

ALEXANDER LUBOTSKY

THE SYNTAX OF THE NEW PHRYGIAN INSCRIPTION No. 88

§ 1. For the interpretation of Phrygian inscriptions we have at our disposal two sources of syntactic information: syntactic constructions attested in Phrygian, and the peculiarities of the Greek language of the 'Phrygian' area of Asia Minor. In the present article I would like to demonstrate how we can use this information for the analysis of Phrygian inscriptions, taking as an example inscription No. 88, which was first published by Calder (1928: 216 f.). This inscription contains a Greek and a Phrygian part:

Αὐρ. Μηνόφιλος Οὐενούστου κὲ Μα-
νία Ἀντιόχου ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ Ἀππη καὶ
Οὐεναουίη τέκνοις ἁώροις καὶ
ἑαυτοῖς μνήμης χάριν (leaf) ιοῖς
νι σεμουν κνουμανει κακε
αδδακετ αωρω ουεναουιάς τιγ
γεγαριτμενο<ς> εἰτου πουρ ουανα-
κταν κε ουρανιον ισγεικετ διουνσιν (leaf)
καὶ Αὐρ. Σῶζοντι Κανκάρου ἀνδρὶ τῆς Οὐεναουίης.

As usual, the Greek part contains an epitaph, from which we learn that the grave has been made by Mēnophilos and his wife Mania for their prematurely deceased children, Appē and Ouenauouia, and for themselves. The message at the end of the inscription, concerning the burial of Sōzōn, the husband of Ouenauouia, "may be a later addition" (Calder 1928: 217).

The Phrygian part constitutes a malediction against the violator of the tomb. Its protasis, ιοῖς νι σεμουν κνουμανει κακε αδδακετ αωρω ουεναουιάς, is quite clear and can be translated "whoever brings harm to this premature tomb of Venavia", αωρω standing for Gr. ἁώρω and Ουεναουιάς being gen. sg. of the name mentioned in the Greek part of the inscription (cf. Haas 1966: 94)¹.

The rest of the inscription, viz.

τιγ γεγαριτμενο<ς> εἰτου πουρ ουανακταν κε ουρανιον ισγεικετ διουνσιν

¹ Haas translates the phrase as "wer diesem frühzeitigen Grabe der Ouen<a>ouia etwas Übles zufügt" (the omitted -a- in the name Ouenauouia is a misprint). The only

is much more problematic, although some elements of this passage are easily identifiable. The first three words, *τιγ γεγαριτμενο<ς> ειτου*, must constitute a curse "let him be condemned" *uel sim.*, parallel to the usual *τιτ τετικμενος ειτου* (for the particle *τιτ* cf. Lubotsky 1989, for *γεγαριτμενος* see below). *Ουανακταν* is most probably the acc. sg. of the word for "king", cf. Old Phrygian (OPhr.) nom. sg. (*mōdro*)*vanak* (M-04), dat. sg. *vanaktey* (M-O1a), whereas *ουρανιον* is likely to be the acc. sg. of an adjective, borrowed from Greek οὐράνιος "heavenly".

The other words are less clear, and for the passage *πουρ ουανακταν κε ουρανιον ισγεικετ διουνσιν*, as far as I know, three interpretations have been proposed:

1) According to Calder 1928: 217, the three last words, *ουρανιον ισγεικετ διουνσιν*, are comparable with the Greek malediction *ἔξει πρὸς* (or *ἔξει κεχολωμένον*) *οὐράνιον Διόνυσον* (in *ουανακταν* Calder saw a name). Calder's analysis was accepted by Gusmani (1958: 902), who suggested that *ουανακταν* is likewise an attribute of *Διουνσιν*, whereas *κε* "è naturalmente l'enclitica e serve da elemento coordinatore con quello che precede".

