

I. FORSCHUNGSBERICHT

The Phrygian Language: An Update

Anlässlich von **Obrador-Cursach, Bartomeu**: *The Phrygian Language*. The Phrygian language. Handbook of Oriental Studies, Section 1, The Near and Middle East, 139. Brill Leiden-Boston, 2020. xvi, 681 Seiten. Gebunden, 239,00 EUR. ISBN: 978-90-04-41998-8.

1. Introduction

The appearance of a new book on the Phrygian language forms the occasion for a scrutiny of my earlier work on the topic. We owe the merit of the new book to the effort of Bartomeu Obrador-Cursach, who reworked his dissertation of 2018 into the publication with Brill of 2020. The author provides a good introduction to the topic, primarily from a linguistic point of view. The main part is formed by a glossary and the edition of a full set of inscriptions, both of Old Phrygian (no. preceded by the letters M, G, B, NW, C, P, K, Dd or HP) and New Phrygian (no. preceded by the abbreviation NPhr) type. This makes the book into a valuable work of reference on the topic.

In connection with the Phrygian alphabet, I have reflected on the views expressed by Obrador-Cursach in my contribution on the role of North Syria in the transmission of the alphabet to Anatolia and the Aegean (Woudhuizen *forthc.*). The main issues are formed by the determination of the values expressed by the old variant of *kaph*, the arrow-sign, and the figure-of-eight sign. In my view these values are: χ , *ti*, and *f*, respectively, instead of *k*, *z* or *dz*, and *b*, respectively, as maintained by Obrador-Cursach (2020: 27–51; for χ , cf. the correspondence of *seχel* “shekel” in G-249 to Lycian *sixla-*).

The relationship of the Phrygian language to Greek is particularly close. This is duly expressed by the title *Phrygian & Greek* of my contribution of 2008–9 (cf. also Woudhuizen 1993). The relationship of the Phrygian language with Greek is deter-

mined by two factors: its position in Proto-Indo-European (PIE) and the origin of the Phrygians in the southern Balkans and mainland Greece.

Within the Indo-European language family Phrygian belongs, with Greek, Thracian, Illyrian, Armenian, and Indo-Aryan, to the augmenting subgroup. The development of the augment belongs to the latest stage of the Indo-European language, which disseminated from the homeland in the North Pontic and North Caspian steppes to regions in the south between *c.* 2300 and 1650 BC (Woudhuizen 2018: 15–22; 32–47).

During the Middle and Late Bronze Age the Phrygians are mostly situated in the southern Balkans. Less well known is the fact that Phrygians, together with Thracians, belonged to the Middle Bronze Age pre-Greek population groups of mainland Greece. Illustrative of this fact is the observation that the Peloponnesos is named after the Phrygian *Pelops*, who stood at the basis of the Mycenaean royal family and was the ancestor of the kings Atreus and Agamemnon. This situation of Phrygians in southern Greece can be further underlined by the fact that typical Phrygian names like *Midas* (**M-01a** and **d**, **T-02b**, **HP-102**, **G-137**), *Muksos* or *Mopsus* (**G-346**), and *Kanuti(es)* (**P-02**, **P-03**, **P-05**), or indications of communities like *toti-*, *toto-*, *teuto-* “people” (**NW-101**, **NPhr-36**, etc.) and *duma-* or *douma-* “religious community” (**B-01**, **NPhr-48**) or reflections thereof are attested for as *mi-da* (**HT 41.4**) and *ka-nu-ti* (**HT 97a.3**) for Linear A and *mo-qa-so* (**KN De 1381**), *te-u-to* (**KN Xd 292**), and *du-ma* (**KN C 1030** and **1039**) for Linear B (Woudhuizen 2016: 327–330). Some of these names are of Old Indo-European or Pelasgian background, like the MN *Tatas* (**G-04**) and GN *Da-* (**W-10**), the MN being paralleled for Cretan hieroglyphic as *ta5-ta6* (**CH # 297**, **2**) and in Luwian hieroglyphic for a Philistine king as *tá-ā-tá-*, *ta4-a-ta4-*, etc. (**Aleppo 6**, § 1; **Meharde**, § 2; **Sheizar** § 1), and the GN being traceable in the composite *da-ma-te* “Mother Earth” (**KY Za 2**) and *po-se-da-o-ne/no* “Lord of the Earth” (**KN V 52**, **KN X 5560**). The Greeks arrived in Greece *c.* 1650 BC, with the shaft graves at Mycenae and the new chariot warfare as chief indicators (Drews 1988; Drews 2017). They lived in co-existence with independent pre-Greek population groups of mainly Phrygian and Thracian stock up till *c.* 1450 BC, accounting for about two centuries of intimate Greek-Phrygian contacts in the region. Mycenaean expansion, though, set into motion a population drift towards the north and the northeast. Such population drift from the southern Balkans to the northwest and the Pontic coastal region of Anatolia already can be shown to have started from *c.* 1500 BC onwards at the latest as Phrygian and Thracian type of names are traceable in Kaskan onomastics (Woudhuizen 2018: 41–45), but the greatest surge of Phrygian migration into Anatolia was of course at the end of the Bronze Age, from *c.* 1200 BC onwards, when they, under the name of *Muski*, even replaced the Hittites in the region of the Halys bend.

