

YAROSLAV GORBACHOV

NINE OBSERVATIONS ON THE
OLD PHRYGIAN INSCRIPTION FROM VEZIRHAN¹

With nearly 90 words, the Old Phrygian inscription on a limestone stele unearthed in the vicinity of Vezirhan in historical Bithynia is the largest text in the entire Phrygian corpus – both Old and New. The stele is in the so-called “Greco-Oriental” or “Greco-Persian” style and is datable to the turn of the 5th and 4th centuries BC (Neumann 1997, 14, Brixhe 2004, 42, 66).

In 1997, a preliminary edition of the inscription was undertaken by Günter Neumann, who only treated the inscription’s “epigraphic data” and commented on selected forms (Neumann 1997). Recently, Brixhe published a thorough treatment of the monument in a supplement to his *Corpus des inscriptions paléo-phrygiennes* (Brixhe 2004, 42–67). Much of the text of the Vezirhan stele remains opaque, however, despite its size, satisfactory state of preservation, relative completeness, and the presence of a parallel text in Greek, which appears to be an abbreviated version of the Phrygian inscription. As is always the case with texts in Phrygian, the main problem standing in the way of the interpretation of the Vezirhan inscription is our poor understanding of Phrygian vocabulary. As Neumann (1997, 27) put it, “Was vor allem fehlt, sind die Bedeutungen der wichtigsten Vokabeln”. In what follows, I complement the observations made by Neumann and Brixhe and propose new interpretations of a few individual lexical items on the Vezirhan inscription.

The two editions of the Vezirhan inscription differ from each other, in particular in a few word divisions and in the identification of some of the eroded characters. In some instances Neumann’s reading of the eroded characters appears to allow a better semantic and syntactic interpretation of a sequence than the newer readings proposed by Brixhe. For the reader’s convenience I repeat below the Phrygian and

¹ I am indebted to Jay Jasanoff, Craig Melchert, Jeremy Rau, Brent Vine, Aurelijus Vijūnas, and Ilya Yakubovich for their invaluable comments and suggestions. All remaining errors are mine.

the Greek parts of the inscription from both publications (Neumann 1997, 18 = N, Brixhe 2004, 65 = B). I depart from Neumann's rendition of the Phrygian text in supplying omitted characters in angled brackets «», in separating possible enclitics by hyphenation, and in providing additional tentative word divisions, for which I use the sign (:). I also depart from both editions in transliterating the OPhr. digamma **F** with a *w* as opposed to *v*.

The Phrygian part of the inscription runs as follows:

- 1 N: *sin-t imenan kaliya<s> ti(:)tedat[.....]e[.]ekmo[.]menan[.]a*
B: *sin t' imenan kaliya ti tedat[---]edekm[---]mea(d?)umid*
- 2 N: *iben edatoy dakeran atriyaş(:)dawoi wrekan akiwan*
B: *iben edatoy dakeran atriyaş dawoi okimakıwa[---]*
- 3 N: *wrekan witaran artimitos kraniya-p[...]*
B: *wrekan witaran artimitos kraniya p[---]*
- 4 N: *panta webras adun(:)poş-key estat pator-p ike[.....]an dati*
B: *panṭa webraş adun p(?)os key estat pator[.]ike[...][e[...]]andati*
- 5 N: *way niptiyay daker karatu [.]enpsatus meka aş-k<e>y*
B: *way niptiyay daker karatu enpsatus meka[---]asiya[.]*
- 6 N: *niduş [.]a(:)kaliyay karatu panato ando-p opostoış klaniw*
B: *nidus ad kaliyay karatu panato andopopostoış klam(?)iw[..?]*
- 7 N: *kelmis-ke umniş etewradus dakeraış-key iweraiş*
B: *kelmis ke umnişet ewraduş dakeraış key iweraiş [---]*
- 8 N: *atikwaiu yos-niy(:)art sin-t imenan kaka oşkawos kakey*
B: *atikraiū yos niy art sin ti(?) imenan kaka oşkawos kakey*
- 9 N: *kan dedapitiy tubeti(:)woynewos deragiw mekaş-key*
B: *kan de dapitiy tubeti woy kewos deraliw mekaş key*
- 10 N: *kowis abretoy(:)nun ibeyn erotan niptiyan girun mireyun*
B: *kow(?)is abretoy nun ibey new(?)otan niptiyan sirun mireyun*
- 11 N: *iwimun inmeney asenan daket torwetun şirayay(:)niyooy*
B: *iwimun inmeney aş enan daket torwetun Tiray² ayni yoy*
- 12 N: *tubnuw newos mederitoy koris-ke abretoy(:)nun oynew*
B: *tubnuw newos mederitoy koris ke abretoy nun oynew*
- 13 N: *yos(:)isekoşos şemeney pupratoy weban ituw*
B: *yos isekosos Temeney² dupratoy weban ituw*

² † = [ts] (cf. Brixhe 2004, 43).

The Greek text is as follows:

- 1 Καλλίας Ἀβικτου παῖς ηἰ (?)
- 2 μηγημας ἀνέ-
- 3 θεκεν. ὅστις (for -θηκεν)
- 4 τὸ ἱερόν κακουρ(γ)ετήσαι ἔδρυν (for ἦ)
- 5 ἐκ(κ)όψαι, μὴ βίος μὴ γόνος γίνοι[ντ]ο,
- 6 καὶ τῷ ἀναγινώσκοντι ἐνθ- (for τῷ)
- 7 ἄδε ἦκοντι πολ(λ)ὰ καὶ ἀγαθὰ

Translation of the Greek text: “Kallias, son of Abiktos, set up ηἰ μηγημας.³ Who does evil around this sanctuary or fells a tree, may neither livelihood nor offspring be produced (for him), and for him who comes and acknowledges/reads (it) – (may) much good (be produced).”

1. *ti*

In the sequence *titedat*[...] a particle or adverb *ti* is clearly segmentable, as observed by Neumann himself (1997, 20, cf. also Brixhe 2004, 51). It is not likely to be the same word as NPhr. *τι*, however (*contra* Brixhe). The latter appears to function as an emphatic particle, generally occurring in the apodosis of malediction formulae, where it immediately precedes the adjective (?) *δρεγρουν* (nos 33, 76, 108) or else a middle participle in *-μενος* (*passim*) (Lubotsky 1989a, 86). Incidentally, NPhr. *τι* usually geminates the following consonant, cf. *τι τετικμενος* (nos 2, 3, 6, 7, 36, 75, 112) and *τι γγεγαριτμενο(ς)* (no. 88), etc., hence its suggested preform **tid*, a contamination of PIE **tod* and **id* (Lubotsky 1989a, 82, 86f.).

