);
       voineios-urienoisku... (G-145; or rather voineio-surienoisku..., 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);
       βιο-σιοι ? (18);
       δικες-ειαν (31; cf. Kowal 1984: 182);
       ονομανιας-εναρκε (116);
       εκατης-ομοσας ? (116);
       αιπος-εκανες-ακα... ? (116);
       νουτας-εδας (116);
       δ.κερης-ονομανιας (116);
       εδας-ις-αργμενα. (116).

Proper nouns are probably OPhr. vasous (P-03), ise (G-114), iosais (G-117), asakas (G-150c); NPhr. Ευγισαρνας (18), which is likely to be the same name as Ευγεξαρνας (ibidem), Μανισος (31), Ιοςος (116). Sometimes the division or construction is unclear: OPhr. esuryoyoy (M-01f), ]esagas (W-07), tesan (T-02b); NPhr. ασιανιος (15), προτσον (31), νιοσιος (48), ουρκυας (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), δεισιν (55), τευτσι (116), and, possibly, ζευμελωσι (75, 92; cf. Brixhe 1978a: 10f). Note that a similar restoration of -s- took place in Greek.

For esse 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 -sje-, cf. the Sanskrit future in -sya-).

materey is dat.sg. of the word for `mother'.
**eveteksetey.** This word was mostly read as evetekseti, but a photograph taken with a telelens (Brixhe – Lejeune 1984: 40) reveals a horizontal stroke at the top of the i, which means that the correct reading is ei.

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 evi-, 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 ευ- ‘well-’ and reflects PIE *H₁su- (for *H₁ > e see s.v. tedatoy, for -s- > Ø 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 *H₁nH₁-mn. For the development of the vocalized laryngeals in Phrygian see above on tedatoy. Vocalic Ṇ 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. (αδίδακτητ, αββερετ) and represent most probably 3 sg. middle, which follows from the parallel forms αδίδακτορ, 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 *dʰeH₁k- ‘to put’ (see above on tedatoy), as the form in -k- could easily be generalized (cf. Lat. fax). 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. -o > NPhr. -ou cf. Brixhe – Drew-Bear 1982: 77) in the formula γεγρειμεναν εγεδον πιος οσταν (Haas 1966: 86), and I believe that the same imperative must be assumed for sijdo-sakor (G-104). Furthermore, the last word of B-03 reads lakeaŋ. The combination of three vowels is hardly possible in Phrygian, and I would

---

8 sakor is probably a neuter noun of the type Gr. ὑδῶρ (= σκόρ ?).
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 (*-tød) found in si|eto⁹ (W-08, W-09, W-10, cf. Brixhe – Drew-Bear 1982: 76) and in NPhr. -το (ετο, οουτετου). A comparable situation occurs in Greek, where we find 3 sg. impv. middle ending -σω next to 3 sg. impv. act. -τω. This fact is important for the dialectal position of Phrygian, as the ending *-dʰo 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. κατημένος + dat., meaning 'devoted to (a god), cursed by (a god)'). The etymological connection of the root is unclear (~ Gr. λαξέσκο < *λακ-σκο '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.

The modal particle key can be compared with the Greek particle κευ, 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, ευτόν'. In NPhr. inscription 116 we find οευτοτα, 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 M other), let he himself be cursed by the M other herself'.

---

⁹ It seems likely that si|eto and si|ido are 3 sg. impv. forms of the same root, active and middle, respectively.
¹⁰ Brixhe – Lejeune 1984: 64 write opitokey and remark about the omitted letter: "k tous les éditeurs; mais traces mal identifiables".
¹¹ The preceding word is da[-]-ati (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/neğertoy)

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 -ën or -ōn, which would yield in Phrygian *-an or *-on/un, respectively. The ending -en is therefore unexpected, but the name A taniyen 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. κοιρανέων 'giving orders, ruling'. As Phrygian borrowed the titles αῦσσα and λαβαγέ τας from Mycenaean Greek (cf. Lejeune 1969a), it is probable that kuryaneyon is a loan, too. The family of κοιρανέων 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 *koryaneyon 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. κακοῦν passim, 33, 76, 108 δρεγουν, 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 δουσσαν, probably 48 Πουνταζ), 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 kuliya[... G-127 kuliyas. The only exception is the unclear G-132 ploriata[... (ploriata...?).

It cannot be excluded that Phrygian borrowed the word κοιρανος `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 < *-ôn. There are
two more examples of final -on in OPhr.\textsuperscript{12}: W-05a natimeyon-na[... and T-02b ajf0n. The latter word is most probably an acc.sg. of the o-stems in view of the form ajfbs 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. ανειτου (14, 53, 99), ανειτγου (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. ανειτου occurs only at the end of the apodosis: τι (τ)τετικμένος ας τιν ανειτου, which can be analyzed also as τι(τ)τετικμένος ας τιν ειτου.\textsuperscript{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. √γερ in 71 τις κε γερε[ν] [ε]πιττετικμ[ε]νοι ιννου '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**

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 Βριγες, 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) ...

\textsuperscript{12} In NPhr. final *-on appears mostly as -ουν, but beside e.g. κακον we also find κακον, κακε(ν), κακιν, κακευν, and κακον.

\textsuperscript{13} This analysis may explain the difference between two NPhr. apodosis formulas: τι (τ)τετικμένος αττι(ε/η) (αδ)ειτου and τι (τ)τετικμένος αστιν ειτου. The former represents the preposition αδ- + dat.sg. τη/τιτη < *tiH-s-ei (cf. fn. 3) + 3 sg.impv. (αδ)ειτου, whereas the latter can be analyzed as the preposition ας (<*e < *ens) + acc.sg. τιαν (< *tiH-s-η) + 3 sg.impv. ειτου. 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: αδ- + dat. vs. ας + acc. This syntax is confirmed by other inscriptions. For ας + acc. cf. 31 ας σεμουν κνομαιαν, 33 ας βαταν, 35 ας αναν (cf. Neumann 1986: 83). The preposition αδ/ας is elsewhere attested only in 14 [i]ος νι σεμουν κνο[ν]μαιει κακιν αδακετ αινι αδ ατεμας ... 'whoever brings harm to this monument or to this (α)τεμας ...' where it is used in order to emphasize the dative of (α)τεμας, which is indeclinable, cf. 87 ιος νι σεμουν κνομαιει κακιν αδακετ αινι τιμας ... or 115 ιος νι σεμουν κνομαιει κακιν αδακετ αινι τιμας.
Mother, let he himself be cursed by the M other 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:

*H₁ > e; *H₂ > a; *H₃ > o: see s.v. tedatoy;
-V sV - > -h- < -∅-: see s.v. esait;
o > u / ___rj, lj: 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: evenememmeneya; B-03: etitevtevey; G-105: sjldosakor;
NPhr. δεως (passim), τιος (passim), απτεαείτου (14, 53, 99).

References

Beekes, R.S.P. forthcoming: The PIE word for ‘name’. Die Sprache.
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 Cybele, Die Sprache 25, 40-45.
Brixhe, Cl. – Drew-Bear, Th. 1982: Trois nouvelles inscriptions paléo-phrygiennes de Çepni, Kadmos 21/1, 64-87.
Brixhe, Cl. – Neumann, G. 1985: Decouverte du plus long texte néo-phrygien: l’inscription de Gezler Köyü,
Kadmos 24/2, 161-184.
Fig. 1. The Areyastis-inscription (drawing made by Mrs T. Wezel-Ignatova)