

Word boundaries in the Old Phrygian Germanos inscription

ALEXANDER LUBOTSKY

1. The text of this longest of Old Phrygian (OPhr.) inscriptions is given by the editors of the *Corpus des inscriptions paléo-phrygiennes* Brixhe and Lejeune as follows (p. 64):

1. *s[-]bev[-]osadi[---]*
2. *kaḡarmoyo[-]imroyedaesetovesniyo[-]*
3. *matarkubeleyaibeyadumanektetoy*
4. *yostivo[-]ašperetdaynikinte[-]eḡmi*
5. *[-]toyo[-]is[-]erktevoysekeyda[-]ati*
6. *opito[-]eyoyev[-]m[-]mesmeneyaanato[-]*
7. *kavarmoyunmatarotekonov[-]*
8. *kesitioyvosaeyapaktneni*
9. *pakrayevkobeyanepaktoy*

As far as word divisions are concerned, the editors remark (p. 62): "Texte dépourvu d'interponctions. Mais des "blancs" s'y manifestent, dont certains pourraient être démarcatifs (ainsi, de part et d'autre du mot *matar* de la l.7), mais dont d'autres ne le sont sûrement pas; ainsi, l.9, le graveur, après avoir serré normalement les douze premières lettres de la ligne, a distendu le dispositif pour les dix dernières, en tronçonnant le texte en lettres ou paires de lettres isolées par les blancs. Aussi les blancs, s'ils figurent sur le fac-similé et s'ils sont signalés et mesurés dans l'apparat critique, n'ont-ils pas été pris en compte dans la translittération (sauf notations [-] et [·], là où il est probable ou possible que le blanc manifeste l'emplacement d'une lettre disparue)."

In the *apparatus criticus*, the editors give the following spaces as significant (p. 64ff):

- line 2: between *kaḡarmoyo* and *imroy* (21 cm), but there are also "traces d'une lettre non identifiable". These traces seem accidental to me (cf. also below, §3).
- line 3: between *kubeleya* and *ibeya* (17,5 cm), between *duman* and *ektetoy* (19 cm).
- line 4: between *kinte[-]eḡ* and *mi* (19 cm).
- line 5: between *[-]is* and *[-]er* (30 cm), between *ktevoys* and *ekey...* (21 cm).
- line 6: between *[-]eyoy* and *ev...* (18,5 cm), between *...eya* and *anato[-]* (21 cm).
- line 7: between *kavarmoyun* and *matar* (30 cm), between *matar* and *ote...* (28 cm).
- line 8: between *ae*y and *apaktneni* (30 cm).
- line 9: see above.

There is one important fact which remained unnoticed by Brixhe and Lejeune, viz. that the distances between the letters increase towards the end of several lines (2, 4, 5, 7, 8). This means that the scribe tried to fill up the lines, which also accounts for the spaces in line 9, the final line of the inscription. The consequence is that the end of a line must always coincide with a word boundary. And indeed, wherever we are able to determine word boundaries on combinatoric grounds, we find new words at the beginning of a line, cf. 2. *kavarmoyo*, 3. *matar*, 4. *yos*, 6. *kavarmoyun*. Also between *ekeyda[-]ati* at the end of line 5 and *opito* at the beginning of line 6 there must be a word boundary, cf. §3 below.

94

Accordingly, the spaces may represent word boundaries, except towards the end of a line. The spaces mentioned by Brixhe and Lejeune are therefore likely to mark word boundaries, with one exception. In line 4, the space between *kinte[-]e* and *mi* is probably due to filling up a line, the more so as the distance between *m* and *i* is also rather large.

We may now look at the final words of lines 6 and 7 from this perspective. About the end of line 6 (*anato[-]*), Brixhe and Lejeune write: "Comme le montrent les photographies, on aperçoit nettement, à gauche de *o*, un tracé, qui, s'il n'est pas accidentel, pourrait correspondre à un *y* plutôt qu'à un *t*." The distances between the letters of this word are decreasing towards the end, and it is clear that the scribe wanted to finish the word before the break in the surface of the rock. It is therefore not very probable that he would have added a letter on a different surface and at a considerable distance from the *o* (although it cannot be excluded that the scribe did not succeed in placing all letters before the break and was forced to continue at a different surface). As to the final letter of line 7 (*otekonov[-]*), the editors comment: "D'après estampage et photographies, il n'est pas impossible que *v* ait été suivi d'un *o*, aujourd'hui évanescent". On photographs XLI/3 and 4 we can clearly see that the apparent trace of an *o* is very close to *v*, which is in contrast with the fact that the distance between the letters steadily increases towards the end. I therefore believe that there is no letter after *v*.