2) Haas (1966: 109) assumed that the malediction formula ends after the curse *τιγ γεγαριτμενο<ς> ειτου*. He divided *ισγεικετ* into the form *ισγει κ' ετ*, and translated *πουρ ουανακταν κε ουρανιον ισγει κ' ετ διουνσιν* as "und für Ouanakta und Ouranios καὶ ἑαυτοῖς ἔτι ζῶσιν".

3) Diakonoff (in Diakonoff—Neroznak 1985: 9 f., 44¹⁹) emends *ουανακταν* to **ουανακτον* and translates *πουρ *ουανακτον κε ουρανιον ισγεικετ διουνσιν* as "ignis regius caelestisque incendat ex caelis" (lit. excendat, cf. OSlav. *izŭ-žŭgo* "I shall burn [it] out"), "the royal and celestial fire, descending from heaven, (shall) burn (him)" (p. 10).

In order to assess these proposals, it is necessary to analyze the syntactic behaviour of two key-words of this inscription, viz. *γεγαριτμενος* and *κε*.

§ 2. *γεγαριτμενος* is nom. sg. of a perf. part. med. Calder (1926: 24) already drew attention to Gr. *ἐνκεχαρισμένος*, attested in a Greek

correction which must be made to Haas' analysis concerns the interpretation of *τιγ*. Haas takes it as a pronomen indefinitum **k'id*, belonging to *κακε*, but, as Brixhe has shown (1978a: 8 ff.), *τι(τ)* is a particle, always forming part of the apodosis and standing immediately before the participle/adjective of the predicate. Haas 1976a: 77 tacitly corrected the translation himself: "Wer diesem allzufrühen Grabe der Venavia κακῶς προσποιεῖ". For more details on the particle *τι(τ)* I refer the reader to Lubotsky 1989.

inscription from Modanlı: τίς δὲ τούτους ἡδίκησε ἐνκεχαρισμένος ἦτω εἰς αὐτὰ τὰ νέκρεια. Later, more Greek inscriptions containing this word were found; cf. ἔστω κεχαρισμένος Δεῖ Οὐρυδ[αμηνῶ] (Calder 1933: 184). In all these inscriptions (ἐν)κεχαρισμένος means something like “devoted (to)”, “at the mercy of”.

Calder proposed to see in these formulae the Greek rendering of the Phrygian expression with γεγαριτμενος, and asked: “Is γεγαριτμενος simply κεχαρισμένος borrowed and dressed in a Phrygian disguise, or is it a genuine Phrygian word?” I believe that borrowing from the Greek is hardly probable, as the difference in form and meaning is too marked for a loan. Note that Gr. χ appears as Phr. κ in κορος, which is attested in the protasis of inscription 92:

ιος vi σ[εμουν κνου]μανε κακουv [αδδακετ αι]vi κορου (92)

“whoever brings harm to this grave or to the κορος” (Brixhe 1978 b: 31², Calder 1933: 116); and which seems to be a recent loan from Greek χῶρος “place” (Brixhe 1983: 127). Consequently, we would expect κεχαρισμένος to be reflected in Phrygian as **κεκαρισμενος. The answer to Calder’s question must therefore be that γεγαριτμενος is a genuine Phrygian word.

I believe that the shift of meaning of κεχαρισμένος in the Greek inscriptions of Phrygia (‘devoted to’ instead of the usual ‘agreeable’) must be due to the influence of γεγαριτμενος, which presumably possessed both these meanings. In other words, when the Phrygians composed malediction formulae in Greek, they used the usual Greek equivalent of γεγαριτμενος, viz. κεχαρισμένος. A similar point of view has already been expressed by Haas (1951: 27¹⁰) and Heubeck (1959: 15). It would follow that the syntax of Greek inscriptions with κεχαρισμένος is based on the Phrygian formulae and can provide us with important information (see below).

As to the origin of γεγαριτμενος, I cannot agree with Haas that there is only “*scheinbare* etymologische Entsprechung” between γεγαριτμενος and κεχαρισμένος (1966: 95)². Gr. κεχαρισμένος is the perf. part. med. of the denominative verb χαρίζομαι, derived from χάρις < PIE *ǵʰrH-i-, an original *i*-stem (cf. acc. sg. χάριν, χαρί-εις, χαριδότης), which has been enlarged to a *t*-stem (gen. sg. χάριτος, etc.).

