

ІСТОРІЯ МОВИ

Редколегія “Українського мовознавства”, колектив кафедри української мови та прикладної лінгвістики КНУ імені Тараса Шевченка сердечно вітають із 50-річним ювілеєм нашого колегу, доктора філологічних наук, професора кафедри Мосенкіса Юрія Леонідовича.

Юрій Леонідович відомий в Україні та за її межами як дослідник походження української мови, історії, культури в контексті формування стародавніх цивілізацій Європи та Азії.

Одним із чільних напрямів діяльності ювіляра є дослідження трипільської культури. У докторській дисертації та численних публікаціях він здійснив унікальну реконструкцію мови трипільців, дешифрував їхню писемність, за мовними свідченнями відтворив календар і міфологію. Перу мовознавця належать книги “Трипільський прасловник української мови” (2001), “Трипільська генеза милозвучності української мови” (2002), “Трипільська держава в Україні” (2003), “Трипільська міфологія: короткий словник термінів” (2003), “Словник трипільської спадщини в українській мові” (2006), “Розшифрування протоіндоєвропейської трипільської писемності” (2006), “Cucuteni-Trypillia – Troy – Greece: Written history 3500–1500 BC” (2018) та ін.

Юрій Леонідович успішно зміцнює престиж України на міжнародній арені. Він – дійсний член Болгарської академії наук і мистецтв, дійсний член Бразильської академії словесності, член-кореспондент Європейської академії наук, мистецтв та літератури (Франція), почесний доктор Інституту культури (Франція), член ПЕН-клубу (Бельгія).

Щиро вітаючи Юрія Леонідовича зі славним ювілеєм, бажаємо йому *многая і благая літа*, творчого неспокою і нових наукових звершень!

УДК 811.14.02

[https://doi.org/10.17721/um/50\(2020\).31-41](https://doi.org/10.17721/um/50(2020).31-41)

Iurii Mosenkis, Doctor of Philology, Prof.
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Kyiv
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9957-0585>

“UNINTERPRETABLE” CRETAN ALPHABETICAL INSCRIPTIONS: “ETEOCRETAN” AS PHRYGIAN?

The article is devoted to an old problem of several “Eteocretan” (i.e. “true Cretan”) inscriptions in Greek alphabet, found in Classical Crete (dated to c. 6–4 c. BC), but not interpreted in Greek until the present time. Despite several hypotheses, the problem remains unsolved. However, this enigma is very important to reconstruct the ethno-linguistic map of ancient Crete as the cradle of Minoan civilization and the oldest interpretable scripts in Europe (Cretan hieroglyphs and Linear A). According to a commonly accepted view, the “Eteocretan” inscriptions can be a rest of “Pre-Greek” languages of the island – despite the “Eteocretan” and the Linear A inscriptions demonstrate no common linguistic features.

The present author proposes an interpretation of the “Eteocretan” language as Phrygian. The latter was a close relative to Ancient Greek, splitted from it c. 4000 BC. This hypothesis correlates with another idea of the same author – of the presence of some Phrygian phonetic features in the language of Cretan hieroglyphs. Some “satem” elements of Phrygian, Cretan hieroglyphs, and Eteocretan (the name of Praisos as possible homonym of the “satem” Indo-European name of pig) make a system.

Summarizing, Eteocretan looks like Phrygian, more or less Graecianized. In some inscriptions, loaned lexical elements are Greek whereas basic lexical and grammatical elements are Phrygian. In such way, a conundrum of “Greek vs non-Greek” Eteocretan inscriptions can be solved.

Key words: “Eteocretan” inscriptions, the Ancient Greek language, the Phrygian language, decipherment.

1. General notes

Homer (*Od.* 19.172–177) mentioned the Eteocretans, alongside the Cydonians, Pelasgians, Achaeans and Dorians, as the inhabitants of Crete. A scholiast (*Od.* 19.176) and Diodorus of Sicily (5.64.1) regarded them *autochthones*. Strabo (10.4.6, 12) described Cretan

ethnolinguistic map: the Dorians – in the east, the Cydonians – in the west, the Eteocretans – in the south where Praesos and the Zeus Dictaeon temple were located.