2. The editors of the *Corpus* only mentioned those spaces which in absolute figures exceed the normal distance between the letters (probably, some 15 cm). In the situation where the spaces mark a word boundary, however, the relative distance between the letters can be even more relevant. Unfortunately, the drawing of the inscription on p. 63 is not entirely reliable in this respect, so that we must resort to the excellent photographs taken by Brixhe with the use of a telelens (Brixhe – Lejeune 1984: Planches XXXVIII-XLI).

line 2: Photograph XL/4 shows that the distance between the letters on both sides of *edaes* is larger than elsewhere in the same line, which is in agreement with the combinatoric analysis (the verbal form *edaes* occurs ten times in Old and New Phrygian). The drawing does not reproduce the distances correctly.

line 3: Except for the spaces mentioned by the editors, there are further spaces between *matar* and *kub...* and between *kubel* and *eya* (cf. photographs XXXIX/2,4 and the drawing). The

latter space is due to the break in the surface of the rock and does not indicate a word boundary (*kubeleya* is the epitheton of *matar*, cf. ° *kubileya*[W-04]).

line 4: Photograph XXXIX/2 and the drawing show the spaces between *yostivo* and [-]a (most probably, *ta*, cf. the palaeographic commentary on p. 65) and between this *ta* and *spe...* Moreover, on photographs XXXIX/4, XL/1,2,4 and XLI/1,2 we can see that *d* stands directly after *speret* and is followed by a space. We thus get *yostivo ta speretd ayni...* As this reading with *-td* at the end of a word is improbable, we must assume *spereta*. On photograph XL/2 the horizontal haste of the letter *a* seems visible. The advantage of this reading is that we can now identify *ayni* with the conjunction αἰνι 'and/or' (Lat. *sive*), which often occurs in the apodosis of the New Phrygian malediction formulae, e.g. 26. ἰος νι σεμον κνουμανε κακον δακετ αἰνι μανκα ... "whoever will bring harm to this grave and/or to this stele."

95

line 5 and 6: spaces between [-]toyo and [-]is (line 5) and between *opito* and [-]eyoy (line 6) are indicated on the drawing, but this part of the inscription is hardly visible on the photographs. These spaces are probably due to the same break in the surface of the rock, which has been mentioned above, ad line 3.

lines 7-9: No discernible spaces on the photographs, except for those already mentioned by Brixhe and Lejeune.

3. We may determine one more boundary by analyzing the distribution of the letter *y* in Old Phrygian inscriptions. In archaic inscriptions, the letter *i* was used for both [*i*] and [*j*]¹, cf.

intervocalic [*j*]: *kakoioi* (G-02), *tiveia imeneia* (G-183), etc.;

initial [*j*]: *ios* (G-02, P-04, P-06), *iosais* (G-117), etc.;

word-final [*j*]: *vanaktei* (M-01a), *adoikavoi* (G-02), etc.

At some stage, an orthographic "reform" took place, and a new letter *y* was introduced for [*j*], cf. examples from the so-called Areyastis-inscription (W-01):

intervocalic [*j*]: *areyastin*, *kuryaneyon*;

initial [*j*]: *yosesait*;

word-final [*j*]: *tedatoy*, *aey*, *materey*, *avtay*, etc.

More complicated is the situation with postconsonantal [*j*] because at the present state of our knowledge of Phrygian phonology and etymology we cannot distinguish between *Ci* and *Cij*. Before the reform we find both *CiV* and *CiiV*, cf. *altos*, *alton* (T-02), *kadiun* (G-103), and *altiai* (T-03), *kanutiievanos* (P-02), etc. After the reform, we find *CyV* in *kuryaneyon* (W-01c) and *esuryoyoy* (M-01f), on the one hand, and spellings *CiyV*, on the other, cf. *ataniyen* (W-01c),

¹ A useful review of different positions where the letters *i* and *y* are used can be found in the *Index des particularités graphiques*, appended to the *Corpus* of Brixhe and Lejeune (p. 279ff.).

tiyes (M-04), *køiyanaveyos* (M-01b), *kuliya...* (G-101, G-127), *babiy[...]* (G-138) and even in the sandhi *tuaveniy : ae* (M-01f) and *adļevasiy · aglavoy* in the so-called Mysian inscription (Bayun – Orel 1988). There is only one exception in the "post-reform" inscriptions, viz. *kl̥tanaveyos* (M-02) with the archaic spelling. This inscription is more carelessly written (cf. also *bba* for *baba*), however, and the spelling may be due to a *lapsus*.

The second element of *i*-diphthongs in non-final position was spelled with *i* both before and after the introduction of the letter *y*, cf. *arkiaevais* (M-01a), *adoikavoi* (G-02a) before the reform, and *memevais*, *proitavos* (M-01b) after the reform.

