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101. Phrygian

1. Introduction

Phrygian is an extinct Indo-European language of West and Central Anatolia, the written sources of which span the period between the 8\textsuperscript{th} century BCE and 3\textsuperscript{rd} century CE.

1.1. Greek sources refer to Phrygians either as Βρίγες (Herodian, Strabo, Stephanus Byzantinus), Βρύγες (Strabo), Βρῦγοι (Strabo), Βρίγαντες (Herodian) or as Φρύγες (Homer). According to Herodotus (VII 73), the Phrygians originally were neighbors of the Macedonians and were called Βρίγες as long as they dwelt in Europe. When they changed their home to Asia, they also changed their name. A similar account is also given by Strabo (VII 3, 2).

1.2. The time of the Phrygian migration to Anatolia is heavily debated, as is also the question of whether we can identify the Muški of Assyrian sources with the Phrygians. Homer has the young king Priam aiding the Phrygians against the Amazons (II. III 189); in return, Phrygians come to Trojan aid (II 862 ff.). If true, these two facts would place the Phrygian migration before the collapse of the Bronze Age, i.e. the 12\textsuperscript{th} c. BCE; but the Homeric account can easily be anachronistic. At any rate, in the 8\textsuperscript{th} c. BCE, Phrygians established a powerful kingdom with the capital Gordion (Gk. Γόρδιον, now Yasshüyük) at the river Sangarios (now Sakarya), where Alexander the Great famously severed the knot on his way to Egypt. Other ancient sites include the so-called Midas city (near Yazılıkaya in Eskişehir province), Daskyleion (near Bandırma), and Dorylaion (now Eskişehir).

1.3. Thriving under the legendary king Midas, the Kingdom of Phrygia was sacked by the Cimmerians around 695 BCE and then frequently changed hands: it was first a part of Lydia (7\textsuperscript{th}–6\textsuperscript{th} c. BCE), then of the Persian Empire (6\textsuperscript{th}–4\textsuperscript{th} c. BCE) and of the Empire of Alexander (4\textsuperscript{th} c. BCE). Later, Phrygia was ruled by the Kingdom of Pergamum (2\textsuperscript{nd} c. BCE), until it was added to the Roman province of Asia during the late Republic. During the Roman period, Phrygia, lying to the east of Troas, bordered on its northern side with Galatia, on the south with Lycaonia, Pisidia, and Mygdonia and on the east, it touched upon Cappadocia.

1.4. Phrygian is most closely related to Greek. The two languages share a few unique innovations, such as the vocalization of the laryngeals (4.3), the pronoun auto- (5.2) and...
the 3sg. imperative middle ending (5.3). It is therefore very likely that both languages emerged from a single language, which was spoken in the Balkans at the end of the third millennium BCE.

1.4. Written in two distinct scripts – one native and the other Greek – Phrygian inscriptions can on the whole be divided into two corpora: the Old Phrygian (OPhr.) corpus written in the native script, and the New Phrygian (NPhr.) corpus written in the Greek script. Old Phrygian, as opposed to New Phrygian, is customarily romanized with the exception of the disputed signs ↑, Φ and Ψ.

1.5. The native script is an alphabet consisting of 21 characters:

| A | B | G | D | E | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | R | S | T | U | ↑ | Φ | Ψ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a | b | g | d | e | i | j | k | l | m | n | o | p | r | s | t | u | ↑ | Φ | Ψ |

Similar to the archaic Greek alphabets, the native script is essentially distinguished by the arrow and the yod. The last two letters of the table above, which look like Greek phi and psi, are very rare. Φ occurs only once as a variant of the arrow, while Ψ (ten occurrences) most probably stands for /ks/. The yod does not appear in the oldest OPhr. inscriptions and was introduced somewhere during the 6<sup>th</sup> c. BCE (Lejeune 1969), first in prevocalic and word-final positions (e.g., areyastin, kuryaneyon, yosesait; tedatoy, aey, materey, avtay, etc.), later also as a second element of i-diphthongs (ayni, ktevoys, etc.; Lubotsky 1993). Most inscriptions from the North-West of Phrygia (Vezirhan, Daskyleion, etc.) show some deviations from the usual OPhr. alphabet. The yod has a different shape, and there are two types of s, usually transcribed as s and š (for an overview and discussion of these peculiarities, see Brixhe 2004: 26–32). Since these inscriptions normally lack the arrow sign, it seems reasonable to assume that š and the arrow indicated the same sound. Words are often separated by a colon consisting of 2, 3, or more vertical dots and occasionally by spaces.

About two thirds of the OPhr. inscriptions run from left to right (dextroverse) and one third from right to left (sinistroverse); a few are written boustrophedon. In North-West Phrygia, however, the proportion is exactly the opposite, two thirds of the inscriptions being sinistroverse.

The OPhr. corpus currently comprises more than 400, unfortunately mostly very short and fragmentary, inscriptions and dates from the 8<sup>th</sup> to the 4<sup>th</sup> c. BCE; ca. one fifth of the inscriptions are on stone and the rest on pottery or other small objects. The inscriptions are found across a huge area, far outside Phrygia proper: as far east as Boğazköy and Tyana (Hittite Tuwanuwa), as far south as Bayındır (near Antalya) and as far west as Daskyleion. The largest number of inscriptions comes from Gordion (ca. 80%).

The standard edition of the OPhr. corpus is Brixhe and Lejeune (1984). The inscriptions are cited by the region where they are found and by a number. Each inscription is hence assigned a siglum: B – Bithynia; G – Gordion; P – Pteria; M – Midas City; T – Tyana; W – West Phrygia; HP (i.e. hors de Phrygie) – from outside of Phrygia; NW – North West Phrygia (Dorylaion); Dd (i.e. documents divers) – of unknown origin. The corpus continues to be updated by means of supplements (Brixhe 2002, 2004).
1.6. NPhr. inscriptions are written in the Greek alphabet, of which only 21 characters are used: <α, β, γ, δ, ε, ζ, η, ι, κ, λ, μ, ν, ξ, ο, π, ρ, σ, τ, υ, ψ, ω>. Greek aspiratae are notably absent, except for Greek names (e.g., Αδιθρερακ, dat.sg. Κλευμαχοι) and loan-words (e.g., dat.sg. θαλαμειδη ‘sepulchral chamber’). The letters ξ and ψ are very rare (found only in the name Ξευν- and υψοδαν ‘above’, respectively), while eta and omega are practically confined to final syllables. New Phrygian by default does not practice word separation.

