

ALEXANDER LUBOTSKY

## NEW PHRYGIAN ΥΨΟΔΑΝ

1. The New Phrygian (NPhr.) inscription No. 15<sup>1</sup> from Nacoleia was discovered and published for the first time by Ramsay (1887: 394). His text was based on two copies made by himself and a copy made by J.R.S. Sterrett. Almost twenty years later (1905: 114f.), Ramsay discussed this inscription again and presented some different readings, although he did not consult the stone in the meantime. Here are both versions of the text:

Ramsay 1887:	Ramsay 1905:
ΞΕΥΝΗΤΑΝΕΙΞΑΥΨΟ	ΞΕΥΝΗ ΤΑΝΕΙΞ[Α]Υ [Κ]Ο- or ΤΑΝΕΙ ΕΛΥΜΟ-
ΔΑΝΠΟΤΥΣΣ[-]ΣΤΑΜ	ΔΑΝ ΠΟΤΥΣ Σ[.] ΣΤΑΜ-
ΕΝΑΝΜΑΝΚΑΝΑΜΙ	ΕΝΑΝ ΜΑΝΚΑΝ ΑΜΙ-
ΑΞΙΑΝΙΟΙΑΝΑΡΔΟΡΥΚΑ	Α]ΞΙΑΝΙΟΙ ΑΝΑΡ ΔΟΡΥΚ[Α

...

As to the readings, Ramsay remarked in the first article: "One of my copies has M for Ψ in l. 1. Only one letter or part of one is lost at the end of l. 3." In the second publication, Ramsay had more doubts about the first line: "In l. 1 the second last symbol may possibly be M in ligature with O, or Ψ or imperfect K. Professor Sterrett and my copy of 1881 read Ψ; but my copy of 1884, which was made with extremest care, rejected Ψ and read < M in ligature with O >." Why Ramsay opted for K in 1905 is unclear, but this reading was taken over by Calder (1911: 172f.) and included in all later collections of NPhr. inscriptions. No drawings or photographs of this inscription have been published.

From Ramsay's remarks we may conclude that the second last letter of the first line looks like Ψ, but its vertical stroke stands not in the middle of the letter, but a little to the left. Perhaps Ramsay was reluctant to assume Ψ because it was the only occurrence of this letter in NPhr. texts. The reading Ψ is now confirmed by NPhr. inscription No. 116 published by Brixhe and Neu-

<sup>1</sup> The numbers of the NPhr. inscriptions refer to: Haas 1966: 114–129 (Nos. 1–110), Brixhe 1978a: 3–7 (Nos. 111–114), Brixhe – Waelkens (Kadmos 20, 1981, 66–75) (no. 115), Brixhe – Neumann 1985 (no. 116).

mann in 1985. The first part of this inscription reads as follows (as given by the editors on p. 163; I have only corrected a printing error in the first line, where we must read ΟΣΟΣ instead of ΟΣ):

- I     ΞΕΥΝΕΙΟΣΟΣΚΕΔΕΤΟΝ<sup>?</sup>  
 II    ΨΟΛ<sup>?</sup>ΑΝΚΕΤΑΝΣΑΥΝΑΜΑΝ<sup>?</sup>  
 III   ΚΝΟΥΜΑΝΚΑΚΡΟΔΜΑΝΚΕΛΟ<sup>?</sup>  
 IV    ΔΙΜΟΝΜΕΙΟΜΟΝΡΙΑΙΤΙΤΑΙΤΟΑ  
 V     ΜΕΟΝΟΜΑΝΙΑΣΕΝΑΡΚΕΕΡΜΩ<sup>?</sup>  
 VI    ΛΟ<sup>?</sup>Σ<sup>?</sup>ΚΝΑΙΚΟΕΚΑΤΗΑΣ

On the third letter of the second line the editors give the following comment (p. 164): "Une lettre triangulaire dont on aperçoit le sommet et le bas de la haste droite (doublée par un trait accidentel): Δ ou Δ." If we read this letter as Δ and assume that the missing letter at the end of the preceding line is [υ], we get [υ]ψοδαν, the same word as in inscription 15.<sup>2</sup>

The initial υ- of this υψοδαν is surprising. In NPhr., /u/ is generally represented by ου, so that we expect /upsodan/ to be written in NPhr. as \*ουψοδαν. This spelling is theoretically possible in 116, where we have only ./ψοδαν and one or two letters are missing at the end of the preceding line. In inscription 15, however, we must assume a graphic variant with υ- (cf. for this kind of variation μουργουν vs. μμυρα, σεμουν vs. σεμυν, etc.). Note that the digraph ου is not attested in this inscription, and υ is used instead (προτυς, δορυκα[]).