Perhaps, Praesos was main Eteocretan city (Strabo mentioned it only – possibly as the most important center of this tribe). Presently known corpus of the Eteocretan inscriptions (Brown Eteocretan) consists: six texts from Praesos (three inscriptions and three fragments), two ones – from Dreros, and one (of disputed genuinity) – from Psychro. This distribution also can evidence for Praesos as main city of the Eteocretans.

Pork was prohibited in Praesos (Athenaeus F 376a, comments: [Beletsky : 125–126]) – obviously, because of the homonymy of the city name (*Πραισος*) and pig name (**pars-*). The latter is a *satem* form (as in Balto-Slavic, Indo-Iranian, Armenian, and Thracian) from Proto-Indo-European **pork'-*. Therefore, the Eteocretan language was *satem* – as Georgiev's 'Pelasgian' substrate in Greek. However, Homer distinguishes the 'Eteocretans' and the 'Pelasgians'.

Strabo's 'ethnic map of Crete' can correspond to ancient Cretan scripts and languages as follows. Linear A has Ionian features, and one can link it with Homer's and Strabo's 'Pelasgians' – in the light of Herodotus' Ionians as Hellenized Pelasgians and Kretschmer's Ionians as the first, pre-Achaean wave of the Greeks. The Cydonians / Cydonians inhabited western Crete where Cydonia city was located. Cretan hieroglyphs and Linear A almost never used there. Perhaps, Cydonian was unwritten language as possible remain of insular Neolithic (Hittite-Luwian? *Kudonia* < Hitt.-Luw. **kutt-wana-* 'place of walls', pointed to Cretan Neolithic fortresses?). The oldest Cretan script was Cretan hieroglyphs which bear Phrygian features (Cret. hier. 'jaw' > Lin. AB *ze* : Phryg. *azen* 'jaw' is phonetically closer than Greek *genus* 'jaw'). As the Cretan hieroglyphs, the Eteocretan inscriptions were also found in Eastern Crete.

The closest (territorially and phonetically) parallel of Cretan city *Gortyna* is the Phrygian capital *Gordion*. Perhaps, Cretan king *Minos* (< **Men-ops* 'moon-faced'? a title?) was a close relative of Phrygian lunar god *Men*. The names of a sacral mountain *Ida* is identical in Crete and Phrygia. If the name of Minos' son *Katreus* means 'lunar

quarter' < Indo-European ^{*}*k^wetuor-* 'four' (cf. 'lunar names' of Minos, Pasiphae, Phaedra, Glaucus), then this name reflects /k^w/ > /k/ as in Phrygian. The change /u/ > /i/ is a common feature of Linear A, alphabetical Cretan dialect, and Phrygian.

Yves Duhoux, summarizing evidence of Eteocretan, concludes that it was an Indo-European language [Duhoux : 262].

Images and drawings of the Eteocretan inscriptions see (Brown Eteocretan).

Let me interpret these inscriptions.

2. Dreros-I

– ρμαF | ετ | ισαλαβρετ | κομν

– .δ | μεν | ιναι | ισαλυρια | λμο

Eteocret. *αβρετ* closely resembles New Phryg. *αββερετ* 'will bring'. In New Phrygian 'standard' inscriptions, this word was used in a stable formula *κακον αββερετ* 'will bring evil'. The previous word in the Eteocretan text is *ισαλ*: *σάλα* 'βλάβη = harm' (Hesych.), Hitt. *idalu-* 'bad', and the Hesychius' glosses *δαλῆ* = *κακουργῆ*, *δάλλει* = *κακουργεῖ*, (cf. also *σαλός*, *δαλός* 'silly' – 'Pre-Greek'. In the next line of the same inscription, *ισαλυρια*: Greek *κακουργία* 'wickedness', cf. *εἰς ἄλληλα μεγίστη τε βλάβη τῇ πόλει καὶ ὀρθότατ' ἂν προσαγορεύοιτο μάλιστα κακουργία* (Plat. *Rep.* 434 c.). Possible disappearance of *γ* in *ισαλυρια* resembles /g/ > /j/ in Greek. Therefore, Eteocret. *ισαλ αβρετ* can correspond to Phryg. *κακον αββερετ* 'will bring evil', whereas *ισαλυρια* (< /isalurja/ < /isalurgia/?) – to Greek *κακουργία* 'wickedness'.

