The Phrygian Zeus and the problem of the “Lautverschiebung”

1. In New Phrygian inscriptions, we come across several malediction formulae which involve the god Τι, e.g.

... τος νι με ζεμελω κε δεος κε Τη ττ τετικμενος ε[τ]ου (6) ‘... let him become cursed by T. among men and gods’;

... Τη ττ τετικμενος ειτου (26) ‘... let him be cursed by T.’;

... ττ τετικμενος ατ Τιε αδειτου (45) ‘... let him be cursed by T.’;

... ατ Τιη κε αδειτου (39) ‘... and let him go to T.’;

... γεγρειμεναν εγεδου Τιος ουταν (34) ‘... let him experience the written curse of T.’;

... ατ Τιη κε αδειτου (53) ‘... let him become cursed by T.’.

On the basis of these formulae we can establish the following paradigm: acc. sg. Τιαν, gen.sg. Τιος, dat.sg. Τιη / Τιε / Τι.

2. Stephanus Byzantius in his ‘Bithyniaca’ directly identifies the Phrygian deity with Zeus:

Δημοσθένης δ ἐν Βιθυνιακοῖς φησὶ κτιστὴν τῆς πόλεως γενέσθαι Πάταρον ἑλόντα Παφλαγονίαν, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ τιμᾶν τὸν Δία Τίον προσαγορεῦσαι (see on this passage Haas 1966: 67, Lubotsky 1989a: 85). It is therefore likely that Phrygian Τι- and Greek Ζεύς are also etymologically related, but there are two obstacles. First of all, it is now generally believed that Phrygian has no Lautverschiebung (LV), and secondly, we have to account for the loss of *-u̯- in the dative 3. The latter problem can easily be solved. Since *-u̯- was absent in the accusative (cf. Gr. Ζήν) and in the genitive (in New Phrygian, *-u̯- was probably regularly lost in front of o⁴), it might then analogically be removed from the dative. The developments can be represented as follows:

acc.sg. *diēm > *tian = τιαν;
gen.sg. *diuos > *tios > *tios = τιος;
dat.sg. *diwei > *tiwei >> *tiei = τι(η) (for the final syllable see Lubotsky 1997: 126, fn. 23).

It is conceivable that the same stem with preserved *-u̯- is found in Old Phrygian tiveia (G-183 A. tiveia⁵ B. imeneia), *tivo⁶ B-01.4 (yos *tivo [t]a spereta aynį *kin *te[l]emi⁸), and

---

³ These are the reasons why Witczak (1992-3: 265ff.) postulates Bithynian origin for the Phrygian god, which is of course possible, but unverifiable. Witczak assumes LV and the loss of intervocalic *-u̯- in “Bithynian”, but this rule is ad hoc and, further, it does not often happen that words are borrowed together with their inflection (for instance, the inflection of Modern German Christus, Christi, etc. is clearly artificial).
⁴ There are no unambiguous examples of this sound change, but we never find /yo/ in NPhr. inscriptions (cf. also Lubotsky 1997: 126).
⁵ Theoretically speaking, this can be an analogue of Gr. δία.
⁶ For the readings see Lubotsky 1993b; [ - ] is a missing sign, word boundaries established on combinatoric grounds are indicated by °.
The possible etymological connection of Τι- with Zeus is thus dependent on the problem of the Phrygian LV. Since there has been no full treatment of this issue since Lejeune 1979, it is worthwhile to reopen the discussion.

