The syntax of the New Phrygian inscription No. 88

ALEXANDER LUBOTSKY

§ 1. For the interpretation of Phrygian inscriptions we have at our disposal two sources of syntactic information: syntactic constructions attested in Phrygian and peculiarities of the Greek language of the "Phrygian" area of Asia Minor. In the present article I would like to demonstrate how we can use this information for the analysis of Phrygian inscriptions, taking as an example inscription No. 88, which was published for the first time by Calder (1928: 216f). This inscription contains a Greek and a Phrygian part:

Αδρ. Μηνόφιλος Ουενούστου κε Μανία ἂντιόχου ἣ γυνή αὐτοῦ ἂνπη καὶ Ὀυεναούη τέκνοις ἀκώροις καὶ ἐσπευτὸς μνήμης χάριν (leaf) τὸς νὶ σεμοὺν κνουμανει κακε ἀδδακετ αὐρω ουεναουιας τιγ γεγαριτμεν<ζ> ειτου πουρ ουανακαταν κε ουρανιον ισγεικετ διουσιν (leaf) καὶ Αδρ. Σώζοντι Κανκάρου ἀνδρί τῆς Ουεναούης.

As usual, the Greek part contains an epitaph, from which we learn that the grave has been made by Mēnophilos and his wife Mania for their prematurely deceased children, Appē and Ouenaouia, and for themselves. The message at the end of the inscription, concerning the burial of Sōzōn, the husband of Ouenaouia, "may be a later addition" (Calder 1928: 217).

The Phrygian part constitutes a malediction against the violator of the tomb. Its protasis, ιὸς νὶ σεμοὺν κνουμανει κακε ἀδδακετ αὐρω ουεναουιας, is quite transparent and can be translated 'whoever brings harm to this premature tomb of Venavia', αὐρω standing for Gr. ἀκώρο and ουεναουιας being gen.sg. of the name mentioned in the Greek part of the inscription (cf. Haas 1966: 94).\(^1\)

The rest of the inscription, viz.

\(^1\) Haas translates 'wer diesem frühzeitigen Grabe der Ouen<α>ouia etwas Übels zufügt' (the omitted -a- in the name Ouenouia is a misprint). The only correction which must be made to Haas' analysis regards the interpretation of πιγ. Haas takes it as a pronomen indefinitum *kʷid, belonging to κακε, but, as Brixhe has shown (1978a: 8ff.), τι(τ) is a particle, always making part of the apodosis and standing immediately before the participle / adjective of the predicate. Haas 1976a: 77 tacitly corrected the translation himself: "Wer diesem allzufrühnen Grabe der Venavia κακός προςποιεί". For more details on the particle τι(τ) I refer the reader to Lubotsky 1989.
is much more problematic, although some elements of this passage are easily identifiable. The first three words, πτηγαρίτμενο<ς> εἰτοῦ, must constitute a curse 'let him be condemned' uel sim., parallel to the usual τίτ τετικμένος εἰτοῦ (for the particle τίτ cf. Lubotsky 1989, for γεγαρίτμενος see below). Οὐρανίκατα is probably the acc.sg. of the word for 'king', cf. Old Phrygian (OPhr.) nom.sg. (modro)vanak (M-04), dat.sg. vanaktey (M-01a), whereas οὐρανίον is likely to be the acc.sg. of an adjective, borrowed from Greek οὐράνιος 'heavenly'.

The other words are less clear, and for the passage πούρ οὐρανίκατα κε οὐρανίον ἴσχεικε διούνσιν, as far as I know, three interpretations have been proposed:

1) According to Calder 1928: 217, the three last words, οὐρανίον ἴσχεικε διούνσιν, are comparable with the Greek malediction ἔξει πρὸς (or ἔξει κεχολαμένον) οὐράνιον Διόνυσον (in οὐρανάκταν Calder saw a name). Calder's analysis was accepted by Gusmani (1958: 902), who suggested that οὐρανάκταν is likewise an attribute of ἄνωθεν, whereas κε "è naturalmente l'enclitica e serve da elemento coordinatore con quello che precede".

