

Blažek, Václav

Paleo-Balkanian languages I : Hellenic languages

Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity. N, Řada klasická.
2005, vol. 54, iss. N10, pp. [15]-33

ISBN 80-210-3784-9

ISSN 1211-6335

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/113980>

Access Date: 27. 11. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

VÁCLAV BLAŽEK

PALEO-BALKANIAN LANGUAGES I: HELLENIC LANGUAGES

In the last three decades several important monographs and monographic articles were devoted to the Paleo-Balkanian languages. Let us mention first just these studies:

- GEORGIEV, VLADIMIR I. (1981). *Introduction to the History of the Indo-European Languages*. Sofia: Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, 1981.
- HAJNAL, IVO (2003). Methodische Vorbemerkungen zu einer Palaeolinguistik des Balkanraums. In *Languages in Prehistoric Europe*. Ed. by ALFRED BAMMESBERGER & THEO VENNEMANN. Heidelberg: Winter, 2003, 117–145.
- KATIČIĆ, RADOSLAV (1976). *Ancient Languages of the Balkans*. The Hague — Paris: Mouton, 1976.
- NEROZNAK, VLADIMIR P. (1978). *Paleobalkanskije jazyki*. Moskva: Nauka, 1978.
- SOLTA, GEORG R. (1980). *Einführung in die Balkanlinguistik mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Substrats und des Balkanlateinischen*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchhandlung, 1980.

The Indo-European languages of the ancient Balkan peninsula represent only a geographical unit. From the point of view of genetic classification, they can be classified into at least three taxonomical units, including some languages historically attested beyond the geographical borders of the Peninsula:

- I. Hellenic: Phrygian, Greek, Macedonian, Paionic, Epirotic, ?Messapic.
- II. South Balkanian: Pelasgic.
- III. Southeast Balkanian: Thracian
- IV. Northwest Balkanian: Daco-Getic, Mysian, Dardanian, Illyrian, Albanian.

In the present study the relic languages of the first, i.e. Hellenic, group, are described.

I. HELLENIC

A. Phrygian

Historical Phrygia occupied the territory between the upper streams of the Rhyndacus and Maeandrus in the west and the river Halys and the lake Tatta in the east. Its south and southeast neighbour was Assyria or the territory controlled by Assyria, namely Cilicia. The capital of Phrygia became Gordion and the cultic center Pessinús. The biggest bloom of the Phrygian state was connected with the king Midas, when he expanded in Cilicia and even Syria. In 709 BC Midas concluded a peace with the Assyrian king Sargon II and started his campaign in Lydia. The end of the territorial expansion of Phrygia was caused by invasion of the Cimmerians from North Pontic steppes in the beginning of the 7th cent. BC. Later Phrygia became a part of Lydia. From the 6th cent. BC both the states were controlled by Persia. In the 3rd cent. BC Alexander of Macedonia started the process of hellenization of Phrygia. The well-known story about the slitting of the ‘Gordian knot’ by Alexander is connected with Gordion [Arrian, II, 3]. From the beginning of the 3rd cent. Phrygia is occupied by Celtic invaders, Galatians. In 117/117 BC Phrygia became a part of the Roman province Asia.

The most powerful Phrygian king Midas was mentioned in the contemporary Assyrian annals as the ruler of Musks. But already around 1165 BC it was the Assyrian king Tiglatpilezar I., who fought against Musks [*Muškāia*]. But it is not clear, if the equation Musks = Phrygians holds in both cases. The corresponding ethnonym occurs in the ancient Asia Minor in more sources: Assyrian *Mušku*, Greek Μόσχοι [Herodotus, III, 94], Μέσχοι, Latin *Moschi*, Hebrew *Mešek* [Gn 10.2]. The name *So-mex-i* (*so-* = “country”) is used for Armenians by their neighbours Georgians. Some scholars judge that these ethnical names are identical with the ethnonym Μῦσοί, Μοισοί, plus the Armenian-like plural suffix *-k’* (Georgiev 1981, 144). On the other hand, in the Hieroglyphic Luwian text of Karkamiš A6, §6 from the end of the 9th or the beginning of the 8th cent. BC the ethnonyms *Muska* and *Musa* are differentiated. Hawkins (2000, 126) identifies the former with Phrygians and the latter with Lydians. Under their name are Phrygians [Φρύγες] first mentioned in Iliad as allies of Troians: “Ascanius strong as a god and Phorcys led the Phrygians in from Ascania due east, primed for the clash of combat” [II, 862–63]. Through the mouth of Priam Homer says: “Years ago I visited Phrygia rife with vineyards, saw the Phrygian men with their swarming horses there — multitudes — the armies of Otreus, Mygdon like a god, encamped that time along the Sangaris [today Sakarya] River banks. And I took my stand among them, comrade-in-arms the day the Amazons struck, a match for men in war” [III, 185–89; translation R. Fagles]. An extraordinary important witness about the Balkanian origin of Phrygians was mediated by Herodotus: “Now the Phrygians, as the Macedonians say, used to be called Brigians [Βρίγες] during the time that they were natives of Europe and dwelt with Macedonians; but after they had changed into Asia, with their country they changed

also their name and were called Phrygians” [VII, 73]. But still in the time of the Greek-Persian wars the Brygians settled the territory between Macedonia and Chalkidike. Herodotus describes, how they attacked Mardonios with his army: “Thus forced the fleet, and meanwhile Mardonios and the land-army while encamping in Macedonia were attacked in the night by the Brygian Thracians [Βρύγοι Θρήκες] and many of them were slain by the Brygians and Mardonios himself was wounded” [VI, 45]. Later the Brygians were subjugated by Persians and included into the great Xerxes’ army. Herodotus quotes them in the list of the European allies of Persians after the inhabitants of Chalkidike and before Pierians, followed by Macedonians: “There is still to be reckoned, in addition to all this which has been summed up, the force which was being led from Europe; and of this we must give a probable estimate. The Hellenes of Thrace and of the islands which lie off the coast of Thrace supplied a hundred and twenty ships; from which ships there results a sum of twenty-four thousand men; and as regards the land-force which was supplied by the Thracians, Paionians, Eordians, Bottiaians, the race which inhabits Chalkidike, the Brygians, Pierians, Macedonians, Perraibians, Enianians, Dolopians, Magnesians, Achaians, and all those who dwell in the coast-region of Thrace ... ” [VII, 185; translation George Rawlinson]. Strabo (64 BC – AD 19) preserved a witness of the Lydian historian Xanthus [XII, 8.3] about Phrygians who had to break into Troada from Thracia, kill the ruler of Troia and settle in neighbourhood. There are some suggestive similarities between Phrygian and Hittite, indicating their early contact, e.g. the formulation *lamn ... dokseš* “name ... establishes” from the inscription from Uyucik (5th cent. BC), where *lamn* exactly corresponds with Hittite *laman* “name”, while the own Phrygian word for “name” is *onoman*, the closest cognate of Greek ὄνομα id.

The Phrygian language is known from inscriptions of two epochs: Old Phrygian (8th–3rd cent. BC) represented by ca. 250 inscriptions and graffiti. They are written in the Old Phrygian alphabet consisting of 17 signs, mostly corresponding to their Greek originals, but two signs, namely “j” and “ts” are specifically Phrygian. More than 100 New Phrygian inscriptions in the Greek alphabet were written in the 1st–4th cent. AD. The third important source of our knowledge of Phrygian are glosses recorded by various Greek authors. The most recent witness about a using of Phrygian is connected with the arrian bishop Sokrates, whose mother was of Phrygian origin. In the following two centuries Phrygian is definitely assimilated by Greek. Although the Phrygian literature is unknown, the work of one of the Phrygian authors is read till the present time. It is the fabulator *Aesop*, who lived at court of the Lydian king Croesus.

Following the antique tradition, modern scholars frequently connect Phrygian with Armenian (after Herodotus; but he explicitly said: “The Armenians were armed just like Phrygians, being settlers [ἄποικοι] from the Phrygians” [VII, 73]) or with Thracian (after Xanthus cited above: “During some time Mysians lived around the [Mysian] Olympus, but when Phrygians swam across from Thracia and killed a ruler of Troia and of the neighbouring country and settled here, Mysians moved up the sources of Caecus near Lydia” [Strabo XII, 8.3].