2. *tedat*[oy]

The remaining part is a verb form *tedat*[...] corresponding to the Gk. aorist ἀνέθηκεν ‘set up, dedicated’. Neumann restores *t-edat*[oy], a form which is actually attested in another OPhr. inscription (W-01/ Areyastis). It may also be compared with the simplex *edatoy* in line 2 of the Vezirhan inscription (Neumann 1997, 20). As for the preverb *t-*, cf. *t-edaes* (W-08) vs. *edaes* (*passim*). Brixhe–Drew–Bear (1982, 72) equate the OPhr. preverb *t-* with OIr. *do-* < **to-*. Whether or not this identification is correct remains an open question. In any

³ The sequence ηἰ μηγημας is enigmatic. Brent Vine suggested to me that ηγημα ‘could perhaps be read as Gk. ἡγημα – see L[iddell]–S[cott]–J[ones] s.v.: attested at “Inscr. Perg. [246.27]” – in a meaning ‘that which guides’ (hence here ‘instruction document, [set of] instructions/guidelines’ *vel sim.*?); also in the Septuagint as ‘thought, purpose’” (Vine, e-mail communication).

event, it is clear that the OPhr. preverb *t-* is the functional analogue of ἄν(α)- ‘on, up (to)’ in Gk. ἀνέθηκεν.

Brixhe (2004, 53f.) is perplexed by *edatoy* (with its augment and what appears to be a *primary* middle ending) and does not venture a definitive morphological analysis of the form. Indeed, as was observed by Lubotsky in his treatment of the Areyastis inscription, the OPhr. 3. sg. middle ending *-toy* tends to occur in forms that look augmented,⁴ and he rightly analyzes *tedatoy* as *t-e-datoy* (Lubotsky 1988, 14, 24). The preterital value of (*t*)*edatoy* is now confirmed by Gk. (ἀν)έθηκεν. It is a descriptive fact, then, that OPhr. *-toy* functions as a secondary ending, which rules out its derivation from IE **-toi* (*contra* Lubotsky 1988, 14, and Brixhe 2004, 53). The NPhr. data show us that Phrygian retained the original PIE middle ending **-tor*.⁵ In other words, Phrygian did not participate in the Germanic /Greco-Indo-Iranian innovation which replaced the primary **-r* of the middle endings with the primary **-i* of the active endings (**-to-r* → **-to-i*). And since the Phrygian corpus does not appear to contain secure instances of the PIE secondary middle ending **-to*,⁶ it just might be the case that OPhr. *-toy* is in fact the reflex of PIE **-to* (by an Auslautgesetz?).

Brixhe (2004, 52) wonders whether *tedat*[...] might be a reduplicated perfect – either active (*tedat* = Gk. τέθηκε) or middle (*tedatoy* = Gk. τέθειται), both continuing a full-grade **d^hed^heh₁-*. Both suggestions run into difficulties. To begin with, an active perfect form with a secondary ending of the *mi*-series is unexpected. If anything, **d^hed^heh₁-t* would have been a perfect injunctive, cf. PIE pluperfect **e-b^heb^hoi_j-t* > Ved. *abibhet* ‘was afraid’ (for a detailed discussion of reduplicated stems with secondary endings attested in the historical

⁴ Cf. *e-statoy* (G-144), *e-gertoy* (W-01c), *e-datoy* (Vezirhan, line 2), *t-e-datoy* (W-01a), possibly also *e-ktetoy*, *an-e-paktoy* (B-01/Germanos), and *mederitoy* (Vezirhan, line 12) which may contain *e-deritoy*.

⁵ To be sure, there are NPhr. primary (present indicative or subjunctive?) forms in *-toi* and *-tai* (beside *-toq*), e.g., ἀββερετοι (in no. 91 and in the Kilise-Orhaniye inscription edited by Haspels 1971, 321f.), ἀββερεται (nos 6, 13), and δακεται (no. 67). It should be noted, however, that such forms are extremely rare. They must owe their shape to the strong Greek influence in the Neo-Phrygian period.

⁶ The only candidate for an OPhr. secondary middle *-to* that I am aware of occurs in the obscure form *siTeto*, which is attested in the three inscriptions of the Çepni group (Gelincik Kayası, Ay Tepesi Kayası, and Gencil Yatağı). Here, it always occurs in collocation with the word *alus* (cf. Brixhe–Drew–Bear 1982). These three inscriptions have not been interpreted, and there is no guarantee that *siTeto* is even a verb form. NPhr. ἀββιρετο (no. 25) is attested in a stereotyped context where ἀββερετο or αδδακετο usually occur and must therefore be a scribal error.

IE languages cf. Jasanoff 2003, 34–44). A strong-stem middle perfect $*d^b ed^b eh_1$ -to would also be ill-formed in any old IE language. Finally, as we have seen, it is preferable to analyze *t-* as a preverb and *e-* as the augment, and so the assertion that *te-* is a reduplicating syllable is quite doubtful. The phonology is likewise problematic: it remains to be shown whether Grassmann's law ($d^b \dots d^b \dots > d \dots d^b \dots$) actually operated in Phrygian, and, furthermore, no attempts to demonstrate a Phrygian Lautverschiebung ($*d > t$, etc., cf. most recently Lubotsky 2004) have been very convincing.

Taking *tedatoy* from the middle imperfect $*ded^b h_1 to$ (thus Diakonoff–Neroznak 1985, 102) is flatly contradicted by the known Phrygian sound laws: it has been securely established that the PIE vocalic interconsonantal and word-initial laryngeals have the same reflexes in Phrygian as in Greek ($*h_1 > e$, $*h_2 > a$, $*h_3 > o$), while $*eh_1$ and $*ē$ both yield *a* (cf. Lubotsky 1988, 14ff. with examples and literature). It would be simplest, then, to see in OPhr. *(t)edatoy* a full-grade middle root aorist $*e-d^b eh_1$ -to, which, incidentally, represents a well-established PIE type (cf. Av. *mantā* < PIE $*(e-)men$ -to 'remembered', Av. *varātā* < PIE $*(e-)uel$ -to 'chose', and, perhaps, Hitt. *merta* – if from PIE $*(e-)mer$ -to 'died'). This full-grade form is not isolated in Phrygian: OPhr. *e-statoy* (G-144) < $*e-steh_2$ -to and *e-gertoy* (W-01c) – if from $*e-h_1 ger$ -to⁷ – reflect the same morphological type.

3. *iman/imen-*

At the end of line 1 Neumann (1997, 20) read [...] *menan* [.].a. Brixhe (2004, 46) believes that Neumann missed a character after *me* and suggests reading the sequence as *meḡumid* or *meḡumid*. Correct or not, Brixhe's reading does not lend itself to any sensible semantic or syntactic interpretation, but there is a way to interpret the opening passage as Neumann read it. Obviously, taking [...] *menan* as the acc. sg. of a middle participle in -μενος as Neumann thought leads to syntactic problems: if [...] *menan* were a middle participle, it would be an accusative feminine modifying either the noun *iben* or the noun *[t²]ekmo[r]*⁸ – both objects of *edatoy* 'set up' in line 2 (on the sentence

⁷ Thus Janda (1997, 276f.), who translates the form as 'erected', cf. Gk. ἐγείρω 'wake up' < $*h_1 ger$ -iē/o-.

⁸ Restoring *[t]ekmo[r]* 'τέκμων' (also attested in OPhr. P-04a) is suggested as a possibility by Neumann (*loc. cit.*). Gk. τέκμων/τέκμαρ is normally taken from PIE $*k^u ek$ - 'see, notice' (cf. Ved. *cāṣṭe* 'sees', *cākṣus*- 'eye', etc.). Since PIE $*k^u$ gives Phr. *k* (cf. NPhr. *nos* < $*k^u os$, -*ue* < $*-k^u e$), OPhr. *tekmor* 'sign' or 'boundary' would have to be a borrowing from early Greek (cf. Hom. Gk. τέκμων, Gk.

boundaries see below). Note, however, that the accusative *iben* can only be a neuter form (as is $[t]ekmo[r]$ if Neumann's restoration is correct⁹). The sequence [...]menan must therefore be another noun rather than a modifier. Judging by its ending, it is either a masculine consonant stem accusative in *-an* < **-m*, or a feminine *ā*-stem accusative in *-an* < **-ā-m*. It seems likely that [...]menan is in fact a repeated masculine acc. sg. *imen-an* (nom. sg. *iman*¹⁰) 'monument, stele', 'foundation' or 'sanctuary' (the possible meaning of *iman* is discussed below).