2. In order to determine the function and meaning of (ο)υψοδαν, let us analyze both contexts in more detail. We first look at inscription No. 116, which has been treated in two publications. The editors of the inscription, Brixhe and Neumann (1985), discuss various possibilities of word division and interpretation with great caution, often without expressing their preference. Bajun and Orel (1988: 154ff.), on the contrary, just present their analysis and translation of the inscription, without any discussion. One can find in the article many ingenious suggestions, but, in general, Bajun and Orel treat the material not without violence. The fragility of their analysis already

<sup>2</sup> Bajun and Orel (1988: 154) have already pointed to the possible identity of these words in 15 and 116, although they read in 15 ειξ λυκοδαν.

follows from the rather incomprehensible translation they give on p. 157: "For Xeune he (sc. the husband) (has placed) the ... grave and this ... tomb and on the top of the monument fixes (her) reduced image. To this (image he gives) her name, of which wife Hecatea the husband Hermolaos", etc. (translation from Russian mine).

In my opinion, some progress in elucidating the syntactic structure of the inscription can be made if we take the following considerations into account:

A. Inscription 116 is clearly an epitaph, where different parts of the grave are enumerated. We do not have many NPhr. epitaphs at our disposal, but at least one starts with a name in the dative, 15  $\Xi\upsilon\nu\eta$ , for which see below. It is probable that  $\Xi\upsilon\nu\epsilon$  or  $\Xi\upsilon\nu\epsilon\iota$  is also a dative of this female name, for whom the grave has been made. An additional argument in favour of this interpretation can be found in  $\gamma\omicron\gamma\omicron\mu\alpha\nu\iota\alpha(\varsigma)$  in line 5, which may mean 'the above-mentioned one' in the dat. or gen.sg. feminine. Brixhe and Neumann (1985: 169) take  $\Xi\upsilon\nu\epsilon$  as nom.sg. and analyze the first words as  $\Xi\upsilon\nu\epsilon$   $\text{I}\omicron\varsigma\omicron\varsigma\omicron\varsigma$   $\kappa\epsilon$  'Xeune and Iosos', which seems less plausible because the only candidate for a verb is  $\rho\iota\delta\iota\tau\iota$  in line 4, which stands in the 3sg., and there are hardly any possible datives for the name of the dedicatee. Moreover, it is by no means certain that  $\Xi\upsilon\nu\epsilon$  can be a nominative. In 31, line 3 reads  $\Xi\upsilon\nu\epsilon\omicron\iota\delta\delta\iota\kappa\epsilon\sigma\epsilon\alpha\nu$ , and the interpretation  $\Xi\upsilon\nu\epsilon$   $\omicron\iota$   $\alpha\delta\iota\kappa\epsilon\sigma\epsilon\iota$   $\alpha\nu$ , assumed by Brixhe and Neumann (ibid.), does not provide an easy analysis (note that Neumann 1986 reads  $\Xi\upsilon\nu\epsilon\omicron\iota$   $(\epsilon)\delta\iota\kappa\epsilon\varsigma$   $\epsilon(\omicron)\alpha\nu$   $\mu\alpha\nu\kappa\alpha\nu$  'für Xeuneos [hat er] diesen Stein / diese Stele gestellt'). Also 69  $\Xi\upsilon\nu\epsilon$   $\pi\epsilon\iota\rho$  is unclear.

