A NOTE ON THE SAMOTHRACIAN LANGUAGE

Very little can be said about the texts found in Samothrace. Confronted with such a discovery, one is acutely aware of our ignorance concerning the ancient languages of the Balkan region.

One negative result, however, is apparent: these texts are certainly not Etruscan, nor are they in any way connected with that language. Etruscan, as is well known, had no voiced occlusives (g, d, b) nor had it voiced aspirates nor the sound o. Both voiced occlusives and the vowel o are rather frequent in our inscriptions.\(^1\) Even the Lenmian stele\(^2\)—granted that it may be somehow related to Etruscan, though it is certainly not Etruscan tout court—has no voiced occlusives, although it has several o’s.\(^3\)

In the new Samothracian inscriptions there are, as it seems, only three examples of aspirates\(^4\) (χ in the form of Ψ and Ψ; one Ω) but, after all, the material is not

---


\(^2\) See, also, Brandenstein, *R.E.*, suppl. vol. VI, col. 178; Della Seta, “Iscrizioni tirreniche di Lemno,” *Scritti in onore di Nogara*, Città del Vaticano, 1937, pp. 119 ff., with bibl. Della Seta also publishes four new inscriptions on vases of the VIIth and VIth centuries b.c.: αρφβ (or αρλφ), αξεπερλεοχ: Εαν, ναφαμεζα—. The alphabet has no relation whatsoever to the Etruscan alphabet (p. 132). Phonetically, the new inscriptions agree with the Lenmian stele in ignoring all three voiced occlusives (γ, δ, β), but having o, which Etruscan lacks (p. 133). On the stele see, also, now Brandenstein, *R.E.*, s.v. Tyrrhener, cols. 1919 ff. and Kretschmer, *Glotta*, XXIX, 1942, pp. 89 ff.; XXX, 1943, pp. 216 ff. Brandenstein believes the four new Lenmian texts to be Thracian, not “Tyrrhenian” (col. 1918) because of their date, which he takes to be IXth-VIth centuries b.c. For historical sources concerning the Tyrrhenians at Lemnos, see, *ibid.*, col. 1912.

\(^3\) See the text in Friedrich, *Kleinasiatische Sprachdenkmäler*, Berlin, 1932, p. 144. Lemnian has nothing to do with Thracian according to Kretschmer, Della Seta (*op. cit.*, p. 139), and Brandenstein, *op. cit.*, col. 1922. Della Seta also lists the differences between Thracian and Lemnian. For the bibliography of Lemnian up to 1948 see, also, D. C. Swanson, “A Select Bibliography of the Anatolian Languages,” *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, New York, 1948, pp. 21 ff.

On the Thracian language see the bibliography here below in note 15.

\(^4\) Since, in Thracian, the Indo-European aspirates *gh, dh, bh* lose their aspiration and fuse with Indo-European *g, d, b* (Jokl, *Reallex. der Vorg.*, s.v. Thraker, col. 289), we should
extensive. Even these examples are not certain. Otherwise, we find all Greek sounds with exception of ζ, the absence of which may be merely accidental, and including ϕ (w). The H of the stele and of No. 33 is probably long ē, not h. Diphthongs (αι, ει, ηυ; perhaps ηι, No. 33) are certainly present; they are a well-known feature of Indo-European languages.

One characteristic that strikes me as important is the high frequency of vowels in proportion to consonants. In the first nine fragmentary lines of the stele—the last three may be Greek, as Professor Lehmann says—I count nineteen consonants and twenty-six vowels, including Η = η. The respective percentages in Sanscrit, Greek, Latin, and Gothic follow according to Hirt:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sanscrit</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Gothic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consonants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vowels</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the modern Germanic languages, the percentage of consonants is certainly even higher than it was in Gothic. Professor Lehmann has already observed that all the endings of the lines on the stele are vowels, a phenomenon rather rare in the world (compare Italian, Old Church-Slavic, Old Rumanian, Japanese). But, of course, this may be purely accidental in the present instance.

theoretically find no aspirates in Thracian (cf., in fact, the ὅψινο for ὅψιθι in the words of the Thracian, Aristophanes, Birds, 1679). But the voiceless stops of Indo-European (*k, *t, *p) are sometimes transcribed with aspirates (cf. Jokl, ibid.). This seems to correspond to a special articulation of these two series of sounds which is preserved in modern Albanian (Jokl, col. 290).