² Haas proposed to connect γεγαριτμενος with Gr. χαράττω, -σσω ‘to scratch, brand-marken’ (1966: 213), but the vocalisms of the Greek and Phrygian words seem to be irreconcilable, and, moreover, the comparison is semantically weak, cf. Heubeck 1987: 74.

It seems plausible to identify the root of the Phrygian verb, -γαριτ-, with Gr. χάριτ- (for the development of vocalic resonants see below, § 4.1), which would indicate that the *t*-suffix is old and is an innovation common to both languages. Moreover, this analysis provides another proof that Phrygian is a *centum*-language because the family of Gr. χάρις has a palatal **g^h*- (e. g. Skt. *báryati*, cf. Frisk s. v.).

Let us now look at the actual occurrences of γεγαριτμενος. Apart from our inscription, it occurs only in one context (γεγαριτμενος has also been restored in 64 and 79, but the context there is unclear), viz. the malediction formula

αυτος κε ουα κ εροκα γεγαριτμενος ας βαταν τευτους (33)
 αυτος κε ουα κ οροκα γεγαριτμενος α<ς> βαταν τευτους (36)

Although the exact meaning of ε/οροκα is unknown, the syntax of the beginning of the malediction is clear: "and he himself and his (ουα) ε/οροκα (progeny/family?)". We have seen above that Gr. κεχαρισμένος in the Greek inscriptions of Phrygia often has a complement, a deity, to whom the violator of the grave will be devoted, and that this use was most probably borrowed from Phrygian. This implies that we must look for the name of a deity in ας βαταν τευτους.

The parallelism of two constructions, γεγαριτμενος ας βαταν τευτους and τι(τ) τετικμενος ας τιαν ειτου (14, 53, 99) "let him become accursed by Tiyas" *uel sim.* (for which see Lubotsky 1989) suggests that ας βαταν must be analyzed as the preposition ας + acc. sg. of a deity, whereas τευτους is a verbal form (so already Gusmani 1958: 903). As the acc. βαταν can belong either to an *ā*-stem, or to a consonant stem, it is tempting to take βαταν as acc. sg. of a *t*-stem (or a root-noun) and to connect it with the deity Βας (nom. sg. < *Βατ-ς), who is mentioned among other deities in 48 (Μιτραφατα κε Μας Τεμρογειος κε Πουντας Βας κε)³.

§ 3. Essential for the syntactical analysis of the inscription is the position of the conjunctive particle κε. Brixhe has recently discussed

³ The name of Bas also occurs in formulae with βεκος 'bread'. The identical apodoseis of 86 (βα[s] ιοι βεκος με βερε[τ]) and 111 (βας ιοι βεκος μαβερετ) can be rendered as "Bas shall take his bread (away)" (cf. also Brixhe 1979: 189, who takes σιοι as a pronoun and translates: "que X lui refuse le pain"). I assume that the apodosis of 99 (με κε οι τοτοσσει τι βας βεκος) has a comparable meaning. For the word-division in 99 cf. 18 βεοσιοι (= βε<κ>ος ιοι?, Gusmani 1958: 903) με τοτοσσ' Ευγισαριναν. Unfortunately, OPhr. *batan* (T-O2b) occurs in a fragment, the context of which is unclear.

the syntax of Phrygian *κε* (1978 b: 1 ff.), and his conclusions can be summarized as follows:

1. When used as a word conjunction, *κε* appears either after each member (*X κε Y κε: δεως κε ζεμελως κε*), or after the second word only (*X Y κε: δεως ζεμελως κε*).