2) Haas (1966: 109) assumed that the malediction formula ends after the curse τίγ γεγαρίτμενο<ς> εἰτοῦ. He divided ἴσχεικε in ἴσχει κ' ετ and translated πούρ οὐρανίκατα κε οὐρανίον ἴσχει κ' ετ διούνσιν as 'und für Ouanakta und Ouranios καὶ ἑαυτοῖς ἐτι ζωσίν'.

3) Diakonoff (in Diakonoff – Neroznak 1985: 9f., 4419) emends οὐρανάκταν to *οὐρανάκταν and translates πούρ *οὐρανάκταν κε οὐρανίον ἴσχεικε διούνσιν as "ignis regius caelestisque incendat ex caelis" (lit. excendat, cf. OSlav. izǔ-čgo "I shall burn [it] out"), "the royal and celestial fire, descending from heaven, (shall) burn (him)" (p. 10).

In order to assess the probability of these proposals, it is necessary to analyze the syntactic behaviour of two key-words of this inscription, viz. γεγαρίτμενος and κε.

§ 2. γεγαρίτμενος is nom.sg. of a perf.part.med. Already Calder (1926: 24) drew attention to Gr. ἐνεκχαρισμένος, attested in a Greek inscription from M odaní: τίς δὲ τούτους ἴδικησε ἐνεκχαρισμένος ἤτο εἰς αὐτὰ τὰ νέκυεια. Later, more Greek inscriptions containing this word were found, cf. ἐπτα κεχαρισμένος Δεί Οὐρυδ[αμνό] (Calder 1933: 184). In all these inscriptions (ἐν)κεχαρισμένος means something like 'devoted (to)', 'at the mercy of'.

Calder proposed to see in these formulae the Greek rendering of the Phrygian expression with γεγαρίτμενος and asked: "Is γεγαρίτμενος simply κεχαρισμένος borrowed and dressed in a Phrygian disguise, or is it a genuine Phrygian word?" I believe that borrowing from Greek is hardly probable, as the difference in form and meaning is too considerable for a loan. Note that Gr. χ appears as Phr. κ in κορος, which is attested in the protasis of inscription 92:

ιος νι σ[εμουν κνου]μανε κακουν [αδδακετ αι]νι κορου (92)

'whoever brings harm to this grave or to the κορος' (Brixhe 1978b: 312, Calder 1933: 116) and
which seems to be a recent loan from Greek χώρος `place' (Brixhe 1983: 127). Therefore, we would expect κεχαρισμένος to be reflected in Phrygian as **κεκαρισμένος. The answer to Calder's question must therefore be that γεγαριτμένος is a genuine Phrygian word.

I believe that the shift of meaning of κεχαρισμένος in the Greek inscriptions of Phrygia (`devoted to' instead of the usual `agreeable') must be due to the influence of γεγαριτμένος, which presumably had both these meanings. In other words, when Phrygians composed malediction formulae in Greek, they used the usual Greek equivalent of γεγαριτμένος, viz. κεχαρισμένος. A similar point of view has already been expressed by Haas (1951: 27) and Heubeck (1959: 15). The consequence of this view is that the syntax of Greek inscriptions with κεχαρισμένος is based on the Phrygian formulae and can provide us with important information (see below).

As to the origin of γεγαριτμένος, I cannot agree with Haas that there is only "scheinbare etymologische Entsprechung" between γεγαριτμένος and κεχαρισμένος (1966: 95).2 Gr. κεχαρισμένος is the perf.part.med. of the denominative verb χαρίζω, derived from χάρις < PIE *gʰR-i-, an original i-stem (cf. acc.sg. χάριν, χαρί-εις, χαρί-δώτης), which has been enlarged to a t-stem (gen.sg. χάριτος, etc.). It seems plausible to identify the root of the Phrygian verb, -γαριτ-, with Gr. χάριτ- (for the development of vocalic resonants see below, §4.1), which would indicate that the t-suffix is old and is a common innovation of both languages. Moreover, this analysis provides another proof that Phrygian is a centum language because the family of Gr. χαρίς has a palatal *gʰ- (e.g., Skt. háryati, cf. Frisk s.v.).