The next (after the verb) word of the Eteocretan inscription is *κομν* (cf. *-ταρκομν* in Praisos-3 line 2, if it isn't < *ταρχύω* 'bury'). It can correspond to Phryg. *κνουμαν* 'tomb' (in a 'standard' New Phryg. formula *κακον αββερετορ κνουμανει* 'will bring evil to the tomb'), known in shortened forms (*κ[ν]ουμινος*, *κ[νου]μανι*) or to Greek *κώμη* 'unwalled village', acc. *κώμην*.

The first word of the inscription (*αρμαFετ* or *αρμαF ετ*) can be a verb in a pair of predicates (*αρμαFετ ... αβρετ*), or a noun in a pair of objects (*αρμαF ετ ισαλ*). In the second case, one can propose a correction *αρμα[v]*. This stem can be linked with Phryg. gloss

ἀρμόν: πόλεμος ‘war’ (EM 145.42), corresponding to Old Ind. *ārm-ā-h* ‘destruction, ruins’ [Neroznak : 136]. If it is a noun, the next word is Greek-Phrygian *ετι* ‘and’ in a shortened form *ετ*. Therefore, the first word is *αρμαFετ* ‘will destroy’ or *αρμα[v] ετ* ‘destroying and’. A space before *ετ* evidences in favor of the second variant.

2–4 letters are omitted in the beginning of the inscription – it can be a place for new Phryg. *ios* = Greek ὅς ‘who’.

Thus, [*ios*] *αρμαFετ* (vs *αρμα[v] ετ*) *ισαλ αβρετ κομν* – ‘[who] will destroy (vs destroying and) evil will bring to the tomb (vs village)’. The conformity of this inscription with ‘standard’ New Phrygian inscriptions is undeniable.

In the second line, *μεν*: Greek μέν ‘indeed’, used, in particular, with infinitives like the next *ιναι* : Greek εἶναι ‘to be’ (infinitive), phonetically cf. the name of a Cretan city *Eínatos* (‘ninth’) > *Inatos*. ‘Non-Indo-European’ *λμο* can appear [*ι*]μο = Greek ἐμοί ‘to me’. The first word of the second line, [*ι*]υδ: Greek ὄ, Sanskrit *yad*, Avest. *yat* < IE **Hi-o-d* (Beekes 1117). Therefore, the second line вторая строка [*ι*]υδ | *μεν* | *ιναι* | *ισαλυρια* | *μο[ι]*: Greek ὃ μέν εἶναι *κακουργία ἐμοί* ‘this, indeed, is wickedness for me’.

One can propose a complete translation of this text:

[*ιος*] *αρμαυ ετ*’ *ισαλ αβρετ κ[v]ομν*

[*ι*]υδ *μεν ιναι ισαλυρια μο[ι]*

‘[who] will bring destroying and evil to the tomb –
this, indeed, is wickedness for me’.

The language of this inscription can be identified as *Phrygian*.

3. *Dreros*–2

ΤΥΠΜΗΡΙΑΙΑ ὑπέρ ‘above, over’, *μηριαῖος* ‘of, belonging to the thigh’ (‘thighs’ of sacrificed animals?).

We have a little ground to identify this inscription as non-Greek.

4. *Praisos-1*

1st line: the letter-group *νκαλμιτκε* contains *νκ* and *τκ* on the word-borders rather than inside of a word. Then, one can distinguish a word *καλμιτ* (cf. *-νυμιτ* in *Praisos-3* line 1): Greek ἄγαλμα, -ατος ‘glory, honour, gift’.

2nd line: *ος βαρξε* ‘who wrote’: Greek ὅς, Phryg. *ios* ‘who’, Greek aor. ind. act. 3rd sg. *-κ-stem* + *-σε* = *-ξε*, perhaps < Phryg. *park-* ‘to write’ (IE **perk-* ‘to dig’).

3rd line: a separate word (*IC* III.138; [Duhoux : 63]) *αγσετ*: Old Phryg. – *egeseti*, New Phryg. *εγεσιτ* ‘to hold, to have’.

4th line: a word final *-οκλες*: Greek names *-ο-κλῆς* ‘glorious’.