At least some sentences on the Vezirhan inscription are verb-final, so the second sentence, like the first one, may end with $(t)edatoy$. We would then have two sentences of almost identical structure: *sin-t imenan Kaliya(s) ti tedat[oy. ...]e [tʰ]ekmo[rʰ iʰ]menan [.]a iben edatoy* which would translate 'this here $(-t)$ ¹¹ *iman* – Kallias has set up/dedicate[d. ... the $tʰ]ekmo[rʰ$, the $iʰ]man$, $[an]dʰ$ the *iben* – (he) has set up'.

4. art

The Greek inscription clearly serves as an abridged version of the Phrygian text, intended for passers-by who had no command of Phrygian: it simply gives the gist of the most important bits of the Phrygian text, introducing Kallias as the establisher of the monument and then skipping right to the curse against potential desecrators: ὅστις περὶ τὸ ἱερόν κακουργετήσῃ, ἢ δρῶν ἐκκόψῃ 'whoever does evil around the sanctuary, or chops down a tree'. Neumann (1997, 23) and Brixhe (2004, 59) correctly identify the protasis of the Phrygian malediction formula: *yosniy art sint imenan kaka oskawos kakey kan dedapitiy tubeti* etc., starting in line 8. As was correctly seen

τέκμαρ), along with OPhr. *kurjanejon* (Gk. **χορῳανέγων > χοιρανέων* (Lubotsky 1988, 23)), OPhr. *lawag-e-ta-ei* (Myc. *ra-wa-ke-ta*, Gk. **λαγᾶγέτᾱς > λαγέτᾱς*), OPhr. *wanakt-ei* / NPhr. *owanakt-an* (Myc. Gr. *wa-na-ka*, dat.-loc. *wa-na-ka-te*, Gk. $(f)\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\acute{\xi}$, $(f)\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\kappa\tau-$), NPhr. *owranion* (Gk. *οὐράνιος*), etc.

⁹ Brixhe (2004, 53) reads [...]edekm[...] and invokes NPhr. *dekmonutais* (no. 9) and *dekmonutais* (no. 31), "possibles accusatifs pluriels qui apparaissent, comme ici, en contexte funéraire" (sic).

¹⁰ Cf. *iman* (G-210, G-274, P-01), *tadoy:imanbagun* (G-136), *wasous imanmekas ... dewos-ke mekas* (P-03), *iman ... edaes mekas* (P-04c), etc.; cf. also the Phrygian PN *Iman* (Zgusta 1964, 195f.). For a discussion of the inscriptions containing *iman* see Brixhe 1974 where he concludes, unconvincingly, that in addition to a *masculine* anthroponym in **-mēn* (e.g., on potsherds) there also was a *neuter* appellative in **-mē* (e.g., in P-03).

¹¹ The Phr. deictic particle *-t(i)* attached to declined pronominal forms is discussed in Lubotsky 1988, 18f. and Brixhe 2004, 50f.

already by Neumann, *yos-niy* is the indefinite pronoun ‘whoever’. It also occurs in the OPhr. inscription P-04a (*ios-ni akenan egeseti*) and is especially richly attested in the NPhr. period in the protasis of the stereotyped malediction formula: *ιος-νι σεμο(ν)ν κνουμαν(ε)ι κακο(ν)ν αδ(δ)ακετ(οο)/αββερετ(οο)*, *τος-νι* etc. ‘whoever does/brings evil to this tomb, [may] that one’.¹²

Neumann’s tentative suggestion that we might analyze OPhr. *art* further as containing the enclitic *-t* is hardly correct, and there is nothing to recommend his idea that *art* is some unspecified adverb or a particle cognate with Gk. ἄρ. For Brixhe (2004, 60) *art* is the predicate of the protasis, a syncopated form of a 3. sg. **aret* cognate with Gk. αἴρω, fut. ἄρεῖ ‘lift, remove; destroy’. Observe, however, that the protasis of the Greek text does not contain a verb with such a meaning. In short, both scholars fail to realize that the beginning of the Greek malediction (ὅστις ...) is a word-for-word translation of at least the outset of the Phrygian curse (*yosniy* ...):

ὅστις περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν κακουργετήσαι, ἢ δοῦν ἐκκόψαι
yosniy art sin-t imenan kaka oskawos kakey ... dedapitij tubeti
 ‘whoever around this *iman* commits bad things ...’

If the above juxtaposition is correct, two conclusions immediately follow: 1) *imen-* is the Phrygian equivalent of Greek ἱερὸν, and 2) the sequence *art*, ‘sandwiched’ between the recognizable *yos-niy* ‘ὅστις’ and *sin-t imenan* ‘τὸ ἱερὸν’, corresponds to the Greek preposition περὶ. I propose that OPhr. *art* is a preposition meaning ‘around’ or ‘near’ and taking the accusative case.

If Neumann was right in analyzing *art* as *ar-t*, then the PP *ar-t sin-t imenan* would mean ‘precisely around this here *iman*’. There is another possibility, however: Phr. *art* ‘near, around’ may be cognate with the Arm. adverb *ard* ‘just now’ and the Gk. adverb ἄρτι ‘eben, gerade’, both providing good formal and semantic matches with the proposed Phr. preposition. Jay Jasanoff also reminds me of the Lithuanian adverb *artì* ‘nearby; nearly, almost’. It is worth noting that the Lith. adverb *artì*, unlike its Armenian and Greek counterparts, has also developed prepositional usages along lines similar to Phrygian: as a preposition it may mean ‘about’ (temporal, = *apiẽ*) and ‘near, beside’ (spatial, = *priẽ*).¹³ The latter meaning neatly

¹² Cf. nos 3, 4, 4b, 6, 7, 12, 14, 25, 28, 40, 53, 57, 61, 68, 73, 82, 86, 87, 88, 99, etc.

¹³ Lith. *artì* and its dialectal variant *artiẽ* are frozen case forms of the historical *ti*-stem noun *artis*, *-iẽs* ‘proximity’. Cf. also *ārtis*, *-čio* and *artjybė* ‘id.’, *ārtimas* ‘close, near’, *artjyn* ‘in die Nähe’, *iš arti* ‘at close range’, *artėti* ‘be close’, etc. Gk. ἄρτι ‘just’ likewise is a historical case form, presumably the instrumental **h₂er-*

matches the semantics of the proposed Phr. preposition *art* in the above syntagma.

5. The meaning of *iman*

As regards the equation OPhr. *iman* = Gk. ἱερόν, the Greek word does not make it much easier to define the semantics of OPhr. *iman*. The meaning of Gk. ἱερόν is notoriously broad, encompassing a range of consecrated or sacralized items, such as offerings or objects under divine protection (cult images, holy places, sacred grounds, temples, etc.). Yet it does clarify at least one thing for us: if the above equation *iman* = ἱερόν is correct, the meaning ‘inscription’ tentatively suggested by Neumann (1997, 20) is effectively eliminated from the list of options.