Let us now look at the actual occurrences of γεγαριτμένος. A part from our inscription, it occurs only in one context (γεγαριτμένος has also been restored in 64 and 79, but the context there is unclear), viz. the malediction formula

αυτος κε ουα κ εροκα γεγαριτμενος ας βαταν τευτους (33)
αυτος κε ουα κ εροκα γεγαριτμεδος α<ς> βαταν τευτους (36)

Although the exact meaning of ε/οροκα is unknown, the syntax of the beginning of the malediction is clear: `and he himself and his (ουα) ε/οροκα (progeny / family?)'. We have seen above that Gr. κεχαρισμένος in the Greek inscriptions of Phrygia often has a complement, a deity, to whom the violator of the grave will be devoted, and that this use was most probably borrowed from Phrygian. This implies that we must look for the name of a deity in ας βαταν τευτος.

The parallelism of two constructions, γεγαριτμενος ας βαταν τευτος and τι(τ) τετικενος ας τιαν ειτου (14, 53, 99) `let him become accursed by Tiyes' uel sim., for which see Lubotsky 1989, suggests that ας βαταν must be analysed as the preposition ας + acc.sg. of a

---

2 Haas proposed to connect γεγαριτμενος with Gr. χαράττω, -σω `to scratch, brandmerken' (1966: 213), but the vocalism of the Greek and Phrygian words seems to be unreconcilable, and, moreover, the comparison is semantically weak, cf. Heubeck 1987: 74.
deity, whereas τευτος is a verbal form (so already Gusmani 1958: 903). As the acc. βαταν can belong either to an ιδ-stem, or to a consonant stem, it is tempting to take βαταν as acc.sg. of a t-stem (or a root-noun) and to connect it with the deity Βας (nom.sg. < *Βατ-ς), which is mentioned among other deities in 48 (Μιτραφατα κε Μας Τεμογειος κε Πουντας Βας κε).³

§ 3. Essential for the syntactical analysis of the inscription is the position of the conjunction particle κε. Recently, Brixhe discussed the syntax of Phrygian κε (1978b: 1ff.), and his conclusions can be summarized as follows:

1. When used as a word conjunction, κε appears either after each member (Χ κε Υ κε: δεως κε ξεμελως κε), or after the second word only (Χ κε: δεως ξεμελως κε).

2.1. When used as a sentence conjunction, κε appears after the first word of the second clause. The clear cases are:

- ... ειτου υ κε ακκαλα οουιτετου υου (2) (where υ most probably stands for οι, Brixhe 1979: 192),
- ... ειτου αυτος κε υου κ εροκα γεγαριτιμενος ας βαταν τευτος (33),
- ... εγεδου ... αυτος κε υου κ εροκα γεγαριτιμενος α<ς> βαταν τευτος (36),
- ... ειτου γεγριμενον Κ' εγεδου τιος ουτοι (76, 108),
- ... αδειτου φυελας κε του κε ισυνου αστοι πορτης (87).

2.2. Brixhe does not separately discuss those cases where the second clause starts with a prepositional. Here we must distinguish between combinations of a preposition + a clitic and combinations of a preposition + a noun. It seems that in the former case κε appears after the first word, too, cf.:

- ... [ε]ιτου με κε οι τοτοσειτι βας βεκος (99).

I therefore believe that ακκεοι, attested in

- ... εγεδου ακκεοι βεκος ακκαλος τιδρεγουν ειτου (33) and
- ... αδειτου ακκεοι βεκος ακκαλος τιδρεγουν ειτου (76),

must similarly be analysed as the preposition αδ + κε + pron. οι (contra Haas 1966: 84 and Brixhe 1978b: 2, according to whom ακκε is of the same origin and function as Lat. atque).