2.1 When used as a sentimental conjunction, *κε* appears after the first word of the second clause. The clear cases are:

- ...ειτου υ κε ακαλα ουιτετου ουα (2) (where υ most probably stands for οι, Brixhe 1979: 192),
- ...ειτου αυτος κε ουα κ εροκα γεγαριτμενος ας βαταν τευτους (33),
- ...εγεδου... αυτος κε ουα κ οροκα γεγαριτμενος α<ς> βαταν τευτους (36),
- ...ειτου γεγρειμεναν κ' εγεδου τιος ουταν (76, 108),
- ...αδειτου ουελας κε του κε ισνου αστοι παρτης (87).

2.2. Brixhe does not separately discuss those cases where the second clause starts with a preposition. Here we must distinguish between combinations of a preposition + a clitic, and combinations of a preposition + a noun. It seems that in the former case *κε* appears after the first word, too; cf.:

- ...[ε]ιτου με κε οι τοτοσσειτι βας βεκος (99).

I therefore believe that *ακκεοι*, attested in

- ...εγεδου ακκεοι βεκος ακκαλος τιδρεγρουν ειτου (33) and
- ...αδειτου ακκεοι βεκος ακκαλος τιδρεγρουν ειτου (76),

must similarly be analyzed as the preposition *αδ* + *κε* + pron. *οι* (contra Haas 1966: 84 and Brixhe 1978 b: 2, according to whom *ακκε* is of the same origin and function as Lat. *atque*).

On the other hand, in the case of combinations of a preposition + a noun, *κε* appears after the noun:

- ...ειτο[υ] ατ τη κε αδειτου (39),
- ...με βερε[τ] ατ τη κε τι τετικμ[ε]νος ειτου (86).

(For the analysis of the malediction formulae with *ατ τη* and *ας τιν* see Lubotsky 1989).

It follows that the interpretation of Haas (1966: 109), who divided *ισγεικετ* as *ισγει κ' ετ* and translated *πούρ ουανακταν κε ουρανιον* *ισγεικετ διουνσιν* as "und für Ouanakta and Ouranios καὶ ἑαυτοῖς ἔτι ζῶσιν", is improbable because *ουανακταν* and *ουρανιον* cannot be coordinated nouns connected by *κε*. The same syntactic objection (among many others) holds for the analysis of Diakonoff (Diakonoff—Neroznak 1985: 9 f. and 44¹⁹), who emends *ουανακταν* to **ουανακτον* and translates the sentence as "ignis regius caelestisque incendat ex caelis".

In taking *κε* either as a word conjunction or as a sentential conjunction, we have two possible interpretations of the apodosis *τιγ γεγαριτμενο<ς> ειτου πουρ ουανακταν κε ουρανιον ισγεικετ διουνσιν* (unfortunately, Brixhe 1978 b: 1 ff. in his discussion of *κε* does not mention inscription 88 and therefore does not express an opinion on the choice):

A. If *κε* be a word conjunction, *πουρ* and *ουανακταν* (*ουρανιον*) must be coordinated, both being the direct object of *γεγαριτμενος*. However, this analysis presupposes the transitive character of *γεγαριτμενος*, which seems unlikely in view of the use of *ενκεχαρισμένος* in Greek inscriptions (v. supra).

B. If *κε* be a sentential conjunction, either *πουρ* belongs to the preceding clause (the second clause beginning with *ουανακταν κε ουρανιον*), or *πουρ* is a preposition and is the first word of the clause. The former alternative meets the same objection as in A, so that we arrive at the following syntactic analysis:

apodosis 1: *τιγ γεγαριτμενο<ς> ειτου* "let him be devoted";

apodosis 2: prep. *πουρ* + accusatives *ουανακταν ουρανιον διουνσιν* + the verb *ισγεικετ*, the two apodoseis being connected by *κε* in the position after the noun, which is in accordance with rule 2.2 above.

§ 4. In other words, we must return to the interpretation given by Calder and Gusmani and consider *πουρ ουανακταν κε ουρανιον ισγεικετ διουνσιν* as parallel to Gr. *ἔξει πρὸς οὐράνιον Διόνυσον*. Let us now discuss the three remaining words.