5th line: in *ασεγδνανιτ, γδ (ΓΔ)* can be read as *μ* – we will obtain *ασε[μ]νανιτ*: Greek ἄσεμνος ‘undignified’ (an expression of author’s modesty?).

Therefore, loaned words of cult sphere (ἄγαλμα, -ατος ‘glory, honour’, ‘gift’, ἄσεμνος ‘undignified’) and personal names (*-ο-κλῆς* ‘glorious’) are Greek, whereas rarely loaned verbs of commonly used language (*βαρξε* ‘wrote’, *αγσετ* ‘holds, has’) are Phrygian. Then the language of the inscription is *Phrygian*.

5. *Praisos-2*

Line 1: in the letter-group *επιμιτσα* the letter-combination *τσφ* inside a word is unlikely, then one can distinguish *επιμιτ* – cf. ἔπειμι a) ‘to be upon’, b) ‘to come upon’. Therefore, *ιμετ επιμιτ* in this line (my word-division) can be a pair of verb-synonyms: *verb* + *επ-verb*.

Line 2: *ιαραλαφραισουιναι φραισουιναι* (cf. *φραισονα* in the 6th line and *πραιναι* in the 8th line). Eteocret. *ιαραλα*: **ιαρόλας* ‘priest’ (*ιαρός* ‘holy’, *ιέρολας* ‘priest’).

Line 3: *νμτορ* : *νεμέτωρ* ‘judge’, cf. *νόμος* ‘custom, law’ in the 6th line

also *σαρδοφσανο* here is a clear variant of the same in line 7 *σααρδοφτενα*.

Line 4: *-σατοις* : Greek dat. pl., cf. Greek *μέσσατος* ‘midmost’.

Line 5: *ανιμεστε* : Greek *ἀνάμεστ-ος, -τη* ‘filled full’; *παλυν*: Greek *πάλιν* ‘back, backwards’; *ευτατ-* – superlat. < *εύς* ‘good, brave, noble’), semantically corresponding to ‘filled full’. Possible translation: ‘filled full repeatedly with the best’.

Line 6: *νομοσελοσφραισωνα*, possible word-division *νομοσ ελοσ φραισo να*.

Line 10: *εἰρήνη, εἰράνα, ἰράνα* ‘peace, peace treat’, Cretan *πολέμω χ[ι]ρήνας* = Boeot. *πολέμω καίράνας* ‘of war and peace’.

6. *Praisos-3*

Line 1: *γνυμιτ*: Greek verbs *-γνυμι*; Greek *νεμέτωρ* ‘judge’ (Praisos 2.3); Latin *Numitor* (king’s name or sacral title?) < Greek.

Line 2: *αρκομν*: Greek part. pass. *ἀρχόμενος* < *ἄρχω* ‘to be first, to begin, to rule’, perhaps in an archaic form like Greek *βέλεμνον*, Latin *alumnus*.

Line 3: *ηδησδεα*, possible word-division *ηδησ δεα*.

Line 4: *πειραρι*: Greek *πεῖραρ* ‘limit, completion, achievement, execution’

Line 5: *τασσετ* (in *τασσετFσευ* whereas *τFσ* inside word is unlikely)

Line 6: *ιρουκλεσ* (cf. Praisos 1.4 *-οκλες*): Greek name *Ἰεροκλής*, Ion., Ep. *ίρο-* = *ίερο-*.

Line 7: *ερμηια*: Greek *Ἑρμαῖα* ‘belonged to Hermes’, *ἔρμα* ‘prop, support’, also ‘border mark’, linked to the cult of Hermes as a god of boundaries. Greek *πεῖραρ* ‘limit’ in the 4th line of this inscriptions.

Line 8: *ειρερ*: Greek *εἶρερος* ‘slavery’; also here *φιν* – Lacon. dat. *φιν* ‘to them’

Line 9: in *μαμδεδικαρκ*, *μαμ* can be separated because of a hard sound-combination *μδ*; if both *δεδικ αρκ* and *δεδικα ρκ* are also hard, *δε δικαρκ* looks acceptable, cf. Greek *δικαιοαρχία* (Hesych.), Greek name *Δικαίαρχος*.