On the other hand, in the case of combinations of a preposition + a noun κε appears after the noun:

---

³ The name of Bas also occurs in formulae with βεκος `bread'. The identical apodoseis of 86 (βε[ς] οι βεκος με βερε[μ]) and 111 (βας οι βεκος με βερετ) can be rendered as 'Bas shall take his bread (away)' (cf. also Brixhe 1979: 189, who takes σια as a pronoun and translates: "que X lui refuse le pain"). I assume that the apodosis of 99 (με κε οι τοτοσπι ιτ βας βεκος) has a comparable meaning. For the word division in 99 cf. 18 βεσποι (= βε<ς>ος οι?, Gusmani 1958: 903) με τοτοσ ποιοιν. Unfortunately, OPhr. batan (T-02b) occurs in a fragment, the context of which is unclear.
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– ... eito[v] at ti kε adεitou (39),
– ... me berε[t] at ti kε ti tετικμε[ε]νος ειτου (86).
(For the analysis of the malediction formulae with at ti kε and ας tiαν see Lubotsky 1989).

It follows that the interpretation of Haas (1966: 109), who divided ισγεικετ as ισγει κε et and translated πουρ ουανακταν κε ουρανιον ισγεικετ διούνσιν as 'und für Ouanakta und Ouranios και ἐντοίς ἐτι ζῶσιν' is improbable because ουανακταν and ουρανιον cannot be coordinated nouns connected by κε. The same syntactic objection (among many others) holds for the analysis of Diakonoff (Diakonoff – Neroznak 1985: 9f. and 4419), who emends ουανακταν to *ουανακτον and translates the sentence as 'ignis regius caelistisque incendat ex caelis'.

In taking κε either as a word conjunction or as a sentence conjunction, we have two possible interpretations of the apodosis τη γεγαριτμενο<ζ> ειτου πουρ ουανακταν κε ουρανιον ισγεικετ διούνσιν (unfortunately, Brixhe 1978b: 1ff. in his discussion of κε does not mention inscription 88 and therefore does not express his position on the matter):

A. If κε be a word conjunction, πουρ and ουανακταν (ουρανιον) must be coordinated, both being the direct object of γεγαριτμενος. However, this analysis presupposes a transitive character of γεγαριτμενος, which seems unlikely in view of the use of ἐγκεχαρισμενος in Greek inscriptions (v. supra).

B. If κε be a sentence conjunction, either πουρ belongs to the preceding clause (the second clause beginning with ουανακταν κε ουρανιον), or πουρ is a preposition and is the first word of the clause. The former alternative meets the same objection as in A, so that we arrive at the following syntactic analysis:
apodosis 1: τη γεγαριτμενο<ζ> ειτου 'let him be devoted';
apodosis 2: prep. πουρ + accusatives ουανακταν ουρανιον διούνσιν + the verb ισγεικετ, the two apodoseis being connected by κε in the position after the noun, which is in accordance with rule 2.2 above.

§ 4. In other words, we must return to the interpretation given by Calder and Gusmani and consider πουρ ουανακταν κε ουρανιον ισγεικετ διούνσιν as parallel to Gr. ἔξει πρός οὐράνιον Δίονυσον. Let us now discuss the three remaining words.

§ 4.1. πουρ must thus be a preposition with the sense of Gr. πρός. This preposition is probably also found in OPhr. inscription W-05b, which can be read ἔναντι[e]daespormatερ[ and analyzed as Obj. (...an), Subj. (N.Pr. St...), V erb ([e]daes `made, dedicated'), por `for', acc.sg. mater[an] or dat.sg. mater[ey] `Mother' (cf. Brixhe-L ejeune 1984: 49). What was the proto-form of this preposition? Gusmani 1958: 902 reconstructed *pɔr (por) and compared Lat. prā, Skt. pra, etc., but *pɔr is nowhere attested, whereas *por in Lat. porrɔ reflects rather *pr- (the same origin may be proposed for Gr. πόρρω, πόρσω with Aeolian vocalization). Therefore, we must assume
that OPhr. por, NPhr. τοῦρ reflects PIE *pré (cf. Gr. παρ, Goth. faur, etc.).