Above, p. 100.

The proportion varies in favor of the consonants, if we include all the other inscriptions and the two remaining words of the stele. We find there 79 consonants and 71 vowels; the total for Samothrace remains, however, 98 consonants and 97 vowels—a very high percentage of vowels in any case. I should add that the restoration of an ο in δεστ. λε is quite certain.

Indogermanische Grammatik, I, Heidelberg, 1921, p. 253, with bibl. I also take from Hirt’s book the percentages of each vowel for Greek (see note 14 below).

According to G. Dewey, Relativ (sic) frequency of English sounds, Cambridge, Mass. and London, 1923, p. 125 (“A classified quantitative analysis of the commoner words and syllables of every sound of 100,000 words of representative English”) the relative frequency for English sounds is (in percentages): consonants 62.10, diphthongs 2.58, vowels 35.32; therefore vowels + diphthongs 37.90. Since, however, every diphthong contains two vowels (according to the general opinion), the percentage of the vowels should be higher: making the necessary proportional changes, I reach: consonants 60.5, vowels 39.5 (in the spelling the percentages are different, because of the many silent vowels as in shake, mouse, etc., and of the double writings such as dead, deed, food: consonants 58.1, vowels 41.9).

Above, p. 100.

It is very interesting to observe that, according to most and the best manuscripts, the Thracian (Triballian) who is massacring Greek in Aristophanes, Birds, always ends his words in a vowel; here are the words with the verses:

1615 νά βασιστρεῖ (or: ναβασιστρεῖ? βασις στρεῖ? βαβακατρεῖ? βαβαί στρεῖ? μαβασιστρεῖ?)
This high vocalic percentage appears again in the only known Thracian inscription, on the ring of Ezerovo which is contemporary, being of the Vth century; we find there 31 vowels and 30 consonants within a total of 61 letters; i.e., more than half are vowels. The frequency of individual vowels on the ring from Ezerovo is as follows: ε (10), η (3), α (10), i (5), o (2), u (1). It is interesting to compare the vocalism of our language with that of other languages of the area, using the statistics of Della Seta.\(^{11}\) The total figures for all the Samothracian inscriptions (reading Η as η, not h) with the exception of the stele are:\(^{12}\)

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\alpha & \varepsilon & i & o & v & \eta & \omega \\
9(7) & 24(21) & 26(24) & 7 & 2(1) & 1 & 1 \\
\end{array}
\]

For the stele, the figures are:

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\alpha & \varepsilon & i & o & v & \eta & \omega \\
7 & 9 & 2 & 9 & 1 & 2 & - \\
\end{array}
\]

I keep the stele apart from the other inscriptions for, in the latter, the repetition of the same formula or formulas may give a distorted picture of the vocalic system. In fact, the surprising frequency of i is not found on the stele and may, in the other texts, result from such repetition. Listing the letters in order of frequency, we obtain in these inscriptions the following order: ε, i, α, o, v, η, ω, and in the stele ε, o (both in equal number), α, i, η (?), v (ω is not represented). The total for all the Samothracian inscriptions is:

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\alpha & \varepsilon & i & o & v & \eta & \omega \\
16(14) & 33(30) & 28(26) & 16 & 3(2) & 3 & 1 \\
\end{array}
\]

or, including η under ε and ω under o:

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\alpha & \varepsilon & i & o & v & \eta & \omega \\
16(14) & 36(33) & 28(26) & 17 & 3(2). \\
\end{array}
\]

The order in frequency of use is ε, i, o, α, v.

Della Seta lists the frequency of occurrence in other "Aegean" languages as follows:

\[1628 \text{ f. } \sigmaω \\nuικα \ βακταρι κροισα (= σω \ νικη βακτηριαι κρουσω) \]
\[1678 \text{ f. } \καλαν \ ιορανα και \ μεγαλα \ βασιλιαν \ ορντο \ παραδιωμα (= καλην κοραν και μεγαλην βασιλειαν \ ορνθη \ παραδιωμι) \]

See, especially, the edition of Fr. H. M. Blaydes (Halis Saxonum, 1882) with the variants and the commentary at the end, and the Belles Lettres edition, by V. Coulon and H. Van Daele (Paris, 1940). Cf., on the other hand, the "broken Greek" of other, non-Thracian peoples (Scythian, Persian), Acharnians, 100 ff., Thesmorph. 1001, 1005, 1082 ff., 1176, which admits final consonants. See also J. Whatmough, Cl. Phil., XLVII, 1952, p. 26.—Notice the frequency of α in these passages.