Dating from the 2nd–3rd c. CE, the NPhr. corpus currently comprises 113 inscriptions, all of them found in the highlands roughly between Eskişehir and Konya. They are numbered from 2 to 129: occasionally, a number is skipped since certain inscriptions are in the meantime considered Greek. A new edition of NPhr. inscriptions is a desideratum. The largest collection (up to No. 110) is presented in Haas (1966: 114–129); editions of Nos. 111–129 are scattered across various publications (Nos. 111–114 = Brixhe 1978a: 3–7; No. 115 = Brixhe and Waelkens 1981; No. 116 = Brixhe and Neumann 1985; No. 117 = Laminger-Pascher 1984: 35; No. 118 = Mitchell 1993: 186, fig. 33; Nos. 119–125 = Brixhe and Drew-Bear 1997; Nos. 126–128 = Drew-Bear, Lubotsky, and Üyümez 2008; No. 129 = Brixhe and Drew-Bear 2010; cf. also an overview in Brixhe 1999).

Typically opening with ιος νι σεμουν κνουμανει κακουν αδδακετ ‘whoever inflicts harm upon this grave’, NPhr. inscriptions usually consist of a curse following a Greek epitaph, but there are a few Phrygian epitaphs, too.

1.7. As expounded in the preceding sections, the chronological difference between the OPhr. and the NPhr. corpora is normally matched by the use of different alphabets: the native alphabet in the case of OPhr. inscriptions and the Greek alphabet in the case of NPhr. inscriptions. There is, however, one exception: the Dokimeion inscription from the 4th century BCE, which most probably represents an epigram, is written in the Greek alphabet. This must no doubt be due to the increased influence of Greek during Alexandrian times.

1.8. Apart from the inscriptions, Phrygian words are known from Greek sources as well. Plato (Krtylos 410a) quotes πῦρ ‘fire’, ὕδωρ ‘water’ and κύνες ‘dogs’ as shared lexical items. The dictionary of Hesychius quotes some forty words and names with a remark like Φρύγες or παρὰ Φρυξί, e.g. γλύσεα: χρύσεα. Φρύγες; ζέμελεν· βάρβαρον ἄνδραπο- δον. Φρύγες; Μαζεύς· ὁ Ζεὺς παρὰ Φρυξί, etc. These glosses are of questionable value, however. The remark “Φρύγες” does not guarantee Phrygian provenance of the gloss, because it could also refer to Anatolians, or even to foreigners in general. Of these glosses, βέκος ‘bread’ (also mentioned by Herodotus II 2) is arguably the most famous one.

2. Phonemic inventory

2.1. Vowels

- OPhr. /a/, /e/, /o/, /i/, /u/ /ā/, /ō/, (/ī/, /ū/ ?);
- NPhr. /a/, /e/, /o/, /i/, /u/ (/ē/, /ō/ ?)
Although vowel length is not expressed in writing, Old Phrygian must have had long vowels, at least /ō/, as follows from the fact that OPhr. <o> has two different reflexes in NPhr.: ο or ου, depending on its origin. OPhr. o that goes back to Proto-Indo-European (PIE) *o corresponds to NPhr. o: OPhr. ios, ios, relative pronoun < PIE *ios ~ NPhr. ioς; OPhr. 3sg. med. ending -toi, -toy < PIE *-toi ~ NPhr. -toι. On the other hand, OPhr. o that goes back to PIE *ō corresponds to NPhr. ou: OPhr. 3sg. imperative ending -do < *-sdhō (cf. Gk. -θω) ~ NPhr. -δου; OPhr. dat.sg. ending -oi, -oy < PIE *-ōi (cf. Gk. -οι) ~ NPhr. -ου.

Presumably, there was no OPhr. phoneme /ē/, since PIE *ē and *eh1 merged with *eh2 into OPhr. a, cf. OPhr. matar nom.sg. ‘mother’ < PIE *meh₂tēr, NPhr. αναρ ‘man’ < *-ēr, OPhr. daΨet ‘to place, make’ < *deh₁-k-, etc. There are no certain examples of OPhr. /ī/, /ū/, so that their existence remains hypothetical.

During the NPhr. period, short and long vowels of OPhr. apparently merged and gave rise to a vowel system without a length opposition: /a/, /e/, /o/, /i/, /u/, at least in initial syllables (thus already Brixhe 1990: 98). The absence of long vowels is further indicated by the use of the hexameter in New Phrygian, where we only find dactylic rhythm and where the function of long vowels was taken by vowels which are long per positionem and by diphthongs (Lubotsky 1998). The status of NPhr. η and ο, which mostly occur in final syllables, is unclear, but they might have represented close long [ē] and [ō].

NPhr. η most often appears in the final syllable: in the dat.sg. ending of the consonant stems, where it varies with -ε/-ι and -ει, cf. κνουμανη dat.sg. ‘grave’ ~ κνουμανε(ι), κνουμανι, Τιη dat.sg. ‘Zeus’ ~ Τι(ε), Ξευνη PN ~ Ξευνε; in the ending -αης, cf. πατερης (No. 98) nom.pl. ‘parents’ (< *-eies), for NPhr. μανκης (No. 86) see 5.1; the function and meaning of δ[α]κερης (No. 116) and παρτης has not yet been clarified. A few times NPhr. η is found in prevocalic position: μαιμαρηαν, τιηιον, εκατηας. For a discussion of this grapheme, see Lubotsky (1998). In contemporary Greek, η had already merged with τ. NPhr. ο is confined, with very few exceptions, to the dat.pl. ending -ος, which goes back to PIE *-οις (this ending is spelled with <ο> only three times). It typically occurs in the formula με ζεμελως κε με δεως κε ‘among men and gods’.

The Phr. short diphthongs are: /ey/ = <ey, ei, ει>, /ew/ = <ev, ευ>, /oy/ = <oy, oi, οι>, /ay/ = <ay, ai, αι>, and /aw/ = <av, αυ>. The existence of the diphthong /ow/ is uncertain. In NPhr., it would at any rate be indistinguishable from ου = /u/. In OPhr., we find it once in the nom.sg. Vasous PN (P-03), next to Vasus (P-05) < *u̯asōus (cf. OPhr. Vol. Ματαρ < PIE *meh₂tēr, NPhr. αναρ ‘man’ < *-ēr, OPhr. daΨet ‘to place, make’ < *deh₁-k-, etc. There are no certain examples of OPhr. /ī/, /ū/, so that their existence remains hypothetical.

Besides short diphthongs, there must have been at least two long diphthongs in OPhr., that is, /ōy/, cf. OPhr. o-stem dat. sg. -oıy, NPhr. -ou < PIE *-ōi (see above), and /āi/, cf. OPhr. ā-stem dat.sg. -ai, NPhr. -α (see further 4.1).