But on the basis of a careful analysis of the relics of Phrygian, it was Plato who was right when he had mentioned the similarity between Greek and Phrygian. In his dialogue *Kratylos* [410] Sokrates says to his partner in this fictive dialogue, Hermogenes: “Well then, consider whether this πῦρ [“fire”] is not foreign, for the word is not easily brought into relation with the Hellenic tongue, and the Phrygians may be observed to have the same word slightly changed, just as they have ὕδωρ [“water”] and κύνας [acc. pl. “dogs”], and many other words” [translation Benjamin Jowett]. In the Phrygian inscriptions and glosses there are numerous, frequently exclusive, isoglosses, connecting this language with Greek: *agaritoj* || ἀχάρτος “unmerciful”, *anar* || ἀνήρ “man”, *awtaj* || αὐτός “alone/himself”, *ios ~ jos* || ὅς “who” (rel.), *knaiko* || γυναικός “woman”, *lawagtaei* || λαγέτας “army-leader” < **lāwāgetās*, cf. Mycenaean *ra-wa-ke-ta*, *mekas* || μέγας “big”, *onoman* || ὄνομα “name”, *ournous* || οὐρανός “heavens”, *wanaktei* || ἄναξ “king” < **wanaks*, cf. Mycenaean dat. *wa-na-ka-te*, *wetei* || ἔτος “year”, cf. Mycenaean. *we-to*, and the idiom *we-te-i-we-te-i* “year after year”, etc. The fragments of the Phrygian morphology indicate the grammatical structure closest to Greek. But there are some peculiarities, e.g. the 3rd sg. pret. in *-s* or the mediopassive in *-r*, differing from Greek and resembling Hittite. It is an open question, if it could be explained from a substratum or neighbourhood. Some scholars believed in the *satəm*-character of Phrygian. Now it is generally accepted that the *satəm*-like features reflect the secondary palatalization before *e*: ἄζήν, gen. ἄζένα · πώγων “beard” : Greek. γένυς “beard”, ζέλικια · λάχανα “greenary, vegetables” : Bulgarian *zelek* “cabbage”, Russian *zelok* “young grass”, ζεῦμαν · τὴν πηγὴν “spring” : Greek χεῦμα “that which is poured, stream, flow”, etc. For the *centum*-character of Phrygian the following arguments can be found: The toponym Ἀκμονία is derivable from IE **ak̑-mōn*, gen. *-men-es*, cf. Old Indic *aśman-*, Avestan *asman-* “stone”, Lithuanian *āšmens* pl. “edge”.

Examples of alternative interpretations of some Phrygian texts:

Rock monument from the Midas town (750–700 BC)

ates arkiavais akenanogavos midai lavagtaei vanaktai edaes

“Ates, the son of Arkias, <honorific title>, has dedicated during the kingship and military leadership of Midas”

[Woudhuizen 1993, 3]

“Ates, the senior official (and) the keeper of monuments, dedicated (this) to Midas, the (military) chief and the lord”

[Orel 1997, 9–12]

So called *Areystis*-inscription written in the triangle represents a good example of Old Phrygian (West Phrygia, 7th–6th cent. BC). The interpretation of this text is ambiguous. It is even difficult to determine its beginning. Let us confront various solutions:

materan arezastin bonok akenan olavos vrekun (:) *tedatoz* : *zos tututrej* a[...]
]noz:akenan olavos

“matrem Arezastim ... hanc petram ... -datus : vivus : .. -tri ... hanc petram”

[Haas 1966, 194–95]

materan areyastin bonok akenanogavos vrekun t(-)edatoj jos-tutut[...] a[.]mnoj akenanogavos aej

“The Phrygian <honorific title> has dedicated (the image of) the Bravest Mother (for his) wife; whoever as <honorific title> [brings damage?] to [the monument?]”

[Woudhuizen 1993, 6]

bonok : akenanogav[os] vrekun : t edatoj : jos tu tut[ej] d[e]mnoj : akenanogavos aes materan : areyastin

“Bonok, the keeper of monuments, let dedicate a magic object that here for the ... pediment established (for?) the Mother Areyasti”

[Orel 1997, 33–36]

materan areyastin Bonok akenanogavos vrekun t-edatoy yos tu tutiy : [an]mnoy : akenanogavos aey

“Bonok *akenanogavos* has put the Areyastis Mother as a monument; whoever after me may become *akenanogavos*”

[Lubotsky 1988, 9–26 and his letter from Feb 28, 2005]

The inscription from Pteria in east Phrygia (7th–6th cent. BC)

otuvoi vetei etlnaie ios ni akenanogavos> egeseti okiterko[...]tekmor ot[...]setivebru

“In the 8th year of Etlna’s (reign); who(ever) as <honorific title> builds ..?.. ..?”

ios ervotsali kakuioi imanolo itovo edae[s] mekas <devos>

who(ever) causes? (any) damage, let he be (a prey) of (Zeus-)Iman! Dedicated to the Great (Gods).”

[Woudhuizen 1993, 13]

otuvoi vetei et(e)naie ios ni (ake)nan egeseti (ot)ir terko(s as) tekmo(r) ot(e) [ege]seti veburu

“(Thou) gavest (this) to the elder Otys. Whoever moves the monuments away from the burial plot, to its limits, does wrong.

ios e(v)vo(i)[o] sati kakuio io(n) oitovo iman edaes mekas

Whoever finishes (of) the good, finishes with?) that of evil fate. ... establishes ... if somebody says (it), then (he) ... good.”

[Orel 1997, 294–299]

As an example of New Phrygian the typical malediction formula from the inscription #88 (West Phrygia, 3rd cent. AD) can be chosen. Let us confront various interpretations:

ιος vi σεμουν κνουμανει κακε αδδακετ αρω ουεναουιας

“whoever brings harm to this premature tomb of Venavis”

“whoever brings harm to this tomb of the prematurely died Wenawia”

τιγ γεγαριτμενο<ς> ειτου πουρ ουανακταν κε ουρανιον ισγεικετ διονυσιν

“let him become cursed/devoted and he will have to do with the heavenly king Dionysos”

[Lubotsky 1989, 153]

“let him become cursed/devoted by [the God of] Fire and the Heavenly King”

[Witzak 1991–92, 157–62]

From the Phrygian grammar (here after Orel 1997, 387–401) best-known is the nominal declension:

case/stem	-o-	-ā	-e-	-ai-	-i-	-u-	-s-	-n-	-r-	other cons.
sg. nom.	<i>devos</i> <i>atoios</i>	<i>meneya</i>	A ^m <i>ies</i> <i>voine</i>	<i>memevais</i> <i>Arkiaevais</i>	<i>Aladis</i>	<i>Olus</i> <i>alu</i>	βεκος	<i>Apelan</i>	αναρ <i>matar</i>	<i>vanak</i>
gen.	<i>devo</i> <i>oitono</i> adj.: <i>kakoio</i> <i>istoyo</i>	f. Δουδας m. <i>Ako</i> <i>geravo</i>	<i>Atevo</i>		μανεις	<i>alus</i>	τιος <i>vaso(u)s</i>	κνουμα- νος		κναικο
dat.	<i>davoi</i> <i>noktoy</i>	<i>lavay</i> <i>voikay</i>	<i>Lasimei</i> <i>Pormatey</i>			? <i>Olivoi</i>	τιε/η <i>vetei</i>	κνουμα- νελ	<i>materei</i> βρατερε	<i>vanaktei</i>
acc.	<i>bagun</i> δετο(υ)ν	<i>duman</i> επταν	τιτεν <i>tekmatin</i>		<i>Areyastin</i>	<i>vrekun</i>	τιαν	<i>keneman</i> <i>onoman</i>		ουανα- κταν κναικων
instr.-loc.			<i>tatiði</i>							
pl. nom.			<i>voines</i>						πατερης	
gen.							<i>meroun</i>			
dat.	δεουσι <i>xurienois</i>	δεκμου- ταις					πει(ε)ς		<i>braterais</i>	
acc.	n. μυρα									<i>podas</i>

The pronominal declension is best preserved in the paradigms of the demonstratives *so-/si-* “this” and *to-* “that”:

	sg.			pl.			sg.			pl.		
	m.	n.	f.	m.	n.	f.	m.	n.	f.	m.	n.	f.
nom.		<i>si</i>					<i>tos</i>					
gen.			σας				<i>tivo</i> <i>toi</i>					
dat.	<i>soi</i>	σεμου(ν) σεμιν	<i>sai</i>				τω		ται			ταις
acc.		<i>si</i>	σαν						ταν			

Another demonstrative is *isto-* “this”, attested in the dat. sg. *istoyo*. In the functions of the relative-interrogative the stems *ko-* and *yo-* were used: nom. sg. κος & κο and nom. sg. m. *yos / ios*, gen. sg. m. ιου, dat. sg. m. *yoy/yoι/oi*, acc. sg. m. *ion*, gen. sg. f. ιας, dat. sg. f. ιαις, acc. sg. f. (ε)ιαν. There are two reflexive stems: nom. sg. m. αυτος, dat. sg. m. *avtoi*, acc. sg. m. *avtun*, dat. sg. f. *avtay / αυται*, corresponding to Greek αντός “self”; and dat. sg. *vis*, acc. sg. *ven* “his own” < **syē-*.

