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. kâvarmöyo[-]imroyedaesetovesniyo[-]
3. matarkubeleyaibeyadumanektetoy
4. yostivo[-]asperetdaynjkinte[-]emi
5. [--]toyo[-]jis[-]erktevoyskeydaj[-]ati
6. opito[-]eyoyev][-]m[-]mesmeneyaanato[-]
7. kavarmoyunmatarotekonov[-]
8. kesitiyvosaeyapaktneni
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 demarcatifs (ainsi, de part et d'autre du mot matar de la l.7), mais dont d'autres ne le sont sufement pas; ainsi, l.9, le graveur, aprè 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. Aissi les blancs, s'il s'agit 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 translitération (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 kâvarmöyo 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[-]e and mi (19 cm).
line 5: between [-]jis and [-]er (30 cm), between ktevoys and ekey... (21 cm).
line 6: between [-]eyoyev 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 aey 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.

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 évanescant". 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 X 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 andeya (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. kūbileya [W-04]).

line 4: Photograph XXXIX/2 and the drawing show the spaces between yostivo and [-]a (most probably, τa, cf. the palaeographic commentary on p. 65) and between this τa 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 τa speret a... 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 any with the conjunction αινι `and/or' (Lat. sive), which often occurs in the apodosis of the New Phrygian malediction formulae, e.g. 26. μοι σεμον κνομμανε κακον δακετ αινι μακναα ... "whoever will bring harm to this grave and/or to this stele."

line 5 and 6: spaces between [-]toy 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 [i]1, cf. intervocalic [i]: kakoioi (G-02), tiveia imeneia (G-183), etc.; initial [i]: ios (G-02, P-04, P-06), iosais (G-117), etc.; word-final [i]: 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 Areystis-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 Cj and Cjj. Before the reform we find both CiV and CiiV, cf. alios, alīm (T-02), kadiun (G-103), and alīmai (T-03), kanutievanos (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), kαιyanaveyos (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. kl'αnaveyos (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. intervocally (kavarmoyun, kubeleya, etc.), word-initially (yos-), and word-finally (imroy, ektetoy, anepakttoy, 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. ayni (line 4), [-]erktevos (line 5), for which see below, and possibly oyyos (line 8). From the other inscriptions I know only one possible example of this spelling, viz. eymiyakh[i... (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, etitvevey (B-03) after the reform2, and, in our inscription, pakrayevkovobeyan. In my opinion, the spelling of i-diphthongs with y points to a comparatively late date of the Germanos inscription.

As the Germanos inscription uses the letter y in more positions than is normally the case, it is to be expected that C(ii)jV be written C(i)yV. We have two relevant passages in our inscription, viz. etovesniyo[-] (line 2) and kesitioyvosay (line 8). The former is sometimes analyzed as etovesniyo[-] (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 kαvarmoy 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: vasos (P-03), me-oun (B-03), eivanous (G-250). The distribution is evident (avC, eyC vs. ouC), but this can hardly be merely a matter of graphic convention. Next to P-03 vasos ... kanuteivais, we find P-05 vasus kanutie[... both vasos 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 [ų] (Brixhe 1990: 70f.). If Brixhe (ibid.: 65) is right that P-02 vassos kanutievanus represents gen.sg. of the same name (< *γασως), this name is an u-stem, and its nom.sg. is then likely to reflect *γασως. B-03 me-oun (meroun or meloun) cannot reflect old ou (*-oun would have yielded *-ouŋ > *-oŋan), so that we may assume that -oun is a spelling for [-õŋ] < *-on, cf. fluctuating spellings for original *-on in OPhr. T-02 al'bn, W-05 natimeyon vs. M-02 akaragayun, W-01b avtun, etc. and in NPhr. κκκον vs. κκκον.

3 Probably, both forms are gen.sg. of the o-stems, cf. (Ποακρος) Μανισσου, genitival patronymicon (Kowal 1984: 184).
We are left with kesitiyoysaey, 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 sibevdos⁴ 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 ayni̱kinten[-]emi we distinguish ayni `or' (see above), followed by kin, which can be identified with NPhr. κιν (cognate with Skt. kīm), attested in 100 ιος σεμιν νονμαν μουρουν δα/κετ σιν κακον 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 (ta) spereta (acc.pl.n.) or (ayni) some (kin) te[l]emi⁶ (acc.sg.n.?)', which is reminiscent of the protasis of a malediction formula.

line 5. [-]erktəvoys seems to be dat.pl. of the o-stems = NPhr. -ος (δεος κεμελως) < *-οῖς (thus Bajun – Orel 1988: 188). The comparison of ekey with Gr. ἔκει ἑ� there, then' proposed by Bajun and Orel may be correct. da[-]at (da[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-√, starting the apodosis) + a modal particle kε (-bind = NPhr. o1 `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. (memesmeneya), preceded by the prefix evε- (cf. eveteksetey W-01b). In both cases, the reading e is compatible with the traces (Brixhe – Lèjeune: 65). The word evmemesmeneya ("well-remembering") is probably an epitheton of the Mother Goddess.

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

⁴ Brixhe and Lèjeune remark about letter 6 that all previous editors saw a, but "barre transversale non évidente ni sur l'estampage ni sur les photographies: a 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. μορός 'foolish, stupid' (Diakonoff and Neroznak 1985: 83), being, like κακον, a substantivized neuter 'foolishness, stupidity'. According to Neumann 1988: 12, it may mean "eine versehentliche, aus Unaufmerksamkeit begangene Fehlhandlung".

⁶ According to the comments by Brixhe and Lèjeune, 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. ka\v ar\mat{\text{mo}}yo imroy edaes etovesniyo
3. matar kubeleya ibe\ya. duman ektetoy
4. yos.tivo [t]\\\a spereta ayni.kin.te{[l]}emi
5. [--]toy[-]is [--]erkt\\\e\\\y oy.ev\[e\]m[e]mesmeney\a anato (-?)
6. opito[-]ey[-]oy ev[\\e\]m[e]mesmeney\a anato (-?)
7. kavarmoyun matar otekonov (-?)
8. kesiti.oyvos[-]aey apaktneni
9. pakray[-]evkobeyan[-]epaktoy
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