2.2. Consonants

- /p/ = <p, π>; /t/ = <τ, τ>; /k/ = <k, κ>
- /b/ = <b, β>; /d/ = <d, δ>; /g/ = <g, γ>
XVI. Languages of fragmentary attestation

- /z/ or /dz/ = <↑, ζ>
- /s/ = <s, σ>
- /m/ = <m, μ>; /n/ = <n, ν>
- /l/ = <l, λ>; /r/ = <r, ρ>
- /w/ = <v, ο(υ)>; /y/ = <y, i, ι>

The phonological interpretation of the OPhr. arrow <↑>, which is probably identical with <ś> (see 1.5), and of NPhr. <ζ> remains controversial. Since OPhr. <↑> only occurs before front vowels (i, e), it is likely that this letter represents a sound which arises through palatalization. In NPhr. inscriptions, <ζ> appears in two words, ζεμελως dat.pl. ‘men’ (< PIE *dhǵ(h)emelo-, cf. Gk. χθαμαλός, Lat. humilis ‘low, humble’) and ζειρα(ι) of unknown meaning and function. If OPhr. širây = ↑irây of the Vezirhan inscription is the same word as NPhr. ζειραι, we have to assume that NPhr. <ζ> and the OPhr. arrow indicated the same sound, presumably a voiced affricate or /z/.

For a possible voiceless geminate nn, see 4.2.

In the Greek alphabet, /w/ is written either <ου> or simply <ο> in prevocalic position, cf. ουεναουιας, ουανακταν (No. 88), οαν οε αυται (No. 116), κοροαν (W-11).

3. Morphology

Morphemes, both suffixes and roots, show ablaut. In nominal inflection of the consonant stems, the suffix changes its vocalism, e.g. nom.sg. -tar (<*-tēr) vs. obl. -ter- in matar, materey, materan ‘mother’; nom.sg. -an (< *-ēn) vs. obl. -en- in orouon, orouenος, orouenαν ‘warden’, iman, i(n)meney, imenαν ‘monument’; nom.sg. -ou- vs. obl. -u- in Vas(o)us, Vasos (< *usyasos). Examples of ablaut in the root are: da- < *dheh1- ‘place, do’ (t-e-da-toy, e-daes, αδδακετ) vs. de- < *dhh̥1- (δετο(υ)ν ‘monument’, a to-participle); teik- < *deik̑ - ‘show’ (ιστεικετ, thus to be read in No. 88, cf. Brixhe 1999: 304, fn. 46 ~ Gk. ἐκ-δείκνυμι) vs. tik- < *dik̑ - (τιτ-τετικμενος ‘condemned’ ~ Gk. δια-δικάζω ‘I judge’).

In Phrygian, word final *-on is raised to -un, for instance, in the acc.sg. ending of o-stems, cf. OPhr. acc.sg. akaragayun (M-02) ‘part of the monument’, avtun ‘himself’ (W-01b), NPhr. κακουν ‘damage, wrong’. The latter word often appears as κακον in NPhr. inscriptions and sometimes as κακιν, κακων. A parallel raising of e to i before nasals is possibly attested in OPhr. iman, imen- ‘monument’, if we assume with Vine (2010) that it goes back to *en-mēn, en-men-os (~ Gk. ἐμμενές ‘continuously’), and in NPhr. πινκε (No. 116), if it means ‘five’, PIE *penkw’e. Further, o was raised to u in the position before ri, li, cf. OPhr. kuryaneyon (W-01c), which was borrowed from Gk. κουρανέων ‘giving orders; ruling’ < *koryj- in Mycenaean times (Lubotsky 1988: 23).

Another development in word-final position is *-ans > -ais, which follows from the inflection of titles or patronymics in -evais (arkiaevais, memevas, kanutievas): nom.sg. -evais, gen.sg. -evanos < *-evans, -evanos, most probably going back to *-eũants, *-eũantoς < *-eũt-, *-eũt-os (for the development of *-nt- see 4.2). For a parallel, cf. Greek Lesbian ταυς < *tavς. It is further attractive to assume that the ending OPhr. -ais, NPhr. -αις, -αις is acc.pl. in some contexts and reflects PIE *-ns (Brixhe 2004: 41–42); similarly, OPhr. -ois can go back to *-ons.
Final clusters are reduced, cf. OPhr. *vanak nom.sg. ‘king’ < *-kts, cf. OPhr. dat.sg. vanaktei, NPhr. acc.sg. ouanaktov, Gk. ὁνάκε, -κος ‘lord, master’; Bας nom.sg. (name of a deity) < *-ts (acc.sg. Βαταν), ας prep. ‘to, towards’ < *-ts (= αδ + s, cf. Gk. είς beside εν and εξ beside ἐκ); NPhr. δακαρεν 3pl. ‘they made erect’ (No. 98) < *-nt; 3sg. aor. ending OPhr. -es, NPhr. -ες < *-est.

The vowels /e/ and /i/ show some vacillation, presumably in pretonic position, both in Old and New Phrygian, cf. kubeleya (B-01) and kubileya (W-04) ‘Cybele’ (epithet of the Mother Goddess), δεως (passim) and διως (Nos. 4, 5, 39), δυως (No. 113) dat.pl. ‘gods’; αββερετορ (Nos. 73, 75) and αββιρετο (No. 25).

In clusters consisting of a dental and a stop, the dental becomes completely assimilated to the stop. The resulting geminate is often simplified in NPhr., cf. α(β)βερετ (αδ°) ‘bring’, τιν-γεγαριτμενος (τιτ°) ‘devoted’. Also other geminates are regularly simplified, cf. α(δ)δακετ (αδ°) ‘inflict’, τι(τ)-τετικμενος (τιτ°) ‘condemned’. In external sandhi, in prepositional phrases, we encounter the same results, cf. NPhr. α(κ) κε οι and α(τ) τιε (for αδ). This loss of contrastive gemination has led to hypercorrect spellings like κνουμ-μανει, κνουνμανει for κνουμανει or αινι μμυρα for αινι μυρα.

More controversial is the assimilation of word-final -s to a following velar, but there are a few good examples in NPhr., cf. -s k- > -k k-: αδιθρερακ ξευνεοι (No. 31), ικ κικαικαν (No. 116); -s g- > -k g-: ποκ γονιον (No. 116), presumably via -h k-, -h g-.

4. Historical development

4.1. Vowels

The Indo-European vowels seem to be well preserved, except for the changes already mentioned in the preceding sections. Here are a few more examples of vocalic phonemes. 

\- *i* : OPhr. *kin*, NPhr. κιν ‘which’ < PIE *kʰim;* NPhr. γεγαριτμενος ‘devoted’ < PIE *gʰerɪm*; (Gk. ἐν-κεχαρισμένος);
\- *e* : OPhr. *ke*, NPhr. κε ‘and’ < PIE *kʰwε;* NPhr. αββερετ, μεβερετ < PIE *bʰer-;*
\- *a* : OPhr. -os, NPhr. -ez, nom.sg. m. of the o-stems < PIE *-os;
\- *u* : NPhr. (ο)υψοδαν adv. ‘above; on the top’ < PIE *(H)upsodʰη (cf. Gk. ὑψόθε[ν] ‘[from] above’); NPhr. κνουμαν- n. ‘grave’ < PIE *knu- (cf. Gk. κνύω ‘I scratch’);
\- *a* (*h₂e): NPhr. αδ preverb ‘to, at, by’ < PIE *h₂e-d (cf. Lat. ad ‘id.’);
\- *e* : NPhr. ορουαν nom.sg. ‘father, guardian’ (gen.sg. ορουενος; acc.sg. ορουεναν) < PIE *soruyën (cf. Gk. οὖρος ‘watcher, guardian’);
\- *eh₁ : NPhr. (αδ)δακετ 3sg. ‘inflicts’ < PIE *dʰeh₁-k- (cf. Gk. aor. εθηκα);
\- *eh₂ : NPhr. βρατερε dat.sg. ‘brother’ < PIE *bʰrehter- (cf. Skt. bhrā́ter-, Lat. frā-ter);