In the Phrygian inscriptions only the first two numerals are attested: *oyvos* “one” ~ Greek οἶος, Cypriote dat. οἶοφωι “alone”, cf. Mycenaean *o-wo-we* “with a single handle”, and *duoi* “two” ~ Greek gen. dat. δυοῖν. The numerals “3” and “4” has been identified in the terms for the ritual dances for the cult of Dionysus: θρίαμβος, διθύραμβος, perhaps **tri-ang^o*- “three-stepped” and **k^uitur-ang^o*- “four-stepped” respectively (Haas 1966, 158, 164-65). The numeral πινκε “5” was recently recognized by A. Lubotsky [*Kadmos* forthcoming] in the New Phrygian inscription #116:

... πινκε τας δ[α]κερης ονομανιας μιρου ικ κναικαν εδαεξ
 “he has made five those parts mentioned of the monument for (the sake of) the wife”

The verbal morphology is preserved only fragmentarily. Our summarization follows Orel 1997, 398–401:

Athematic present: 1 sg. *eymi* “be(come)” 3 sg. ειτι id., *kiti* “move”, *nati* “?lead”, *siti* “tie together”.

Thematic present: 3 sg. [d]akiti “put, set”, *poreti* “provide, furnish”, ριδιτι “establishes, puts, sets”; 2 pl. *e tete* “eat”.

Aorist: 2 sg. *edae* “dedicate”, *avie* “be favorable” < **e-eyi-es-s*, *vide* “see”; 3 sg. *aes* “be” < **e-ē-es-t*, *edaes* “dedicate”, εγδαεξ “offer”, εσταεξ “stand”; *en-e-parkes* “write, scratch”, etc.

Future: 3 sg. *dokses* “put, establish”, *eg-ese-ti* “push, take away”.

Imperfect: athematic: 3 sg. *est*; thematic: βερετ “bring”, δακετ “put, set”, *deiket* “show, say”; 3 pl. οπαδεν “grant, give”.

Perfect: 3 sg. δακαρ “put, set”, 3 pl. δακαρεν id.

Optative: 3 sg. *ektetoy* “possess, rule”, *edatoy* “dedicate”, *estatoi* “stand”, *anegertoy* “elect, elevate”; 3 pl. *apaktne*, corr. perhaps *apakten* “bring away”.

Imperative: 3 sg. αδειτου = **ad-ei-to*, εγεδου “push, take away”, *sir-eto* “succeed”; 3 pl. αδειτνου = **ad-ei-tno*, [ειττ]νου = **i-tno* “be”, ισνου = **es-tno* “be”.

Medium: 3 sg. pres. *astai* “be”; 3 sg. impf. αββερετορ “bring”, αδδακετορ “cause”.

Prepositions:

ap “from, of” = Greek από, *as* “in; up to” < **H₁ns*; *at* = Latin etc. *ad*; *die* “through, at” = Greek διά < **disa*, ενς “in” = Greek ενς, εις; *me* ~ Greek μετά, *op* “on” = Mycenaean *o-pi*, *ote* “from, out; again, more” ~ Lithuanian *at-*; πος “for, towards” = Arcado-Cypriote πός, Mycenaean *po-si*; πουρ “for” (but after Witczak “fire”) ~ Gothic *faur*.

Conjunctions and other particles:

de = Greek δή; *eti* “and, also” = Greek ἔτι “again”; *ke* “and” = Greek τέ, Latin *que*.

BASIC BIBLIOGRAPHY

BRIXHE, CLAUDE (1983). Épigraphie et grammaire du phrygien: état présent et perspectives. In *Le lingue indoeuropee di frammentaria attestazione / Die indogermanischen Restsprachen*. Ed. by E. VINEIS. Pisa: Giardini, 1983, 109–131.

BRIXHE, CLAUDE (1994). Le phrygien. In *Langues indo-européennes*. Ed. by FRANÇOISE BADER. Paris: CNRS, 1994, 165–178.

- BRIXHE, CLAUDE (2004). Phrygian. In *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages*. Ed. by ROGER D. WOODARD. Cambridge: University Press, 2004, 777–788.
- BRIXHE, CLAUDE & LEJEUNE, MICHEL (1984). *Corpus des inscriptions paléo-phrygiennes*, 2 vols. Paris: Recherche sur les Civilisations, 1984.
- DIAKONOFF, IGOR M. & NEROZNAK, V. P. (1985). Phrygian. Delmar (NY): Caravan Books, 1985.
- GEORGIEV, VLADIMIR I. (1981). *Introduction to the History of the Indo-European Languages*. Sofia: Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, 1981 (pp. 129–145: Phrygian).
- GEORGIEV, VLADIMIR I. (1982). Le paléo-phrygien. *Balkansko ezikoznanie* 28, 1982, 5–8.
- GUSMANI, R. — SALVINI, M. — VANICELLI, P. (1997). *Frigi e frigio: Atti del I° Simposio Internazionale*. Roma: Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, 1997.
- HAAS, OTTO (1966). *Die Phrygischen Sprachdenkmäler*. Sofia: Balkansko ezikoznanie 10, 1966.
- HAAS, OTTO (1970). Das Problem der Herkunft der Phryger und ihrer Beziehungen zu den Balkanvölkern. *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 18, 1970, 31–69.
- HAAS, OTTO (1976). Die Sprache der spätphrygischen Inschriften, I–II. *Balkansko ezikoznanie*, 19/3, 1976, 49–82 & 19/4, 1976, 53–71.
- HAWKINS, JOHN D. (2000). *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*, Vol. 1: *Inscriptions of the Iron Age*. Berlin — New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2000.
- HEUBECK, ALFRED (1959). Bemerkungen zu den neuphrygischen Fluchformeln. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 64, 1959, 13–25.
- HEUBECK, ALFRED (1987). Phrygiaka, I–III. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 100, 1987, 70–85.
- KÖDDERITZSCH, ROLF (1985). Brygisch, Päonisch, Makedonisch. *Balkansko ezikoznanie* 28/4, 1985, 17–41.
- LUBOTSKY, ALEXANDER (1988). The Old Phrygian Areyastis-inscription. *Kadmos* 27, 1988, 9–26.
- LUBOTSKY, ALEXANDER (1989a). New Phrygian ετι and τι. *Kadmos* 28, 1989, 79–88.
- LUBOTSKY, ALEXANDER (1989b). The syntax of the New Phrygian inscription No. 88. *Kadmos* 28, 1989, 146–155.
- LUBOTSKY, ALEXANDER (1993). Word boundaries in the Old Phrygian Germanos inscription. In *Epigraphica Anatolica* 21, 1993, 93–98.
- NEROZNAK, VLADIMIR P. (1978). *Frigijskij jazyk*. In NEROZNAK, VLADIMIR P. *Paleobalkanskije jazyki*. Moskva: Nauka, 1978, 66–155.
- NEUMANN, GÜNTER (1988). *Phrygisch und Griechisch*. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, Bd. 499, 1988.
- OREL, VLADIMIR (1997). *The Language of Phrygians. Description and Analysis*. Delmar (NY): Caravan Books, 1997.
- WITCZAK, KRZYSZTOF T. (1991–92). Some remarks on the new Phrygian inscription No. 88. *Lingua Posnaniensis* 34, 1991–92, 157–162.
- WOUTHUIZEN, FRED C. (1993). Old Phrygian: Some Texts and Relations. *JIES* 21, 1993, 1–25.