Now we may look at the distribution of *y* in the Germanos inscription. This letter is found in all usual positions of the reformed spelling, cf. intervocalically (*kavarmoyun*, *kubeleya*, etc.), word-initially (*yos-*), and word-finally (*imroy*, *ektetoy*, *anepaktoy*, etc.). Moreover, if we take the spaces seriously, we see that the Germanos inscription goes one step further, using *y* also for *i*-diphthongs within a word, cf. *aynī* (line 4), *[-]erktēvoys* (line 5), for which see below, and possibly *oyvos* (line 8). From the other inscriptions I know only one possible example of this spelling, viz. *eymiṽākī[...]* (G-178). The use of *y* for the second element of *i*-diphthongs thus becomes parallel to the general use of *v* for *u*-diphthongs, cf. *avtoi* (T-03) before the reform, and *venavtun*, *avtay* (W-01b), *evteveyay*, *etitevtevey* (B-03) after the reform², and, in our inscription, *pakrayevkobeyan*. In my opinion, the spelling of *i*-diphthongs with *y* points to a comparatively late date of the Germanos inscription.

96

As the Germanos inscription uses the letter *y* in more positions than is normally the case, it is to be expected that *C(i)jV* be written *C(i)yV*. We have two relevant passages in our inscription, viz. *etovesniyo[-]* (line 2) and *kesitioyvosaey* (line 8). The former is sometimes analyzed as *etoves.ni.yo[-]* (e.g. by Bajun and Orel 1988: 186f), but there is no compelling reason for this segmentation. Brixhe and Lejeune say about the last letter (p. 65): "*i* tous les éditeurs; en réalité, absence de traces certaines." Moreover, a final *i* would have contradicted the practice of the Germanos inscription and of all inscriptions after the reform to write final *i*-diphthongs with *y* (see above). It therefore seems more plausible to read *etovesniyo* and to consider it an attribute of *kaṽarmoyo* at the beginning of the same line.³ For the syntax (a nominal syntagm being interrupted by a verb) see Lubotsky 1989: 153.

² Exceptions are: *vasous* (P-03), *me-oun* (B-03), *[-eivanouš]* (G-250). The distribution is evident (*avC*, *evC* vs. *ouC*), but this can hardly be merely a matter of graphic convention. Next to P-03 *vasous ... kaṽnutiēivaīs*, we find P-05 *vasus kaṽnutiē[...]*, both *vasous* and *vasus* most probably being a name in the nom.sg., which may indicate that *u* and *ou* are different spellings for a closed vowel [ō] (Brixhe 1990: 70f.). If Brixhe (ibid.: 65) is right that P-02 *vasos kaṽnutiēevanos* represents gen.sg. of the same name (< **uas̄yos*), this name is an *u*-stem, and its nom.sg. is then likely to reflect **uas̄ōus*. B-03 *me-oun* (*meroun* or *meloun*) cannot reflect old *ou* (**-oun* would have yielded **-oūn* > ***oūan*), so that we may assume that *-oun* is a spelling for [-*on*] < **-on*, cf. fluctuating spellings for original **-on* in OPhr. T-02 *alton*, W-05 *natimeyon* vs. M-02 *akaragayun*, W-01b *avtun*, etc. and in NPhr. *κακον* vs. *κακουν*.

³ Probably, both forms are gen.sg. of the *o*-stems, cf. (Πουκρος) Μανισου, genitival patronymicon (Kowal 1984: 184).

We are left with *kesitioyvosaey*, where the absence of *y* between *-ti* and *o-* suggests that there is a word boundary after *kesiti*.

4. Finally, we may add some considerations of combinatoric nature, which may facilitate further segmentation of the text.

line 1. The subject of the verb *edaes* in line 2 is likely to begin the inscription, so that a word boundary after *sibevdos*⁴ is probable.

line 3. It is tempting to divide *ibeyaduman* in *ibeya* (as another epitheton of the Mother, next to *kubeleya*) and *duman*, the object of the verb *ektetoy* in acc.sg. There is no space between these two nouns, however, whereas elsewhere in the inscription only clitics are not separated by a space.

line 4. The segmentation *yos.tivo* (*yos* being a relative pronoun) is probable, although *tivo* remains enigmatic. In the complex *aynikinte[-]emi* we distinguish *ayni* 'or' (see above), 97 followed by *kin*, which can be identified with NPhr. κιν (cognate with Skt. *kím*), attested in 100 ιος σεμιν κνουμανε μουρου[ν δα/κετ αι]νι κακουν κιν ... 'whoever brings μουρουν⁵ to this grave or harm of some kind, ...' (cf. Bajun – Orel 1988: 187). The syntactical structure of line 4 is then as follows: 'who (*yos*) *tivo* these (*tā*) *speretā* (acc.pl.n.?) or (*ayni*) some (*kin*) *te[l]emi*⁶ (acc.sg.n.?)', which is reminiscent of the protasis of a malediction formula.