As far as we can see, the diphthongs remain unchanged in Old Phrygian, but in New Phrygian the long diphthongs /ai/ and /oi/ often lose their second element in final position, while word-final /ei/ gradually becomes monophthongized and is then written as <-ε, -i, -η>. PIE *-oís shows a special development to NPhr. -ος:
XVI. Languages of fragmentary attestation

− *h₂ei/*eh₂i : OPhr. ai, NPhr. αι ‘if’ < PIE *h₂ei (cf. Gk. Aeol., Dor. αι ‘if’); OPhr. ayni, NPhr. αυνι ‘and/or’ < PIE *h₂ei-ni; NPhr. κναικαν acc.sg. f. ‘wife’ < PIE *gʷneh₂ikn̥ (cf. Gk. γυναίκα);

− *h₂eu : OPhr. avtoi dat.sg.m., NPhr. αυτος ‘self’ < PIE *h₂euto- (cf. Gk. αὐτός ‘self’);

− *ei : NPhr. γεγρειμενα acc.sg. f. ‘written’ < PIE *gʰreih- (cf. Gk. γρίω ‘I touch’); OPhr. dat.sg. ending of the consonant stems, e.g., mater ‘mother’, Tiei ‘Zeus’ (NW-101), NPhr. Τι, Τι, Τιη dat.sg. ‘Zeus’, κνουμανει, -ε, -ι, -η dat.sg. ‘grave’ < PIE *-ei (cf. Lat. -ei, -i);

− *eu : OPhr. bevdos acc.sg. n. ‘statue, image’ (B-01) < PIE *bʰeuḍ̥os;

− *oi : OPhr. 3sg. med. ending -toi, -toy, NPhr. -toi < PIE *-toi; NPhr. τετικμενοι nom.pl. m. ‘condemned’ < PIE *-oi;

− “*āi” : OPhr. ā-stem dat.sg. -ai (Midai, Atai), dat.sg. f. pron. ἀσai-t (W-01b), NPhr. dat.sg. f. dem. pron. σα(ι), pron. αυται, dat.sg. f. μανκα(ι) ‘stele’ < PIE *-eh₂ei, cf. Gk. -ᾱι, -ηι, Lat. -ae;

− *ōi : OPhr. o-stem dat.sg. ending -oi, -oy, NPhr. -ou < PIE *-ōi (cf. Gk. -o); NPhr. o-stem dat.pl. ending -ως < PIE *-ōis.

4.2. Resonants

Consonantal resonants have undergone few changes. Word-final /m/ and /n/ have merged into /-n/ in Phrygian, just as in Greek, cf. OPhr. o-stem acc.sg. ending -un, NPhr. -ouv, -ov < PIE *-om. Possibly, *u was lost before a following *o in Phrygian, cf. OPhr. nom.sg. vas(o)us PN (P-03, P-05), gen.sg. vasos (P-02) < *u̯ asu̯ os (Brixhe 1990:65). The apparent counterexamples, OPhr. tovo and devos, go back to *toho < *toso and *dehos < *dʰh₁sos, respectively, where -v- is a Hiatustilger.

The development of the cluster *nt in Phrygian is unclear. First of all, it is remarkable that this cluster is very rare in Phrygian texts: among well-attested words we find only the possible borrowings OPhr. panta (B-05.4), παντς (W-11), NPhr. παντα (No. 35) ~ Gk. πᾶς, παντ- ‘all, every’ and NPhr. Πουντας (No. 48) ~ Gk. Πόντος ‘Pontic region’ (Lubitsky 1997: 123 with refs.). On the other hand, the ending of the 3pl. imperative, which presumably goes back to *-ntō (parallel to 3sg. impv. ειτου < *-tō), is spelled in NPhr. as -ττνου (αδειττνου No. 12) and -ννου (ιννου Nos. 35, 71). These spellings may point to a voiceless geminate n̥n̥, IPA[n̥n̥]. Also the OPhr. spellings tn, ttn, found in apaktneni (B-01.8), eventnoktoy (B-06), seem to point in this direction (cf. Lubotsky 1997: 121–122). However, Annelies Hämmig points out to us (p.c.) that αδειττνου in No. 12 must rather be read αδειννου, which would mean that *-nt- > -nn- in Phrygian. See further 3 on OPhr. -evanos < *-eun̥tos < *-eun̥tos.

The vocalic nasals have become an, cf. OPhr. onoman acc.sg. n., NPhr. ονομαν- ‘name’ < PIE *h₂nh₂mŋ (cf. Gk. ὄνομα ‘id.’); NPhr. κναικαν acc.sg. f. ‘wife’ < PIE *gʷneh₂ikn̥.

The reflexes of vocalic *r̥ and *l̥ are less certain. OPhr. por, NPhr. πουρ prep. ‘for’ < PIE *pr (cf. Gk. πάρ, Goth. fāur ‘id.’) seems to indicate that *r̥ has developed into *or, but this is the only example. For NPhr. γεγαριτμενός ‘devoted, at the mercy of’ < PIE *gʰr̥Hit- see the next section.
4.3. Laryngeals

Vocalization of the Indo-European laryngeals shows the same “triple representation” as in Greek and, being a common innovation of the two branches, it is an important indication of the dialectal position of Phrygian. Initial laryngeals develop a prothetic vowel, i.e. *h₁C- > eC-, *h₂C- < aC-, *h₃C- > oC-. OPhr. eu- ‘well’ (?) < PIE *h₁su- (cf. Gk. εὖ-, Skt. su- ‘id.’); NPhr. αναρ- ‘husband’ < PIE *h₂nēr (cf. Skt. nár-, Gk. ἀνήρ ‘id.’); OPhr. onoman acc.sg. n., NPhr. ονομαν- ‘name’ < PIE *h₃mh₃mn (~ Gk. ὄνομα, Skt. nāman- ‘id.’). In a similar fashion, interconsonantal laryngeals are vocalized to e, a, o, respectively: NPhr. δεως instr.pl. m. ‘god’ < PIE *dhh₁so- (cf. Gk. θεός ‘id.’); NPhr. δετου m/n. ‘monument’ < PIE *dhh₁to-; OPhr. -meno-, NPhr. -meno- middle ptc. < PIE *-mh₁no- (cf. Gk. πατήρ ‘id.’); NPhr. πατερης nom.pl. ‘parents’ < PIE *ph₂ter- (cf. Gk. πατήρ ‘id.’); NPhr. τιτ-τετικμενα nom.pl. n. ‘condemned’ < PIE *-h₂ (cf. Gk. -α, Lat. -a, Skt. -i); OPhr. onoman, NPhr. ονομαν- ‘name’ < PIE *h₃mh₃mn.