B. Macedonian

The territory occupied by ancient Macedonians had the following borders: in west from the Ohrid Lake, in east from the river Strymon, in north from the Mount Olympus and in south from Skopje the contemporary capital of the modern Republic of Macedonia. According to Strabo [VII, fragment 11], the original name of this country was Ἠμαθία, while the name Μακεδονία has to be derived from Greek μακεδνός “tall, taper”. The name Ἠμαθία also was used for one of the historical provinces, besides Περία, Ἀλωπία, Βοττιαία. In the highlands small communities (Ἐλίμεια, Ἐορδαία, Ὀρεστίς, Λυγκηστίς) kept their autonomy longer than in lowland [Thucydides II, 99; Strabo VII, fragment 7]. Herodotus recorded a witness about the genealogy of the Macedonian kings: “Now of this Alexander the

seventh ancestor was that Perdiccas who first became despot of the Macedonians, and that in the manner which here follows: From Argos there fled to the Illyrians three brothers of the descendents of Temenos, Gauanes, Aeropus, and Perdiccas. And passing over from the Illyrians into the upper parts of Macedonia they came to the city of Lebaia. There they became farm-servants for pay in the household of the king. One pasturing horses, the second oxen, and the youngest of them, namely Perdiccas, the smaller kinds of cattle ... [VIII, 137]. From this Perdiccas the descent of Alexander was as follows — Alexander was the son of Amyntas, Amyntas was the son of Alketes, the father of Alketes was Aeropus, of him Philip, of Philip Argaius, and of this last the father was Perdiccas, who first obtained the kingdom” [VIII, 139; translation George Rawlinson]. Herodotus’ Alexander I reigned over Macedonia in ca. 497–454 BC. The unification of the Macedonian tribes by Temenids was probably realized in the 7th cent. BC. The king Archelaos (413–399 BC) moved the capital from Aegae for Pella, penetrated to Thessaly and reached the entrance to the sea. From the struggle for the Macedonian throne the victor became Amyntas III (393–370 BC). After the death of his follower Perdiccas III in 359 BC, Philip II starts his rule. Thanks to his clever combination of the military power and diplomacy based frequently on corruption he also got under control over a big part of Thracia, the peninsula Chalkidike. He became an equivalent member of the Delphian amphictyonia. When he was assassinated in 336 BC, Macedonia had occupied a dominant position among the Hellenic states. The successor of Philip became twenty-year old Alexander III. In the following 13 year he controlled not only whole Greece, but he definitively defeated the Persian Empire. He crossed the rivers Indus and Oxus (today Amudaria), by the river Iaxartes (today Syrdaria) he founded the most distant Alexandria, Egypt submitted him voluntarily. From the present point of view it seems that Macedonia was a world’s great power, but it does not mean any bloom of the Macedonian culture, but the expansion of the Hellenic civilization, continuing still several following centuries. After the disintegration of Alexander’s empire in some of the succession states Greek becomes an official language (e.g. Parthian or Bactrian Empires), or the Greek alphabet is used (later Bactrian Empire).

The first documents written by Macedonians are coin legends, beginning of the 6th BC. Unfortunately, they offer only a scarce witness about the Macedonian language. The Macedonian literary tradition started in the end of the 5th cent. BC and finished in the 4th cent. BC, but its language was Greek. Greek was used at courts of two most important Macedonian rulers, Philip II and his son Alexander III, called Great or Macedonian. The work of Arribaïos, the only Macedonian poet, who is known, is lost. Till the present time the only Macedonian inscription was not found. The recent discovery of a ‘Macedonian’ malediction inscription on the lead table from the 4th cent. BC found in Pella (Dubois 1995; Hajnal 2003, 123–24) represents no proof, it is simply written in Greek with numerous Doracisms. Some vacillations in vocalism could perhaps be interpreted as an influence of Macedonian, but it is all. There are no lexical Macedonisms. And so the only sources of our knowledge of the ancient Macedonian are the glosses of the antique lexicographers and onomastics. The complete collection of all acces-

sible information about Macedonian has been ascribed to the grammarian Amerias from Alexandria living in the 3rd cent. BC. But from his work only a few citations is preserved by such lexicographers as Athenaeus (2nd–3rd cent. AD), Pollyx (2nd cent. AD), and especially Hesychius (5th cent. AD). Just in the unique dictionary of Hesychius Alexandrine the biggest number (totally 85) of glosses with the mark ‘Macedonian’ occur. In one case the Macedonian origin is indicated by the reference to Amerias.

Already in antiquity the question about the affiliation of Macedonians into the Hellenic world or to barbarians was unsolved. Herodotus [V, 22] recorded, how the Macedonian king Alexander I was rejected to participate the Olympian games as a barbarian by other participants. Only when he presented his genealogy leading to the ancient kings of Argos, the organizers of the Games allowed his participation. Titus Livius [31, 29] said about Macedonians and two Greek tribes, Aetolians and Acarnans, that they are “of the same language”. On the other hand, Plutarch mentioned the observation of the Achaean general Aratus (3rd cent. BC) that Hellenes felt the Macedonian supremacy as foreign and imported from abroad: “A year after, being again elected general, he [= Aratus] resolved to attempt the capture of the Acro-Corinthus, not so much for the advantage of the Sicyonians or Achaeans, as considering that by expelling the Macedonian garrison he should free all Greece alike from a tyranny which oppressed every part of her. ... it was not against natural Greeks, but against a foreign and stranger domination ” [Vita Arati 16; translation John Dryden]. The controversy concerning the genetic classification of Macedonian within the Indo-European family continues up to the present day. Till now the following hypotheses about the position of Macedonian were formulated: (a) Mixed languages on the basis of Illyrian (Müller, Bonfate); (b) Greek dialect strongly influenced by Thracian and Illyrian (Kretschmer, Schwyzer); (c) Greek dialect with certain substratal features, e.g. of Pelasgic or Thracian (Hoffmann; most of Greek scholars); (d) Language different from Greek, but together with Phrygian closely related to and strongly influenced by Greek (Russu, Meillet, Masson, Georgiev, Ködderitzsch). The preserved lexical material can be divided into three groups (cf. Katičić 1976, 108–111): (1) Borrowings and the words or proper names adapted from Greek: ἀκρουνοί· ὄροι “border stones” || Greek ἄκρον “end, extremity”; ἐταῖροί “the cavalry guards of the Macedonian kings” || ἐταῖρος “comrade”; Κόρανος· βασιλεὺς Μακεδονίας || κοίρανος “ruler” < **korianos* or κάρανος “chief” < **kr̥₂sno-*; σωτορία “salvation” || σωτηρία etc.; (2) Words with unambiguous Greek parallels, but differing in phonetics: ἄβεις || ὄφεις “snake”; ἄβροῦ[φ]ες || ὄφρες “eyebrows”; ἄδη· οὐρανός || αἰθήρ “sky” & ἀδραῖα || αἰθρία “blue sky”; δάλαγχαν || θάλασσαν “sea” (acc.); δάνος || θάνατος “death”; κάναδοι· σιάγονες, γνάθοι || γνάθοι “jaws”; κεβαλά || κεφαλή “head”; κόμβους· ὀδόντας γομφίους || γόμφοι “teeth”, etc.; (3) Words without close Greek cognates, but with transparent Indo-European etymology: ἄλιζα· ἡ λεύκη τὸ δένδρων “white poplar” perhaps more probably than λεύκη τῶν δένδρων “white leprosy of the trees” || Gothic > Spanish *aliso* “alder”; ἄξος “forest” || Old Icelandic *askr* “ash”, γόδα· ἔντερα || Old Indic

guda- “intestines”. For the word νίβα Suidas (apud Photius) knows two translations: (i) χιόνα “snow” & (ii) κρήνεν “spring”, both in acc. sg. They can be derived from two different protoforms: **(s)nig^u-m* > Greek νίφα “snow” and **nig^u-m*, cf. Greek νίζω “I wash” < **nig^u-iō*. For some of toponyms there are also promising etymologies, classifying them into groups (2) or (3): The name of the city Ἐννέα-δρόμιος from southeast of Macedonia has been glossed “Ἐννέα ὁδοί”, i.e. “nine roads”, by Stephanus Byzantius 90, 12 (5th cent. AD). Hence *α*να- “nine” < **enna* < **enya* < **eny^m* and δρόμιος “road” < **d^rmiōs*, with closest equivalents in Greek ἔννεα “nine” & δρόμος “course, running” respectively. The capital of Macedonia was Πέλλα. Its name perfectly corresponds with Hesychius’ gloss πέλλα: λίθος < **pelsā*, cf. Old High German *felis* “rock”. The mountain *Bora mons* attested by Livius [45, 29], today *Nidže* mountains, corresponds exactly with Slavic **gora* < **g^uorHā*. The limited relics of Macedonian do not allow any definitive conclusion. The most probable seems the solution (d).