\(^{11}\) \textit{Op. cit.}, p. 139.

\(^{12}\) The numbers in parenthesis are the readings that are absolutely certain.
Lemnian: \[a \ i \ o \ e \ v\]
Phrygian: \[a \ e \ o \ i \ v\]
Carian: \[e \ a \ o \ v \ i\]
Lycian: \[e \ i \ a \ v\]
Lydian: \[a \ i \ e \ v \ o\]
Thracian (Ezero): \[e \ a \ i \ o \ v\]
Eteocretan: \[a \ e \ i \ o \ v\]
Greek: \[e \ o \ a \ i \ v\]

with which we compare:

Stele: \[e \ o \ a \ i \ v\]
All the other inscriptions: \[e \ i \ a \ o \ v\]
General average: \[e \ i \ o \ a \ v\]

Two characteristics are common to the stele, the other Samothradian inscriptions and the ring from Ezero: \(e\) is the most frequent and \(v\) is the least frequent of all vowels. \(o\) occupies the same (third) place in the average of all the Samothradian texts, a position not very far from that (second) in the inscription on the ring. While there is a strong divergence in the frequency of \(i\) between the two classes of Samothradian documents (fourth place on the stele, second place in the other texts), \(i\) occupies an intermediary place (the third) in the inscription from Ezero.

---

13 I believe the reader will like to have the text here in transcription (from Friedrich, op. cit., p. 148): ρόλωτενεασ—περενατι—εναμυηοκα—ραξεδαμα—εαντιλεξυ—παμηραξα—ήηα. It is written in an Ionian alphabet of the 7th century B.C. It may have two hexameters. There is no division of words.

14 The numerical percentages for Greek are: \(e\) 32 \((e\ 19 \text{ and } \eta\ 13)\), \(o\ 19 \text{ (o} 13 \text{ and } o\ 6\), \(a\ 17, i 7, v 6\); for Sanscrit (where \(a\) has absorbed Indo-Eur. *\(\hat{e}\) and *\(\hat{o}\)) \(a\ 19.78, \hat{a} 8.19, i 4.85, \hat{i} 1.19, u 2.61, \hat{u} 0.73\). Cf. W. D. Whitney, Sanscrit Grammar, 3d ed., Leipzig and Boston, 1896, p. 26; Idem., Journal Am. Or. Soc., X, p. 150; Förstemann, Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung, I, 1852, pp. 163 ff., II, 1853, pp. 35 ff. and Whitney, op. cit., also give data for the consonants, which I have not counted. For the Romance languages see S. Pușcariu, Die rum. Spr., Leipzig, 1943, pp. 89-92; for Spanish in particular, T. Navarro Tomás, Manual de pronunciación esp., 4th edit., Madrid, 1932, pp. 74 ff., 114 ff.

15 This rather high percentage of \(o\) in comparison to \(a\), and the word κόης, κόας (see, below, p. 109; \(η\) becomes \(a\) in many Thracian dialects), seem to indicate that the Samothradian dialect did not change Indo-Eur. *\(\hat{a}\) to *\(\hat{a}\). Some Thracian dialects preserved \(\hat{a}\), some changed it to \(a\). See N. Jokl, Reallex. der Vorg., s.v. Thraker, p. 285, 1; Brandenstein, s.v. Thraker, Sprache, col. 410. Probably the *\(\hat{a}\) > \(a\) wave, which engulfed Iranian, Slavic, Baltic, Germanic and, partly, Celtic, reached only the northern Thracian and Illyrian area. It did not reach the southernmost languages, Greek, Phrygian, Latin, and Italian at all. Note that κόας, κόης appears in southern Bulgaria and, it seems, in Samothrace, that is, in the southern section of the Thracian area. On Thracian personal names see also G. Matescu, Ephemeris dacoromana, I, 1923, pp. 57 ff. I was unfortunately unable to see D. Detschew, Charakteristik der thrakischen Sprache, Sofia, 1952.
Diphthongs and groups of vowels are frequent both in Thracian and in Samothracian, as one would, indeed, expect in a language having such a very high percentage of vowels. We have in the inscription from Ezerovo:

\( \text{ea} (5), \text{oa} (1), \text{u} \text{e} (1) \)

and in Samothrace:

\( \text{ev}, \text{ae}, \text{a} \text{e} \text{ (twice), a} \text{a} \text{a} \text{a} \text{ (?)}, \text{ve}, \text{a} \text{on}, \text{e} \text{p} \text{o}, \text{ue}, \text{ei}, \text{io}, \text{vo} \).