line 5. *[-]erktεvoys* seems to be dat.pl. of the *o*-stems = NPhr. -ως (δεως ζεμελωσ) < *-ōis (thus Bajun – Orel 1988: 188). The comparison of *ekey* with Gr. ἐκεῖ 'there, then' proposed by Bajun and Orel may be correct. *dā[-]ati* (*dā[k]ati*?) seems to be the verb, closing the protasis.

line 6. Elsewhere (Lubotsky 1988: 22) I proposed to analyze *opito[-]eyoy* as *opito* (3 sg. impv. of the verb *op-√i-*, starting the apodosis) + a modal particle *key* (+ *oy* = NPhr. οι 'his, him').⁷ In the same article (p. 15, fn. 15), I suggested that *ev[-]m[-]mesmeneya* is the feminine form (nom.sg.) of the part. pf. (*mēmesmeneya*), preceded by the prefix *evε-* (cf. *eveteksetey* W-01b). In both cases, the reading *ε* is compatible with the traces (Brixhe – Lejeune: 65). The word *evememesmeneya* ("well-remembering"?) is probably an epitheton of the Mother Goddess.

line 8. *ayey* is attested in W-01a (cf. Lubotsky 1988: 17f), which may be identical with the finale of *oyvosaey*, but this remains hypothetical.

⁴ Brixhe and Lejeune remark about letter 6 that all previous editors saw *a*, but "barre transversale non évidente ni sur l'estampage ni sur les photographies: *ā* ou *d*?" I think it must be *d* (thus also Bajun and Orel 1988a: 186) because the sequence *aoC* is unknown in Old Phrygian.

⁵ μουρουν is probably cognate with Gr. μωρός 'foolish, stupid' (Diakonoff and Neroznak 1985: 83), being, like κακουν, a substantivized neuter 'foolishness, stupidity'. According to Neumann 1988: 12, it may mean "eine versehentliche, aus Unaufmerksamkeit begangene Fehllhandlung".

⁶ According to the comments by Brixhe and Lejeune, *l* in *te-emi* is the most probable reading.

⁷ Brixhe 1990: 69 is rather sceptical about this proposal primarily because the *k* is uncertain.

line 9. The segmentation of this line can only be proposed on rather shaky grounds. *pakray* looks as if this is a dat.sg., *evkobeyan* as acc.sg. of *a*-stems. No further identifications can be proposed at this moment.

5. We arrive at the following word division (a point indicates word division based on combinatoric grounds):

1. *s[i]bevdos.adi[---]*
2. *kaṽarmoyo imroy edaes etovesniyo*
3. *matar kubeleya ibeya.duman ektetoy*
4. *yos.tivo [t]a spereta ayni.kin.te[l]emi*
5. *[--]toyo[-]is [-]erktevoys ekey.da[-]ati*
6. *opito_(.)[-]ey_(.)oy ev[e]m[e]mesmeneya anato (-[?])*
7. *kavarmoyun matar otekonov (-[?])*
8. *kesiti.oyvos_(.)aeey apaktneni*
9. *pakray_(.)evkobeyan_(.)epaktoy*

REFERENCES

98

- Bajun, L.S. – Orël, V.È. 1988: Jazyk frigijskix nadpisej kak istoričeskij istočnik. *Vestnik drevnej istorii* 1988/1, 173-200.
- Bayun, L. – Orel, V. 1988: The 'Moesian' Inscription from Uyušik. *Kadmos* 27, 131-138.
- Brixhe, Cl. 1990: Comparaison et langues faiblement documentées: l'exemple du phrygien et de ses voyelles longues. *La reconstruction des laryngales (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, fascicule CCLIII)*. Liège-Paris, 59-99.
- Brixhe, Cl. – Lejeune, M. 1984: *Corpus des inscriptions paléo-phrygiennes*. 2 vols. Paris.
- Diakonoff, I.M. – Neroznak, V.P. 1985: *Phrygian*. New York.
- Kowal, B. 1984: Zur spätphrygischen Inschrift 31. *Kadmos* 23/2, 180-185.
- Lubotsky, A. 1988: The Old Phrygian Areyastis-inscription. *Kadmos* 27, 9-26.
- Neumann, G. 1988: *Phrygisch und Griechisch*. (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, 499. Band). Wien.