There are three more possibilities. Brixhe (2004, 51) suggests ‘monument’ or ‘stele’. Alternatively, *iman* might designate the sacred area around or behind the stele rather than the slab itself. The mention of a tree in the Greek text hints at a grove around the stele, and that may well be the meaning of Phr. *iman*: a ‘sanctuary’ or a ‘holy ground’, if not exactly a ‘holy grove’. And if Neumann’s plausible restoration of [.]*ekmo*[.] as [t]*ekmo*[r] in the same sentence were to be confirmed, then *tekmor* ‘sign, boundary (mark)’ might refer to the actual orthostat (stele). The top portion of the Vezirhan stele carries an image of a goddess with symmetrically arranged birds on the shoulders and two lying lions on either side, while the inscription itself makes mention of Artemis in line 3 in the genitive: *artimitos* (Neumann 1997, 13, 20f., Brixhe 2004, 43, 55f.). It is not impossible that the stele may have marked a sacred grove and a sanctuary dedicated to the πόντια θηρῶν. Such sacred groves were known from other places all over the Greek world and beyond.¹⁴ Some of

ti-h₁ having lost its laryngeal in pausa. Alternatively it may be the locative of an archaic acrostic *t*-stem **h₂er-t-*, **h₂r-et-*. Yet, most *t*-stems were fixed as *ti*-stems already in a distant past, and the compound form in Greek is, of course, ἄρτι-. cf. Gk. ἄρτι-φεπής ‘des Wortgefüges kundig’, ἄρτι-πούς ‘mit gesunden Füßen’, etc. Pokorny and Fraenkel derive Lith. *artis* and Gk. ἄρτι from PIE **ar-ti-*, **r-ti-* (i.e., **h₂er-ti-*, **h₂r-tej-*) ‘Zusammenfügung’ and see cognates in Lat. *ars*, *artis* ‘Kunst’, *artiō* ‘fest zusammenfügen, zusammenpressen’, Ved. *ṛtí-* ‘Art, Weise’, etc., and ultimately in Ved. *ṛtá-* ‘passend, recht’, *ṛtá-m* ‘wohlgefügte, heilige Ordnung’ and Av. *aša-* ‘was recht, wahr ist’ (IEW, 56f.; LEW, 17).

¹⁴ To mention a few: a cypress grove on Mt. Lycone with a sanctuary on the top devoted to Artemis Orthia (i.e., ‘the upright’ or ‘of the steep’); Saronia – a grove and a festival sacred to Artemis at Troizen; a grove of Artemis at Epidauros; a cypress and pine grove at Oiantheia in Phokis; a grove at Hestiaia on Euboea;

them had steles carrying inscriptions, as Artemisium in Euboea (cf. Plutarch, Themistocles 8.3–5, transl. by Marr 1998, 25f.).

The Anatolian look of the word suggests a third possibility – in addition to ‘orthostat’ and ‘sacred grove/ground’. Ilya Yakubovich (pers. comm.) draws my attention to Urart. *imena-* = Sum. É.URU₄ ‘foundation’ (cf. Salvini 2002, 339, 340).¹⁵ Incidentally, if OPhr. *iman* is indeed a borrowing, its ablauting stem *imanli(n)men*¹⁶ has to be secondary. The alternation would be due to the morphological assimilation of the loanword to the ablaut pattern of inherited hysterokinetic animate *men*-stems: **-ménl/*-m(e)n-* (cf. Gk. ὑμήν, -μένος ‘membrane’, λιμήν, -μένος ‘harbor’, ποιμήν, -μένος ‘shepherd’, etc.).¹⁷

6. *kaka* and *akey*

Kaka clearly is a substantivized nom. pl. neuter: ‘bad things, *mala*’. We expect to see a verb meaning ‘do, inflict’ *vel sim.*, with which *kaka* would make up a VP corresponding to Gk. **κακουργετέω* ‘do evil, work wickedness’.¹⁸ The expected Phrygian 3. sg. verb, however, does not readily present itself. Neumann (1997, 23) suggested that it is to be seen in *akey*, “wenn in *kaka* ... *akey* eine figura etymologica vorläge”. He compares the ending *-ey* with that in OPhr. *lakedokey* (W-01b). Brixhe (2004, 60) agrees that *akey* is a 3. sg. verb. While it is not unprecedented that a verb might be derived from an adjective meaning “bad” (cf. Gk. *κακώω* ‘mistreat; spoil’, *κακίζω* ‘abuse; reproach’, Ger. *verschlechtern* ‘worsen’, etc.), the identification of Phr. *akey* as a 3. sg. verb remains unlikely. Such

Artemisium Nemorensis – the sacred grove of Diana Nemorensis near the lake of Nemi in Latium; etc.

¹⁵ There have been other attempts to find an Anatolian source for OPhr. *iman*, cf. Bajun’s unconvincing proposal to equate OPhr. *iman* with Hitt. *himma-* ‘cultic object; ritual substitute/model in a sacrifice’, and with the HLuw. verb *a(n)ta imani-*, for which she suggests the meaning **‘substitute’* → *‘usurp’* (Bajun 1992, 134f.).

¹⁶ In addition to the acc. sg. *imen-an* (Vezirhan, line 1) and dat. sg. *inmen-ey* (line 11), cf. also the relational adjective *imen-eya* (G-183).

¹⁷ It is interesting to note that the ablaut in the *men*-suffix was all but eliminated in Neo-Phrygian in favor of the vowel in the nominative-accusative: cf. NPhr. nom. sg. *κνουμα* (no. 9), *κνουμα* (no. 18), *κνουμαν* (no. 116) ‘tomb’ and dat. sg. *σεμο(υ)ν κνουμανει* ‘to this tomb’ (nos 3, 10, 14, 34, 88, 101, 105, etc.), *κνουμανι* (nos 7, 12, 25, 36, etc.), *κνουμανε* (nos 6, 26, 28, 40, 97, etc.); cf. also *ται κολταμανει* (no. 18). I am aware of only one instance of a retained *e*-grade in the suffix in an oblique case: gen. sg. *κνουμινος* (no. 5) for *-μενος*.

¹⁸ A denominative from **κακουργάτης* or **κακουργέτης* ‘malefactor’ ← *κακό-* + *εργάτης* (cf. *εργάτης* ‘negotiator’ and *εὐεργέτης* ‘benefactor’).

a *figura etymologica* ('to "bad" some bad things') would be without parallel in any IE tradition, and, more crucially, the Phrygian 3. sg. active indicative (and, perhaps, also subjunctive) is known to end in *-et* < PIE **-eti*, not *-ey* (cf. OPhr. *daψet* (W-01b), NPhr. αββερετ (nos 6, 13), εγερετ (no. 30), ισγεισχετ (no. 88),¹⁹ (αδ)δαχετ (*passim*),²⁰ etc.). The sequence *lakedokey* does not contain a 3. sg. *dokey*, despite attempts to show otherwise.²¹

It is difficult to make any definitive claims here beyond stating that *kakey* is hardly a verb form: the opacity of the Phrygian passage retards any positive analysis. It is not entirely out of the question that *kakey* is an adverb to be compared with the NPhr. adverb(?) *κακε* or *κακεν*²²; cf. *κακε* αδ(δ)αχετ (no. 21, 88, 99), *κακεν* αδ(δ)αχετ(ορ) (no. 40, 97), *κακιν* αδαχετ (no. 14), and possibly also *κακευν* αδαχετ (no. 45).

