Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland

<http://journals.cambridge.org/TRA>

Additional services for *Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

XVII. Remarks on some Inscriptions found in Lycia and Phrygia

G. F. Grotefend

Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland / Volume 3 / Issue 02 / July 1833, pp 317 - 331
DOI: 10.1017/S0950473700001051, Published online: 24 September 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0950473700001051

How to cite this article:

G. F. Grotefend (1833). XVII. Remarks on some Inscriptions found in Lycia and Phrygia. Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, 3, pp 317-331 doi:10.1017/S0950473700001051

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

XVII. *Remarks on some Inscriptions found in Lycia and Phrygia.**By Dr. G. F. GROTEFEND, F.M.R.A.S.*

Read 19th of March 1831.

FROM the little information in our possession concerning the Lycian and Phrygian language and character, it was very gratifying to find some light thrown on the subject by the discovery of certain inscriptions, for which we are indebted to Messrs. COCKERELL, CARLYLE, and Colonel LEAKE; and fac-similes of which have been published by Mr. ROBERT WALPOLE.* The valuable information which these inscriptions promised to afford for the illustration of the Archæology of Asia Minor, induced the French scholars, MM. LETRONNE and SAINT-MARTIN, to republish them in the *Journal des Savans*,† and to add many new observations upon them to those previously recorded by Mr. WALPOLE.‡ Notwithstanding, however, the numerous explanations given by these scholars of these inscriptions, which Mr. WALPOLE thought it impossible to decypher, and how far soever the perplexities of them may have been overcome, especially by M. SAINT-MARTIN, still there are many particulars which will allow of different views being entertained; and so far, therefore, it may not be altogether superfluous to submit the whole to a new and careful investigation.

As there is among the Lycian inscriptions one *Inscriptio bilinguis*, which opens the way to understand the remainder, we naturally begin with that. Not only from the resemblance of the characters, but also from the great similarity of the contents, we combine with the *Inscriptio bilinguis* (which, according to Mr. COCKERELL, was met with near the city of Phineca, among the ruins of the ancient Lycian city of Myra, on a marble sepulchre rivalling the most tasteful architecture of the Athenian master-pieces), three other inscriptions engraven on tombs of no less beauty at *Kakava*, in

* Travels in various Countries of the East, by ROBERT WALPOLE: Vol. II. 4to. London, 1820-4.

† October 1820, p. 624, and April 1821, p. 248.

‡ Travels, &c. p. 526.

the island of *Dolichiste*; and as a proof that the same characters and language were used in *Caria*, we also add a rather imperfect copy of a very mutilated inscription from among those copied there by Dr. CLARKE and Capt. BEAUFORT. To facilitate the comparison we will place the whole together, divided into separate words, marking the mutilated passages by dots.

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
I.↑EIP:	↑PRAF↑EIP:	M↑TE	PENPFF↑TY	SEΔ↑PEIA:
II. ↑P↑E~*:	PICAAE~*:	~*VTE	~*PENAΓAITY	↑PPTENAMOFAI
III. ↑BYE~*↑	B.PENAF~*	M~*TΔ	PPEXANFAT~*	↓AOF~*NEME
IV. ↑B~*E~*~*	YOP~*:	M~*TE:	PPENPFFAT~*:	↑E↑T↑EIA
V. AB.E....	PΓ~*	MAT	PPEWPREΛ↑.	CIEIPM

6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.
I. A....	TEΔ↑EME	.P~*E	↑TAE	↑.BEN	Λ↑ΔE	↑+BE	↑↑
II.		+PΓGE			ΑΔΔE	↑+PE	↑↑
III.		+PΓGE			ΛFΔE	↑+BE	↑↑
IV.		+PΓGE	F...E	T+BE:	↑↑:ΛΔE:	↑+BE	↑↑:
V. M↑T.	TΔ~*...ME		ETEΔ	EPAP	↑PΔ.	~*III	

14.	15.	16.
I. TEΔ↑EME	Λ.E.Λ↑↑.	
II. TEΔ↑EMΛ.	↑+BE↑.	
III. TEΔ↑EM↑	+BE↑	~*~*P↑PEKΛ~*+↓ETAFPTA.
IV. TEΔ↑EM↑.		
V.	Λ+PΛ	ΛPΔ↑PΔ.....

No. I. is the Lycian portion of the *Inscriptio bilinguis*, the Greek translation of which runs as follows:

ΤΟΜΝΗΜΑΤΟΑΦΑ...ΟΙΗΣΑΤΟΣΙΔΑΡΙΟΣΓΑΙΝ.ΝΙΟΣΥΙΟΣ
ΕΑΥΤΩΙΚΑΙΤΗΓΥ..ΙΚΙΚΔΙΥΙΔΙΓΥΒΙΑΛΗ.