Conclusions:

a) The inscription contains Greek words (Eteocret. *αρκομν*: Greek *ἀρχόμενος*; Eteocret. *πειραρ*: Greek *πεῖραρ* ‘limit’), Greek proper names (Eteocret. *ιρουκλεσ* : Greek *Ἰεροκλῆς*, Ion., Ep. *ίρο-* = *ίερο-*; Eteocret. *δικαρκ*: Greek *Δικαίαρχος*), names of Greek gods (Eteocret. *ερμηια*: Greek *Ἑρμαῖα* ‘belonged to Hermes’).

b) This inscription is related to justice / law (*πεῖραρ* ‘limit’, *Ἑρμαῖα* ‘belonged to Hermes as a god of limits’ in possible relation to *ἔρμα* ‘border mark’, *δικαίαρχος* ‘prime judge’, *ἀρχόμενος* ‘leaded’, possibly also *-ννμ-* ‘law’), cf. the same justitial subject in the Praisos-2 inscription.

c) The language of this inscription contains possibly verb forms with ending *-t*, i.e. Phrygian-like (*γννμτ* – if it isn’t a Greek verb with *-νννμι*; *τασσετ*) – cf. in Praisos-1 the similar forms with *-ιτ* (*καλμιτ*) and *-ετ* (*αγσετ*).

7. Psychro

One can propose three ways to interpret the inscription.

This inscription is interpretable in Greek [Georgiev 1947; Georgiev 1949; Voskresensky, Nazarov]. E. g., Eteocret. *επιθι*: Greek *ἔπειμι*, ‘come upon’ [Voskresensky, Nazarov]. Recent reading *επιοι* : Greek *ἐπίοι*, 3rd sg. pres. opt. act. of the same verb (‘if he go’). Eteocret. *ενετη*: Greek *ἐνετή* (fem.) ‘inserted’ [Brown The “Epioi”] (of a door? See below).

Second, the inscription may be read in Phrygian-like language: *ζηθανθη*: Phryg. *ζετνα* ‘gate’, and Paphian *θόρανδε*, Arcadian *θύρδα* = *θύραζε*, ‘ἔξω, outside’. This fragment was found *near the sacred cave*.

The brick fragment with the inscription, now known to be a modern fake, was part of the private collection of Dr Stylianos Giamalakakis. The date of its purchase and of its discovery are unknown. According to Spyridon Marinatos (“Γραμμάτων διδασκάλια”, *Minoica: Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag von Johannes Sundwall*, Berlin, 1958, p. 227), he was told by

Dr Giamalakakis that it had been found in the vicinity of the village Psykhro on the Lasithi Plateau near to the once sacred cave, identified by excavators and several scholars with the Diktaian Cave of the ancient Greeks and, indeed, used as a place of cult since Neolithic times [Brown The “Epioi”].

Then, this inscription might be related to ritual call of a goddess, cf. the myths of Demeter and Persephone. Initial *επιθι* / *επιοι* *ζηθανθη* might mean ‘come out (from the cave, sanctuary, Underworld)’ or similar. Syllabic *i-pi-ti* (Phryg. /e/ > /i/?) might be a repeat of magic call. About τ : θ in Phryg. *ζετνα* : Eteocret. *ζηθανθη*, cf. Eteocret. *Φραισοι* ‘inhabitants of Praisos’. Thus, Eteocret. *ζηθαν-θη* might be interpreted in comparison to Phrygian *ζετνα* ‘gate’ and Eteocr. *-δαν* (word ending), Phryg. *-dan* ‘from’, Lin. A *i-da-da* ‘from Ida’ (*-da* is exact parallel of Eteocret. *-θη*), Greek *-θεν*: ‘from the gate’.

Third, Hurrian-like elements might be found in the inscription. Alphabetical *epiti*, confirmed by syllabic *i-pi-ti*, resembles the name of Hurrian *Hebat*, reflected in the Hittite masculine name *Hepa-ziti* and Thracian name *Ετα-ζητα*, reconstructed as *H[π]τα-ζητα* in comparison with *Επτα-κενθος*, *Επτα-πορις* etc. [Georgiev 1974 : 9]. The second component of *H[π]τα-ζητα* is known with other god names: *Βενδι-ζητα*, *Διτι-ζητης* [Georgiev 1974 : 7]; see also: [Tsymbursky]. *Parsiphai* (*Persephone* and *Pasiphae* combined) might be a Greek interpretation of Hurrian-Hittite goddess.