7. *tubeti*

The idea that *dedapitiy* (a *verbum destruendi*?) and *tubeti* may be 3. sg. verb forms (thus Neumann 1997, 23) has more merit. On the face of it, *tubeti* looks like the counterpart of Gk. ἐκκόψαι 'chop down' and possibly a borrowing from Luwian *tūb(a)i-* 'strike' (cf. CLuw. 3. sg. *dūpiti*, 3. pl. *dūpainti*, HLuw. *tupi-*, *tupa[i]-*, Lyc. *tubidi*, *tubeiti*), although it does not have to be an Anatolian loanword.²³ The

¹⁹ Unless it is to be interpreted as a perfect comparable to Gk. εἴσχηκε (cf. Lubotsky 1989b, 152f.).

²⁰ NPhr. *δαχετ* (*passim*) may well be a preterit (the perfect?). Lubotsky (1997, 25) has observed that in the quasi-bilingual inscription 48 the form *αδδαχετ* corresponds to the Gk. aor. *παρεθέμην*, and that we have at least one other instance of a preterit in the protasis of a malediction: the aor. *εγδαεξ* in inscription 18. NPhr. *δαχετ* may thus be cognate with the Lat. perfect *fēcit* (both from **d^heh₁-k-e-*), in which case its *-t* would be a secondary ending. His analysis, however, cannot apply to the other forms in *-et*.

²¹ Thus, Janda (1997, 274) segments the complex as *la ke-dokey* and derives it from an unlikely **leh₁ ke-dh₃kei* 'der soll sich nicht hingeben'. An equally unconvincing analysis is due to Lubotsky, who proposes *lakedo-key* 'may he be cursed' (cf. Dor. Gk. *λακέω* 'utter, ordain') with an imperative ending *-do* < **-d^ho* supposedly cognate with Gk. 3. sg. impv. mid. *-σθω* (thus already Haas 1966, 89, 236) and a clitic *-key*, which Lubotsky unconvincingly equates with the Gk. modal particle *κεν* (Aeol., Cyp. *κεν*), Russ. *-ka*, and Lith. *-k(i)* (Lubotsky 1988, 21f.; cf. also Woudhuizen 1993, 6).

²² For the fluctuation between the spellings *e* and *ey* in the inscription cf. *pos-key* (line 4), *dakerais-key* (line 7), *mekas-key* (line 9) vs. *kelmis-ke* (line 7) and *koris-ke* (line 12); perhaps also *iben* (line 2) vs. *ibeyn* (line 10).

²³ LIV² (602f.), following IEW (1034) and Oettinger (1979, 417, 535), sets up *(s)*tup-ǵéló-* (cf. Gk. *τύπτω* 'stoße, steche', Lat. *stupeō* 'staune'). The preform *(s)*tup-ǵéló-* cannot be correct: the inflection of the Luwian verb points to a causative/

semantics of the verb *tūb(a)i-* in the Luwian languages ranges from ‘strike, beat (the earth)’ to ‘strike down, vanquish; afflict, damage’ and ‘chisel away’ (with the preverb *ARHA*), or ‘incise, engrave’ (with *anda*). For some attestations of Luw. *tūb(a)i-* and Lyc. *tub(e)i-* see Gorbachov 2005, 52f., endn. 15. The general notion of hacking or striking (down) overlaps with the notion expressed by Gk. κόπτω. This interpretation of *tubeti* as a Luwianism, or even simply as a verb meaning ‘chop (down)’, must remain provisional, however, until its object, ‘a tree’, can be securely identified in the Phrygian text.

Noteworthy is the presence of the primary *-i* in the OPhr. ending (cf. the NPhr. *i*-less forms just cited). If OPhr. *egeseti* (P-04b) is a verb form, as it certainly appears to be,²⁴ and if it is the same form as NPhr. εγεσιτ (no. 58) (see Lubotsky 1988, 13, 18ff., Neumann 1997, 25), then the apocope of *-i* may be demonstrated to have occurred in the post-Old-Phrygian period. NPhr. δαδιτι (no. 9) occurs in an obscure context and may not be a 3. sg. verb.

8. *kowis abretoy*

The sequence *abretoy* in lines 10 and 12 is taken to be a syncopated and de-geminated **ad-b^heretoj*, i.e., the same form as NPhr. αββερετοι (cf. Brixhe 2004, 62). The alleged syncope, which is absent at a later stage of the language, makes this identification somewhat suspect. And even if *abretoy* is in fact a form of **b^her-elo-*, it is hardly the same form as NPhr. αββερετοι. NPhr. -τοι is an aberrant primary ending (cf. fn. 5), the normal NPhr. form being -τοϝ, whereas OPhr. -toy in *abretoy* is a regular ending, most likely secondary as discussed above.

I owe to Brent Vine the following astute observation: the presumed rho in *koriske* in line 12 may actually be a botched digamma. If correct, this emendation makes the sequence *koris-ke abretoy* look almost identical with *kowis abretoy* in line 10. And if one were to assume further that OPhr. *kowis* contains the PIE root **kouH-* (of Gk. κοέω ‘notice’, Skt. *kavi-* / Av. *kauii-* ‘seer, poet’, Lat. *caveō*

iterative in **-éje/o-* (cf. the 3. pl. in *-ainti*, not *-i(ia)nti!*), while the lenition of *p* is out of place before a stressed vowel. Melchert sets up PAnat. **(s)toṃb^h-éje/o-*, to be compared with Gk. στρυφερίζω ‘strike hard, thrust; maltreat’ (Melchert 1994, 242). If Melchert is correct in positing a PIE archetype with a **b^h*, OPhr. *tubeti* does not have to be a Luwian borrowing. It may continue a PIE *tudáti*-present **(s)tub^h-é-ti*.

²⁴ The passage is *iosni akenan egeseti*, where *akenan* looks like the direct object of *egeseti* (contra Lubotsky 1988, 13). For more potential subjunctive forms in *-seti* see Lubotsky 1988, 12.

‘watch out’, OCS *čujō* ‘perceive’, etc.) and has a basic sense ‘perceive, be aware of’ *vel sim.*, then *kowis* might be an adjective (or a noun used appositionally?) meaning (roughly) ‘being aware of, cognizant of, perceiving’. If, then, *abretoy* was built not with **ad-*, but with **ap(o)-* (plus voicing assimilation and de-gemination), it could mean ‘took away, stole’, in which case *kowis abretoy* could be similar to phraseology in Latin legal sanctions involving sacred groves etc. like *sciens abstulit*, referring to someone who ‘knowingly/with full realization stole [something] out [of the grove]’ (Vine, e-mail communication).

9. *pupratoy*

Neumann and Brixhe make no attempt to parse the concluding clause – perhaps because the last lines are very opaque and it is not quite clear just where that last sentence exactly begins. The possible presence of *yos* ‘who(ever)’ (*yos isekosos Tēmeney pupratoy weban ituw*) suggested to Neumann the protasis of a second curse, but he did not exclude the possibility that *yos* in fact continues the sequence *new-* in the previous line, with which it makes up a form *newyos*.