Nos. II. III. and IV. are the three other Lycian inscriptions; and No. V. is that from *Caria*.

Notwithstanding the mutilation of this last-named inscription, and the consequent imperfection of the transcript, still the conformity of its cha-

acters to those of the others, and the similarity of its import, are manifest ; and thus, although we may be unable to explain this particular inscription itself in a satisfactory manner, the resemblance which it bears to the rest may lead to their clearer elucidation. If we deduct the characters which occur but once, and which may be mistakes of the artist, this inscription will still contain all the characters found in the others, with the exception of the single Ψ , and therefore appears to be of much the same age with them. But their antiquity must not be supposed extremely great on account of the letters and language of the Greek translation, although the Lycian alphabet dates from a period when the Greek had a χ , but hardly an η and ω ; at least there are no traces of these letters in the Lycian writing, though, as we shall soon see, it distinguished between long and short vowels, and thus enriched the Greek alphabet, which it had taken as its basis, with several vowels. That the Lycian alphabet itself was more ancient than the Greek translation above quoted, is evident, from the different forms of the S in the name SIDARIOS, which is the fifth word in the first Lycian inscription. A comparison of the p 's of the eighth word will shew, that the alphabet of the *Inscriptio bilingualis* belongs to a somewhat earlier date ; while the other inscriptions, on the contrary, as is proved especially by the first letter of the fourth word, gradually give such a form to the p , that, in the fourth inscription, this letter is written precisely as in the Greek translation. If we may rely on the copy of the Carian inscription, we there find the p formed exactly as in the Latin alphabet. Thus much, at least, appears to result from a comparison of the p 's in the several inscriptions, *viz.* that they in the order of time succeeded each other, according to the arrangement above given ; and that the Lycians not only in their writing originally took the Greek alphabet for a basis, but also altered particular characters after the Greek. Still other characters retain so very ancient a form, that we may from them infer a comparatively early origin for the Lycian alphabet.

The import of those characters which the Lycian alphabet has in common with the Greek, may be easily determined : but that of the rest can only be discovered by their being substituted for others ; for the orthography of the Lycians was so little settled, that one and the same word (as, for instance, the fourth) was not unfrequently written in forms distinctly different. But before we seek to determine the value of each separate letter, it will be advisable to explain as far as possible, with the assistance of the Greek

translation, what is the signification of each particular word. Whether the words of the Carian inscription are properly divided or not, must be left undecided, in consequence of its imperfect state. The separation of words in the other inscriptions, is for the most part determined by a colon, either in one inscription or another, or by other signs, as will appear in the course of the examination. Now, if we wish to ascertain the signification of the respective words, our first care must be to seek out the names, of which the Greek translation exhibits three. No one of these is more easily perceived than SIDARIOS in the fifth word, by which also the different names of the remaining inscriptions are given. With little more difficulty, the name of PYBIALE is discovered in the last word of the first inscription. But we are not to infer that the other inscriptions should also contain a name at this particular place. The greatest obstacle is in the decyphering of the name, which, in the Greek translation, is rendered by Παύριος, since not only does the Greek translation present a *lacuna* in this name, but the Lycian inscription itself shews a considerable gap in that part at which the name in question should be found. Hence it has happened, that M. SAINT-MARTIN has both read the name in the Greek translation in a manner with which we cannot easily agree, and has sought for this name in a wrong part of the Lycian inscription. Taking both the *p*'s of the eighth word for two *n*'s, he finds the name Παύριος in a word which occurs in all the inscriptions; whereas it appears, on the contrary, to have stood in the mutilated spot immediately after the name of SIDARIOS.

Next to the names, there is no word of which the import is more clearly discoverable than the seventh, which in the Greek translation is rendered by υἱός. Now as this word in the fourteenth passage corresponds to the Greek υἱός, which undoubtedly signified a daughter (since υἱός would have been written for a grand-daughter), παῖς, or *child*, may be considered as its proper meaning, and it is very possible that the slightly varied termination of this word denotes the plural, *children*. We can only thus account for the circumstance, that in the fourth inscription nothing occurs after this word; whereas, both in the second and third, a word is found after it, which, according to the termination, must be an adjective belonging to it. This adjective likewise in the twelfth word appears in the singular, belonging to the eleventh word, which, following the Greek translation, must be taken to signify *woman*; for, in the fourth inscription, this word is preceded by the same two signs, which are found at the thirteenth passage before the