This reconstruction furnishes the first certain example of a reflex of PIE *r in Phrygian. There seems to be a communis opinio that PIE *r and *l yield Phrygian ar, al (Haas 1966: 205, Bajun – Orėl 1986: 209, Diakonoff – Neroznak 1985: 5), but the material presented by Haas is unreliable, while the Soviet scholars do not adduce any evidence in favour of this development. Moreover, reconsidering the attestations of Phr. -ar-, we see that they all may have another origin:

-ar- < *-ɛɾ-: 3sg.aor. eneparkes (M-01d, G-01c, G-125) = ενεπαρκής (31);
nom.sg. matar = ματαρ (18), αναρ (15);
3sg.pf. δακαρ (18), 3pl. δακαρεν (98);
#-ar- < *H2(e)-: αργου (30, 98), αργυμενο (116);

Personal names: Kavarmoyos* (B-01), Agartioi (G-02);
Geographical name: Ευγεξαρναι, Ευγισαρναι (18);
Unclear: παρτος (9), παρταν (103), παρτης (42, 87), ενοσαρνα (48), εναρκε (116).

The only form where -ar- seems to reflect syllabic r is γεγαρτμενος < *-gHrHit discussed above (§2), but reflexes of syllabic resonants before a laryngeal may differ from those in other positions (cf. Skt. -ir/-ur- < *CrHV vs. -r- < *CrC).

On the other hand, it is difficult to find further evidence in favor of the development PIE *r, *l > Phr. or/ur, ol/ul because Phr. or/ol may also reflect PIE *or/ol. We have the following material:

1. The ending of 3sg.med. αδακετος, αββερετος, if < *-ɛɾ;
2. OPhr. nom.sg. sakor (G-105, cf. Lubotsky 1988: 21), tekmor (P-04) may reflect *-ɛɾ, although the ending *-ɛr is also possible;
3. There are several cases of Phr. ol which may reflect syllabic resonants: OPhr. isvolkay (G-01A), NPhr. κόλταμανε (18);
4. Moreover, as I have tried to demonstrate elsewhere (1988: 23), Phr. o > u /__rj, lj. Some of these combinations ury, uly may likewise reflect syllabic resonants, cf. esuryoyoy (M-01f), voineiosuriienoisku... (G-145), kuliya[... (G-101), küliyas (G-127).

§ 4.2. According to Calder’s analysis, ἰγεικετ must be a verb parallel to Gr. ἐξελ. It is tempting to see in -ṣγ- the zero-grade of the root of Gr. ἐχω. The initial 1- may be prothetic because “Phrygian” Greek regularly shows prothetic i- before word-initial sC-clusters (cf. Dressler

Kretschmer (1932: 66) considered ἰγεικετ a loan from Gr. εἰσχίκε, but this explanation cannot account for the Phrygian -γ- (see above on Phr. κ for Gr. χ in loan-words) and is therefore improbable. On the other hand, our inscription contains so many Greek elements (αορφο, ουρανιον) that we may assume that the scribe did not have sufficient command of Phrygian. It seems then conceivable that ἰγεικετ contains the productive Greek element -κ- (cf. ήδελκα, κεχαρικα, Schwyzer 1939: 774f.), which in the III-IV century A.D. had become [-ικ-].
1965: 96ff. and Brixhe 1984: 115f.). The ending is the same as in 3sg.fut./subj. αδδακετ, which also shows a secondary -κ- taken from the perfect. The only problem is the enlargement -ει- (phonetically [-ι]). This -ει- cannot be of the same origin as -η- in Gr. ἐσχηκα because *Debe yields Phr. a, but as the Greek -η- is secondary and as we know so little about the Phrygian verbal morphology, we may assume for the time being that Phrygian used a secondary enlargement -ει- where Greek used -η- (cf. also fn. 4).