2. There can hardly be any doubt that Proto-Indo-European (PIE) mediae aspiratae developed into Phrygian mediae (*bh > b, *d’h > d, *g’w’h > g, *g’h > g), cf. New Phrygian ἀββερετ, μεβερετ < *b’her; -αδδακετ < *d’eh1-k-; γεγαριμενος < *g’h-e-g’rH-i-t-; γεγρειμεναν < *g’h-e-g’rei(H)-, etc.8

As neither Old Phrygian (OPhr.) nor New Phrygian (NPhr.) regularly uses signs for kh, th, ph9, the question whether or not PIE tenues developed into tenues aspiratae in Phrygian is only of theoretical interest. Those who argue in favor of this development can always hold that the opposition between tenues and tenues aspiratae was not expressed in writing. Assertions of the type “it looks as if I.-E. p,t,k yielded Phrygian ph,th,kh with a very weak aspiration” (Diakonoff – Neroznak 1985: 43) can hardly be verified. The fact that in Greek inscriptions of Phrygia we frequently find interchange of Κ and Χ, Τ and Θ, Π and Φ (Brixhe 1987: 58) can be interpreted in a variety of ways. The same is true for the substitution of Gr. γ by NPhr. κ in loan-words, cf. NPhr. ευκιν, borrowed from Gr. εὐχήν (Brixhe 1983: 129, 1999: 298) and NPhr. κορου (dat.sg.), borrowed from Gr. χῶρος (Brixhe 1983: 127). The only conclusion we can draw from these phenomena is that Phrygian did not have the same contrast between tenues and tenues aspiratae as Greek had.

It appears that the only issue at stake is the fate of the PIE mediae: do they yield mediae or tenues in Phrygian? Whereas the older scholarship (Solmsen, Marstrander, Haas) favored the idea of LV, nowadays the communis opinio follows Lejeune (1979), who argued against LV in Phrygian. I myself was for many years convinced of the correctness of Lejeune’s position, but this is no longer the case. Here I would like to present the evidence and to weigh the arguments.

Lejeune only considered the OPhr. words and glosses. He first dismissed the evidence of the glosses (Φρύγες / Βρίγες / Βρυκεῖς, βέκος, βέδυ) as being unreliable and then stated that whereas there is no reasonable evidence in favor of LV in the OPhr. material, there are three words which seem to show no LV:

– bagun ‘gift’ < *b’hagom, if G-136 ταδού : ιμαν / bagun, inscribed on a small statue of a falcon, means something like ‘to Tados Iman (gives, offers) a gift’. The interpretation is formally possible, but not very probable. The original meaning of the IE root *b’hag- (*b’hag-) was ‘to (give) share’, and derivatives of this root hardly ever get the meaning ‘gift’.10 If bagun rather means ‘idol’, then a borrowing from Iranian becomes likely. Since the meaning of the inscription is hypothetical, etymologizing separate words does not seem fruitful. For instance, we might as well take bagun as πῆχυν, acc.sg. of the word for ‘arm’.

7 This inscription has been published by Gusmani and G. Polat (1999). I write ̆ instead of the question mark of the edition.
8 As far as I know, only Bajun and Orel (e.g. 1986: 209) assumed that IE mediae aspiratae sometimes became tenues and sometimes mediae in Phrygian; later, this point of view was renounced by Orel 1997: 377.
9 On OPhr. Φ, Ψ see Lejeune 1969 and 1978, on NPhr. θ and φ see Brixhe 1999: 298f.
10 Lejeune further mentions in this connection the Hesych gloss Βαγαῖος· Ζεὺς Φρύγιος and interprets the name as ὁδηγὸς ἐλεον, which is of course very uncertain.
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- PN benagonos (G-116), if it is comparable to Gr. compounds in -γονος. Since we usually do not know the meaning of the names, the etymologies based on them are gratuitous. Alternatively, we may think of a name in *-gʷonos, Gr. -φονος or even *-dʰgonos, Gr. -χθονος.  