Also in other positions, the development of the laryngeals in Greek and in Phrygian is identical, cf. NPhr. γεγαριτμενος ‘devoted, at the mercy of’ < PIE *g hr̥ Hit- (cf. Gk. ἐν-κεχαρισμένος ‘id.’, χάρις, χάριτος ‘love’); NPhr. γλουρεος ‘golden (?)’ (for the meaning, cf. the above-mentioned gloss by Hesychius γλούρεα·χρύσεα, Φρύγες ‘golden items [Phrygian]’) < PIE *ghl̥h₃-ro- (cf. Gk. χλωρός ‘green’).

4.4. The single Phr. fricative /s/ is practically restricted to word-final position and to clusters with a stop, cf. OPhr. o-stem nom.sg. -os, NPhr. -ος < PIE *-os, NPhr. 3sg. s-aor. εσταες ‘established’, OPhr. 3sg. subj. daΨet/dakset/ ‘will do’. In other positions, word-initially and intervocally, it was lost, cf. NPhr. ορουαν ‘warden’ < PIE *soru̯ēn; OPhr. egeseti, NPhr. εγεσιτ, εγεδου ‘hold, experience’ < PIE *seg̑h-; NPhr. dat.pl. δεως ‘god’ < PIE *dhh₁so-. PIE *s was further lost in the clusters *sy- and *-sdh-, cf. OPhr. ven- ‘self’, NPhr. nom.pl. n. ουα ‘own’ < PIE *su̯e/*syo- and impv. ending -do, -δου < PIE *-sdh. The intervocalic /s/ in the s-subjunctives OPhr. egeseti, NPhr. εγεσιτ, mentioned above, has probably been generalized from postconsonantal positions, just like in Greek.

4.5. Stops

It is clear that PIE tenues are reflected as Phrygian tenues, and mediae aspiratae as PIE mediae, cf. OPhr. 3sg. primary act. -ti, NPhr. -τι < PIE *-ti; NPhr. πατερης nom.pl. ‘parents’ < PIE *ph₂ter-; NPhr. dat.pl. δεως ‘god’ < PIE *dhh₁so-; NPhr. acc. sg. γεγρειμ-εναν ‘written’ < PIE *g̑reihH-; NPhr. βρατερε dat.sg. ‘brother’ < PIE *b̥reh₂ter-, etc. The fate of PIE mediae is more controversial, but there is a growing body of evidence that they have become Phrygian tenues (cf. Lubotsky 2004 for more examples and a discussion of the counterevidence), cf. NPhr. acc.sg. Τιαν, gen. sg. Τιος, dat.sg. Τι(ε), OPhr. Tiei ‘Zeus’ < PIE *diēm, *diuos, *diuei; NPhr. acc.sg. κναικαν ‘wife’ < PIE *g̑neh₂ikm (~ Gk. γυναίκα); OPhr. torv- (B-05) ‘wood’ < PIE *doru̯-/*dr̥u̯-; NPhr. (τιτ-)τετικμενα ‘condemned’ < PIE *deik̑-, cf. Gk. δια-δικάζω ‘I judge’, κατα-δικάζω ‘I condemn’. PIE labiovelars have lost their labial feature, cf. OPhr. ke, NPhr. κε ‘and’ < PIE *kwe, NPhr. acc. sg. κναικαν ‘wife’ (116) < * g̑neh₂ikm.
In view of the close relationship of Phrygian and Greek, it is likely that Phrygian is a centum language, too, cf. OPhr. *geseti, NPhr. *γεσετι, γεσεδον ‘hold, experience’ < PIE *segʰ-; NPhr. (τιτ-)τετιμενος ‘condemned’ < PIE *deik’h-; NPhr. γεγαριμενος ‘devoted, at the mercy of’ < PIE *gʰh₄Hit’h-; NPhr. γλουρεος ‘golden (?)’ < PIE *gʰh₃ro-. This implies that ζεμελως dat.pl. ‘men’ (< PIE *dhgʰ(h)emelo-) must be due to a special development of the initial cluster and that the Phrygian demonstrative pronoun s- (OPhr. acc.sg.n. si, acc.sg.m. sin; NPhr. gen.sg. f. σας, dat.sg. σα(ι), dat.sg.n. σεμου, see 5.2) must reflect PIE *ki̯- with palatalization (as indicated above, 4.4, PIE initial *s- shows a zero-reflex in Phrygian).

5. Morphology

5.1. Nouns

Phrygian nouns are inflected for case, gender and number. There are at least 4 cases: nominative, accusative, genitive and dative; other cases, possibly unidentified, could have existed as well; cf., for instance, the puzzling NPhr. κναικο ‘wife’ (No. 116) or kavarmoyo (B-01) next to acc.sg. kavarmoyun in the same inscription. There are three genders (masculine, feminine, neuter) and two numbers (singular and plural). Nominal stems can be divided into o-stems, ā-stems and consonant stems (C-stems). Poorly attested stems include i-, u- and “e”-stems (i.e. Anatolian names in -es, like Ates, Bateles, Iktes) We make no distinction between substantives and adjectives, since their inflection is identical.

When we cite the actually attested forms and inscriptions, we use brackets as follows: [ ] = reconstructed portion of the text, < > = omitted portion of the text, ( ) = mistake of the engraver. Damaged letters are indicated by a subscript dot.

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>singular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o-stems</td>
<td>ā-stems</td>
<td>C-stems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPhr.</td>
<td>NPhr.</td>
<td>OPhr.</td>
<td>NPhr.</td>
<td>OPhr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom.</td>
<td>-os</td>
<td>-ος</td>
<td>-a f., -a(s) m.</td>
<td>-α f.</td>
<td>-s, -θ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>?-ovo</td>
<td>-ου</td>
<td>-αι, -ay</td>
<td>-αι, -α</td>
<td>-ei, -cy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat.</td>
<td>-oi, -oy</td>
<td>-ου</td>
<td>-an</td>
<td>-αν</td>
<td>-an, -θ [n.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td>-un</td>
<td>-ουν, -ον</td>
<td>-an</td>
<td>-αν</td>
<td>-αις, -αης</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>plural</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-oi</td>
<td>-α [n.]</td>
<td>-α</td>
<td>-αις, -αης</td>
<td>-αις, -αης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>?-oys</td>
<td>-ως</td>
<td>-αις, -αης</td>
<td>-ais</td>
<td>-αις, -αης</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nominative singular:
- o-stems: akenanogavos title (M-01a), τιττετικυμενος ‘condemned’ (passim) < PIE *-os;
- ā-stems: *Kubeleya* ‘Cybele’ (B-01), OPhr. *μανκα* ‘stele’ (W-11) < PIE *-eh₂; *Midas* (M-01d), the name of the second king of Phrygia, most probably of Anatolian origin; other Anatolian names appear both with and without *-s in the nominative, cf. *Baba* (M-01b) next to *Babas* (G-06), *Kaliya* (B-05), but *Kuliyas* (G-127), etc.; PN in *-es always have a sigmatic nominative: *Åtes* (M-01a), *Bateles* (W-08), *Eies* (G-108), *Iktes* (G-02), etc.;