In general, the vocalic structure of Samothracian is similar—though I should hesitate to call it a striking similarity—to that of the Thracian inscription on the ring from Ezerovo.

As to consonants, the inscription on the ring has the clusters \( \sigma \kappa, \sigma \nu, \sigma \tau, \lambda \tau, \nu \tau \); Samothracian has \( \chi \beta \nu \) (or \( \xi \beta \nu \)?) and \( \nu \tau \) (in \( \delta \upsilon \tau \omega \lambda \epsilon \) several times but, also, in one instance, on the stele), \( \lambda \delta \) (No. 24; 7?), \( \rho \kappa, \tau \lambda, \sigma \varphi, \lambda \chi, \lambda \nu, \beta \lambda \) (stele), \( \tau \rho \) (stele), \( \psi \) (?stele, possibly a \( \chi \) ?). The clusters \( \beta \lambda \) and \( \beta \nu \) are particularly remarkable. All in all, consonantic clusters are certainly not uncommon in either language—nor, of course, in Indo-European, in general. The \( \mu \mu \) in No. 35 is dubious.

A word that looks rather familiar to every Indo-European scholar is the \( \beta \text{eka} \) (so separated from the preceding word by a dot) of line 7 of the stele, as Professor Lehmann observed independently of me. It looks very much like the \( \beta \text{ekos} \) attested by Herodotos, II, 2 to be Phrygian and having the meaning “bread” and, possibly, etymologically related to English “bake.” It also appears in a verse by Hipponax (fr. 80 Bergk; fr. 75 Diehl):

\[ \text{Κυπριών βέκος φαγώντι κ’Αμαθονιών πυρών} \]

which also proves the word to be Cypriote—and Cyprus is not very far from Phrygia. The word occurs twice in Neo-Phrygian inscriptions for which I give the translations offered by O. Haas.\(^{18}\)

\( (33, \text{part}) : \text{akke} \ \text{o} \ \text{i} \ \text{bekos} \ \text{akkalos}, \ \text{t} \text{i} \text{d} \text{r} \text{e} \text{g} \text{r} \text{o} \text{u} \text{v} \ \text{ei} \text{tou} \)

“Brot und Wasser sollen ihm ungenieszbar worden”

(the Inscr. Friedrich 76 is identical in this passage).

\( (86, \text{part}) : \text{o} \ \text{i} \ \text{bekos} \ \text{me} \text{b} \text{e} \text{r} \text{e} \text{t} \text{a} \text{t} \text{i} \text{a} \text{t} \text{i} \text{n} \ \text{h}’ \text{e} \text{p} \text{u} \text{t} \text{t} \text{e} \text{t} \text{i} \text{k} \text{e} \text{m} \text{e} \text{v} \text{os} \ \text{ei} \text{tou} \)

“ei \ panem ne ferat sit [?G.B.] stigmatiasque itato”

(Instead of \( \text{sit} \) which makes no sense, I should prefer, with Pisani, to write hinc).

\(^{16}\) For the etymology of \( \beta \text{ekos} \), see Bonfante, *Armenian Quarterly*, I, 1946, pp. 88 f., with bibl.; Marstrander, *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogsvidenskap*, II, 1929, p. 299 (who proposes a different Indo-European etymology: Arm. \( \text{be} \text{k} \text{e} \text{n} \text{a} \text{m} \text{e} \) “I break,” etc.).

\(^{17}\) Friedrich, *Kleinasiatische Sprachdenkmäler*, Nos. 33 and 86.

\(^{18}\) *Wiener Zeitschrift zur Kunde des Morgenlandes*, XLV, 1938, pp. 128 f.