Irrespective of where the concluding sentence begins, the verb *pupratoy* and the sequence *weban ituw* (or at least *ituw* ‘may he become’, on which more below) make it very likely that we indeed are looking at another malediction, or else at the continued enumeration of transgressions which begins at *yos-niy art sin-t imenan kaka* in line 8.

I see two ways of parsing the last part of the final sentence beginning at *Tēmeney* (*Tēmeney pupratoy weban ituw*). Neumann was undoubtedly right in suggesting that *Tēmeney* is an *n*-stem dative, while *ituw* is the same imperative form as the amply attested NPhr. εἶτου ‘may he become’ (Neumann 1997, 25f.) < PIE **h₁ejtōd* ‘may he go’?²⁵ The meaning of Phr. *weban* has yet to be established,²⁶ but

²⁵ It has been suggested that Phr. εἶτου/*ituw* is a form of PIE **h₁ej-* ‘go’ (in the sense ‘become’) rather than **h₁es-* ‘be’ (thus already Haas 1938 *apud* Haas 1966, 89); cf. also Brixhe 2004, 64). The semantic development ‘go’ → ‘become’ is not unusual: cf. the Latin future passive infinitive of the type *captum iri*, and, closer to home, English expressions such as *go crazy*, *go bad*, etc. If so, Phr. εἶτου/*ituw* has to continue a full-grade **h₁ejtōd* (cf. Skt. *etu* ‘go!’) rather than a zero-grade **h₁itōd* (cf. Gk. ἴτω) favored by Brixhe, because the NPhr. spellings εἶτου (ca. x30, *passim*) and ηἶτου (no. 5) suggest a long *i* (hence */itū/*).

²⁶ The form *weban* occurs in the NPhr. corpus at least two times: in inscriptions no. 30 (οὐεβαν) and no. 48 (οὐθβαν or οὐωβαν). Lubotsky (1997, 117) has elegantly amended ΟΥΘΒΑΝ to ΟΥΕΒΑΝ. Haas (1966, 98, 111) interpreted οὐεβαν εγερετ (no. 30) and οὐθβαν αδδακετ (no. 48) as synonymous with κακον αδδακετ

if – as seems very likely – it forms one clause with *ituw*, we have the apodosis of a malediction. The first possible interpretation of the concluding syntagma is:

- (1) '[... he who] *pupratoy* to the *Ṭeman* (Dat.), may he become *weban*!'

A second possibility would be to take *weban* as the direct object of *pupratoy* as do Lubotsky 1997 (cf. fn. 26) and Brixhe (2004, 64), while *Ṭemeney* would be an adjunct meaning 'on/in the *Ṭeman*', with locative meaning:

- (2) '[... he who] *pupratoy* the *weba* on the *Ṭeman* (Loc.), may he become ...!'

Under this latter interpretation we would have to posit that the argument of *ituw* 'let he become' was omitted by the inscriber of the stele:

- (2a) '[... he who] *pupratoy* the *weba* on the *Ṭeman*, may he become [accursed?]

We will return to these two possibilities shortly.

Neumann tentatively identifies *pupratoy* as a 3. sg. middle verb form, which seems very plausible (cf. fn. 4). According to Brixhe (2004, 50) the first character is "très certainement une lettre triangulaire". He suggests a *d*, but at the same time he admits that it is eroded at the top.

Under Neumann's reading the verb *pupratoy* strongly resembles a family of Hittite reduplicated verbs with the general meaning 'be(come)/make impure', cf. the stative *papre-zzi* 'be impure', also used euphemistically to mean 'defile', and the *hi*-conjugation factitive *paprahḫ-i* 'make impure'.²⁷ A verb meaning 'desecrate', 'defile' or 'commit an impurity' would be expected in the protasis of a malediction formula. I therefore submit that OPhr. *pupratoy* is a borrowing of the Hittite legal term (3. sg.) *paprezzi* or *paprahḫi* 'defiles', which came directly from Hittite or via a related (Hittite-influenced) Ana-

(*passim*), hence the interpretation '*malum afficit*, Schaden antut'. Lubotsky (1997, 119f., 127f.) questions this analysis and translates οὐραν ἀδδακετ as 'has put the tombstone'.

²⁷ 2. sg. *paprahḫti*, 1. sg. pret. *paprahḫun*, etc. Cf. also Hitt. *paprešš-* 'become impure' (3. sg. *paprišzi/paprašzi*, 2. pl. *paprešteni*), Hitt. *paprant-* 'impure', CLuw. *paprātar* and *papreššar* 'defilement, impurity' and CLuw. unreduplicated *parattan-za* 'impurity'. Melchert connects PAnat. **papr-* with PIE **per-* 'go across' → 'transgress, sin', cf. also Go. *fairina* 'guilt', OHG *firina* 'crime' (Melchert 1984, 33, fn. 68). The inherited reduplicated stem **pep(e)r-* gave rise to Pre-Hitt. **pe-pr-eh₁-* > Hitt. *paprezzi* 'be impure', **pe-pr-eh₁-s* > *paprišzi* 'become impure', and "**pe-pr-eh₂-*" > *paprahḫ-* 'make impure'.

tolian tradition (note in particular the reduplicating vowel *a*, which is consistent with Luwian as the source language²⁸).

If OPhr. *pupratoy* reflects Hitt. *paprezzi/paprahhi*, the vowel *u* in the reduplicating syllable requires an explanation. As suggested to me by Jay Jasanoff (pers. comm.), there are reasons to believe that the phonetic realization of the Proto-Anatolian phoneme **a* (continuing largely PIE **a* and the *schwa secundum*) was rather central, surfacing as [ʌ] or perhaps even [ɔ] – at least in closed syllables. Unlike the etymological **o* and **e*, PANat. **a* does not lengthen when accented in closed syllables in Hittite (see Melchert 1994, 105, 107, 147). Furthermore, it is prone to syncope in Lycian.²⁹ It is conceivable that the Hittite unaccented *a* was likewise realized as a “schwa” or as the mid-low central [ʌ]. It would not be surprising then, if the somewhat raised low central vowel, flanked by two labial stops was labialized to the extent that it was perceived as an [u] (or, rather, as a lax [ʊ]) by the Phrygian speakers who borrowed the word from Hittite or another Anatolian source.

The vowel *a* in the root could continue both the /ē/ of *papre-zzi* and the /a/ of *paprahhi*, so either verb could be the source of OPhr. *pupra-toy*. It is worth noting at this point that Hitt. *paprezzi* in the meaning ‘defile, soil’,³⁰ takes the dative-locative of the noun signifying the defiled object: [takku] LÚ.U₁₉.LU-aš DUGÚTUL-i našma luliya *paprezzi karū* [6 GÍ]N KÜ.BABBAR pišker: *paprezzi kwiš* 3 GÍN

²⁸ PANat. **e* > Luw. *a*, cf. the reduplicating vowel in CLuw. *papr-ā-tar* and *papr-e-ššar* ‘defilement’, *pappa-r-š-* ‘sprinkle’, *nana-mman* ‘(being) led’, etc. In Hittite, on the other hand, *a* < **e* is phonologically unexpected, yet *a* does often occur as the reduplicating vowel: cf. Hitt. *papparš-* ‘sprinkle’, *nanna-* ‘drive, lead’, *lalukk-eš-* ‘become light’, *tatr-ant-* ‘cutting, sharp’, etc. (beside the phonologically regular *lelḫuwāi-* ‘pour’, *wewakk-* ‘demand’, *kikkiš-* ‘become’, *tit(ta)nu-* ‘install, make stand up’, *tittiya-* ‘place, assign’, etc.). Oettinger (1979, 213) explains *papparš-* via an *a*-umlaut. Melchert (1994, 142) rejects the idea but abstains from proposing a solution of his own “until the prehistory of Anatolian reduplicated stems is clarified”.