- C-stems: the sigmatic nominative is attested with the *i-* and *u-* stems *Ṭuvatis* PN (G-133), *Alus* PN (W-09), *Vasous* PN (P-03) next to *Vāsus* (P-05) < *yāsōus; with stems in stops: *Manes* PN (B-07), *Bāz* ‘Bat (name of deity)’ (No. 99) < *-ts, Modrovanak ‘king of Modra’ (M-04) < *-kts and with OPhr. patronymics in -evan-: *arkiaevais* (M-01a), *kanutievaivais* (P-03) < *-u̯ans < *-u̯nts; the regular *r-* and *n-* stems have an asigmatic nominative: *matar* ‘mother’ (W-04), *αναρ* ‘man’ (No. 15) < *-ēr; *iman* ‘monument’, *ορουαν* ‘father, warden’ (No. 48) < *-ēn; *kuryaneyon* ‘commander’ (W-01c) is borrowed from Greek.

Genitive singular:
- o-stems: *ʔαργου* ‘because of’ (No. 30); the ending is pronominal, cf. OPhr. *tovo* (G-02c), NPhr. *tou* (No. 87); *Atevo* PN (W-10) is probably gen.sg. of *Åtes*, with an ending analogical to o-stems;

- ā-stems: *Ουεναουιας* PN (No. 88) < PIE *-eh₂es; the interpretation of *μανκης* ‘stele’ (No. 86), which is used in the function of a dative, is uncertain: genitive (pro dat.) or, rather, dat.pl.?

- C-stems: *Τις* ‘Zeus’ < PIE *diu̯os* (with loss of *-u̯- before *-o*); *Vasos* PN (P-02) < *u̯asuos* (idem); *kanutiieveanoς* title/patronymic (P-02), *ορουενος* ‘father, warden’ (No. 106); *Artimitos* ‘Artemis’ (B-05), *Manitos* ‘Manes’ (B-07) < PIE *-os.

Dative singular:
- o-stems: *adoikavoi* PN (G-02a); *κορου* ‘ground for the grave’ (No. 92), a loanword from Gk. χῶρος; *σορου* ‘sarcophagus’ (Nos. 21, 124), probably borrowed from Gk. σορός < PIE *-ōi;

- ā-stems: *dumeyay* adj.f. ‘of the religious community’ (G-01a), *μανκα*(i) ‘stele’ < PIE *-eh₂ei; cf. also *Midas* (M-01a);

- C-stems: *Τιε* (NW-101), *Τιε* dat.sg. ‘Zeus’ < PIE *diyei* (with analogical loss of *-u-* due to leveling with other cases); *materey* ‘mother’ (W-01b), *imneney* (B-05) ‘monument’, *βρατερε* ‘brother’ (No. 31); *ματερας* (thus to be read in No. 129, instead of *ματρέ* of the edition); *ματερας* (B-05) ‘monument’, *ορουενας* ‘warden’ (No. 128) < PIE *-en-m̥;

Accusative singular:
- o-stems: *akaragayun* ‘part of the monument’ (M-02), *δετου* (No. 116) and *δετουν* (No. 31) ‘monument’ < PIE *-om;

- ā-stems: *kinanogavan* title (M-04), *κοροαν* ‘girl’ (W-11), *μανκαν* ‘stele’ (No. 15) < PIE *-eh₂m;

- C-stems: *areyastin* epithet of Cybele (W-01a), *εωκιν* ‘vow’ (No. 30), possibly a loanword from Gk. εώκη ‘id.’ < PIE *-im; Τιαν ‘Zeus’ < PIE *diēm; *materean* ‘mother’ (W-01a) < PIE *-er-m̥; *imenan* (B-05) ‘monument’, *ορουενας* ‘warden’ (No. 128) < PIE *-en-m̥; *Batani* (T-02b), *Βαταν* (No. 33) ‘Bat’, *duman* ‘religious community’ (B-01), *ουανακταν* ‘king’ (No. 88), *κναικαν* ‘wife’ (No. 116) < PIE *-η. The neuters
keneman ‘niche (?)’ (M-01), κνουμαι ‘grave’ (No. 31); bevdos ‘image, statue’ (B-01), βεκος ‘bread’, have a zero ending.

Nominative plural:
- o-stems: τετικμεναι ‘condemned’ (No. 71) < PIE *-oi of pronominal origin; n.pl. τετικμενα (No. 12) < PIE *-h2;  
  a-stems: ουελας ‘relatives (?)’ (No. 120) < PIE *su̯-eh2-es;  
- C-stems: πατερης ‘parents’ (No. 93), most probably reflecting PIE *eies. Neuter kena ‘generation’ (No. 35), if correctly analyzed, < PIE *γενh2-es-h2.

Genitive plural:
- o-stems: τετουκμενουν (No. 28) < PIE *-ōm, although the interpretation of the final part of this inscription (ιος νι σεμουν κνουμανε κακουν αδακετ ιος τιτετουκμενουν ειτου) is far from certain.

Dative plural:
- o-stems: δεως ‘god’ (No. 40) < PIE *-ōis.

Accusative plural:
- o-stems: κτεβους ‘property (?)’ (B-01), pạtriyiọis ‘paternal (?)’ (B-04) < PIE *-ons;  
  neuters kạka ‘harm’ (B-05), μμυρα ‘stupidity’ (No. 25) < PIE *-h2;  
- a-stems: δεκμουταις ‘?’ (No. 9), δεκμουταης (No. 31);  
- C-stems: ṛαṭerạis ‘brother’ (B-04) < *-ans < PIE *-νς.

5.2. Pronouns

The proximal demonstrative pronoun (‘this here’) has the stem *se/-si- in masculine and neuter, and *sa- in feminine. Since initial PIE *s- seems to disappear in Phrygian, the stem is likely to go back to PIE *kī- (Goth. hi-, Lith. ši-, Gk. σήμερον ‘today’ < *κi̯-άμερον, etc.) + *e-/i- (Lat. is, ea, id). The Phrygian demonstrative pronoun is often followed by an emphatic particle appearing in the inscriptions as OPhr. t, NPhr. του, το, τι, τ. The attested forms are:

- acc.sg. m. sin-t (B-05) < PIE *-im, n. si (M-01b, B-01) < PIE *-id; NPhr. σεμουν (No. 31) in the function of acc. must be due to generalization of the oblique stem.  
- dat.sg. m./n. σεμουν, with the variants σεμον, σεμυν, σεμιν < PIE *-smōi + n (reminiscent of Greek νό ἐφελκυστικόν);  
- gen.sg. f. (pro dat.) σας, dat.sg. f. σαι or σα, acc.sg. (pro dat.) f. σαν (No. 60).