Curses aiming at the prevention of eating and drinking are found in several languages. One must admit that Haas’s interpretation is little more than guesswork. But the meaning of βέκος as bread seems to be documented. I think, in agreement with Professor Lehmann, that the character of the stele and the probably poetical form of the text indicate rather a religious hymn than a curse. The latter are written on tombs and on less conspicuous material. In this instance, for example, we might consider an invocation to the gods to grant "bread"—something like the Christian "panem nostrum quotidiamum da nobis hodie." Certainly βεκα, whether a feminine singular, a neuter plural, or a collective plural (cf. Lat. locī: loca), can well be morphologically related to Phrygian βέκος. If accepted as such, it offers a link between Samothracian and Phrygian. Another connection with Phrygian will be mentioned later.

I do not dare to attempt any interpretation of these poor remnants. One may consider the possibility that such forms as -εβενεφοντο (No. 1), -δεντο (?) No. 3), διντο− (No. 2), -πιτο− (No. 26), -δαιτο− (No. 40), -εβλασθείο (ibid.), -ντο− (No. 40) may be verbal forms of the type of Greek ἐγένε, ἐγένετο, ἐξεύχατο. βεκα, -ολειτρα, -μελα, -ντολα (2) could possibly be nominative feminine in ā. The -τρα of -ολειτρα could be the frequent Indo-European instrumental suffix -τρά. -αρκαιε (No. 30), -εκαιε (No. 31) and -καιε (No. 1) look as if they were related forms. As for ἐποτεχ (No. 1) on a drinking vessel,—if we isolate that as a word, which is only a guess—one might think of Lat. pōtus, Greek ποτήριον etc.

Besides these new inscriptions and the gloss παυρακίς: πέμπτη, we know of the "Samothracian" language the names of four gods which, according to the Schol. Apoll. Rhod. I, 917, are, Ἀξίερος (Δημήτριος), Ἀξιοκέρσα (= Περσεφόνη), Ἀξιόκερσος (= Ἄιδης), to which προστιθέμενος τέταρτος Κασμίλος ὁ Ερμῆς ἔστω ὡς ἵστορεῖ Διο-

---


20 Above, p. 100.

21 See, for example, Audollent, *Defixionum Tabellae*, Paris, 1904.

22 The ceramic inscriptions show frequent repetition of the same word or formula, appearing sometimes as δέντο (ολε) sometimes as δέντο (ολε); this obvious oscillation between ὑ and ἴ before nasals appears perhaps in Thracian (Tomaschek, *Sitzungsber. Wiener Akad.*, 128, 1893, p. 44), certainly in Phrygian, Armenian and in several " Aeolic " dialects (lato sensu) that were once in close contact with those peoples in Thessaly and Macedonia (s. Bonfante, *Armenian Quarterly*, I, 1946, p. 94, n. 17). Cf., above, p. 96.

23 See above, p. 93 and note 3.
νυςόδωρος.\textsuperscript{24} We have here an old group of three divine names beginning with 'Αξιο—
which, of course, recalls the name of the river "Αξιος; but after all these do not seem to
be river-gods.\textsuperscript{25} A Greek etymology was proposed for 'Αξιόκερσος and 'Αξιέρος by E. Maass\textsuperscript{26} and another by M. C. Waites.\textsuperscript{27} But Kretschmer wisely observes: \textsuperscript{28} "Ob
mit mehr Recht, ist zweifelhaft; denn man darf bei den Kabiren nicht ihre fremde
ungriechische Herkunft vergessen, die es offenlaesst, ob hier nicht unungriechische
Namen verliegen." \textsuperscript{29}

The name of the fourth god Κασμύλος or Καδμύλος\textsuperscript{30} is certainly related to
Κάδμος.\textsuperscript{31} Kadmos, too, is closely connected with Samothrace.\textsuperscript{32} But Kadmos is
obviously an Illyrian hero. Furthermore, in Samothrace, the presence of such an
Illyrian hero as Dardanos\textsuperscript{33}—one might add Elektra, too—definitely points to an
Illyrian element on the island.\textsuperscript{34,35}

\textsuperscript{24} For Dionysodoros, see E. Schwartz, \textit{R.E.}, vol. V, col. 1004, Nr. 15.