BASIC BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BLUMENTHAL, ALBRECHT VON (1930). *Hesychstudien*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1930 (pp. 16–21: Makedonisch).
- BRIXHE, CLAUDE & PANAYOTOU, ANNA (1994). Le Macédonien. In *Langues indo-européennes*. Ed. by FRANÇOISE BADER. Paris: CNRS, 1994, 205–219.
- CHANTRAINE, PIERRE (1966). La langue des Macédoniens et leur onomastique. *BSLP* 61, 1966, 157–166.
- CYMBURSKIJ, V. L. (1984). K interpretaciji nekotoryx drevnemakedonskix gloss. In *Etnogenez narodov Balkan i severnogo Pričernomorja. Lingvistika, istorija, arxeologija*. Moskva: Nauka, 1984, 152–157.
- GEORGIEV, VLADIMIR I. (1981). *Introduction o the History of the Indo-European Languages*. Sofia: Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, 1981 (pp. 165–171: The Macedonian Region).
- HOFFMANN, OTTO (1906). *Die Makedonen, ihre Sprache und ihr Volkstum*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1906.
- ILIEVSKI, PETAR X. (1992). The Ancient Macedonian Language and the name of the Contemporary Makedonski. *Macedonian Review* 22, 1992, 247–268.
- ILIEVSKI, PETAR X. (1994). Mestoto na antičkot makedonski među drugite indo-evropski jazici. *Živa antika* 44, 1994, 73–94.
- KALLÉRIS, J. N. (1954–76). *Les Anciens Macédoniens. Études linguistique et historique*, I–II. Athènes: Institut français, 1954–76.
- KATIČIĆ, RADOSLAV (1976). *Ancient Languages of the Balkans*. The Hague — Paris: Mouton, 1976 (pp. 100–116: Macedonia).
- KÖDDERITZCH, ROLF (1985). Brygisch, Päonisch, Makedonisch. *Balkansko ezikoznanie* 28/4, 1985, 17–41 (pp. 24–36: Macedonian).
- PUDIĆ, I. (1966–67). Staromakedonski jezik. *Godišnik Centara za balkanološka ispitivanja*, 2, 1966, 5–25 & 3, 1967, 145–150.

C. Paeonian

Paeonians [Παίονες] are first mentioned in Iliad. Homer located them to the river Axios (today Vardar): “Pyraechmes led the Paeonians, reflex bows in hand, hailing from Amydon far west and the broad river Axios, Axios, clearest stream

that flows across the earth" [II, 848–50] further "... and hit Pyrachmeus, firebrand who led the Paeonians, the master riders from Amydon, from Axius' broad currents" [XVI, 187–88; translation Robert Fagles]. According to Herodotus "... Paeonia was a country upon the river Strymon, and the Strymon was at no great distance from the Hellespont. The Paeonians were colonists of the Teucrians from Troy" [V, 13; translation George Rawlinson]. Similarly Strabo connects Paeonians with Phrygians [VII, fragm. 37], although elsewhere he describes them as Thracians [VII, fragm. 11]. But both Herodotus [VIII, 185] and Thucydides [II, 98] differentiate them from the Thracians. Pausanias presents a genealogy of Paeonians: "The Eleans we know owned over from Calydon and Aetolia generally. Their earlier history I found to be as follows. The first to rule in this land, they say, was Aethlius, who was the son of Zeus and of Protogeneia, the daughter of Deucalion, and the father of Endymion. The Moon they say, fell in love with this Endymion and bore him fifty daughters. Others with greater probability say that Endymion took a wife Asterodia — others say she was Cromia, the daughter of Itonus, the son of Amphictyon, others again, Hyperippe, the daughter of Arcas, but all agree that Endymion begat Paeon. Epeius, Aetolus, and also a daughter Erycyda. Endymion set his sons to run a race at Olympia for the throne, Epeius won, and obtained the kingdom, and his subjects were than named Epeans for the first time. Of his brothers, they say that Aetolius remained at home, while Paeon, vexed at his defeat, went into the farthest exile possible, and that the region beyond the river Axius was named after him Paeonia" [V, 1.3–5; translation W.H.S. Jones & H.A. Ormerod]. Another genealogy, which is still more confused, recorded Appian in his *Illyrian Wars*: "They say that the country received its name from Illyrius, the son of Polyphemus; for the cyclops Polyphemus and his wife, Galatea, had three sons, Celtus, Illyrius, and Galas, all of whom migrated from Sicily, and the nations called Celts, Illyrians, and Galatians took their origin from them. Among the many myths prevailing among many peoples this seems to me the most plausible. Illyrius had six sons, Enchelus, Autariens, Dardanus, Maedus, Taulas, and Perrhaebus, also daughters, Partho, Daortho, Dassaro, and others, from whom sprang the Taulantii, the Parthii, the Dassaretii, and the Darsii. Autarieus had a son Pannonius, or Paeon, and the latter had sons, Scordiscus and Triballus, from whom nations bearing similar names were derived" [I, 2; translation Horace White]. It is probable that Appian was not able to differentiate Paeonians from Pannonians.

From the Paeonian language almost nothing is preserved. Aristotle in *Historia animalium* [IX, 45] recorded the word μόναπος, μόνωψ "wisent", which contains the IE word for "neck": Old Indic *mānyā*, Old Irish *muin* id., Old High German *mana* "mane". Richer linguistic data are reflected in the proper names. Hesychius preserved the gloss Δύαλος · ὁ Διόνυσος, παρὰ Παίωσιν, which is perhaps derivable from **d^h(u)u^hno-*, cf. Old Irish & Welsh *dall* "blind", Gothic *dwals* "foolish", Old English *dwala* "error", Old Saxon *dwalm* "fascination" etc. The name of the capital of Paeonians Ἀμυδών ~ Ἀβυδών allows to be derive from **ambi-udōn* "on both [sides of] water" (Duridanov, Georgiev). The ethnonym Ἀγριῶνες of one of the Paeonian tribes can be formed from IE **aǵro-* "field". This etymology, if correct, would indicate that Paeonian belongs among

the languages of the *centum*-type. But the names of other tribes as Δόβηρες, Λαιαῖοι, Σιροπαῖονες, Παῖόπλαι, are not satisfactorily explained. It is only apparent that the latter two are compounds consisting of the ethnonym Παῖονες.

BASIC BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ΚΑΤΙČIĆ, RADOSLAV (1976). *Ancient Languages of the Balkans*. The Hague — Paris: Mouton, 1976 (pp. 116–120: Paconia).
 KÖDDERITZSCH, ROLF (1985). Brygisch, Pänisch, Makedonisch. *Balkansko ezikoznanie* 28/4, 1985, 17–41 (pp. 23–24: Paconian).