B.  $\delta\epsilon\tau\omicron\nu$  is likely to be identical with 31  $\delta\epsilon\tau\omicron\nu$  (Brixhe – Neumann 1985: 170). The context of 31 ( $\pi\omicron\upsilon\kappa\rho\omicron\varsigma$   $\mu\alpha\nu\iota\sigma\omicron\upsilon$   $\epsilon\nu\epsilon\pi\alpha\rho\kappa\epsilon\varsigma$   $\delta\epsilon\tau\omicron\nu$ ) suggests the translation 'Pukros, son of Manios, inscribed d.' (on  $\epsilon\nu\epsilon\pi\alpha\rho\kappa\epsilon\varsigma$  'inscriptit' cf. Lejeune 1970: 68). Accordingly,  $\delta\epsilon\tau\omicron\nu$  can mean either 'inscription' or 'monument'. If we assume with Brixhe and Neumann that this word is verbal adj. of the root  $*d^b eH_1-$  ( $*d^b H_1 to-$ ), only the meaning 'monument' seems appropriate (cf. *edaes* 'placed, erected'). We know a few other neuters which are substantivized adjectives in Phrygian, cf.  $\kappa\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu$  'something bad',  $\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\nu$  'something foolish'. It is by no means surprising that Phrygians have two names for a monument,  $\mu\alpha\nu\kappa\alpha$  (probably 'a stele') and  $\delta\epsilon\tau\omicron\nu$  (a generic name for a monument?). Considering the variety of different types of monuments, we can expect that there were many names for them.

C.  $\kappa\nu\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\nu$  is a term for the grave proper. I disagree with Brixhe and Neumann (171) that " $\kappa\nu\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\nu$  semble désigner le tombeau dans son ensemble (emplacement + monument)" because expressions like  $\text{I}\omicron\varsigma$   $\nu\iota$   $\sigma\epsilon\mu\omicron\nu$   $\kappa\nu\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\nu\epsilon\iota$   $\kappa\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu$   $\alpha\delta\delta\alpha\kappa\epsilon\tau$   $\alpha\iota\nu\iota$   $\mu\alpha\nu\kappa\alpha$  'whoever brings harm to  $\kappa\nu\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\nu$  or to the stele' or  $\kappa\nu\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\nu\epsilon\iota$  ...  $\alpha\iota\nu\iota$   $\kappa\omicron\rho\omicron\upsilon$  'to  $\kappa\nu\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\nu$  or to the place (= Gr.  $\chi\omega-$

πος, cf. Brixhe 1983: 129)' would then be incomprehensible. The other argument of Brixhe and Neumann, viz. that "κνουμαν ..., quand il est associé à un autre terme, il figure toujours en première position" (ibid.), is also by no means compelling. The malediction formulae generally concern the grave and the monument on it, so that it is quite natural that κνουμαν is mentioned first. This point is important because these two authors further conclude that κνουμαν cannot be preceded by other names for parts of the grave (cf. for instance on p. 170: "Le second sens [= "monument" of δετον, AL] serait naturellement difficile à admettre ici, puisque le nom ou le groupe de noms désignant le tombeau apparaît plus loin".)

D. In ακροδμαν Brixhe and Neumann recognized "accusatif d'un composé AKPO-ΔΜΑ, comparable au grec μεσό-δμη et désignant une partie du tombeau: "partie supérieure de..." (172). According to Neumann (1988: 22), "akrodma" meant also "Oben – an der Spitze – Gebautes". Since μεσόδμη indicates a part of the building, viz. "tie-beam", from where "a box amidships", in inscriptions also "a shelf built between the floor of the gallery and the roof" (LSJ 1106), it seems conceivable that ακροδμα- is a term for the 'roof' of the grave.<sup>3</sup>

E. The 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) (Brixhe 1978: 1ff.). When more than two members are connected by κε, the only unambiguous way to indicate the relationship between the words is to put κε after each member. In the first four lines of 116 we find κε or κ' four times. Moreover, at the end of line 2 we read ταν σανναμαν [...], followed by κνουμαν in the next line. Due to its ending, σανναμαν cannot be an adjective in acc.sg.n. belonging to κνουμαν (*pace* Bajun – Orel 1988: 154). Rather, σανναμαν is a term for one of the parts of the grave. This means that σανναμαν must have been followed by [κε]. Brixhe and Neumann remark that "à la fin de la ligne II, on ne dispose apparemment pas des 2,5 cm nécessaires pour un ΚΕ" (p. 170), but as we do not really know the original measurements of the stone, this is not a compelling argument.

These considerations lead us to the following analysis: Ξευνε(ι) is the name of the woman, to whom the grave is dedicated, followed by five parts of the grave or monument:

<sup>3</sup> ακροδμαν (κε) is followed by λῶδιμον, which may be an adjective belonging to it (acc.sg.n.). At the end of the third line there is enough space for an I, so that the Phrygian word may also be read λῶ[ι]διμον. Etymologizing words with an unknown meaning is a hazardous business, but if λῶ[ι]διμον contains the suffix -ιμο-, connection with Gr. λοῖσθος 'beam' seems possible (for Phr. -d- < \*-sdʰ- cf. the Phr. ending of 3sg. middle imperative -δο, -δου (lakedo, εγεδου) < \*-sdʰō, Gr. -σθω).