- The strongest argument is podas, apparently acc.pl. of the word for ‘foot’, which is attested in an inscription from Gordion (G-02), written next to two sculptured foot-prints. After the dedication agartiôi : iktes : adoiakovoi, we read iosoporokitis- / kakoitoito : podaska[?]. It is probable that this is a malediction formula with the protasis ‘whoever (ios) will ... (oporokitis- ?)’, but the syntax of the apodosis is unclear. Lejeune sees in it probable that this is a malediction formula with the protasis ‘whoever (ios) will ... (oporokitis- ?)’, but the syntax of the apodosis is unclear. Lejeune sees in kokoioi the 3sg. optative of the verb ‘endommager’ (= Gr. κακοῦν), but as far as the rest is concerned, “le détail soit encore incomplètement éclairci”. Lejeune writes: “Après podas, ou particule, ou reprise (inachevée, faute de place) du verb ‘endommager’ (cette fois alors en principale, subordonnée). Dans un tel contexte, visant l’objet à protéger cette figuration de pieds, il est à peu près inévitable qu’on identifie, en podas, l’acc. pl. du nom du ‘pied’ (rigoureusement identique à gr. πόδας)” (p. 224). There is no indication, however, that the inscription is incomplete. The last letters are written very small in order to fit the available space. The meaning ‘may he injure his feet’ is not very probable, and the remaining *ka[?] is unaccounted for. Of course, the interpretation of podas as ‘feet’ in combination with the sculptured foot-prints is tempting, but the context remains unclear. It cannot be excluded that the analysis is still wrong and that we have to do, for instance, with a derivative of the type *po(s)-dēh1- (cf. Slavic *podhr ‘under’ < *po-dēh1-).

3. We may conclude that, from Lejeune’s list, only podas constitutes serious, albeit not decisive, evidence against the Phrygian L.V. From NPhr., we may add the preverb αδ-, which is attested in the verbal forms αδδακετ, αββερετ, ατετικμενος, αδειτου. Whereas the first three forms are ambiguous, αδειτου demonstrates the voiced consonant in Phrygian, which corresponds to Lat. ad, Goth. at, etc. < PIE *h₂ed. This might be a case of final voicing, although I know of no parallels in Phrygian, or a secondary extension of the voiced stop from forms like αδδακετ. As far as I know, all other etymologies involving the development of PIE mediae into Phrygian mediae are inconclusive.

---

11 Lejeune proposed the same analysis already in 1969b: 294; Neumann (1988: 9) quotes it with approbation.
12 Lejeune’s suggestion that bena- comes from *gʷenh- and means ‘woman’ is very improbable. A name ‘woman-born’ is unlikely, there is no evidence for the development *gʷ > b in Phrygian, and the Phrygian word for ‘woman’ is now found in 116 κνακ-. As an alternative for the first member, Lejeune (1969b: 294) considered “ben(n)ā- en relation avec l’épithète de Zeûς Bénnioς”.
13 A different analysis of the apodosis is given by Orel (1997: 159ff.), who takes kokoioitovo to stand for kokoioi of evil fate (gen.sg.). The syntax remains cumbersome.
14 Consider, for instance, the Phrygian word acc.sg. "duman" B-01.3, dat.sg. δομος(e) 48 ‘religious community’. The origin of the term *dum- can hardly be determined. It clearly belongs to the Kybele cultus and may well be non-IE. Neumann (1999 and 2002) hypothesized that *dum- comes from Phrygian and derived it from the Indo-European word for ‘house’, PIE *dem-/dom-, under the assumption of an original meaning ‘Haus, Gebäude; Zimmer, Gelass’, then ‘private Hausgemeinschaft’, ‘Kollektiv (der Benutzer des Hauses), Verband’. The problem with this etymology is that it presupposes the development *-om- > -um- in Phrygian, for which there is no evidence. Neumann’s only parallel is the PN Νομάδος, attested in Phrygia, which he connects with Gr. νομας, νομάδος. On the other hand, this development is contradicted by OPhr. onomani and NPhr. ομωνομα, ομωνυμα, ομονυμα.
4. Let us now consider the evidence in favor of LV, beside the already discussed Zeus. I have found six words with sound etymologies.

- **bekos-** n. ‘bread’ (acc.sg. βεκός 33 76 86 99 108 111, βε<κ>ος<ς> 18, βεκος(?)) 120) < PIE *bh₁<γ>-os-.