§ 4.1. *πουρ* must thus be a preposition with the meaning of Gr. *πρὸς*. This preposition is probably also found in OPhr. inscription W-05b, which can be read *ḵanst[...][e]daespormater[* and analyzed as Obj. (...an), Subj. (NPr. *St...*), Verb (*[e]daes* "made, dedicated"), *por* "for", acc. sg. *mater[an]* or dat. sg. *mater[ey]* "Mother" (cf. Brixhe—Lejeune 1984: 49). What was the proto-form of this preposition? Gusmani 1958: 902 reconstructed **pōr* (*por*) and compared Lat. *prō*, Skt. *pra*, etc.; but **pōr* is nowhere attested, whereas **por* in Lat. *porrō* reflects rather **pr̥* (the same origin may be proposed for Gr. *πόρρω*, *πόρσω* with Aeolian vocalization). We must therefore assume that OPhr. *por*, NPhr. *πουρ*, reflects PIE **pr̥* (cf. Gr. *πάρ*, Goth. *faur*, etc.).

This reconstruction furnishes the first certain example of a reflex of PIE **r̥* in Phrygian. There seems to be a *communis opinio* that PIE **r̥* and **l̥* yield Phrygian *ar*, *al* (Haas 1966: 205, Bajun—Orël 1986: 209, Diakonoff—Neroznak 1985: 5), but the material presented by Haas is unreliable, while the Soviet scholars do not adduce any evidence in

favour of this development. Moreover, reconsidering the attestations of Phr. *-ar-*, we see that they all may have another origin:

-ar- < **-ēr-*: 3sg. aor. *enēparkes* (M-O1d, G-O1c, G-125) = ἐνεπαρκες (31);

nom. sg. *matar* = ματαρ (18), αναρ (15);

3sg. pf. *δακαρ* (18), 3pl. *δακαρεν* (98);

ar- < **H₂(e)r-*: *αργου* (30, 98), *αργμενα* (116);

Personal names: *Kavarmoyos** (B-01), *Agartioi* (G-02);

Geographical name: *Ευγεξαρναι*, *Ευγισαρναν* (18);

Unclear: *παρτυς* (9), *παρταν* (103), *παρτης* (42, 87), *ενοσταρνα* (48), *εναρκε* (116).

The only form where *-ar-* seems to reflect syllabic *r* is γεγαριτμενος < **-ḡrHit-* discussed above (§ 2), but reflexes of syllabic resonants before a laryngeal may differ from those in other positions (cf. Skt. *-ir-/-ur-* < **CrHV* vs. *-r-* < **CrC*).

On the other hand, it is difficult to find further evidence in favour of the development PIE **r, l* > Phr. *or/ur, ol/ul* because Phr. *or/ol* may also reflect PIE **or/ol*. We have the following material:

1. The ending of 3sg. med. *αδδακετορ*, *αββερετορ*, if < **-tr*;
2. OPhr. nom. sg. *sakor* (G-105, cf. Lubotsky 1988: 21), *tekmor* (P-04) may reflect **-r*, although the ending **-ōr* is also possible;
3. There are several cases of Phr. *ol* which may reflect syllabic resonants: OPhr. *isvolkay* (G-01A), NPhr. *κολταμανε* (18);
4. Moreover, as I have tried to demonstrate elsewhere (1988: 23), Phr. *o* > *u/-r_i, l_i*. Some of these combinations *ury*, *oly* may likewise reflect syllabic resonants; cf. *esuryoyoy* M-01f); *voineiosuriienoisku...* (G-145), *kuliyaf...* (G-101), *kuliyas* (G-127).