(ι)οσος κε  
 δετον [(ο)υ]ψοδαν κε  
 ταν σαυναμαν [κε]  
 κνουμαν κ  
 ακροδμαν κε

As (ο)υψοδαν cannot be acc.sg.n. of an adjective, it is not congruous with δετον (acc.sg.n.) Therefore, (ο)υψοδαν is likely to be an adverb, characterizing the monument. A probable meaning is ‘above, on the top (scil. of the grave)’. ταν must be a demonstrative pronoun ‘that’ in acc.sg.f., which means that σαυναμα is feminine.

Theoretically, there is another possible analysis of these five parts. If we assume that κε stands after the first word of each syntactic member (cf. 33. αυτος κε ουα κ' εροκα = 36. αυτος κε ουα κ' οροκα ‘and he himself and his progeny (?)’), the division would be different, viz. (ι)οσος κε δετον // [(ο)υ]ψοδαν κε ταν//σαυναμαν [κε], etc. This analysis is less probable, however. Firstly, (ι)οσος can only be acc.sg.n. of the *s*-stems, which would indicate that δετον is an adjective and not a term for (a part of) the monument. Secondly, (ο)υψοδαν is then a part of the grave or monument, which seems difficult to reconcile with the context of inscription 15 (see below).

What are these five parts? Three of them are more or less clear: δετον is probably the monument, κνουμαν is the grave proper, and ακροδμαν is its upper part, the “roof”. Since σαυναμαν stands between δετον ‘monument’ and κνουμαν ‘grave’, it is likely that σαυναμαν is the term for the foundation, the pedestal of the monument. The Phrygian word is reminiscent of Hitt. *šam(a)na-* c. “foundation, foundation-stone”, *šam(a)natar-* n. “foundation, supporting wall” and is probably a borrowing from an Anatolian language. We are left with (ι)οσος, which can be analyzed as acc.sg. of the neuter *s*-stems (cf. acc.sg. βεκος in 111 βας ιοι βεκος μεβερετ “Bas will take his bread away”). The meaning and etymology of this word remain unclear to me.

The analysis of the rest of the inscription goes beyond the scope of this article.

3. The general syntactic structure of inscription 15 is quite transparent. Here, too, the first word is the female name Ξευνη. The ending –η sometimes occurs instead of the usual dat.sg. ending of the consonant stems –ε(ι), cf. κνου|μανη (114) vs. κνουμανε(ι) (passim), ατ τη (6, 39, 62, 65, 86, 114) vs. ατ τι(ε) (passim), so that it is probable that Ξευνη is a dative of the dedicatee. The name is followed by a group, indicating the object in acc.sg. ταν ειξα υψο/δαν προτυς σ[.]σταμ/εναν μανκαν, and then (after unclear αμ|ασιαν) the

subject, the name of the dedicator  $\iota\omicron\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\alpha\rho\ \delta\omicron\rho\upsilon\kappa\alpha\upsilon[\nu\omicron\varsigma]$  ‘her husband Dorykanos’.<sup>4</sup> As in inscription 116,  $\upsilon\psi\omicron\delta\alpha\nu$  belongs to the description of the monument (in this case  $\mu\alpha\nu\kappa\alpha$  ‘stele’), so that the function of an adverb ‘above, high’ seems appropriate. Notwithstanding the fact that  $\epsilon\iota\chi\alpha$ , the reading of which is uncertain (see above, § 1), and  $\pi\rho\omicron\tau\upsilon\varsigma$ <sup>5</sup> remain obscure, the interpretation of  $\upsilon\psi\omicron\delta\alpha\nu$  as a part of the grave or monument, although possible in inscription 116, seems improbable here. For  $\sigma[.] \sigma\tau\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\nu$  we may assume  $\sigma[\epsilon] \sigma\tau\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\nu$ , middle perf. part. of the root  $st\tilde{a}-$  ‘to erect’. The combination of  $\mu\alpha\nu\kappa\alpha$  with the root  $st\tilde{a}-$  is attested two more times in NPhr.: in inscription 31 ...  $\mu\alpha\nu\kappa\alpha\nu\ \iota\alpha\nu\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\epsilon\varsigma\ \beta\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\epsilon$  ... ‘the stele, which he erected for (his) brother’, and probably in 9  $\mu(\alpha)\nu\kappa\alpha\nu\ \omicron\pi\epsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\nu$  (for the reading see Calder 1926: 26).