In OPhr. inscription W-01b, we encounter dat.sg. f. e-sai-t (materey) ‘to this very (mother)’, with yet another pronominal stem e- added (type French celui-ci). If NPhr. ειαν (No. 31) is to be read ε(σ)αν with Neumann (1986: 81), the same pronoun is also attested in NPhr.

In enclitic position, we find NPhr. dat. sg. ọi/ọi and, possibly, OPhr. ọh (B-05). The distribution among the two NPhr. forms is determined by the phonological context. In clear cases, ọi always appears after a vowel, whereas ọi is found after consonants. This means that we have to start with *iọi, which presumably is an enclitic dative of the type Skt. me, te < *h̥2moi, toi (cf. Lubotsky 1997: 126), built on the stem of the *e-/i- pronoun.
The pronoun to-/ta- < PIE *to- seems to have an anaphoric function, which is most clear in relative clauses, where we often find ιος νι ..., τος νι ... in NPhr. malediction formulae. Other forms are less clear, cf. gen.sg. m. tovo (G-02c), του (No. 87), dat.sg. f. ται (No. 116), acc.sg. f. ταν (No. 15), acc.pl. n. ta (B-01). If the gen.sg. tovo, του is correctly identified, it probably goes back to *toso > *toho > *to-o, with v as a Hiatustilger.

The relative pronoun is *io- from PIE *(h1)io-: nom.sg. m. yos (W-01), ios (P-04a), ιος (passim), acc.sg. f. ταν (No. 31). It also once occurs reduplicated: yosyos (B-03).

The pronoun *auto- ‘self’ (< PIE *(h2)euto-, cf. Gk. αὐτός) inflects like a thematic adjective: nom.sg. m. αυτος (No. 33), dat.sg. avtoi (T-03); dat.sg. f. αυται (W-01b). It can be reinforced by a reflexive pronoun /we-/ < PIE *su̯ e (cf. also Gk. ἑαυτόν): acc.sg.m. αυτων (W-01a), τοι (No. 31). It also once occurs reduplicated: αυτων (B-05.3).

Finally, the interrogative pronoun in indefinite function is acc.sg. n. kin (B-01), κιν (No. 100: [αι]νι κακουν κιν ‘or whatever harm’) < PIE *k’im (cf. Skt. kim).

5.3. Verbs

Phrygian verbs are marked for tense, voice, and mood. Identified categories include 3 tenses (present, perfect, aorist), 2 voices (active, middle), and 4 moods (indicative, imperative, optative, subjunctive). Since the stem formation and the function of the majority of verbal forms are still unknown, they are grouped below in accordance with their endings.

- 3sg. -es: edaes (passim), ἐδαὲς (2 × No. 116) ‘put, placed’; eneparkes (G-125, M-01d), ἐνεπαρκὲς (No. 31) ‘engraved’; ἐσταῖς ‘erected’ (No. 31); ἐκαὶνεξ (No. 116) ‘dug (?)’; unclear are εὐδαὲς (No. 18) and δῶικες (No. 31). These forms are characterized by an augment e-, which immediately precedes the root, and appear in preterital contexts, except for εὐδαὲς (No. 18), but the reading of this inscription is uncertain. The ablaut of the root is ambiguous in edaes and ἐσταῖς (full or lengthened grade), but the lengthened grade is probable in eneparkes (<*pērḱ-). However, the ending *-eto is primary in Greek dialects and in Indo-Iranian, and its appearance in the aorist is unexpected. See further below on -etor.

- 3sg. -toi: edatoy ‘put, placed’ (B-05.2), t-edatoy (W-01a), tit-edatoy (B-05.1);  egertoy ‘?’ (W-01c); eketoy ‘possessed’ (B-01.3); epaktoy ‘?’ (B-01.9); estatoi ‘erected’ (G-144). The augment and the preterital contexts make it probable that we are dealing with a middle counterpart of the -es-forms. The root usually has full grade, but zero-grade in eketoy (<*h1e-tēknh1-toi). However, the ending *-toi is primary in Greek dialects and in Indo-Iranian, and its appearance in the aorist is unexpected. See further below on -etor.

- 3sg. -et: daket (B-05.11), (α)δακετ ‘do, inflict’, αββερετ ‘bring’ in the protasis of NPhr. maledictions ‘whoever will inflict/bring harm upon this grave’. There are two cases of με-βερετ (Nos. 86, 111), which occur in an apodosis Βας τοι βεκος μεβερετ ‘Bat will take away his bread’. Maybe, βερετ ‘break (?)’ in the protasis ιος κε βερετ περβεδαν (No. 114) belongs to the same category. Because of the contexts, the -et-
forms are usually considered subjunctives, but it is by no means certain that they are morphological subjunctives. Once, in a NPhr. quasi-bilingue No. 48, αδδακετ seems to be used in parallel to the Greek aorist παρεθέμην.

- 3sg. -etor: αδδακετορ (Nos. 40, 63, 121) and αββερετορ (Nos. 73, 75) appear in exactly the same contexts as αδδακετ and αββερετ. Moreover, we also find three times αββερετο (Nos. 91, 113, 129) there. The difference between forms in -et and those in -etor/-etoi is generally interpreted as a difference of voice (active vs. middle), but this leaves unexplained why active and middle forms are used in the same contexts. Probably, we must rather assume that all these forms, i.e. -et, -etor, -etoi, belong to the middle paradigm, which is further confirmed by the forms in -seti/-set.

- 3sg. -seti/-siti: egeseti ‘will hold, experience’ (P-04a); dedasitiy ‘will do’ (B-05.9; thus to be read with A. Hämmig, p.c., instead of dedapitiy of the edition); με-τοτοσσετί ‘will give away (?)’ (No. 99) are likely to be subjunctives. These forms show that final -i has not disappeared in Phrygian.

- 3sg. -set/-sit: daΨet /dakset/ ‘will do’ (W-01b), εγεσιτ ‘will hold’ (No. 58) are very similar in form and function to the preceding group, and are likely to be their middle counterpart.

- 3sg. -oi: kakuoi (G-02c), kakuioi (P-04b) are often considered optatives to a denominative verb ‘to go bad’ (< *oit), but the syntactic analysis of these inscriptions is uncertain.

- 3sg. impv. act. ετου ‘let become!’ (passim) < PIE *-tō(t), cf. Gk. -τω, Skt. gachatāt.

- 3sg. impv. med. lakedo (W-01b, B-03), εγεδου ‘let hold!’ (passim). The ending has a close parallel in Gk. -θω (cf. Rix 1992: 265) and represents a common innovation of the two languages.


- 3pl. ind. perf. act. δακαρεν ‘put, placed’ (No. 98) < PIE *-ēr (cf. Lat. -ēre) + an additional 3pl. ending *-ent.