2. Linguistic relation with Greek

My list of correspondences between Phrygian and Greek of 2008–9, which alongside vocabulary words also included evidence from onomastics, entailed as many as 167 items in sum. Thanks to the effort of Obrador-Cursach and a few additions of mine, these instances can now be supplemented by the following 18 cases ($\approx 10\%$), most of which are exemplified in the texts presented below:

1. *agomoi* “for the game(s)” = Greek ἀγών “game”
2. *bevdos* “statue” = Greek βεῦδος “woman’s dress, statue”
3. *eg(e)-* “to have”, corresponding to Greek ἔχω “to have, hold”
4. *ei-k* = Greek εἰ καὶ “in this case, thus”
5. *eilikrinḡ* = Greek εἰλικρινής “unmixed, without alloy, pure”
6. *era* = Greek ἄρα “then”
7. *gou-* = Greek βοῦς “bull, cow, ox” (< PIE *g^wow- “ox”)
8. *ibeya* “herself”, cf. Greek σφεῖς “themselves” (< PIE *s(w)e)
9. *kaprus* (D pl.) corresponds to Greek ἱεροῖς ἐνὶ καρποῖς “in the midst of the holy fruits”
10. *koraka* “offspring” < Greek *korw- “boy”, Mycenaean *ko-wo*
11. *korou, kopoumanḡ* = Greek χώρας “piece of ground”
12. *kraniya-*, epithet of Artemis = Greek κρήνη (Aeolic κράννα) “spring” (Obrador-Cursach 2020: 134)
13. *mei-* = reflex of the root of the Greek verb μειόω “to diminish”
14. *monan* “alone, only” = Greek μόνος “alone, only”
15. *nadrotu* “without male offspring” = Greek ἀνάνδρωτος “widowed”
16. *ni, -ni* (as in *aini*) = Greek -νι (Obrador-Cursach 2020: 309–310)
17. *saqta* “equipments” = Greek σαγή “equipment”, σάπτω “to equip”
18. *zeirai* “with (his) hand” corresponds to Greek κακὴν χεῖρα “a bad hand”

One item, the preposition †*die* corresponding to Greek διὰ “through, by means of, during”, is to be deleted because it is based on an outdated reading. This brings us to a grand total of 184 Phrygian correspondences with Greek.

3. “Lautverschiebung”?

From a linguistic point of view, the approach of Obrador-Cursach can best be qualified as deductive in nature. He works from the theory launched by Alexander Lubotsky in 2004 that Phrygian is subject to “Lautverschiebung” (esp. pp. 229–230 identification of *Tios, Tie(i), Tian* as reflexes of Greek “Zeus” < PIE *dyēw-). This

phenomenon is best described as devoicing: $*b > p$, $*\acute{g}/g > k$, $*d > t$. Alongside this devoicing, Phrygian also bears the testimony of deaspiration: $*b^h > b$, $*\acute{g}/g^h > g$, $*d^h > d$ (Obrador-Cursach 2020: 72). As opposed to this, my approach is inductive, and I start from feasible translations of the inscriptions, based on the one hand on etymological evidence like the correspondences with Greek and on the other hand on an accurate reconstruction of the grammatical paradigms (see Table I below for the latest updates). In contrast to excluding evidence on the basis of the fact that forms are incompatible with the theory of “Lautverschiebung”, as Obrador-Cursach does, I take such evidence as for granted if this is soundly embedded in these feasible translations. Accordingly, I arrive at the following set of data relevant to the topic of “Lautverschiebung” (for the PIE roots, cf. Mallory & Adams 2007):