4. The analysis of the context of inscriptions 15 and 116 shows that  $(\omicron)\upsilon\psi\omicron\delta\alpha\nu$  most probably is an adverb with the meaning ‘above, on the top (*scil.* of the grave)’. As far as its etymology is concerned,  $(\omicron)\upsilon\psi\omicron\delta\alpha\nu$  can be connected with the Greek adverb  $\upsilon\psi\omicron\theta\epsilon(\nu)$  ‘(from) above’ or rather  $*\upsilon\psi\omicron\theta\alpha$ . To be sure, Gr.  $*\upsilon\psi\omicron\theta\alpha$  is not attested, but this may be a matter of chance, since adverbs in  $-\theta\alpha$  (like  $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\theta\alpha$ ,  $\omicron\pi\iota\sigma\theta\alpha$ , etc.) are found in Arcadian, Thessalian, Asiatic Aeolian and the western dialects and are often known only from inscriptions and grammatical treatises (cf. Lejeune 1939: 357). On the other hand, the opposition between  $\epsilon\nu\theta\epsilon\nu$  ‘thence’ and  $\epsilon\nu\theta\alpha$  ‘there, thither’ shows that the Greek adverbs in  $-\theta\epsilon\nu$  had an ablative meaning, whereas those in  $-\theta\alpha$  have a general locative meaning (ibid.: 386), a meaning which better suits the proposed function of Phr.  $\upsilon\psi\omicron\delta\alpha\nu$ . The etymology of the Greek suffix  $-\theta\alpha$  is unclear, but if Lejeune is right that  $-\theta\alpha$  reflects  $*-d^h\eta$ ,  $-\theta\alpha$  would regularly match NPhr.  $-\delta\alpha\nu$ . Another possible explanation is to assume that Phr.  $-\delta\alpha\nu$

<sup>4</sup> For this name see Haas 1966: 106, who compares  $\Delta\omicron\rho\upsilon\kappa\alpha\nu\omega$  in MAMA I: 308. For  $\iota\omicron\iota$  cf. 86, 111  $\beta\alpha\varsigma\ \iota\omicron\iota\ \beta\epsilon\chi\omicron\varsigma\ \mu\epsilon\beta\epsilon\rho\epsilon\tau$  ‘Bas will take his bread away’.

<sup>5</sup> For  $\pi\rho\omicron\tau\upsilon\varsigma$  two explanations have been proposed. One explanation takes  $\pi\rho\omicron\tau\upsilon\varsigma$  as the predicate of the sentence with the meaning ‘made, erected’, cf. Meister 1909: 319, fn. 4 (3sg. sigm. aorist ‘er gab hin, er weihte’), Haas 1966: 106 (‘erbaute’). The obvious flaw of this analysis is the absence of the augment and the ending  $-\epsilon\varsigma$ , which are characteristic of the Phrygian aorist forms. According to the others,  $\pi\rho\omicron\tau\upsilon\varsigma$  is an adverb or a preverb. Ramsay (1905: 115) assumed an adverb ‘in front’, probably having Gr.  $\pi\rho\omicron$  in mind, Diakonoff and Neroznak (1985: 131) saw in  $\pi\rho\omicron\tau\upsilon\varsigma$  a preverb ‘against’, derived from  $*\pi\rho\omicron\tau\iota$ , whereas Bajun and Orel (1988: 140) considered it identical to Gr. Hom.  $\pi\rho\omicron\tau\iota$ , Skt.  $\pi\rho\acute{a}ti$ . Connection with  $\pi\rho\omicron\tau\iota$  is improbable because in the Greek inscriptions of Phrygia we find  $\pi\omicron\sigma\sigma$  /  $\pi\omicron\sigma$  instead of  $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma$  /  $\pi\rho\omicron\delta$ , which is to be explained by the fact that in Phrygian this adverb had the form  $\pi\omicron\sigma$  (cf. Brixhe – Neumann 1985: 176, who point at  $\pi\omicron\sigma\text{-}\epsilon\kappa\alpha\nu\epsilon\varsigma$  in inscription 116). Moreover, the proposed meaning of this adverb does not suit the context: a monument does not stand in front of or against something.