D. Epirotic

The land-name Ἡπειρος means “mainland” in contrast to the island Κόρκυρα. The territory is limited by the mountains Ceraunia in north and northeast, mountains Pindus in southeast, Aetolia and Acarnania in south and the Ionian Sea in west. The native name of Epirus was probably Αἴσσα, the inhabitants used the ethnonym Αἴσιοι. The richest information was mediated by Strabo. He knows 11 Epirotic tribes: Χάονες, Θεσπρωτοί, Κασσιωπαῖοι, Ἀμφίλοχοι, Ἀθαμᾶνες, Αἴθικες, Τυμφαῖοι, Μολοττοί, Παρωραῖοι, Ὀρέσται, Ἀτιντᾶνες, but quotes Theopompus’ information on 14 tribes in Epirus [VII, fragm. 7.5]. The remaining three tribes could be those which were located in the Upper Macedonia by Thucydides [II, 99.2]: Λυγκησταί καὶ Ἐλιμιῶται καὶ ἄλλα ἔθνη, and again Strabo himself [VII, 7.8]: περὶ Λύγκησταί καὶ Πελαγονίαν καὶ Ὀρεστιάδα καὶ Ἐλίμειαν τὴν ἄνω Μακεδονίαν ἐκάλουον, i.e. Λυγκησταί, Ἐλιμιῶται, Πελαγόνες. The fourth ethnonym quoted by Strabo, Ὀρέσται, are apparently identical in both Epirus and the Upper Macedonia. Strabo also informs us about the bilingualism of the inhabitants of Epirus [VII, 7.8]. One of these languages was probably Greek. The intensive hellenisation of Epirus is connected with Tharrypus’ climb to power in the end of the 5th cent. BC [Plutarch: *Pyrrhus* I, 3]. On the other hand, Strabo mentioned similarities between Epirotic aboriginals and the inhabitant of Macedonia in their clothing, hair cut and especially in language [VII, fragm. 7.8.]. Thucydides [II, 80.5] classified Epirots as barbarians, similarly Strabo referring to Hecateus [VII, 7.10], further Pseudo-Scylax and Pseudo-Scymnus. It seems possible to demonstrate the closeness between the Epirotic and Macedonian languages too. Epirotic βατόρα “bathing-tube” || Macedonian βατάρα “vapour bath” (both by Hesych.) < *b^hotārā, cf. Old Icelandic bað “bath”, esp. “vapour-bath”; Epirotic δράμιξ “bread” || Macedonian δράμις “a kind of a loaf” < *d_rH₂-mi-, cf. Thessalian δάρατος “a kind of bread” < *d_rH₂-to-; Epirotic = Macedonian πέλιος “old man”, πελία “old woman”, cf. Greek παλαιός “old in years”, Mycenaean pa-ra-jo “old”.

BASIC BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ΚΑΤΙČIĆ, RADOSLAV (1971). Epirska plemena i njihov jezik. *Živa antika* 21/2, 1971, 375–380.
 KOKOSZKO, MACIEJ & WITCZAK, KRZYSZTOF T. (1991). Ancient Epirus and its Inhabitants. *Balkansko ezikoznanie* 34, 1991, 42–47.

PAJAKOWSKI, WŁODIMIERZ (1970). *Starożytny Epir i jego mieszkańcy*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo naukowe Uniwersytetu im. A. Mickiewicza, 1970.

E. Messapic

Messapians lived in Calabria and Apulia, including its extension almost up to Garganus mons and Argyripa-Arpi in the north. For the first time they are mentioned by Herodotus as descendants of Cretans of the time of Minos who shipwrecked in Iapygia: “So, when off Iepygie they [= Cretans] had come to be in their sailing, then a great storm overtook and cast out onto the land and, their boats smashed, since for them no means of conveying themselves any longer appeared, thereupon, having founded Hyrie, a city, they remained behind and, having changed, instead of Cretans they became Iepygian Messapians [Ἰήπυνης Μεσσάπιοι] and instead of being islanders mainlanders” [VII, 170]. It was probably Strabo who first tried to explain the ethnonym of Messapians: “In the Anthedonian territory [in Boeotia] is Mount Messapius [Μεσσάπιον ὄρος], named after Messapus [Μεσσάπος], who, when he came into Iapygia, called the country Messapia” [IX, 2.13; translation Horace J. Jones]. Similarly Pliny in his *Naturalis Historiae*: “The Greeks call it [= Calabria], occurring at the territory of Sallentinians, according to their leader Messapia, and earlier Peucetia according to Peucetius, the brother of Oinotrus” [III, 99]. The name of Messapians, i.e. Latin *Messāpii*, Greek Μεσσάπιοι, has been explained as “[those] in the middle of waters”, cf. Greek μέσσος “middle” & Old Indic *ǎp-* “water” (Krahe 1955, 14–15; other references see Urbanová 2004, 103–04, fn. 11); in the (pre-)Greek toponymy are similar compounds known, e.g. Μεσσοπία ‘Peloponnesus’. It is quite natural for inhabitants of both Calabrian & Apulian and Peloponnesos peninsulae. The ethnonyms of such South Italian tribes as *Iapyges*, *Peucetii*, *Sallentini*, *Daunii* etc. were mutually interchangeable, cf. the witness of Strabo: “... And Iapygia borders on them. The Greeks call it Messapia, also, but the natives, dividing it into two parts, call one part (that about the Iapygian Cape) the country of the Salentini, and called Daunii, but the natives give the name Apulia to the whole country that comes after that of the Calabri, though some of them, particularly the Peucetii, are called Poedicli also. Messapia forms a sort of peninsula, since it is enclosed by the isthmus that extends from Brentesium as far as Taras, 310 stadia” [VI, 3.1]; “... and the overland journey from Brentesium to Taras, which is only a one day’s journey for a man well-girt, forms the isthmus of the aforesaid peninsula, and this peninsula most people call by one general name Messapia or Iapygia, or Calabria, or Salentina, although some divide it up, as I have said before” [VI, 3.5]. Later Strabo concludes that Apulii, Daunii and Peucetii use the same language, apparently that what we call Messapic: “The intervening space, immediately after Cape Gargano, is taken up by a deep gulf, the people who live around it are called by the special name of Apulii, although they speak the same language as the Daunii and the Peucetii, and do not differ from them in any other respect either, at the present time at least, although it is reasonable to suppose that in early times they differed and that this is the source of the three diverse names for them that are now prevalent” [VI, 3.11; translation Horace J. Jones]. From the an-

tique authors only Polybius differentiated Messapians and Iapygs, enumerating the allies of Romans against Hannibal: “The lists of men able to bear arms had been returned were as follows: Latins 80.000 foot and 5.000 horse, Samnites 70.000 foot and 7.000 horse, Iapygians and Messapians 50.000 foot and 5.000 horse, ...” [II, 24.10–11; Loeb Classical Library 1922–27].

The Messapic language is known from ca. 550 inscriptions from the 6th–1st cent. BC and several glosses recorded by Strabo and Hesychius. The alphabet used in the inscriptions is the only Old Italian script borrowed directly from Greeks, concretely Doric colonists from Laconia who were founders of Tarent (Greek Τάρων, -ωντος, Latin *Tarentum*, Italian *Taranto*) in the end of the 8th cent. BC. The inscriptions from Daunia and Peucetia are younger (3rd–2nd cent. BC) and were written in a Hellenistic alphabet. Let us confront two interpretations of the same inscription, discovered in Basta (so Plinius III, 100, while Ptolemaius wrote Βαῦστα; today Vaste) in south from Hydruntum, today Otranto:

KLOHI ZIS ΘOTORI AMARTAPIDO VASTEIBAS TA VEINA ... ARAN IN
DARANΘOA VASTI STABOOS

*audi Iupiter *teutore Amartapidio Vastinis haec lex ... illam in gerusia
Vasti statuerunt*

XONEDONAS DAXTAS-SI VA ANETOS IN-ΘI TRI[]ONOXO A STABOOS
XONETΘIHI DAZIMAIHI BEILIIHI IN-ΘI

*Xonedonus Daxtus-que iniverunt ? in-que tri[b]unici.. a statuerunt Xonetii
Dazimi filii in-que*

REXXOROXOA KAZAREIHI XONETΘIHI OTΘEIIHI-ΘI DAZOHONNIHI IN-ΘI
VASTI MA[NNATI] DAXTAS

*rectoricia Kazariaei Xoneti Ussiaei-que Dazohonnihi inque Vasti mo-
net ? Daxtus*

KRAΘEHEIHI INΘI ARDANNOA POXXONNIHI A IMARNAIHI

Crataiei [filius] inque ... Pausonii

[Haas 1962, 91–2]

KLOHI ZIS ΘOTORIA MARTA PIDO VASTEI BASTA VEINAN ARAN IN
DARANΘOA VASTI STABOOS

“One must heed these [things]. I, Čuturia Marta, in the city Basta manage the vine fields
in Darančua, a city, of Stabeus

XONEDONAS DASTAS-SI-VA ANETOS IN-ΘI TRIGONOXO A STABOOS
XONETΘIHI DAZIMAIHI BEILEIHI

Šunedo and also [those] of Dašet Aneteus; and in Trigunušua [those] of Stabeus Sunec-
ces, Dazimas's son;

IN-ΘI REXXORIXOA KAZAREIHI XONETΘIHI OTΘEIIHI-ΘI
DAZOHONNIHI IN-ΘI VASTI MA...

and in Reššurišua [those] of Kazarias Šuneččius, and Uččes Dazuyunnius; and in the
city Ma[nduria]

DAXTAS KRAΘEHEIHI IN-ΘI ARDANNOA POXXONNIHI A IMARNAIHI
[those] of Dašet Kračėius; and in Ardannua [those] of Poššunnius Aimarnas.”