indication of the children, and which, according to the Greek translation, can signify nothing else than, *and*. Now, if we take the eighth word as having the same meaning with the Greek *ἑαυτῷ*, or the Latin *sibi*, then the twelfth word, which seems to be a derivative from the eighth, must signify *suus*. But the tenth word not appearing to be distinguished from this, we must of necessity take the ninth as a substantive, which, as being of no essential importance, is not only left out in the second and third inscriptions, but is also unnoticed in the Greek translations. It may perhaps signify *memory*. In the first two words, the inscriptions severally differ; the third and fourth, on the contrary, are, with the exception of the different forms of writing, the same in all the inscriptions. Hence it is probable that these two words combined express one idea, which has been rendered in the Greek translation by the reflective *ἀνεποιήσατο*, as the word must probably be read. The Latin *curavit ædificandum* might be taken for those two words, inasmuch as the fourth appears to be derived from the second word of the second and third inscriptions, which would hence signify *ædificium*. For the first word, which is obliterated in the first inscription, must in the fourth signify by itself a tomb, in case no second word accompanies it.

We may perhaps, through the second word of the fourth inscription, arrive at some conclusion with regard to the family of languages to which the Lycian belongs. As the last character in this word is found at the end of the fourth word, and in the middle of the first, interchanging with an *Υ*, it is probable that the sound is the same, but prolonged; and this leads us to the observation, that the Lycian writing, like the Persian, distinguished long from short vowels by different marks, the former of which might have been changed like diphthongs into different sounds; and that as the old Greek alphabet only gave marks for short vowels, new ones were invented in the Lycian for the long vowels. Thus we may in the simplest manner account for the various characters peculiar to the Lycian writings, as long vowels besides the short ones taken from the Greek alphabet. For it is manifest, from a comparison of the Lycian and Greek alphabets, that the Lycians received all the letters of the Greek alphabet for which they had corresponding sounds in their own language, and enriched them with vowels for such sounds as were not satisfactorily defined for them by those characters. If, accordingly, we read the second word of the fourth inscription *yopÿ*, we can scarcely refrain from comparing it with the word *ἰωπι*, which,

according to TZETZES,* had among the *Lycians* the same signification as δεῦρο, and may therefore probably have been used by the *Lycians* for ἐνθάδε. Consequently the Lycian language, as we find it also in the Lycian characters of Caria, would seem to be related to the Lydian; and this is all the more probable, from the fact that HOMER brings the *Lycians* into connexion with the *Trojans* in *Mysia*. Now the *Mysians*, according to HERODOTUS,† were descendants of the *Lydians*, and both were of the same family with the *Carians*,‡ with whom the *Lycians* § had many customs in common. STRABO || tells us that the *Mysian* language was a mixture of the *Lydian* and *Phrygian*; and as the *Mysians* and *Phrygians* are made *Thracian* tribes by STRABO,¶ so HERODOTUS** calls the *Armenians* descendants of the *Phrygians*.

But the Armenian language approaches in its grammatical structure more nearly to the European tongues, and especially to the Greek, than to the Aramæan, which M. SAINT-MARTIN adduces to assist in his explanation of Lycian words. The abundance of vowels in the Lycian language, is of itself an argument against a comparison of it with the Aramæan. It much rather evinces, in the few remains of it which we possess, the character of the Armenian by its impure vowels, its sibilant and aspirated sounds, and its unwieldy combination of consonants. Like the Armenian, it appears to have neither article nor gender; but, on the other hand, it distinguishes a plural with a rich declension by particular terminations, while the pronouns are individually expressed, all which is opposed to the character of the Aramæan language. What is said of the Armenian, *viz.* that by reason of the similarity of its composition, of its tenses, and of its use of the participles, it is best calculated for translation from the Greek, seems to apply equally to the Lycian. Thus the *Inscriptio bilinguis* displays throughout the same succession of words in Lycian and Greek, though the Latin language might perhaps have been still better calculated for the literal translation of our inscriptions. Though the *Solymians* and *Arimians* of HOMER, as all the *Cilicians*, may have belonged to the Aramæan family of languages, yet we have no reason for supposing the Aborigines of *Lycia*, whom HOMER†† places at enmity with those tribes, to have spoken any other than a branch of the Phrygian language. As the *Telchinians* were skilful workers in ore, it may be supposed that the *Phœnicians*, like the Greeks, settled in the

* Ad Lycophron. v. 1232.

† VII. 74.

‡ I. 171, and Strabo XIV. 2, 23.