The bilingual (Eteocretan-Linear A) inscription from Psychro is now interpreted as a modern forgery [Kritzas; Brown The “Epioi”], but contrarguments were also proposed [Kenanidis, Papakitsos]. Some scholars based on logic error: first, they ascribed the Greek language to the inscription and, secondly, they have difficulties with the Greek interpretation of the text (J. Chadwick, R. A. Brown [Brown The “Epioi”]). However, Greek interpretation and difficulties in this interpretation may be explained in the light of the hypothesis of the Greek-like but not namely Greek language such as Phrygian.

R. Brown concludes that the Psychro inscription ‘bears no obvious resemblance to the Dreros and Praisos inscriptions’ [Brown The

“Epioi”]. As for me, the inscription reflects Greek-influenced Phrygian while other Eteocretan inscriptions may reflect more pure Phrygian.

Thus, the Psychro inscription may include Greek and Phrygian elements, and the Hurrian-Hittite name of Hebat might be also used.

In summary, *ἐπιθι ζηθανθη ἐνετη παρσιφαι* might be *ἐπίθι* (imperat. ‘go!’) or *ἐπίοι* ‘oh, if he go’ *ζηθαν-θη* (‘from the gate’), *ἐνετή* (‘she who was sent’, about a priestess or a victim?) *παρσιφαι* (a ‘hybrid’ of *Πασιφάη* and *Περσεφόνη* in dat. ‘to the goddess’ or in dat.-loc. ‘by the goddess’). Perhaps, Pasiphae-Persephone lived in a cave (like Minotaur in the Labyrinth), and a priestess (or a girl as a victim) was sent to her (as boys and girl were sent to Minotaur). The Psychro inscription might be a lamentation of a groom / lover after his bride or of parents after their daughter: *ἐπίοι ζηθαν-θη ἐνετή Παρσιφάι* ‘oh, if he go from the gate (of the cave), (she who) was sent to Pasiphae-Persephone’.

General conclusion

The present state of the research gives us a possibility to interpret so-called “Eteocretan” inscriptions as *Graecianized Phrygian*.

REFERENCES

- Beletskiy A. A.* (1950). Principles of etymological research on the Greek language. Kiev: Izd-vo Kiev. un-ta, 265 p. (in Russian).
- Voskresenskiy M. L., Nazarov V. P.* (1968). An attempt to interpret the Eteocretan inscriptions. *Vestnik drevney istorii*, № 2, pp. 89–94 (in Russian).
- Neroznak V. P.* (1978). Paleo-Balkan languages. Moscow: Nauka, 250 p. (in Russian).
- Tsyimburskiy V. L.* (2006). Thracian-Hittite-Luwian formulaic correspondences: their types and possibilities of chronology. *Indo-iranskoe yazykovedenie i tipologiya yazykovykh situatsiy: sbornik statey k 75-letiyu prof. A. L. Gryunberga* (1930–1995). URL : <http://www.russ.ru/var/russ/storage/original/application/9beaa190a8152d7383b3861fd46b1fbc.pdf> (in Russian) (accessional date: 05.03.2020).
- Brown R. A.* Eteocretan language pages. URL : <http://www.carolandray.plus.com/Eteocretan/Eteocretan.html> (accessional date: 05.03.2020).
- Brown R. A.* The “Epioi” fake (a. k. a. the Psychro inscription), URL : <http://www.carolandray.plus.com/Eteocretan/Epioi.html> (accessional date: 05.03.2020).

Duhoux Y. (1982). L'Étéocrétois: Les textes, la langue. Amsterdam, 335 p.

Georgiev V. (1949). Etat actuel des recherches et coordination du travail dans le domaine des langues anciennes Balkano-asiatiques. *Archiv orientalni*, XVII/1, pp. 276–278.

Georgiev, V. (1947). Une inscription prétendue éteocrétoise. *Revue de philology*, XXI, pp. 132–140.

Georgiev V. I. (1974). Prinzipien der Deutung der thrakischen zweistämmigen Personennamen. *Балканско езикознание / Linguistique balkanique*, XVII/3, София, pp. 3–11.