- (1.1) $*b > b$: no examples
 (1.2) $*b > p$: no examples
- (2.1) $*\acute{g} > g$: 1. $*h_2e\acute{g}$ - “to drive, lead” > *lavagta*- “leader of the host” (**M-01a**)
 $*g > g$: 2. $*h_1ger$ - “awake” > *anegertoy* “he built” (**W-01**), *egeretoi* “he built” (**NPhr-30**) (= Greek *ἀν-εγείρω* c. *δόμον, δώματα*)
- (2.2) $*\acute{g} > k$: 1. $*mégh_2$ - “big, great” > *meka*- “great”
- (3.1) $*d > d$: 1. $*h_2ed$ “at, to” > *ad* “to, at, by” (most *ad*- as in *addaket* and *adeitou*; **NPhr130**: *ad* “by” c. A)
 2. $*dékmt$ - “ten” > *dekmout*- “tithe” (**NPhr-9**)
 3. $*deiwo-$ “god” > *devos* “to the gods” (**P-03**), *deos* (D pl.), *Diounsi-* “Dionysos” (**NPhr-88**), *Dii* “to Zeus” (**NPhr-116**)
 4. $*deik-$ “to rule” > *adikesai* “you should experience as an injustice” (**NPhr-31**),
 5. $*deik-$ “to show, point, indicate” > *Adoikavo-* “the Un-speakable one” (**G-02**)
 6. $*deh_3$ - “to give” > *daditi* (**NPhr-9**), *sitidos(akor)* “grain-offering” (**G-05**; **G-346**; **HP-110**)
 7. $*dwéh_3(u)$, $*dwi-$ “two” > *Δοιάς* “twin brother of Akmon”, *Δοιοντος πεδιον* “two lowlands”
 8. $*ped-/pod-$ “foot” > *podaska* “feet-bound (objects) (N-A(n) pl.)” (**G-02**)
 9. $*wódr$ “water” > *ὕδωρ* “water” (Plato, *Cra.* 410, 1-7), *bedu* (gloss)

- (3.2) **d > t*:
1. **deik-* “to show, point, indicate” > *tetikmen-* “being accursed, damned”,
 2. **deiwó-* “god” > *teve-* (**M-04; B-04**), *tive-* (**G-183**) “goddess” (< Linear B *di-wi-ja*), *Tios* (G sg.), *Tie(i)* (D sg.), *Tian* (A sg.) “Zeus”
 3. **ped-/pod-* “foot” > *petes* “feet (N(m/f) pl.)” (**NPhr-12**)
 4. **weid-* “to see, know” > *ouite-* “to perceive” (**NPhr-2**)

The evidence concerning (2.1) **ǵ/g > g* is dismissed by Obrador as either a loan from Greek (p. 284) or as linguistically impossible (p. 218), whereas these examples outnumber the evidence for (2.2) **ǵ > k*, which is considered regular. Nevertheless, the material is too scanty to be affirmative either way.

In the case of the voiced dental **d*, however, there is a lot more evidence (3.1) for its reflex as voiced *d*, 9 cases in sum. The evidence for devoicing, on the other hand (3.2) entails only 4 cases in sum. It must be admitted that some cases of (3.1) **d > d* may be explained as Greek loans, like *Diounsi-* “Dionysos” and *Dii* “to Zeus”. In some other instances an alternative analysis has been put forward, like in case of *deos* from PIE **dʰh₁-s-ó-* “god” in like manner as Greek *θεός* (p. 209). But to dismiss *ad* “to, at, by”, *adikesai* “you should experience as an injustice” and *dekmout-* “tithe” as “unexpected”, as Obrador-Cursach does (p. 156–157, p. 161, and p. 210), given the overall overwhelming evidence for **d > d*, in effect boils down to an action best circumscribed as “throwing out the baby with the bathwater”. At any rate, insofar as the voiced dental is concerned devoicing or “Lautverschiebung” cannot possibly come into consideration as a regularity or sound law, given its underrepresentation. What the underlying principles are for preservation of the voiced dental in the one case (preposition *ad* “to, at, by” never †*at*, see below) and the devoicing in the other case (*tetikmen-* “being accursed, damned”, never †*dedikmen-*), is difficult to fathom. However, in view of on the one hand *pod-* “foot” and *devo-* “god” and on the other hand *petes* “feet” and *Tios* “of Zeus”, I am of the opinion that one should reckon with certain amount of instability in the reflex of the voiced dental **d*.