§ Herod. i. 173.

|| XII. 7, 3.

¶ VII. 3, 2.

** VII. 73.

†† Il. vi.

southern coasts of Asia Minor; in support of which opinion, M. SAINT-MARTIN adduces divers medals with characters resembling the Phœnician, and also two verses of QUINTUS SMYRNÆUS,* in which the name of the *Phœnicians* is made to extend as far as the Lycian mountain *Massikytes*. It would however be as difficult to explain from the Aramæan all the names which we find in the inscriptions on the Caramanian shores, such as *Dae*, *Epiuasis*, *Kidamuasis*, *Kualis*, *Kuas*, *Las*, *Nineis*, *Obranguis*, *Obrangeris*, as the names and words of the Lycian inscriptions themselves. Phœnician, as well as Greek words, may have become mixed with the barbarous elements of the Lycian language; but the latter belonged (as is to be inferred from the names of places in *assus*, *essus*, or *issus*) to the widely extended Phrygian tribes, and so closely resembled the Medo-Persian language, that ALEXANDER, according to ABRRIAN,† employed as an interpreter in *Bactria* and *Sogdiana*, a Lycian named PHARNUCHOS, which very name exhibits some similarity with the Persian PHARNAKES. Even the outward form of the Lycian tombs, together with the fire-worship prevailing in Lycia,‡ has reference to Persian taste, and Persian ideas of religion. We do not, however, hereby mean to contend, that a knowledge of one of the languages mentioned will be sufficient to explain the Lycian inscriptions; we should rather seek to illustrate them from their own contents.

As by a comparison of the different inscriptions we have defined the probable signification of the separate words, so must we also proceed to ascertain the import of each particular character. Let us then re-commence with the name of SIDARIOS at the fifth space of the first inscription. The fourth character in this name, and the only one not corresponding to any Greek character, seems to have had the value of an *a*; which supposition is borne out by the fact that in the Carian inscription, at the beginning of the first word, and in the middle of the third, an *a* is actually written instead of it. But as other signs also in the Lycian alphabet seem to have expressed the sound of *a* (insomuch that M. SAINT-MARTIN believes he has found no less than five different characters for *a*), while other vowels exist only in a single form, it becomes doubtful whether the Greek translation can justify us in receiving the unknown character as a secondary form of the *a*; for, as the Lycian writing uses an *e* instead of an *i*, so that the *i*, which always occurs after one, and mostly between two vowels, seems to have the

* Paralipom. Hom. viii. 106, *et seq.*

† IV. 3.

‡ See Creuzer, Symbolik und Mythologie, II. page 136, *et seq.*

value rather of the Latin consonant than the Greek vowel, the character in question may have been rendered by an *a*, only in order to produce a Greek sounding name like Σιδάριος, which PHAVORINUS explains by χαλκεύς. That the name is however really Lycian, appears from the name Σιδηροῦς, which, according to SCYLAX, is given to a cape and harbour in Lycia: and here we should observe, that in *Lycia*, as in *Caria*, the *η* was, even in CICERO's time, pronounced as it is now by the modern Greeks. At least, at the Parthian expedition of CRASSUS, according to CICERO,* the word Καυναίαις, by which Carian figs were offered for sale, was spoken exactly like the Latin *Cave ne eas*. It is true that STEPHANUS writes this name Σιδαροῦς; but as he mentions a Lycian city Σιδάκη, which is said to have taken its name from the daughter of AMISODORUS; and also Σιδήνη and Σίδυμα, whose names he derives from Σίδυμος, as well as an Ionian city Σιδήλη and Σίδουσσα, together with many small towns named Σιδοῦς, we perceive that the name of the Pamphylian city Σίδη is the true root of all those names, notwithstanding their having received various terminations with different vowels.

With regard to the Carian inscription, we are not certain, from the imperfect state of its characters, whether the *a* is not an incorrect representation by the copyist of the character whose import we are seeking to establish, and which is in other instances also not very accurately given. In the third word, at least, this *a* corresponds to the character which we have above, in the word *yopȳ*, taken for a long *y*, but which, in the second inscription, as well as the *m* preceding it, is not clearly exhibited. According to the relation of that character to the long *i* (which would also appear to be the last character of the fourth word of the Carian inscription, if we may rely upon the transcript), we must feel all the more disposed to receive it for a long *i*; it being, in fact, nothing more than an *I* with an apex. SIDARIOS was therefore SEDÍREJA, as PYBIALE was properly PYBEALIJĬ, at least in the dative. What the sound of the third name may have been, we cannot determine, since the whole of it in the Lycian inscription is destroyed except the letters at the beginning. But the Greek inscription has also a chasm between παιν and νιος, which is probably to be supplied by an *η*, inasmuch as the adjectives of the above-mentioned names of cities generally end with ηνός. And it is clear that the names in question must also be taken as adjectives, since the *Lycians*, as is expressly affirmed by HERODOTUS,† took their names, not from the father, but from the mother,

* De Div. II, 40; and Plin. Hist. Nat. xv, 19 (21) extr.