§ 4.2. According to Calder's analysis, *ισγεικετ* must be a verb parallel to Gr. *ἔξει*⁴. It is tempting to see in *-σγ-* the zero-grade of the root of Gr. *ἔχω*. The initial *ι-* may be prothetic because 'Phrygian' Greek regularly shows prothetic *i-* before word-initial *sC*-clusters (cf. Dressler 1965: 96 ff. and Brixhe 1984: 115 f.). The ending is the same as in 3sg. fut./subj. *αδδακετ*, which also shows a secondary *-κ-* taken from the

⁴ Kretschmer (1932: 66) considered *ισγεικετ* a loan from Gr. *ἔσχηκε*, but this explanation cannot account for the Phrygian *-γ-* (see above on Phr. *κ* for Gr. *χ* in loan-words) and is therefore improbable. On the other hand, our inscription contains so many Greek elements (*αωρω*, *ουρανιον*) that we may assume that the scribe did not have sufficient command of Phrygian. It seems then conceivable that *ισγεικετ* contains the productive Greek element *-ηκ-* (cf. *ἠθέληκα*, *κεχάρηκα*, Schwyzler 1939: 774 f.), which in the III–IV century A.D. had become *[-īk-]*.

perfect. The only problem is the enlargement -ει- (phonetically [-ī-]). This -ει- cannot be of the same origin as -η- in Gr. ἔσχηκα because *ē yields Phr. *z*, but as the Greek -η- is secondary and as we know so little about Phrygian verbal morphology, we may assume for the time being that Phrygian used a secondary enlargement -ει- where Greek used -η- (cf. also fn. 4).

§ 4.3. Finally, we will have in διουνσιν the acc. sg. of Gr. Διόνυσος. We expect -ουv as the acc. sg. ending of the *o*-stems, but -iv is attested in κακiv (14), next to κακουv (thirty-seven times), κακον (twelve times), κακεv (40, 97), κακυv (62), κακων (11), κακευv (45), and κακε (21, 99 and in our inscription 88), cf. also σεμiv (76, 100) instead of σεμουv (passim). Gusmani (1958: 902) explains the aberrant form διουνσιν by a syncope, followed by the raising of -o- to -u- before a nasal; but we may also suggest a scribal error which would have led to the spelling διουνσiv instead of *διονυσiv.

§ 4.4. The syntax of the malediction formula πουρ ουανακταν κε ουρανιον ισγεικετ διουνσiv, with the nominal syntagm interrupted by a verb, may appear aberrant, but this syntax is not without parallels; cf.

- υκε ακαλα ουιτετου ουα (2), where the verb ουιτετου (3sg. impv.) stands between the coreferential ακαλα and ουα (< **μη* “his own”);
- γεγρειμεναν εγεδου τιος ουταν, attested eight times, where the verb εγεδου (3sg. impv. middle) interrupts the nominal syntagm, consisting of the coreferential γεγρειμεναν and ουταν plus gen. sg. τιος “the established punishment of (god) Tiycs” *uel sim.* (cf. Haas 1966: 67, Lubotsky 1989). A variant of this formula is found in 106: γεγρειμενον κ εγεδου ορουενος ουτον.

§ 5. Conclusions

- 1) The NPhr. inscription No. 88 represents a malediction against the violator of the tomb and consists of a protasis and two apodoseis. The protasis, ιος vi σεμουv κνουμανει κακε αδδακετ αωρω ουεναουιας, can be translated “whoever brings harm to this premature tomb of Venavia”. The use of Phrygian Greek (ἐν)κεχαρισμένος (an equivalent of Phr. γεγαριτμενος) and the syntax of Phr. κε show that the rest of the inscription must be divided into two apodoseis, which is in accordance with the interpretation of Calder (1928: 217) and Gusmani (1958: 902):
 - τιγ γεγαριτμενο(ς) ειτου “let him become cursed/devoted” and
 - πουρ ουανακταν κε ουρανιον ισγεικετ διουνσiv “and he will have to do with the heavenly king Dionysos”, which is parallel to the Greek malediction ἔξει πρὸς οὐράνιον Διόνυσον.

2) The root of Phr. γεγαρτμενος may be identified with Gr. χάριτ- < **ḡrff-i-t-*, which would indicate that the *t*-stem of this word is an innovation common to both Greek and Phrygian. Moreover, this analysis provides another proof that Phrygian is a *centum*-language.