As a theoretical possibility, we can mention that if  $\upsilon\psi\omicron\delta\alpha\nu$  has the function of a preposition,  $\pi\rho\omicron\tau\upsilon\varsigma$  may be acc.pl. of the  $\omicron$ -stems ( $*-ons > *-uns > -us$ ), depending on  $\upsilon\psi\omicron\delta\alpha\nu$ .

is  $-\delta\alpha$  (= Gr.  $-\theta\alpha$ ) + an additional  $-v$ , an explanation which is generally applied to the Greek adverbs in  $-\theta\epsilon\nu$ , viz.  $-\theta\epsilon$  (PIE  $*-d^he$ ) +  $-v$ .

As far as I know, no other forms in  $-\delta\alpha\nu$  are attested in Phrygian. For the sake of completeness, we mention that  $\text{I}\epsilon\delta\alpha\nu$  in NPhr. inscription 114 (Brixhe – Drew-Bear 1978) may represent an adverb in  $-\delta\alpha\nu$ , but the context is too unclear for any conclusions. Here is the text of this inscription (for the segmentation of which cf. also Lubotsky 1989a: 82):

[ $\text{I}\omicron\varsigma$   $\nu\text{I}$   $\sigma\epsilon\mu\omicron\nu$   $\kappa\nu\omicron\upsilon$ ]  $\mu\alpha\nu\eta$   $\kappa\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu$   $\alpha\beta\beta\epsilon$   
 $[\rho\epsilon\tau + 11 \text{ letters}] \omicron\nu$   $\mu\omicron\omicron\varsigma$   $\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ ,  $\text{I}\omicron\varsigma$   
 $[\text{ca. } 14 \text{ letters}] \epsilon\delta\alpha\nu$   $\tau\eta$   $\tau\text{I}$   $\tau[\epsilon$   
 $\tau\text{I}\kappa\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron]$   $\varsigma$   $\epsilon\text{I}\tau\omicron\upsilon$

## References

- Bajun, L.S. – Orël, V.Ė.  
 1988: Jazyk frigijskix nadpisej kak istoričeskij istočnik II. Vestnik drevnej istorii 1988/4, 132–167.
- Brixhe, Cl.  
 1978: Études néo-phrygiennes II. Verbum 1,2, 1–22.  
 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.
- Brixhe, Cl. – Drew-Bear, Th.  
 1978: Un nouveau document néo-phrygien. Kadmos 17, 50–54.
- Brixhe, Cl. – Neumann, G.  
 1985: Découverte du plus long texte néo-phrygien: l'inscription de Gezler Köyü. Kadmos 24, 161–184.
- Calder, W.M.  
 1911: Corpus inscriptionum neo-phrygiarum. JHSt. 31, 161–215.  
 1926: Corpus inscriptionum neo-phrygiarum III. JHSt. 46, 22–28.
- Diakonoff, I.M. – Neroznak, V.P.  
 1985: Phrygian. New York.
- Haas, O.  
 1966: Die phrygischen Sprachdenkmäler. Sofia.
- Lejeune, M.  
 1939: Les adverbes grecs en  $-\theta\epsilon\nu$ . Paris.  
 1970: Les inscriptions de Gordion et l'alphabet phrygien. Kadmos 9, 51–74.
- Lubotsky, A.  
 1988: The Old Phrygian Areyastis-inscription. Kadmos 27, 9–26.

- 1989a: New Phrygian  $\epsilon\tau\iota$  and  $\tau\iota$ . *Kadmos* 28, 79–88.
- 1989b: The syntax of New Phrygian inscription No. 88. *Kadmos* 28, 146–155.
- Meister, R.
- 1909: Die äolischen Demonstrativa  $\delta\upsilon\epsilon$ ,  $\delta\upsilon\iota$ ,  $\delta\upsilon\upsilon$  und die Partikel  $\upsilon\iota$  ( $\upsilon\epsilon$ ) im Phrygischen. *KZ* 25, 312–325.
- Neumann, G.
- 1986: Zur Syntax der neuphyrgischen Inschrift Nr. 31. *Kadmos* 25, 79–84.
- 1988: Phrygisch und Griechisch. (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, 499. Band). Wien.
- Ramsay, W.M.
- 1887: Phrygian inscriptions of the Roman period. *KZ* 28, 381–400.
- 1905: Neo-Phrygian inscriptions. *Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Institutes in Wien* VIII (Beiblatt), 79–120.