²⁹ Cf. CLuw. *ḫandawati-* ‘king’ vs. Lyc. *xñtawati-* ‘king’, *xñtawata-* ‘reign, rule’; CLuw. *ānda* vs. Lyc. *ñte* ‘into’ (< PANat. **ando*); CLuw. *Tarḫu(a)nza*, obl. *Tarḫunt-* vs. Lyc. *Trqqiz* ‘Storm-god’ (< PANat. **tərHwénts*), obl. *Trqqñt-* < **tərHwənt-*; etc.

³⁰ The verb was also used intransitively to mean ‘turn out to be guilty (by ordeal)’ < **‘prove impure’* < **‘be impure’*: cf. *nu ṽZuliyaš ḫapā pait n=aš paprit* ‘Zaliya went to the river and he was found guilty’ (359/u + Bo 4410:8 – Instructions for Palace Servants, MH²/NS); *attaš=maš ḫaršani ḫID-ya mekkeš papreškir š=uš ABI LUGAL natta ḫwišnuškēt* ‘many were proven guilty in the river (ordeal) in (i.e., before) the person of my father, and king’s father (i.e., my father) did not let them live’ (KBo III 28 ii 17f. – Anecdotes, OH/NS) (CHD, vol. P, fasc. 1, 106).

KÙ.BABBAR *pāi*, [LUGAL-*w*]ann=*a parna* 3 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR *daškēr*; kinun=*a LUGAL-uš ŠA É.GAL^{LIM} [peššie]t; kwiš paprezzi nu apāš=pat* 3² G[ÍN KÙ.BAB]BAR *pāi* ‘if a person “is impure” (i.e., urinates) into a vessel or into a vat (a pond?), formerly they would give six shekels of silver: he who “is impure” gives three shekels, and they would also take three shekels of silver for the house of the kings; but now the king dropped the palace (levy); whoever “is impure”, he only gives three shekels of silver’ (KBo 6.2 i 56ff. (§25)).

Notice that under the first of the two interpretations given above ([... he who] *pupratoy* to the *seman*, may he become *weban*!), the verb *pupratoy* takes the dative *Ṭemeney* – just as Hitt. *paprezzi* takes the dative-locatives ^{DUG}UTUL-*i* and *luliya*. The clause [yos] *Ṭemeney pupratoy, weban ituw* would then translate: ‘[who] defiles this *Ṭeman*, may he become *weban*!’ Under this analysis both clauses are verb-final, matching in this respect the first two sentences ending in *tedatoy*. Notice also that this interpretation is incompatible with Lubotsky’s translation of Phr. *weban* as some kind of installation, if not exactly a tombstone (see Lubotsky 1997, 127). Haas’s translation ‘Schaden’ (Haas 1966, 98, 111) is more in tune with the context of the curse.

The other possible reading would link *pupratoy* to Hitt. *paprahhi* ‘defile, make impure’. The Hittite verb subcategorizes for the object in the accusative and the adjunct in the instrumental: cf. *nu=wa=mu anda ištaminit paprahhi* ‘it (will) defile me on the ear’ (KUB XXXIII 120 ii 33 – Song of Kumarbi, NS); *nu=za twekkam=man natta paprahhun* ‘I have never defiled my own body’ (KUB XXX 10 obv. 14 – Prayer of Kantuzzili, OH/MS) (CHD, vol. P, fasc. 1, 102f.). The syntax of the former Hittite example is almost identical to the syntax of the protasis of the Vezirhan curse under our second interpretation: [yos] *Ṭemeney pupratoy weban*, [omission] *ituw* ‘[who] defiles this *weban* on the *Ṭeman*, may he become [cursed?]’.

It is difficult, in short, to decide whether the source of Phr. *pupratoy* is a verb comparable to Hitt. *paprezzi* ‘be impure, defile’ or *paprahhi* ‘make impure, defile’. Both work semantically and syntactically. It is more economical, however, to do without the omission of a constituent in the apodosis and to favor the first interpretation ([yos] *Ṭemeney pupratoy, weban ituw* ‘[who] defiles this *Ṭeman*, may he become *weban*!’). This interpretation is also preferable as it makes the two last clauses verb-final, just like the first two clauses. The likeliest source of OPhr. *pupratoy* was Hitt. *paprezzi* or a closely related form.

The tense-aspect category of OPhr. *pupratoy* remains to be established. On the face of it, the form is reminiscent of Greek perfect indicative middles of the type πεπαίδευται, λέλυται, etc. The difficulty with this analysis is that OPhr. *-toy* appears to function as a secondary ending (cf. the OPhr. middle aorists of the type *edatoy* discussed above). A pluperfect would likewise be suboptimal as it would not be suited to the context. Nor, with the augment missing, could the form easily be taken as an aorist or imperfect (unless we were to envisage a system where, similarly to Armenian, only monosyllabic forms required an augment). I leave this problem to future investigators of the Vezirhan inscription.

Conclusions

In sum, two items of the recalcitrant Phrygian lexicon have been elucidated securely: the preposition *art* ‘near’ and the middle verb *pupra-* ‘defile’. In addition, OPhr. *iman* has been matched up with Gk. ἱερόν, and its meaning circumscribed as ‘sacred object’ (including ‘stele’) or ‘holy place/sanctuary’ (possibly, a holy grove). In any event, the meaning ‘inscription’ is to be excluded. A fourth item addressed in the paper, *tubeti*, is more problematic. It may be a verb meaning ‘chop (down)’ and a potential borrowing from Luwian, but this result must remain tentative.³¹

The word *pupratoy* is especially important as it is clearly an Anatolian loanword – quite likely from Hittite, even though Luwian as a source cannot be excluded (see fn. 28). Given the geography of Phrygian migrations and settlement, as well as the nature of the Phrygian religion, some Anatolian influence on Phrygian has long been presumed, and attempts have been made to demonstrate it. Thus far, however, these efforts have been surprisingly unfruitful.³² If the

³¹ The same applies to all other Luwian-looking forms found in unclear contexts. After this paper was accepted for publication, a new Luwian inscription came to my attention, ALEPPO 6 (which will be soon published by David Hawkins). It has the following two clauses: BOS-[...]i-pa-wa/i || OVIS.[ANIMAL] ka+ra/i-tu ‘let him sacrifice an ox and a sheep’ (line 6) and a-wa/i pa-sa-ha-*a OVIS.ANIMAL || ka+ra/i-tu ‘let him too sacrifice a sheep’ (line 9). Both clauses contain an imperative *karatu* ‘let him sacrifice’ identical with OPhr. *karatu* in lines 5 and 6 of the Vezirhan inscription (Ilya Yakubovich, pers. comm.). Matching the Phrygian form with the Luwian imperative may ultimately prove productive. However, it is difficult to pursue this possibility until the meaning of the Phrygian passage is clarified.