The Phrygian word is also mentioned by Herodotus and Hipponax and is given as a gloss by Hesychius. The only reasonable Indo-European etymology connects Gr. φώγω, ON baka, OHG bahhan, OE bacan ‘to bake’ < PIE *bh(o)h₁-g- (Panagl – Kowal 1983: 186f). As indicated by Lejeune (1979: 223), however, a word of this meaning can easily be borrowed.

- **kenos-** n. ‘generation’ (?) (nom.pl.n. κενα: 35. ιις νια κακουν αδδακεμ μανκαι, ας ανανκαι οι παντα κενα [ιννου] < *genh₁os-.

In the apodosis, παντα κενα must be nom.pl.n., correlated with 3pl. impv. [ιννου, presumably a form of the verb ‘to be’. Since ανανκαι is likely to correspond to Gr. ἀνάγκη, the apodosis can be rendered: ‘let all his κενα be [delivered] to mischief’. It seems tempting to me to explain κενα from *keneha < *g_enh₁es-h₂ (Gr. γένεα, Lat. genera). It is generally assumed (Haas 1966: 119, Brixhe 1993: 341, Orel 1997: 255) that κενα is a loanword from Gr. κενός ‘empty, idle’ in view of common imprecations in Greek inscriptions, where ὅικον ἐρημον or χῆρον βίον are mentioned, but the syntax is then rather strained (Orel 1997: 256 translates: ’let all his [property] be void in (the hour of) need’).

- **knaik-** f. ‘wife’ (acc.sg. κνακαν 116; gen. κνακο 116) < *gwneh₂ik-.

This word has been compared with Gr. γυναικ- already by the editors of the inscription (Brixhe -Neumann 1985: 174). Since they are not prepared to assume LV in Phrygian, they explain κ- by neutralization of k/g in the position before a nasal. Although this explanation is not impossible, it is not very likely either. It is true that the sequence gn is not attested in NPhr., but in OPhr. we find °bugnos° (P-02), and in the position before m we find NPhr. αργμενα- (116) vs. τετικμενος (passim).

- **lak-** (3sg.impv.med. lakedo °W-01b, °lakeασ B-03), cf. Gr. λαβεῖν?

In B-03, °lakeασ[?] is likely to be read lakedo, since the combination of three vowels is improbable in Phrygian (Lubotsky 1988: 21). In W-01b, lakedo starts the apodosis of the malediction formula (lakedo °key : venavt un : avtay : materey ‘let he ... himself to the Mother herself’). The same function is possible in B-03, but the further text has disappeared. As to the meaning, we expect something like ‘to devote, place oneself at the mercy of (+ dat.)’. The etymological connection of the root is unclear. If we assume LV in Phrygian, we may connect Gr. λαβεῖν (middle with the passive meaning ‘to be grasped, taken’) or, less likely, Gr. λήγω (connection with λάσκω, tentatively proposed in Lubotsky 1988: 21), is improbable.

Janda 1997: 273ff. offers a different analysis of the syntagm, viz. la-ke-dokey, where la is compared with Hitt. prohibitive la, ke is a particle or a preverb, and dokey is a verbal form, derived from the root *deh₃- ‘to give’ (*d(o)h₃kei). He compares Gr. (Herodotus) δίδωμι ἑωτόν ‘sich übergeben an’ and renders the sentence as ‘der soll sich nicht besagter Mutter hingeben’. The major flaw in this analysis is the meaning of the apodosis. From the Luvian imprecations,
after which the Phrygian rulers coined their inscriptions (cf. Lubotsky 1998), we know that the usual curse for the next king, who puts his own name on the monument, is that he himself will deal with the deity.\footnote{For a typological parallel see, for instance, Karkamiš A11a, where we read ‘If in future they [the gates] shall pass down to (one) who shall ..., and shall overturn these orthostats from (their) place(s), or shall overturn this god from (his) place, or shall erase my name, against him may Tarhunzas, Karhuhas and Kubaba litigate!’ (translation Hawkins 2000: 96).} Janda’s analysis further leaves *lakedo* (B-03) out of consideration, and postulates unattested particles *la* and *ke*.