† I. 173.

and consequently had, in all probability, like the Etrurians, a particular form of adjective for *metronymics*. The correctness of this remark of HERODOTUS is borne out by HERACLIDES PONTIUS,* and PLUTARCH,† from which M. SAINT-MARTIN erroneously considered Παίῖνιος to be the genitive of Παίῖνις, the name of a father; and it is further corroborated by the fact that the god of the Lycian archers was called in preference Λητοῖδης.

Whether the name *Pæan* has any relation to the Lycian name Παίῖνι, we must leave undecided. But the name LETO or LATONA probably originated in the designation of a woman, *lade*, as we are to read the eleventh word of the third inscription. By this word we are made acquainted with two different characters representing *a*; one of which resembles the *spiritus asper* in the Heracleian tables, and has only a slight stroke too much in the third inscription; while the other, which is always confounded with the *p* in the Carian inscription, is distinguished from the *a* merely by the want of a stroke. The first of these signs may be an *a*; but the other in all probability signified the same with the Latin *æ*; at least, a mark is added to the character which occupies the place of the *a* in the middle of the fourth word of the third inscription, which mark no where else occurs, and in all likelihood indicates it to be a diphthong. The termination of the first word of the bilingual inscription would therefore be *iejæ*. We find the same termination in the name in the fifth division of the fourth inscription, whilst the name corresponding thereto in the Carian inscription (the last character of which is apparently by mistake drawn to the word following next) has the same termination as the second word of the first inscription, if we may assume the central mark of the second character to have been omitted by error. Hence, the first two words of the bilingual inscription are nouns, the first being perhaps equivalent to the Greek τόδε, which must be read instead of TOAF in the Greek translation. But if the first word be a demonstrative pronoun, the second must signify *tomb*; the yet undeciphered character in this word is probably an *n*, or long *e*; for in the fourth word it stands between *pr* and *n*, and elsewhere between compound consonants; and appears to be merely a compound of two *e*'s. That the *e* was written also in the reversed form, is satisfactorily shewn by the third inscription.

We find the digamma in the fourth word exchanged for a *π*; and if we further consider that the inscription of some medals of the Cilician city

* 15.

† De Mul. virt. 9.

Nepheleis,* runs thus Ν↑Γ↑Λ↑ΔΔ↑, it will appear that among the *Lycians* the digamma had the sound of the Latin *f*; according to which, the second word of the bilingual inscription should be read thus: *īræfæējæ*. There is as much reason for comparing this word with the Greek ἱρίον, as for comparing the first word of the other inscriptions, *ībȳēnȳ*, to the Syriac *abana*, a tombstone. The second word of the second and third inscriptions should be read *prēnafē* rather than *baēnafē*, as M. SAINT-MARTIN reads it. At least the second inscription has clearly a Π at the beginning of the word, and the additional point, in the third inscription, probably indicates, that instead of B properly Π should be written. The succeeding letter, which in the second inscription is imperfectly written, is clearly a P, an opinion corroborated by the fact that the word is thus similar to the fourth, *prēnafāty*. If the last character but one in the second inscription be not incorrectly written, like several of the preceding ones, it must be taken as a Greek Z, and accordingly the word must be read *prēnapazy*. Now taking *prēnafē* in the sense of *ædificium* or *ædificatum*, *prēnafāty* may stand for the participle *ædificandum*, and the preceding word *mīte* or *myte* for an aorist, corresponding to the Latin *curavit*. The last word of the third inscription has a similar termination, but its commencement is as difficult to define as to decypher. M. SAINT-MARTIN reads the peculiar addition to the third inscription *anapareklē phchetafata*, without however attempting any translation of it.