4. Grammatical sketch (updated)

On the basis of the updates of the texts in transliteration and translation (see below sub 5), the grammatical paradigms can be sketched as follows (see Table I).

The salient points concerning the verbal conjugation are the following:

(1) The nominative plural of the o-stems is attested in the sequence *tit-tetikmenoi innou* “let them be damned” of **NPhr-71**, in which the verb renders the 3rd person plural of the imperative in *-nnou* (cf. Greek *-ovτω(v)*).

(2) The 3rd person plural of the past tense in *-ssinni* (cf. Greek $-\alpha\sigma\iota(v)$ in the perfect) is represented by *dedassinni* “they have consecrated” in **NPhr-130**, in which case the subject is *patres* “Fathers”.

(3) The 3rd person plural of the optative in *-oiun* (cf. Greek $-\omicron\iota\epsilon\nu$) we come across in the form *apnekroiun* “let them be killed” in **B-04**, where it occurs in combination with the modal particle *an* (= Greek $\check{\upsilon}\nu$) also attested in **NPhr-31**, but this time with the 2nd person of the imperative middle-passive *adikesai* “you should experience as an injustice” (cf. Obrador-Cursach 2020: 175, who could not find these references in my contribution of 2008–9: 201; 210–211).

(4) The 3rd person singular of present tense of the passive in *-tor* is represented by *addakat(t)or* (**NPhr-40**, **NPhr-63** and **NPhr-121**, used in the same position as the active *addaket* “he brings, inflicts”) and *abberetor* (**NPhr-73** and **NPhr-75**, used in the same position as the active *abberet* “he brings, inflicts”), the one in *-ter* by *irter* “he sacrifices” (protasis of the damnation-formula of **P-04**).

(5) The 3rd person of the plural of the present of the passive in *-ren* and *-rna* are attested for *dakaren* “they will dedicate for themselves” (**NPhr-98**) and *estarna* “they will be supervizing” (**NPhr-48**). Phrygian is more conservative than Greek in preserving passive forms in *-r-*, which are typical for members of the conservative group of languages among the Indo-European family, namely IE Anatolian, Tocharian, Celtic, and Italic (Gamkrelidze & Ivanov 1995: 345, isogloss 13b; Armenian also has a few passive forms in *-r-*, see Woudhuizen 2018: 18).

nomen		
	sg.	pl.
N(m/f)	—, <i>-s</i>	<i>-oi, -es, -ηs</i>
A(m/f)	—, <i>-n</i>	<i>-ous, -as</i>
N-A(n)	—, <i>-n</i>	<i>-a</i>
D	<i>-e, -η, -i, -y</i>	<i>-oiś, -ais, -os, -ωs, -as, -us</i>
G	<i>-os, -as, -s, -ou, -ω</i>	<i>-oun</i>

		pronomen		
		sg.	pl.	
N(m/f)		<i>tos, ios/yos</i>		
A(m/f)		<i>sa(n), tan, ion, yen, ian</i>		
N-A(n)		<i>si</i>	<i>oua</i>	
D		<i>s(o)i, sa(i), semoun, to, toi,</i>	<i>tais, iais, scos</i>	
		<i>tai, ti ioi/yoi, oi, ai</i>		
G		<i>sas, tivo, tou, iou, ias</i>		
Loc.-Instr.		<i>-esait</i>		
		verbum		
		active	middle	passive
pres./fut. tense	3rd pers. sg.	<i>-(si)t, -(sa/e)ti, -s/s'</i>		<i>-ter, -tor</i>
pres./fut. tense	3rd pers. pl.			<i>-ren, -rna</i>
past tense	3rd pers. sg.	<i>-t, -ti, -s</i>	<i>-toy</i>	
past tense	3rd pers. pl.	<i>-ssinni</i>		
optative	3rd pers. pl.	<i>-oiun</i>		
imperative	2nd pers. sg.		<i>-sai</i>	
imperative	3rd pers. sg.	<i>-tovo, -tou</i>	<i>-to, do, -dou</i>	
imperative	3rd pers. pl.	<i>-nnou</i>		
participle				<i>-men-</i>

Table I. (Pro)nominal declension & verbal conjugation.