Kenanidis I. K., Papakitsos E. C. (2014–2015). The Eteocretan inscription from Psychro (Crete) is genuine. *Anistoriton*, № 14. URL : <http://www.anistor.gr/english/enback/index.htm> (accession date: 05.03.2020).

Kritzas Ch. B. The “Bilingual” inscription from Psychro (Crete). A coup de grâce. *Μεγάλοι Νήσοι. Studi dedicati a Giovanni Rizza per il suo ottantesimo compleanno* (ed. R. Gigli). Catania, 2004 [in fact, published in May 2006], I, pp. 255–261.

ЛІТЕРАТУРА

Белецкий А. А. Принципы этимологических исследований (на материале греческого языка) / А. А. Белецкий. – К. : Изд-во Киев. ун-та, 1950. 265 с.

Воскресенский М. Л. Опыт интерпретации этеокритских надписей / М. Л. Воскресенский, В. П. Назаров // *Вестник древней истории*. – 1968. – № 2. – С. 89–94.

Нерознак В. П. Палеобалканские языки / В. П. Нерознак. – М. : Наука, 1978. 250 с.

Цымбурский В. Л. Фрако-хетто-лувийские формульные соответствия: их типы и возможности хронологии / В. Л. Цымбурский // *Индоевропейское языкознание и типология языковых ситуаций: сборник статей к 75-летию проф. А. Л. Грюнберга (1930–1995)*. – СПб., 2006. – URL : <http://www.russ.ru/var/russ/storage/original/application/9beaa190a8152d7383b3861fd46b1fbe.pdf> (дата звернення: 05.03.2020).

Brown R. A. Eteocretan language pages / R. A. Brown. – URL : <http://www.carolandray.plus.com/Eteocretan/Eteocretan.html> (дата звернення: 05.03.2020).

Brown R. A. The “Epioi” fake (a. k. a. the Psychro inscription) / R. A. Brown. – URL : <http://www.carolandray.plus.com/Eteocretan/Epioi.html> (дата звернення: 05.03.2020).

Duhoux Y. L'Étéocrétois: Les textes, la langue / Y. Duhoux. – Amsterdam, 1982. – 335 p.

Georgiev V. Etat actuel des recherches et coordination du travail dans le domaine des langues anciennes Balkano-asiatiques / V. Georgiev // Archiv oriental. – XVII/I. – 1949. – P. 276–278.

Georgiev V. Une inscription prétendue éteocrétoise / V. Georgiev // Revue de philology. – XXI. – 1947. – P. 132–140.

Georgiev V. I. Prinzipien der Deutung der thrakischen zweistämmigen Personennamen / V. Georgiev // Балканско езикознание. – XVII/3. – София, 1974. – P. 3–11.

Kenanidis I. K. The Eteocretan inscription from Psychro (Crete) is genuine / I. K. Kenanidis, E. C. Papakitsos // Anistoriton. – № 14. – 2014–2015. – URL : <http://www.anistor.gr/english/enback/index.htm> (дата звернення: 05.03.2020).

Kritzas Ch. B. The “Bilingual” inscription from Psychro (Crete). A coup de grâce / Ch. B. Kritzas // Μεγάλοι Νήσοι. Studi dedicati a Giovanni Rizza per il suo ottantesimo compleanno / R. Gigli (ed.). – Catania, 2004 [in fact, published in May 2006], I. – P. 255–261.

Юрій Мосенкіс, д-р філол. наук, проф.
КНУ імені Тараса Шевченка, Київ

“Неінтерпретабельні” критські алфавітні написи: “етеокритська” мова як фригійська?

Присвячено давній проблемі інтерпретації декількох “етеокритських” (“справжніх критських”) написів грецькою абеткою, датованих VI–IV ст. до н. е., які досі не вдалося витлумачити грецькою мовою. Ця проблема важлива для реконструкції етнолінгвістичної мапи давнього Криту як колиски мінойської цивілізації й дуже давніх писемностей Європи. Автор пропонує інтерпретувати написи фригійською мовою, близько спорідненою з давньогрецькою.

Ключові слова: “етеокритські” написи, давньогрецька мова, фригійська мова, дешифрування.

Стаття надійшла до редколегії 14.04.20