According to the preceding definition, we must read the first word thus: *īnȳpīrekle*. We cannot take the succeeding letter for Φ, especially as we have already recognized the digamma as its substitute in the medals of *Nepheleis*. If we determine the signification of the character by its form, it can be nothing else than Ξ, which those who find *Xchētafæta* too difficult to pronounce, may draw to the foregoing word. Although this is almost the only case in which a word of the Lycian inscriptions terminates with a consonant, yet the whole addition may perhaps be explained as an incantation, if we can compare *chētafæta* with the Milesian term of magic, *Chthypes*. The *Telchinians*, with whom LYCUS† built the temple to APOLLO near the *Xanthus*, are called magicians by the Greek grammarians, and the name of *Telmissus* (whose astrologers we are told‡ were consulted by CRÆSUS), seems to signify “a city of Talismans.” We further

* Mionnet, Descr. de Méd. Antiq. t. iii. p. 596.

† Diodor. v. 56.

‡ Herod. i. 78.

know,* that the *Milesians* honoured the Lycian APOLLO, as the *Ephesians* did the Persian ARTEMIS; and, according to EUSTATHIUS,† the coronet, the girdle, and the feet of the Ephesian ARTEMIS, bore certain words to which was ascribed a magic power of delivering from imminent danger. HESYCHIUS says that these words were Ἀσκιον, Κατάσκιον, Λιξ, Τετραῖξ, Δαίμονα μινεύς, Αἴσιον, and signified *darkness, light, earth, year, sun, and truth*. The *Milesia grammata*, which differed from these, were Βέδυ, Ζωῖψ, Χθών, Πλῆκτρον, Σφιγξ, Κνώξζβι, Χθύπτης, Φλεγμός, Δρωῖψ; among which *Bedy* is expressly stated by CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS‡ to be a Phrygian word, signifying, according to some, *water*; and to others, *air*. From the Persian *bad*, the latter interpretation is the most probable, especially as PLATO, in *Cratylus*, says that the Greek words ὕδωρ and πῦρ are Phrygian. According to that example, we may consider, if not the Ephesian, yet at least the Milesian incantatory words as Phrygian, and thus compare the Lycian *Chētafæta* with χθυπτης.

Although we might take χθών for *earth* or *netherworld*; πλῆκτρον for something to *strike with*; σφιγξ for *an oppressive being*; φλεγμός for *warming blood*; and even δρωῖψ for an extraction of noxious humours from the body, still κνώξζβι and χθύπτης sound too strangely not to lead us also to refer ζωῖψ rather to the Persian *shæb*, “night;” which in Zend is pronounced *Qsaps*, than to receive it as a Greek designation of a tempest at sea. But if κνώξζβι was a Phrygian word, it cannot appear singular in the Lycian, if we read the twelfth word *ixbe*. The tenth word is not very different from this; indeed, in the fourth inscription, it is precisely the same, with the exception of the first letter: in the fifteenth word, however, the termination *iz* is added, which seemingly indicates a plural, since the preceding word, which in the first inscription is in both cases *teuīeme*, in the remaining inscription has taken the final letter *z*. The Carian inscription will therefore, if not in the eleventh, at all events in the sixteenth word, relate to several women. But the whole inscription is so imperfectly copied, that it is impossible to decide, with respect to the seventh word, whether the character peculiar to it be an *z*. Now, though the seventh word rather signifies *child* than *son*, yet its plural in the fourteenth word denotes the daughters rather than the children generally; for NICOLAUS DAMASCENUS § expressly says, Λύκιοι ταῖς γυναῖκας μᾶλλον ἢ τοὺς ἀνδρας τιμῶσι καὶ καλοῦνται μητρόθεν, τὰς τε κληρονομίας ταῖς θυγατράσι λείπουσιν, οὐ τοῖς υἱοῖς.

* Tacit. Ann. iv. 55.

† On Odyss. xix. 247.

‡ Strom. v. p. 568.

§ Stobæus, p. 292, 23.

The last character in the fourteenth word is not perfectly marked in the second inscription, while in the third it is entirely omitted, and the character occupying its place seemingly belongs to the following word. Unless, by an oversight, one of the two similar characters has been here omitted, we might explain that which occurs at the end of the fourteenth word in the second inscription as being a sort of apostrophe. The character at the beginning of the fifteenth word, as well as of the tenth and the twelfth, is however, like the ε in the Greek $\varepsilon\delta\varsigma$ and $\varepsilon\mu\omicron\varsigma$, to be considered as a prosthesis or a metathesis, since the possessive pronoun is to be derived from the personal pronoun *chæppe* (*sibi*), in the eighth word. Whether, in the ninth word of the fourth inscription, the digamma be only incorrectly written, or another word, as in the first inscription, be signified thereby, it is impossible to say, on account of the mutilated state of the following characters.