\textsuperscript{25} The second part of the names 'Αξιό-κερσος, 'Αξιό-κέρασ may contain the root of Sanscrit kārsati,
Avest. kārsaiti, " to furrow," for which see, for example, Walde-Pokorny, \textit{Vergleichendes Indogermanisches Wörterbuch}, I, p. 429: a not unfitting name for vegetation gods. Since Thracian is
certainly a \textit{satem} language, the \textit{k} is quite in order. Prof. Lehmann rightly calls to my attention the
name of the Thracian king Κερσο-βλέπτης (\textit{R.E. s.v.}; Tomaschek, \textit{Sitzungsber. Wiener Akad.},
131, p. 47).

\textsuperscript{26} \textit{Archiv für Religionsw.}, XXIII, 1925, pp. 221 ff.

\textsuperscript{27} \textit{A.J.A.}, XXVII, 1923, pp. 25 f.

\textsuperscript{28} \textit{Glotta}, XVII, 1928-29, p. 244.

\textsuperscript{29} See, also, \textit{R.E.}, \textit{s.vv.} Axieros and Kabeiros, col. 1402; Hemberg, \textit{Die Kabiren}, pp. 88 ff.;

\textsuperscript{30} Καδμύλος is probably nothing but an (Indo-European!) diminutive of Κάδμος (note the i!);
the two names are certainly identical—see Lykophrôn, 219 and Kretschmer, \textit{Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung}, LV, 1927-28, p. 84; \textit{Glotta}, XXX, 1943, p. 98.

\textsuperscript{31} It, thus, seems possible that the mysterious ancient language of Samothrace mentioned by
Diodoros as the language of the aborigines (above, p. 93) was Pelasgian, which I hold to be an
Illyrian or "Proto-Illyrian" language. It would then be different from that of our inscriptions.
(\textit{Cf.}, e.g., Kretschmer, \textit{Glotta}, XXIV, 1935, p. 36, n. 3).

That Kadmos is an Illyrian hero one may conclude from an unbiased reading of the evidence
available in Roscher (especially cols. 824 f., 849 ff., 888 f.) and \textit{R.E.}, cols. 1466 ff.

\textsuperscript{32} \textit{R.E.}, \textit{s.vv.} Kadmos, cols. 1468 f.; Roscher, pp. 854 ff., 891.

\textsuperscript{33} See, Roscher, \textit{s.v.} Kadmos, col. 854; \textit{R.E.}, \textit{s.v.} Dardanos, col. 2171.

\textsuperscript{34} Herodotos tells us (II, 51) that: ὅστις δὲ τὰ Καβάρων ὄργα μεμινθήσατο, τὰ Σαμοθρῆκες ἐπιτελέσατο
παραλαβόντες παρὰ Πελασγῶν, αὐτοὶ ωνὴ οἶδε τὸ λέγω. τὴν γὰρ Σαμοθρῆκην οἴκεσ πρότερον Πελασγοῖι . . . καὶ
παρὰ τοῖνοι Σαμοθρῆκες τὰ ὄργα παραλαβάνουσαν. ὥρθα ὕν ἔχαν τὰ αὐτοί τῶν ἀγάλματα τοῦ Ἑρμών 'Αθηναῖοι
πρῶτοι Ἑλλήνων ὀρθύντες παρὰ Πελασγῶν ἐποίησαντο. οἱ δὲ Πελασγοῖ ιρὸν τινα λόγον περὶ αὐτοῦ ἔλεσαν, τὰ ἐν
τοίς ἐν Σαμοθρῆκει μυστηρίως ἔβεβλησαν.

\textsuperscript{35} See, also, Jokl, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 283, 2: "Die ‘thrak.’ Insel Samothrake führt nach Strabo X, 472
ursprünglich den Namen \textit{Μαλίτης}, einen Namen, den wir auch in der Adria als Bezeichnung für eine
dalmatische Insel und auf Kerkyra als Bergnamen wiedergeben, und den wir (s. \textit{Albaner B}, \textit{Illyrier B})
as illyr. kennen gelernt haben." On the relationship between Thracian and Illyrian, see also,
\textit{ibid.}, p. 295. \textit{Μαλίτης} is also the ancient name of the island of Malta (see, \textit{R.E.}, \textit{s.v.}) where, how-
ever, I cannot find other Illyrian traces. Σάμος is also Illyrian according to Brandenstein, \textit{R.E.}, suppl.,
The Κάβειροι also seem to be Samothracian deities.\textsuperscript{36} Another conceivably Samothracian name appears in a prayer quoted by St. Hippolytus \textsuperscript{37} which seems to come from Anatolia: \textsuperscript{38} σὲ καλοῦσι . . . . . Σαμοθραϊκες 'Αδάμ[να] σεβάσμιον ("'Αδάμνα for 'Αδάμ is a restoration of Bergk). This we may connect with a Phrygian gloss of Hesychios, s.v. 'Αδάμνειν: τὸ φιλεῖν. καὶ Φρύγες τὸν φίλου 'Αδάμνα λέγουσιν. It may be a taboo-name.\textsuperscript{39} The Phrygian origin of the Kabeiric cult asserted by Stesimbrotos of Thasos and recently defended by O. Kern \textsuperscript{40} cannot, therefore, be rejected \textit{a priori}.\textsuperscript{41} The connection of the Phrygian Κορύβαρτες with Samothrace should be recalled, too.\textsuperscript{42} A Thracian origin of the Samothracian (!) language and cult is not incompatible with these observations. We know that Thracians and Phrygians were closely related peoples.