[Huld 1995, 150]

Traditionally the Messapians are connected with Illyrians (so e.g. Pliny Elder in his *Naturalis Historiae* [III, 102] from the first cent. AD: “Nine young men and the same number of young women from Illyria are ancestors for 12 tribes [of southern Italy]”; further Servius living in the 5th cent. AD in his comments to Aeneis [VII, 691] and in the recent time e.g. Rădulescu 1994). Regarding the fatal scarceness of the credible information on Illyrian some scholars substitute the missing Messapic-Illyrian parallels by the Messapic-Albanian ones. Analyzing the trustworthy comparisons, in the Indo-European context the relationship is always wider and often semantically closer: *aran* acc. “field” | Albanian *arë* id., cf. Latvian *āra* id., Latin *ārea* “space, ground, threshing-floor”, Hittite *arha-* “border, area”, Lydian *aara-* “farmstead, land”; βαρυκα: αἰδοῖον παρὰ Ταρ-αντίνοις | Albanian *bark* “belly, womb, abdomen”, cf. also Greek φάρυγξ “throat”; βαυρία: οἰκία, βύριον: οἴκημα | Albanian *burrë* “man, husband”, cf. Old High German. *būr* “house”, *gibūr(o)* “villager, peasant”; *bilia* “daughter” | Albanian *bijë* ~ *bilë* id., cf. Latin *fīlia*, Faliscan *filea*, Venetic *filia* id.; βρένδον: ἔλαφον | Albanian *bri*, pl. *brinj* “horns”, cf. Latvian *briēdis* “elk”, Swedish *brind* “deer”; *klaohi, klohi* “listen, hear!” | alb. *kluhem* ~ *quhem* “I am called”, cf. Lithuanian *klausyti* “to hear”, Tocharian B *klyauṣ-* id., etc. The most important argument against the exclusive Messapic-(Illyrian)-Albanian relations consists in the different realizations of the palatal velars: Albanian and probably also Illyrian represent the languages of the *satəm*-type, while Messapic can be classified as the *centum*-language, cf. the personal pronoun *ik* “I” in the inscription *va ik Anetaos* “also I [am] Aneteus’ [vase]” (Huld 1995, 153) < **eġō*, with closest cognates in Germanic: Gothic. *ik*, further Venetic *ego*, Faliscan *eko* ~ *ego*, Latin *egō* etc. : Avestan *azə* & *azəm*, Armenian *es*, Old Lithuanian. *eš*, Old Church Slavonic *azъ* id. (Pokorny 1959, 291); *dehatañ* “tithe” < **deġmtā*, cf. Greek δεκάτη id. (Haas 1962, 190). The cases, when the original palatal velar is realized as a dental (spirant), can be explained by the palatalizing role of the following front vowel, e.g. *dentas*, ac. *dentan* “sign” : Avestan *paiti-zantū-* “reputable”, *denḫavan* “knowledge”: Avestan *zantū-* id. A similar development is assumed in Phrygian, see above. In the recent time Huld (1995, 152–54) has presented a hypothesis on the operation of Grassmann’s law in Messapic. This rule is best described in Old Indic [a] and Greek [b], but it is possible to determine its variant [c] in ancient Macedonian and Pelasgic too:

- [a] B^H ... D^H > B...D^H
 [b] B^H ... D^H > P^H ... T^H > P...T^H
 [c] B^H ... D^H > P^H ... D^H > P...D

Ad [a] & [b]: Old Indic *bódhati* “wakes, observes, understands”: Greek πεύθομαι “I examine, experience”, cf. Gothic *ana-biudan* “to order, command”, Lithuania *budėti*, Old Church Slavonic *bǫděti* “to wake”, etc. < **b^heud^h-* (Pokorny 1959, 151).

Ad [c]: Macedonian κεβλή “head” : Greek κεφαλή id., cf. Gothic *gibla* “gable” < **g^heb^h-z₂llo-* (Pokorny 1959, 423); Pelasgic πύργος “tower” : Gothic

baurgs “city, fortified place, tower”, Old High German *berg* “mountain”, Armenian *barjr* “high”, Old Indic *brhánt-* id. < **b^hrǵ^h-*, **b^herǵ^h-* (Pokorny 1959, 140–41). Huld finds the main argument in Messapic verb *pido*, for which he supposes the meaning “manage” and derives it from the root **b^heid^h-*, continuing in Greek *πείθω* “I persuade, convince”, Latin *fidō* “I believe”, *fidēs* “confidence”, *foedus* “pact, league”, Gothic *baidjan* “to compel, exercise a moral constraint”, *beidan* “to wait for”, Russian *ubedit’* “to convince”, Albanian *be* “oath”, etc. (Pokorny 1959, 117). It implies the variant [c] of Grassmann’s law.

Accepting the results of the most recent research, including Huld’ ones, it is probable to characterize Messapic as the *centum*-language with the secondary palatalization of velars before front vowels, similarly as in Phrygian, with the function of Grassmann’s law close to Macedonian, with the inconsistent tendency to the change **s* > *h*, **o* > *a*, known also from Macedonian. Regarding some of the lexical isoglosses of the type Messapic *vasti* “city”: Greek *ἄστυ* id., with *w-* preserved in some dialects, e.g. Boeotic gen. *Ἔαστιος* (and further Old Indic *vāstu* “dwelling”, Tocharian A *wast* “house”), seems more promising the hypothesis of a closer Helleno-Messapic relationship than the traditional Illyro-Messapic conception.

From the Messapic grammar the richest information is in our disposal about the nominal declension, regarding the majority of the proper names in the Messapic texts. The following table summarizes Haas’ (1962) conclusions:

stem (*)	-o-	-jo-	-ā	-jā	-i-	-u-	-or	-ēr	-ōn
sg. nom.	<i>artas</i> <i>Dazimas</i>	σαπιτος	<i>tabara</i>	<i>bilia</i> <i>Damatria</i>	<i>datis</i>	<i>Etos/Etis</i> <i>Zis</i>	<i>Œotor</i>	<i>mata</i>	<i>mato</i> <i>Laoho</i>
gen.	<i>Dazimaihi</i>	<i>bilihi</i> & <i>bollihi</i>	<i>tabarovaz</i> <i>Lenas</i>	<i>Œeotorias</i> <i>Domatrias</i>	<i>Keireos</i>	<i>Morkos</i>	<i>Œaotoras</i>	<i>Damatras</i>	<i>Dazihonas</i>
dat.	<i>Kretaaihi</i>		<i>tabarai</i> <i>Aproditahi</i>	<i>Œeotiai</i>		<i>Morkihi</i>	<i>Taotori</i> <i>[v]ekori</i>	<i>Dama[ta]ri</i>	<i>Dazihoni</i>
acc.	εικοναλον n. <i>dentan</i>		<i>dehatan</i> <i>Aproditan</i>		<i>datin</i> <i>danin</i>	<i>denavan</i> n. <i>vasti</i> < -u		[D] <i>amatra</i>	
loc.	<i>isareti</i>		<i>tabaraihe</i>	<i>-borrahe</i>		n. <i>vasti</i>	<i>Œotori</i>		
abl.	<i>iamaro</i>		<i>deranþoa</i>						
pl. nom.			<i>-etas</i>	<i>Spalias</i>					
gen.	n. <i>lamihon</i>								
dat.				<i>Lai.dehiab</i> <i>as</i>	<i>Logetibas</i>	n. <i>vasteibas</i>			
acc.	n. <i>kerma</i>		? <i>metas</i>						
abl.	<i>nomais</i>			<i>zatatþebis</i>	<i>ogrebis</i>				
du. nom.				<i>biliva</i>					
dat.				<i>Lenabis</i>					
acc.						<i>ratoz</i>			

Personal pronouns: *ik* “I”, „*u* “thou”, *is* “he, that, this”.