The whole of the inscriptions, with the exception of the most difficult, the Carian, are therefore to be read and translated as follows :

I.	... <i>īejæ.</i>	<i>iræfæjæ.</i>	<i>mīte.</i>	<i>prenæfātj.</i>	<i>Sedireja.</i>	<i>P.....</i>	<i>tedieme.</i>
	Hoc.	monumentum.	curavit.	ædificandum.	Sidarius.	Pænenius.	filius.
	<i>chæppe.</i>	<i>itte.</i>	<i>ichben.</i>	<i>lāde.</i>	<i>ichbe.</i>	<i>sī.</i>	<i>tedieme.</i>
	sibi.	memoriæ.	suæ.	uxori.	suæ.	et.	filiæ.
							<i>Pybealijī.</i>
							<i>Pybialæ.</i>
II.	<i>Ibĵēnĵ.</i>	<i>prēnæfæ.</i>	<i>mīte.</i>	<i>prēnapazj.</i>	<i>Partenamofaj.</i>		
	Sepulcrale.	ædificium.	curavit.	ædificandum.	Parthenamofæus.		
	<i>chæppe.</i>	<i>lade.</i>	<i>ichbe.</i>	<i>sī.</i>	<i>tediemī.</i>	<i>ichbejī.</i>	
	sibi.	uxori.	suæ.	et.	filiabus.	suis.	
III.	<i>Ibĵēnĵ.</i>	<i>brēnæfæ.</i>	<i>mĵte.</i>	<i>prēnaiſatj.</i>	<i>Chaofeneme.</i>		
	Sepulcrale.	ædificium.	curavit.	ædificandum.	Chaofenemus.		
	<i>chæppe.</i>	<i>lāde.</i>	<i>ichbe.</i>	<i>sī.</i>	<i>tediemī.</i>	<i>ichbe</i>	<i>Ynypēreklex.</i>
	sibi.	uxori.	suæ.	et.	filiabus.	suis.	<i>chētafæta.*</i>
IV.	<i>Ibĵēnĵ.</i>	<i>yopj.</i>	<i>myte.</i>	<i>prēnæfætj.</i>	<i>Ietiejæ.</i>		
	Sepulcrum.	hīc.	curavit.	ædificandum.	Ietieus (Eētīon).		
	<i>chæppe.</i>	<i>f...e.</i>	<i>ichbe.</i>	<i>si.</i>	<i>lāde.</i>	<i>ichbe.</i>	<i>si.</i>
	sibi.	memoriæ.	suæ.	et.	uxori.	suæ.	et.
							filiabus.

That the Carian inscription is written in the Lycian, and not in the Carian language, appears deducible from the fact that, according to STEPHANUS,† a grave was called in Carian $\Sigma\omicron\upsilon\lambda\alpha$, and that $\Gamma\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha$ signified a king.

But it is now time to pass on to the two Phrygian inscriptions found by Colonel LEAKE on a tomb, which is cut in a rock in the Phrygian valley or *Doganlu*, near the borders of *Bithynia* and *Lydia*, the form being that of a palace with a very small entrance. The two inscriptions belong, as is proved

* Cf. Pers. Sat. I. 112.

† De Urbibus, s. v. $\Sigma\omicron\upsilon\lambda\gamma\epsilon\lambda\alpha$.

by the identity of their final words, to one language and character, but were cut at very different periods, as we infer from the rounded form of the A and D in the more modern inscription. The oldest inscription, which is above the gable roof to the right, and like it, slants upwards, is as follows :

IAFFAFAKFAYANOΓAFOS: MIDAI: LAFAGTAEI: FANAKTEI:
EDAE.

The more modern inscription, which is cut in a line downwards on the left side of the monument, runs thus :

BABA: MEMEFAIS: PROITAFOS: KPHIZANAFEZOS: SIKEMEMAN:
EDAES:

Besides these, HAMILTON has given the following fragment of an inscription as an Appendix to his *Aegyptiaca*. It is deserving of a place here, on account of the resemblance of the language and writing to the foregoing.

AS: TYAY..... ENIS: AE: ES YPGOSOSI: TIN:

The great similarity of the characters to the Greek, leaves no great doubt as to the way of reading them; yet the twelfth character of the first inscription, if judged by the middle character of the fourth word of the second, would seem to be rather an N, like the tenth character, than an R, for which M. SAINT-MARTIN has taken it. In Latin letters, the inscriptions run thus :

1. IAEFAFAKENANOGAFOS. MIDAI. LAFAGTAEI. FANAKTEI. EDAE.
2. BABA. MEMEFAIS. PROITAFOS. KPHIZANAFEZOS. SIKEMEMAN. EDAES.
3. AS. TYAY.....ENIS. AE. ESYRGOSOSI. TIN.