We might add the priestly title κοίης or κόης (Hesychios, s.v. Koión: οἱ δὲ κόης: ἱερείς Καβείρων ὁ καθαύρων φονέα) as also possibly Samothracian. Pettazzoni has com-


\textsuperscript{36} Κάβειροι can hardly be Greek, as Wackernagel admits, because the \textit{k} of Sanscrit Kubera indicates a labiovelar for which we would expect \textit{p} in Greek; the \textit{β} = Scr. \textit{b} would also be rather strange (Greek \textit{β} usually derives from a labiovelar *\textit{g}w*). Moreover, nobody will assert that the Κάβειροι are Greek divinities. Wackernagel admits that the word might belong to another Indo-European language—Phrygian or Thracian.


\textsuperscript{39} Vollgraf, \textit{Mnemosyne}, N.S., XLIX, 1921, pp. 286 ff. ("De voce Thracia ad\textit{π}ατ\textit{α}ς") connects with this the Thracian word ad\textit{π}ατ\textit{α} (plur. dat. ad\textit{π}ατ\textit{αις}) which appears in an epigram of Dioscurides in the IIIrd century after Christ (\textit{Anthol. Pal.}, VII, 485). It must mean something like ad\textit{πάπ}α (in its two senses).

\textsuperscript{40} \textit{R.E.}, s.v., cols. 1401 f.

\textsuperscript{41} See Strabo, X, p. 472; also, Schol. Apoll. Rhod., I, 917 (Müller, \textit{F.H.G.}, IV, 345) says that the Κάβαροι ἐντεύθεν (that is from Phrygia) μερενήθησαν. See, also, C. Fredrich, \textit{Ath. Mitt.}, XXXI, 1906, p. 82, and P. Kretschmer, \textit{Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung}, LV, 1927-28, p. 83.

The Κορύβαρτες, however, have (as it seems) an Illyrian suffix, just like, for example, the \textit{Αβαρτες} and Πενεκτάρτες. See P. Kretschmer, \textit{Glotta}, XIV, 1925, p. 105, XXVIII, 1940, p. 274; XXX, 1943, pp. 103 ff.; XXXII, 1953, p. 192 and also \textit{R.E.}, s.v. Korybantes.
pared it with the Lydian title kaves which, in turn, has been related to Vedic kavi-ś: “seer,” “poet,” “nates,” cf. Greek ἰβο-σκός, German schauer, etc. On a hydria found at Duvanlji in southern Bulgaria (!), one reads the word koas (η frequently becomes a) over the figure of a priestess.⁴³ I see no reason to doubt that the word is both Thracian and Samothracian.⁴⁴

In conclusion, the language of the new inscriptions and, in particular, of the stele may quite well be Indo-European, more specifically, Thracian—especially in its vocalism. The language is surely neither Greek nor Etruscan nor “Tyrrhenian”—whatever that means—unless we understand under the term Etruscan or “Tyrrhenian” something entirely different from the language documented in approximately ten thousand non-Latin inscriptions found in Etruria.

G. Bonfante

⁴³ See, Ure, J.H.S., LXXI, 1951, pp. 196 ff., with bibliography.
⁴⁴ See, now, the important article by O. Masson, Jahrbuch für kleinasiatische Forschung, I, 1950-51, pp. 182 ff.; also, Pettazzoni, op. cit., 2, 3, p. 259, index.