³² Cf. the all-too short and almost entirely unconvincing list in Bajun–Orël 1989, 32, and Bajun 1992, 135, fn. 9. More credible is Lubotsky’s tentative identification of NPhr. σαναμαν (no. 116), very likely to mean ‘pedestal’, as a borrowing

analysis offered here is correct, the verb *pupratoy* is one of the few reasonably certain instances of lexicon borrowed from an Anatolian language into Phrygian.

References

- Bajun, Lilia. 1992. A Phrygian Word in Hieroglyphic Luwian. *Journal of Ancient Civilizations* 1992, 131–139.
- Bajun, Lilia and Orël, Vladimir. 1989. Frigijsko-anatolijskije jazykovye otnošenija. In: *Paleo-balkanistika i antičnost': sbornik naučnykh trudov*. Moskva, 24–33.
- Bittel, Kurt. 1970. Hattusa. The Capital of the Hittites. New York.
- Brixhe, Claude. 1974. Réflexions sur phrygien *iman*. In: *Mansel'e Armağan I (Mélanges Arif Müfid Mansel I)*. Ankara, 239–250.
- 2004. *Corpus des inscriptions paléo-phrygiennes: Supplément II*. *Kadmos* 43, 1–130.
- Brixhe, Claude, and Drew-Bear, Thomas. 1982. Trois nouvelles inscriptions paléo-phrygiennes de Çepni. *Kadmos* 21, 64–87.
- CHD (Chicago Hittite Dictionary) – Hans G. Güterbock and Harry A. Hoffner (eds.). 1980–. The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. Chicago: The Institute.
- Diakonoff, I. M., and Neroznak, V. P. 1985. Phrygian. *Anatolian and Caucasian Studies*. Delmar/New York.
- Frigi e Frigio, *Atti del 1° Simposio Internazionale*. Roma 16–17 ottobre 1995, R. Gusmani, M. Salvini, P. Vannicelli (eds.). Roma, 1997.
- Gorbachov, Yaroslav. 2005. Toward the Interpretation of the Old Phrygian Inscription from Vezirhan. *Harvard Working Papers in Ling.* XI, 41–57.
- Haas, Otto. 1966. Die phrygischen Sprachdenkmäler. *Linguistique Balkanique* X. Sofia.
- 1969. Neue phrygische Sprachdenkmäler. *KZ* 83, 70–87.

from Hitt. *šamana*- 'foundation stone' (Lubotsky 1993, 131). Anatolian influence is more securely attestable in the personal names, cf. at least *Iktes* (G-02) ~ Lyc. *Ἰκκτας* (Neumann 1988, 15, Woudhuizen 1993, 11) and *Midas* (*passim*) ~ *Mitaš* of *Pabhuwa* in a Hittite New Kingdom record (CTH 146). Note that *Pabhuwa* is a city in East Anatolia near the upper Euphrates. It is clear from these two facts that the name *Mida*- is indigenous Anatolian, rather than brought into Anatolia by the immigrant Phrygians, as has been often assumed (but cf. Bittel 1970, 136). Another *Mitas* is attested in a HLuw. inscription on a stone bowl from Babylon from the first millennium BC (Babylon 2, § I = CIH I 3–4). It has also been suggested that *387-*ta_{4/5}-sá* (or *SERVUS-ta_{4/5}-sá*) 'servant' (Phoen. 'bd) on the Karatepe bilingual (Karatepe 1, § I) and on Cekke (§ I) is to be read *mī-ta₄-sá* /*mitas*/ (Bossert, JKF 2 (1953), p. 328, *apud* Hawkins 2000, 58). The syllabic reading of *387 as *-mī-* is corroborated by two alternative spellings of *miyatinzi* 'many' (Karatepe 1, § LI) as *mi-ia-ti-ti* (Hu.) and *387-*ia-tí-ti₄* (Ho.) (see Hawkins 2000, 55, 58, who remains skeptical, however). The name *Midas* may thus be ultimately of Luwian origin – perhaps, a shortening of (unattested?) theophoric names of the shape *X-mitas* 'servant of (god) X'.

- Haspels, C. H. Emilie. 1971. *The Highlands of Phrygia. Sites and Monuments*, vol. 1. Princeton (New Jersey).
- Hawkins, John David. 2000. *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions. Volume I: Inscriptions of the Iron Age. Part I: Text. Introduction*. Berlin/New York.
- IEW – Pokorny, Julius. 1994, *Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 3. Aufl. Tübingen/Basel, 1994 [1. Aufl. 1959].
- Janda, Michael. 1997. Zur altphrygischen Areyastis-Inschrift. In: *Frige e Frigio*, 271–277.
- Jasanoff, Jay. 2003. *Hittite and the Indo-European Verb*. Oxford.
- LEW – Fraenkel, Ernst. 1962. *Litauisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Bd. I. Heidelberg/Göttingen.
- LIV² – Helmut Rix et. al. (eds.). 2001. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*, 2. erweiterte und verbesserte Auflage bearbeitet von Martin Kümmel und Helmut Rix. Wiesbaden [1. Aufl. 1998].
- Lubotsky, Alexander. 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 the New Phrygian Inscription No. 88. *Kadmos* 28, 146–155.
- 1993. New Phrygian $\nu\pi\omicron\delta\alpha\nu$. *Kadmos* 32, 127–134.
- 1997. New Phrygian Inscription No. 48: Palaeographic and Linguistic Comments. In: *Frige e Frigio*, 115–130.
- 2004. The Phrygian Zeus and the Problem of the “Lautverschiebung”. *Historische Sprachforschung* 117, 229–237.
- Marr, John. 1998. *Plutarch. Life of Themistocles. Introduction, Text, Translation and Commentary*. Warminster.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 1984. *Studies in Hittite Historical Phonology*. Erg.hefte zur Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung, Nr. 32. Göttingen.
- 1994. *Anatolian Historical Phonology*. Atlanta/Amsterdam.
- 2000. The Problem of Luvian Influence on Hittite: When and How Much? In: *Akten der XI. Fachtagung der Idg. Gesellschaft*, Halle, 2000.
- Neumann, Günter. 1988. Phrygisch und Griechisch. In: *Österr. Ak. Wiss., phil.-hist. Kl., Sber.*, 499. Band. Wien.
- 1997. Die zwei Inschriften auf der Stele von Vezirhan. In: *Frige e Frigio*, 13–32.
- Oettinger, Norbert. 1979. *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums*. Erlanger Beiträge zur Sprach- und Kunstwissenschaft, Bd. 64. Nürnberg.
- Salvini, Mirjo. 2002. *Noti di lessico urarteo*. *SMEA* 44, 339–341.
- Watkins, Calvert. 1986. The Language of the Trojans. In: *Troy and the Trojan War. A Symposium held at Bryn Mawr College October 1984*, Machteld J. Mellink (ed.), Bryn Mawr College: 45–62.
- Woudhuizen, Fred. 1993. Old Phrygian: Some Texts and Relations. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 21, 1–25.
- Zgusta, Ladislav. 1964. *Kleinasiatische Personennamen*. Prag.