- 3sg. -ei: aey ‘be (?)’ (W-01), etitevtevey ‘?’ (B-03) might be perfects (for a discussion see Lubotsky 1988: 17–18).

Perfect middle participles are athematic and reduplicated, nom.sg. γεγαριτμενον ‘devoted, condemned’, ττ-τετκιμενον ‘id.’, acc.sg. f. γεγρειμενην ‘written’, acc.sg. f. οπεσταμενα ‘erected’ (No. 9; cf. also σεσταμενα in No. 15 with restored reduplication); possibly also αργμενα ‘?’ (No. 116). For this reason, αιδομενου (No. 116) probably belongs to the system of the thematic present.

6. Syntax

6.1. Word order

The unmarked word order seems to be SOV, cf. with a direct object: OPhr. baba ... sikemenem edaes (M-01b) ‘Baba has established this niche (?)’; with an indirect object: OPhr. ates ... midai ... edaes (M-01a) ‘Ates has established for Midas’. An indirect object normally precedes a direct object, cf. OPhr. yos-esai-t materey ... onoman daΨet ‘whoever would make ... name for this very Mother’ or NPhr. ιος νι σα του μανκα
κακον αδδακετ ‘whoever inflicts harm upon this very monument’, ιος νι σεμου κνουμανει κακον αδδακετ ‘whoever inflicts harm upon this grave’. On the whole, word order in NPhr. seems to be less strict, possibly because many inscriptions are metrical, or at least go back to a metrical original (cf. Lubotsky 1998).

In OPhr. inscriptions, we also encounter OSV order with topicalization, e.g., sin-timenan kaliya titedat ‘This very monument Kaliya has established’ (B-05), materan areyastin bonok akenanogavọṣ vrekun tedatoy ‘Bonok, the high priest, has established Mother Areyasti as an image’ (W-01); cf. further si-bevdos ad[---] kạṿarmọyo imroy edaes etovesniyo (B-01), akenanogavan tiyes modroyanak avarâ (M-04).

Attributives follow their heads, cf. OPhr. materan areyastin (W-01a), mator kubeleya ibeya (B-01), but pronouns usually precede them, cf. OPhr. si-keneman ‘this niche’ (M-01b), avtay matereya ibeya ‘to the Mother herself’ (W-01b), σεμου κνουμανει ‘to this grave’ (incidentally, this consideration may be used as an argument for considering OPhr. -vin in ovevin onoman W-01b as a pronoun, presumably meaning ‘(his) own name’, rather than an adjective; ove- may be a conjunction ‘or’). An exception is κακον κιν ‘whatever harm’ (No. 100), for which cf. the Gk. postposed enclitic τίς ‘someone’. In the NPhr. protases with μανκα, the pronoun and the noun are often separated, probably for metrical reasons, cf. ιος νι σαι κακον αδδακεμ μανκαι (No. 35; for more examples see 6.2) as opposed to the regular ιος νι σα του μανκα κακον αδδακετ (No. 82).

Clitics (particles, conjunctions, enclitic pronouns) obey Wackernagel’s Law and appear after the first accented word of the sentence, e.g., the particle ni in OPhr. ios ni akenan egeseti (P-04a) or NPhr. ιος νι σεμου κνουμανει κακον αδδακετ (No. 3). An interesting pattern is found with the sentence conjunction κε ‘and’. It normally stands in second position, even if the sentence begins with a preposition, e.g. … τιττετικμενος ας τιαν ειτου, με κε οι τοτοσσειτι Βας βεκος (No. 99) ‘… let him be condemned by Zeus, and Bat will deprive him of his bread’; … τιττετικμενος ατ Τι αδειτου, ακ κε οι βεκος ακκαλος τιδρε<γ>ρουν ειτου (No. 76) ‘… let him be condemned by Zeus, and let his bread be unetable’. Here, the prepositions με and ακ (= αδ) are followed by the sentence conjunction κε and then by a clitic pronoun of the 3rd person. If, however, prepositions are construed with a noun rather than with a clitic, the conjunction κε stands after the noun, cf. … Βα[κ] ιοι βεκος μεβερε[τ], ατ Τι κε τιττετικιμενος ειτου (No. 86) ‘… Bat will deprive him of his bread, and let him be condemned by Zeus’: ... γεγαριτμενο<ς> ειτου, πουρ ουανακταν κε ουρανιον ιστεικετ (~ Gk. ἐκδείκνυμι) Διουνσιν (No. 88) ‘… let him be devoted, and he will be exposed to the heavenly king Dionysos’. When used as a word conjunction, κε appears either after each member (Χ ΚΕ Υ ΚΕ: δεως κε ζεμελως κε), or after the second word only (Χ Υ ΚΕ: δεως ζεμελως κε) (cf. Brixhe 1978b: 1 ff.). Incidentally, asyndetic δεως ζεμελως is also attested several times.

Preverbs generally stand immediately before the verb, but tmesis is also attested. For instance, in με κε οι τοτοσσειτι Βας βεκος (No. 99) ‘Bat will deprive him of his bread’, με and τοτοσσειτι are separated, in contrast with βε<κ>ος ιοι με-τοτοσσειτι σαρναν (No. 18; to be read thus with A. Hämmig, p.c., rather than as τοτοσσα ευγισαρναν with Haas 1966: 100). A slightly different case is the apodosis ‘let him be condemned by Zeus (and by gods)’, e.g., ατ Τι κε τιττετικμενος ειτου (No. 94), ατ Τι κε τιττετικιμενος ειτου (No. 86), ατ Τι κε δεως κε τιττετικμενος ειτου (No. 62), even ατ Τι ειτου (No. 56), where αδ was felt by the speakers to belong to the verb, as follows from many occurrences of the formulaic (τιττετικιμενος) ατ Τι αδ-ειτου with preverb repetition.
6.2. Agreement

In NPhr., we witness progressing case syncretism in ā-stems, probably triggered by the change of final *-āi to -ā and thus by a merger of nom. and dat.sg., cf. the following examples of the protasis ‘whoever will inflict harm upon this stele’: No. 35. ἵς νὶ σαι κακουν ἀδακε μανκαι with “correct” endings vs. No. 69. ἵς σαι κακον ἀδακετ μανκαν and No. 60. ἵς νὶ σαν κακουν ἀδ[δα]κε μανκαι, which show an accusative ending instead of a dative.

If the subject of the sentence is “A and B”, the predicate adjective agrees in gender and number with the first member. For instance, in the apodosis of No. 33. αὐτος κε οὐα κ ἐροκα νεκαρίτμενος ας Βαταν τευτους ‘he himself and his progeny (?) will be condemned by Bat’, γεγαριτμενος agrees with αὐτος. Similarly, in No. 12. ζειρα κε οι πειες κε τιττετικμενα ατ Τιε ἀδειττνου, we see that nom.pl. n. τιττετικμενα agrees in gender with ζειρα.
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