– *tetikmeno*- part. pf. med. ‘cursed’ (NPhr. *passim*) < *de*-di-k-mh,–no–.

This participle is always already preceded by *τι*(*τι*), except in 118 (without a preverb) and 51 a*τε[τικμενο]*ς (presumably influenced by *αδ– of the formula *a(τι) τι αδείτου*). Assuming LV, we may compare *τι*(*τι*) *τετικμενος* with Greek δια–δικάζω ‘judge’, κατα–δικάζω ‘to condemn’, PIE *deik–* (Lubotsky 1998: 420, fn. 22). If *ισγεικετ* in the apodosis of 88 (... πουρ ουανακταν κε ουανακτη ισγεικετ διουςθιν) is to be read *ιστεικετ* (cf. Brixhe 1999: 304, fn. 46, for the analysis of this phrase see further Lubotsky 1989b), it seems possible to etymologically relate this verb to Gr. ἐκ–δείκνυμι ‘to expose’. The meaning corresponds even better to ἐν–δείκνυμι ‘to declare oneself to smbd.’ i.e. ‘to be responsible towards’. The Phrygian malediction can then be rendered as ‘... he will be responsible towards the heavenly king Dionysos’.

– *ti* preverb ‘Gr. δια– (?) (τιπ–τετικμενος, τι–δρέγρουν, τι–γεγαριτμενος 88) < *d(y)is–*.

In previous scholarship, this word was usually analysed as a particle of pronominal origin, belonging to the apodosis (e.g. Lubotsky 1989a with an analysis of the formulae), but since *τι* only occurs in front of the verbal forms, it must be a preverb. Assuming LV for Phrygian, we may connect NPhr. *τι* with Gr. δια–, δια–, which go back to *d(y)is*.\footnote{Gr. δια– has probably taken over the -α from μετά, παρά, etc.} Descriptively, the Phrygian preverb can be defined as *τι* + (optional) gemination of the next stop. There are indications that *s* assimilated to a following voiced consonant in Phrygian, cf. 3sg. impv. med. -εδου < *e–sa*δ–, 3pl. impv. of the root ‘to be’ οννου. It is also likely that final -s assimilated to the following velar (Orel 1997: 131), cf. αὐθήρεσακ ἦσσε (31), ποκγονιον (116), possibly ικ κναικαν (116). We may therefore assume that gemination was generalized from these contexts, which accounts for *τι(τ)τετικμενος*.

We have already seen the comparison of *τι(τ)τετικμενος* with Greek δια–δικάζω ‘judge’. As to *τι–δρέγρουν* (only found in the malediction ακ ὡ τι βέκος ακκαλός τύρεργουν επιου 33, 76, 108 ‘may bread ακκαλός become τύρεργουν for him’), the most attractive etymology remains that of Haas (1966: 69, 84), who interpreted this adjective as ‘unenjoyable, *inmutubile*’ and reconstructed PIE *d(y)is–d(ĕ)reg–* with the same root as in Gr. τρέφω and *τι* with LV (for more details on the formation see Panagl – Kowal 1983: 187f., who also point to Mycenaean adj. *to–ro–qa*, which modifies a word for ‘oil’ and may point to a labiovular in the Greek verb).

5. Of these six words, βέκος may be a loan word, while *lakedo* and *κενα* are slightly doubtful because the contexts are not absolutely certain. The other three (κναικαν, τετικμενος, *τι*) seem fairly convincing to me, and together with the name of Zeus, they tip the balance in favor of LV in Phrygian. For LV in other Indo-European languages and its implications for the reconstruction of the Indo-European system of stops see now Kortlandt 2003: 238ff.
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