5. Texts in transliteration and translation (with updates)

W-08 Rock inscription from the region near Midas town, dated to the late 8th or 7th century BC, written boustrophedon, starting in left-to-right direction of writing. For the emendation of Das in line 3, see **W-10**.

- | | | |
|----|---------------------------|---|
| 1. | <i>Ates agomoi</i> | “Ates has dedicated |
| 2. | <i>saqta t-edaes</i> | equipments for the game(s).” |
| 3. | <i>Alus sitieto (Das)</i> | “Let Alys, ([the son] of Mother Earth) be nourished!” |
| 4. | <i>fateles faf.[?-?]</i> | “?” |

agomoi: D sg. in *-i* of the noun *agomo-*, likely to be considered a reflex of Greek *ἀγών* “game”, hence rendering the meaning “for the game(s)”.

saqta: N-A(n) pl. in *-a* of the noun *saqt-*, which recalls Greek *σαγή* “equipment”, related to the verb *σάπτω* “to equip”, and hence likely meaning “equipments”.

For *t-edaes*, cf. **W-01** *t-edatoy*. Unfortunately, the function of the element *t-* remains unclear for the moment.

In line with the given interpretation, the inscription has been set up in memory of games held near the rock it is inscribed on, in the course of which a sacrifice to the god had taken place.

W-01 Rock monument near Midas town, dated to the 7th or 6th century BC; written boustrophedon, starting in retrograde direction of writing.

- | | | |
|----|---|--|
| 1. | <i>materan areyastin
bonok akenanogavos
vrekun t(-)edatoy</i> | “The Phrygian priest of the cultic fire has dedicated (the image of) the Bravest Mother (for/on behalf of his) wife; |
| 2. | <i>yos-tutut[...].ja[.]mnoy
akenanogavos aey</i> | who(ever) as priest of the cultic fire [brings damage?] to [the monument?] or |
| 3. | <i>yos-esait
materey eveteksetey
ovevin onoman daxet</i> | who(ever) (as <honorific title>) puts his own name on this (monument) for the Mother of Good Birth, |
| 4. | <i>lakedo-key
venavtun <meroun>
avtay materey</i> | let him (herewith) ordain his own (destiny) from the Mother Herself! |
| 5. | <i>Ataniyen Kuryaneyon
t-anegertoy</i> | The (workshop) of Atanies from Gordion has built it.” |

The main adjustment to my previous attempt is that *Kuryaneyon* likely constitutes an ethnic adjective “from Gordion”, under consideration of the phonetic development *d > y*.

G-02 Stone pedestal from Gordion, reused for the reconstruction of a canal in the Hellenistic period, but probably stemming from the 7th or 6th century BC; written in left-to-right direction of writing.

1. *agaritoi:Iktes:Adoikavoi* “Iktes: for the Ungracious Unspeakable (one);
2. *ios oporokiti si kakoio* who(ever) brings (any) damage to this,
3. *itovo podaska/* let him be (like) feet-bound (objects)!”

As rightly pointed out by Obrador-Cursach (2020: 252), the MN *Iketaios* (**W-02**), of which *Iktes* appears to be a syncopated variant, is most closely paralleled by Greek Ἰκέτας. In contrast to the same author, however, I do not agree with Kloekhorst’s (2015) new reading of *Iktes* as †*petes* “feet”, even against the backdrop of the attestation of *petes* “feet” in **NPhr-12** (see below), because it does not fit the context.