Demonstratives: f. *ta* < **iā*, n. *ta* < **to(d)*.

Interrogatives & relatives: *kos* “who” < **k^hos*; „*is/tis* “quis” < **k^his*; *ti* “quid” < **k^hid*.

Numerals: *doa* “2”, *tri-* “3”, **penke* “5” (reconstructed on the basis of such proper names as *Penkeos* and *Penkaheh*), *inoῖbes* “9th” < **enuat̄ios* < **enuṅt̄ios*, *dehatan* acc. sg. “tithe” < **deḱmt̄ām*.

The verbal morphology is reconstructible only fragmentarily in comparison with the nominal inflection.

In the 1st person sg. of the present there are reflexes of both **-ō* and **-mi* endings: *do* “I give”, *pido* “I manage”, *in-vaho* “I consecrate” < **en-vas-iō* and *predami*, *pred.mi* < **pre-dō[d]-mi*; maybe also *ημι* “sum”, if it is not borrowed from Greek.

3 sg. present or perfect: *ha-garati* “he encloses, -ed”, *zavati* “he consecrates, -ed”, *ivvasi* id. < **en-vas-ti(?)*; *mannati* “he proposes, -ed” < **mṅ-ḱ[e/o]-ti*, *kroseti* “violat”; *est* “est” < **es-ti*;

3 sg. hortative: *dazet* “faciat” < **d^hḱ₂-k-ḱā-t*, *deirret* “praehendat” < **g^her-ḱā-t*, *berad* “ferat” < **b^her-ā-t*.

3 sg. sigmatic aoriste: *vetes* “vetuit, vetat”; *pa-des* “dedicavit” < **po-d^hē-s-t*, cf. Phrygian *edaes* “fecit”, *esta(e)s* “posuit”.

3 sg. aoriste in **-b^hu-*: *stabes* “posuit” < **stā-b^hu-es-t*, 3rd pl.: *staboos* “statuerunt” < **stā-b^hu-ṅs*.

3 sg. pefect: *dedaren* “posuit” < **d^hed^hēr-en*; 3 pl. perfect: *pa-dazeran* “posuerunt”, cf. Phrygian *dakaren* “fecerunt” (the perfect in *-r-* occurs in the gloss ἀπεκελλερεν ἀπέκλεψεν by Hesychius, in confrontation with another Hesychius’ gloss ἀκελλεα ἔκλεψαν, οἱ Ταραντῖνοι).

3 pl. prohibitive: *ma beran* “ne ferant” < **mē b^her-ā-nt*.

Prepositions and prefixes: *anda* “before”, *apa* “ab” = ἀπό, *atar-* “inter” < **H₁ṅ-ter-*, *ex* “from”, *ha-/sa-* “con-” < **sm-*, *hipa-/?hopa-* “ὑπο-” < **(s)upo-*, *in* “in”, *pa-* = Latin & Slavic *po-*, Lithuanian & Tocharian *pa-*.

Conjunctions and other particles: *ai* = Greek “αἰ”, *an* “ἐάν” = Greek ἄν, Latin, Gothic *an*, *de* = Greek δέ, Gaulish *de*, *i* “or”, *ma* “ne” = Greek μή, *min* = Greek μέν, *ne-* = Latin *ne-*, *-pi/-si* = Latin “-que” or Greek ἔτι “again”?

In spite of the scarceness of the relevant grammatical and lexical data, the Hellenic hypothesis of the closer genetic unity of Greek with such relic languages as Macedonian, Paeonian, Epirotic from the South Balkan or Phrygian and Messapic, originating historically from the same region, seems a hypothesis promising more than any of their alternative affiliations.

BASIC BIBLIOGRAPHY

- HAAS, OTTO (1962). Messapische Studien. Inschriften mit Kommentar, Skizze einer Laut- und Formenlehre. Heidelberg: Winter, 1962.
 HULD, MARTIN (1995). Grassmann’s Law in Messapic. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 23, 1995, 147–155.

- KRAHE, HANS (1955). Die Sprache der Illyrier. I: Die Quellen. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1955 (pp. 12–37: Die messapische Inschriften).
- LOMBARDO, MARIO (2000). Messapii, Messapia. In Der Neue Pauly 8. Stuttgart — Weimar: Metzler, 2000, cc. 48–49.
- MILEWSKI, TADEUSZ (1965). The relation of Messapic within the Indo-European. In *Symbolae linguisticae in honorem G. Kuryłowicz*. Wrocław — Warszawa — Kraków, 1965, 204–219; reprinted in *Balkansko ezikoznanie* 25, 1982, 204–219.
- PARLANGELI, ORONZO (1978). Il messapico. In *Popoli a civiltà del'Italia antica*, VI. Roma, 1978, 919–951.
- RĂDULESCU, MIRCEA-MIHAI (1994). The Indo-European Position of Messapic. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 22, 1994, 329–344.
- SIMONE, CARLO DE (1962). Die messapische Sprache (seit 1939). *Kratylos* 7, 1962, 113–135.
- SIMONE, CARLO DE (1964). Die Messapische Inschriften und ihre Chronologie. In HANS KRAHE (ED.). *Die Sprache der Illyrier, II*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1964, 1–152.
- SIMONE, CARLO DE (1989). Gli studi recenti sulla lingua messapica. In *Italia omnium terrarum parens*. Ed. by PUGLIESE CARATELLI. Milano, 1989, 651–658.
- SIMONE, CARLO DE (1993). Messapisch tabaras, -ā “Priester, -in”. In *Sprache und Schriften des antiken Mittelmeerraums. Festschrift für Jürgen Untermann zum 65. Geburtstag*, eds. by F. HEIDERMANN ET AL. Innsbruck: IBS 78, 1993, 445–454.
- SIMONE, CARLO DE & MARCHESINI, STEFANIA (EDS., 2002). *Monumenta linguae Messapicae, I*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2002.
- STRABO (1909–13). *Geographica*. Ed. by AUGUSTUS MEINECKE. Leipzig: Teubner, 1909–13.
- URBANOVÁ, DANIELA (2004). Messapština. *Listy filologické* 127, 2004, 102–111.

RESUMÉ

Termín *paleobalkánské jazyky* označuje starověké jazyky Balkánského poloostrova (s výjimkou řečtiny) nebo jazyky z Balkánského poloostrova pocházející, pro něž se předpokládá indoevropský původ. Shodou okolností jsou všechny tyto jazyky jen fragmentárně dokumentovány, o všech tedy můžeme hovořit jako o reliktových. Z hlediska genetické klasifikace se mezi jazyky starověkého Balkánu rýsují tři vyšší taxonomické jednotky, o jejichž hlubší jednotě lze spekulovat, ale dostatečné důkazy chybějí. Nejjižnější část poloostrova zaujímaly jazyky, které kromě geografické polohy spojuje užší vztah k řečtině v lexiku i gramatice, včetně specifické realizace Grassmannova zákona. Proto bylo pro danou genetickou jednotku zvoleno označení *helénské jazyky*. Jde o tyto jazyky (v závorce formy dokumentace): fryžský (asi 250 nápisů starofryžských a 100 novofryžských), makedonský (glossy), paiónský (vlastní jména), epeirotský (glossy, vlastní jména) a hypoteticky též messapský (asi 550 nápisů). Ač fryžské nápisy nacházíme v Malé Asii a messapské nápisy zase na Apeninském poloostrově, antické historické povědomí spojovalo Frygy i Messapy s Balkánem.

Václav Blažek
Ústav jazykovědy FF MU
(blazek@phil.muni.cz)