In the first inscription, the words *Midai Fanaktei* are too clearly similar to the Greek *Μίδαι Φάνανκτι*, not to induce a belief that the inscription relates to the king MIDAS, or a king of the Gordian dynasty, which ruled in *Phrygia* between 740 and 570 A.C. If so, *Lafagtaei*, which divides those words, would be a surname of that king in the dative case, to distinguish him from another MIDAS; and what stands before the name *Midai* would then denote him who founded the monument. The last word *edae* is then a verb, as is the last word of the second inscription *edaes*: yet, whether both words are alike, or whether the shorter is the singular, and the longer the plural, cannot be determined by a comparison with Greek words, as *ἑδαιξες* and *ἑδαιξαν*, as little suited by signification as by form to the Phrygian inscriptions, but it can only be decided according to the number of the subjects. If *os* be regarded as the termination of the subject, we find it only once in the first

inscription; in the second, on the contrary, twice, to which may be added also the termination *is* in *Memefais*. But whether the different subjects be names of persons or indications of rank, is not perfectly clear; and it is also difficult to ascertain how the first word of the first inscription (which we must consider as one compounded from several, because at the beginning of it, according to the traces on the monument, there must be something wanting), is to be reduced to its simple elements. As an accusative is wanting in the first inscription, which in the second seems to be indicated by *Sikememan*, after *iaefafaken* a distinction might be made, so that *Anogafos* would remain as the proper subject of the first inscription. Let us compare the beginning of the first inscription...*iaefafaken* with the similarly mutilated commencement of the first Lycian inscription *īejæ iræfæējæ*, and further take into consideration that this word might also have been pronounced thus, *īææfæeejæ*; and that in the Phrygian language, as is clear from a comparison of the word *Φωναντες* with *ΛαΦωνται*, the F has also the value of a digamma, and soft letters are likewise hardened; we shall then be inclined to conjecture that the sense of the inscription is: "This monument *ANOGAVUS* consecrated to king *MIDAS Lavagtaes*."

What this last word signified, and whether the first letter of the same be rightly interpreted or not, must be left for others to decide. But *edae* may be compared with the Greek *ἔδωκε*, or the Latin *dedit*, particularly as also in Armenian *dam* still signifies, "I give."

The second inscription is more difficult, yet the word *kphizanafezos* may perhaps be divided into *κφίζαν* and *ἄφεζος*, and the first of these considered as the accusative of the Carian word *γίσσα* or *μεγίσσα*, which, according to STEPHANUS,* signified a stone. In this case the sense might be, that *Baba Memefais Proitafos* had given the stone, and *Afezos* the expenses of the workmanship (*Sikememan*). But it will still remain uncertain whether *Afezos* was the name of a man or of a place. The latter is likely, if by *Baba Memefais Proitafos* any dignity is designated. STRABO † names a district *Ἀβασίτις* in this part. Although ATHENÆUS ‡ mentions *Babys* among other Phrygian names, yet *Baba* in so many languages signifies *father*, that we may even here imagine a kind of Phrygian nobility, especially as *προιταφος* seems so similar to the Greek *πρώτος* or *πρύτανις*, though HOMER § names a noble Lycian PRYTANIS. What *Memefais* means,

* De Urbibus, s. v. *Μονόγισσα*.

† XII. 5, 11.

‡ XIV. 18.

§ II. v. 678.

however, it is difficult to say, unless a portion of the first part of the word stands in relation to the latter part of the word *Sikememan*, which possibly signifies the expenses or charges. The passage might therefore be thus translated: "The superintendent of the payments, PROETAVUS, gave the stone; ABASIS the charges of the workmanship." Uncertain as all this may still remain, thus much is clear, that the monument is much more modern than the period about which king MIDAS lived, by whom we may reasonably understand the old king MIDAS, whose memory it was wished to preserve even in later times. If we may compare the Armenian with the Phrygian, it would perhaps be more correct to read *gafagtaei* than *lafagtaei*, by which, according to the Armenian *khaghakh* (city) might be meant the founder of a city. From all these remarks it results, that the Phrygian language is the intermediate link in the family of Indo-Germanic tongues, its words and inflections bordering as closely on the Greek, as the written characters are manifestly Grecian. This is further corroborated by the near relationship of the *Phrygians* with the *Thracians*, from whom proceeded the original cultivation of *Greece*. The *Etruscans*, on the contrary, who are usually derived from *Lydia*, have nothing in common with the *Phrygians* either in language or writing.