Adoikavoi: cf. [*A*]doikavos (**G-146**) and [*A*]doikav/ (**G-153**). I follow here its analysis by Frits Waanders (2008–9: 217) as a compound of the *alpha*-privans with the root *-doik(a)-*, a reflex of PIE **deik-* “to show, point, indicate”, and the suffix *-(a)vo-*, in sum expressing the meaning “the Unshowable” or “the Unspeakable/Unspoken”.

NW-101 Terracotta disc from Dorylaion, no date indicated but probably archaic.

- A. *dexeti totzi Atiei* “One has dedicated to the public Attis
- B. *asna isnou* tokens of consideration/reverence.”

totzi: D sg. in *-i* of adjective related to the noun *toti-*, *toto-* or *teuto-* “people”, attested for Linear B in form of *te-u-to* (see above). Note the use of *sampi* for *t₂*.

asna: N-A(n) pl. in *-a* of a noun also attested in form of unsyncopated *asena-* in **B-05**, which is related to Lydian *ašina-*, an alternative for *vāna-* as an indication of the memorial in question in **Lyd. no. 4** (Gusmani 1964: 67; 252; cf. Obrador-Cursach 2020: 184). In line with this observation, a meaning “token” seems likely in the present context.

isnou: G sg. in *-ou* of *isno-* “consideration, reverence”. This form is also attested for **NPhr-87** and likely to be interpreted in line with Greek εἰς “in” and νόος, νοῦς “spirit, mind” as in εἰσνοέω “to realize, perceive”. Note that Obrador-Cursach’s (2020: 259) alternative according to which *isnou* is a verb in the 3rd pers. pl. of the imperative is to be rejected because such verbal forms are always in *-nnou* (see discussion of **NPhr-130** below).

B-01 Rock monument from the village of Bolu near Göynük in Bithynia, unspecified date; written in retrograde direction of writing underneath a niche for a statue(ette).

- | | | |
|----|--|--|
| 1. | <i>soi bevδος adioi[-ke]
kavarmoyoi mroy edaes
etoves</i> | “One has dedicated a statue for this
(..?.) monument (and)
made (it) as a sacrifice, |
| 2. | <i>ni yoi matar Kubeleya
ibeya duman eketoy</i> | during which (event) Mother Kybela
Herself presided over the religious community. |
| 3. | <i>yos tivo t-asperet d-ayni
kin telemin</i> | Who(ever) brings damage (to something) of this
(monument) or what(ever) distant part (of it), |
| 4. | <i>istoyo vis verktevoys ekey
dakati</i> | (or) dedicates (something) of this (monument) for
his (own) constructions at another (place),” |
| 5. | <i>opito ke yoy evememes
meneya anatoy
kavarmoyun matar o-te
kanovo-ke siti oyvos aey
apakne ni pakray
evkobeyan epaktoy</i> | (apodosis of the damnation-formula, the apparent
positive elements of which, like <i>eve-</i> corresponding
to Greek εὖ- (cf. Myc. <i>e-u-</i> , <i>e-wa-</i> or <i>e- we-</i> < * <i>esu-</i>)
“good”, are changed into the expected opposite
meaning by means of the negative <i>o-te</i>
corresponding to Greek οὔτε “and not, nor”.) |

bevδος: endless form of *bevδος*- “statue” used for the A sg. We owe this identification to the merit of Lubotsky 2008, who compared Greek βεῦδος “woman’s dress, statue” (cf. Obrador-Cursach 2020: 136; 195–196).

ibeya “Herself”: cf. Latin *sibi* and Greek σφεῖς based on PIE **s(w)e* (Obrador-Cursach 2020: 249), also present in *ovevin* “his own” (**W-01**) and *venavtun* “his own” (**W-01**), see transliteration and translation above. Note that the staging of Mother Kybela as presiding over the religious community is paralleled for **NPhr-48**, in which the god referred to as “the Keeper, Guardian” (so also in **NPhr-106**; the Guardian or Keeper is none other than Father Asklepios of the Greek part of the text) is held responsible for the erection of the monument.

NPhr-12 Damnation-formula of an inscription from Ilgin.

- | | | |
|----|---|--|
| a. | <i>eios ni semoun knoumani
kakon addaket</i> | “Who(ever) brings damage to this grave, |
| b. | <i>zeira-ke oi petes-ke tit-
tetikmena Attie adeinnou</i> | let his hands and feet be damned by Attis because of
it!” |