3) The sentential conjunction *ke* mostly stands after the first word of the second clause, unless the second clause starts with a combination of a preposition + a noun. In the latter case *ke* stands after the noun.

4) The word *πουρ* appears to be a preposition going back to PIE **p_ṛ*, which makes it likely that the Phrygian reflex of PIE vocalic resonants is *or/ur*, *ol/ul*.

Postscript

In a recent publication, L. S. Bajun and V. Ė. Orël ("Jazyk frigijskix nadpisej kak istoričeskij istočnik. II", *Vestnik drevnej istorii*, 1988/4, p. 132–167) propose the following translation of the NPhr. inscription No. 88 (p. 152 f.): "Kto ètoj preždevremennoj grobnice Venavii zlo pričinit, (tot) da budet prokljat. Ogon' (da) soxranit nebesnogo carja sredi (ili: dlja) nebesnyx (božestv)" ("He who brings harm to this premature tomb of Venavia, let him be cursed. May the fire keep the heavenly king among (or: for) the heavenly (deities)"). In my opinion, the second sentence does not make any sense and is misplaced in a curse. Moreover, their assumption that *ke* was used in the construction noun + attribute is improbable.

References

- Bajun, L. S.—Orël, V. Ė.
 1986: Review of Brixhe—Lejeune 1984. *Vestnik drevnej istorii* 1986/3, 202–210.
- Brixhe, Cl.
 1978 a: Études neo-phrygiennes I, *Verbum* 1,1, 3–21.
 1978 b: Études neo-phrygiennes II, *Verbum* 1,2, 1–22.
 1979: Études neo-phrygiennes III, *Verbum* 2,2, 177–192.
 1983: Épigraphie et grammaire du phrygien: état présent et perspectives. *Le lingue indoeuropee di frammentaria attestazione / Die indogermanischen Restsprachen*, ed. by E. Vineis. Pisa, 109–131.
 1984: Essai sur le grec anatolien au début de notre ère. Nancy.
- Brixhe, Cl.—Lejeune, M.
 1984: Corpus des inscriptions paléo-phrygiennes. 2 vols. Paris.
- Calder, W. M.
 1926: Corpus inscriptionum neo-phrygiarum III. *JHSt.* 46, 22–28.
 1928: Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua I. Manchester.
 1933: Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua IV. Manchester.

- Diakonoff, I. M. — Neroznak, V. P.
 1985: Phrygian. New York.
- Dressler, W.
 1965: *i*-Prothese vor *s* impurum in Kleinasien (und im Vulgärlatein). *Balkansko Ezikoznanie* 9,2, 93–100.
- Gusmani, R.
 1958: Studi sull'antico frigio, RIL 92, 835–69, and Le iscrizioni dell'antico frigio, RIL 92, 870–903.
- Haas, O.
 1951: Zur Deutung der phrygischen Inschriften, RHA XI (f. 53), 1–30.
 1966: Die Phrygischen Sprachdenkmäler. Sofia.
 1976 a: Die Sprache der spätphrygischen Inschriften I. *Balkansko Ezikoznanie* XIX/3, 49–82.
 1976 b: Die Sprache der spätphrygischen Inschriften II. *Balkansko Ezikoznanie* XIX/4, 53–71.
- Heubeck, A.
 1959: Bemerkungen zu den neuphygischen Fluchformeln. IF 64, 13–25.
 1987: Phrygiaka I–III. KZ 100, 70–85.
- Kretschmer, P.
 1932: Χθών. Glotta 20, 65–67.
- Lubotsky, A.
 1988: The Old Phrygian Areyastis-inscription. *Kadmos* 27, 1988, 9–26.
 1989: New Phrygian ετι and τι. *Kadmos* 28, 1989, 79–88.
- Schwyzler, E.
 1939: Griechische Grammatik. Band I. München.