§ 4.3. Finally, we will have in διούσσιν the acc.sg. of Gr. Διόνυσος. We expect -ουν as the acc.sg. ending of the o-stems, but -ιν is attested in κακίν (14), next to κακον (37 times), κακεν (12 times), κακεν (40, 97), κακτιν (62), κακεν (11), κακεν (45), and κακε (21, 99 and in our inscription 88), cf. also σεμν (76, 100) instead of σεμνον (passim). Gusmani (1958: 902) explains the aberrant form διούσσιν by a syncope, followed by the raising of -ο- to -υ- before a nasal, but we may also suggest a scribal error, which led to the spelling διούσσιν, instead of *διούσσιν.

§ 4.4. The syntax of the malediction formula πουρ ουανακταιν κε ουρανον ισγεικετ διούσσιν, with the nominal syntagm interrupted by a verb, may appear aberrant, but this syntax is not without parallels, cf.

– υκε ακαλα οουιτετου ουα (2), where the verb οουιτετου (3sg.impv.) stands between the coreferential ακαλα and ουα (<*σμα 'his own');
– γεγρειμενον εγεδου τιος ουταν, attested eight times, where the verb εγεδου (3sg.impv.middle) interrupts the nominal syntagm, consisting of the coreferential γεγρειμενον and ουταν plus gen.sg. τιος 'the established punishment of (god) Tiyes' uel sim. (cf. Haas 1966: 67, Lubotsky 1989). A variant of this formula is found in 106: γεγρειμενον κ εγεδον ορουενος ουτον.

§ 5. Conclusions

1). The NPhr. inscription No. 88 represents a malediction against the violator of the tomb and consists of a protasis and two apodoseis. The protasis, τοις νε γεμαυμενε κακε αδδακετ αιφων ουεναουιας, can be translated 'whoever brings harm to this premature tomb of Venavía'. The use of Phrygian Greek (εν)κεχαρισεμενος (an equivalent of Phr. γεγαριτμενος) and the syntax of Phr. κε show that the rest of the inscription must be divided into two apodoseis, which is in accordance with the interpretation of Calder (1928: 217) and Gusmani (1958: 902):
– τιν γεγαριτμενον<ζ> ειτου 'let him become cursed/devoted' and
– πουρ ουανακταιν κε ουρανον ισγεικετ διούσσιν 'and he will have to do with the heavenly king Dionysos', which is parallel to the Greek malediction ἔξει πρός οὐρανον Διόνυσον.
2). The root of Phr. γεγορίτευνος may be identified with Gr. χαρτ- < *gʰrH-i-t-, which would indicate that the t-stem of this word is a common innovation of Greek and Phrygian. Moreover, this analysis provides another proof that Phrygian is a centum language.

3). The sentence conjunction κε mostly stands after the first word of the second clause, except if the second clause starts with a combination of a preposition + a noun. In the latter case κε stands after the noun.

4). The word πονυρ appears to be a preposition going back to PIE *pr, which makes it likely that the Phrygian reflex of PIE vocalic resonants is or/ur, ol/ul.

Postscript

In a recent publication, L.S. Bajun and V.Ë. Orël ("Jazyk frigijskix nadpisej kak istoriískij istorií II", Vestnik drevnej istorii, 1988/4, p. 132-167) propose the following translation of the NPhr. inscription No. 88 (p. 152f.): "Kto étoj prezdevremennoj grobnice Venavii zlo prihit, (tot) da budet prokljat. Ogon' (da) soxranit nebesnogo carja sredi (ili: dlja) nebesnych (božestv)" ("He who brings harm to this premature tomb of Venavia, let him be cursed. May the fire keep the heavenly king among (or: for) the heavenly (deities)"). In my opinion, the second sentence does not make any sense and is misplaced in a curse. Moreover, their assumption that κε was used in the construction noun + attribute is improbable.
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