



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

New Phrygian ετι and τι.
Lubotsky, A.M.

Citation

Lubotsky, A. M. (1989). New Phrygian ετι and τι. *Kadmos*, 28/1, 79-88. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/2664>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/2664>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

New Phrygian $\epsilon\tau\iota$ and $\tau\iota$

ALEXANDER LUBOTSKY

I. $\epsilon\tau\iota$

1. In New Phrygian (NPhr.), one has generally assumed two words $\epsilon\tau\iota$ (cf. Haas 1966: 96, Brixhe 1978a: 12, Heubeck 1987: 72 and fn. 6, etc.): a conjunction with a meaning, comparable to that of Gr. $\xi\tau\iota$, and a preverb or emphatic particle, immediately preceding the participle (τ) $\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\kappa\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ 'cursed'.

The former meaning is based on two inscriptions where NPhr. $\epsilon\tau\iota$ occurs between $\kappa(\iota)\nu\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha$ and $\mu(\alpha)\nu\kappa\alpha$: $\kappa\iota\nu\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha \epsilon\tau\iota \mu\upsilon\kappa\alpha\nu \omicron\pi\epsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\gamma \delta\alpha\delta\iota\tau\iota \text{N}\epsilon\nu\upsilon\epsilon\rho\iota\alpha$ (9)¹ 'made a grave and a standing monument for Nenueria' *uel sim.* and $\kappa\nu\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\nu \epsilon\tau\iota \delta\epsilon\alpha\delta\alpha \mu\alpha\nu\kappa\alpha\gamma$ (18). As both $\kappa(\iota)\nu\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha$ and $\mu(\alpha)\nu\kappa\alpha$ must be parts of the grave, cf. $\iota\omicron\varsigma \nu\iota \sigma\epsilon\mu\omicron\nu \kappa\nu\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\nu\epsilon \kappa\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu \delta\alpha\kappa\epsilon\tau \alpha\iota\nu\iota \mu\alpha\nu\kappa\alpha \tau\iota\epsilon\tau\iota\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\kappa\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma \epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon$ (26) 'whoever brings harm to this $\kappa\nu\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\nu$ (grave?) or $\mu\alpha\nu\kappa\alpha$ (monument?), let him be cursed', it seems probable that $\kappa(\iota)\nu\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha$ and $\mu(\alpha)\nu\kappa\alpha$ - are correlated and that $\epsilon\tau\iota$ is a conjunction meaning something like 'and'.²

2. Closer inspection of the occurrences of $\epsilon\tau\iota(\tau)\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\kappa\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ shows, however, that this word most probably does not exist. The dossier of $\epsilon\tau\iota\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\kappa\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ based on the texts as given by Haas and Brixhe (cf. fn. 1) can be divided in several categories (in the following I mostly give only the apodosis of the malediction formulae):

a. In ten inscriptions the sequence $\epsilon\tau\iota\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\kappa\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ has been restored and is thus useless as evidence: 80

– $\delta\eta \delta\iota\omega\varsigma \zeta\epsilon\mu\epsilon\lambda\omega[\varsigma \epsilon\tau\iota\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\kappa\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma \epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon$ (4); restoration $\delta\eta \delta\iota\omega\varsigma \zeta\epsilon\mu\epsilon\lambda\omega[\varsigma \tau\iota\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\kappa\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma \epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon$ is equally possible and is given by Calder (1911: 166).

– $[\epsilon\tau\iota\tau\tau]\epsilon\tau\iota\kappa\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma \epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon$ (10); restoration $[\tau\iota\tau \tau]\epsilon\tau\iota\kappa\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma \epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon$ is more probable and was already proposed by Calder (1911: 169).

¹ The numbers of the NPhr. inscriptions refer to: Haas 1966: 114-129 (Nos. 1-110), Brixhe 1978a: 3-7 (No. 111-114), Brixhe – Waelkens 1981 (No. 115), Brixhe – Neumann 1985 (No. 116). The numbers of the OPhr. inscriptions refer to Brixhe – Lejeune 1984.

² In Old Phrygian (OPhr.), the sequence *eti* occurs only in *etitevtevey* (B-03), which can be analysed *eti-tevtevey*. The form *tevtevey* strongly reminds one of *anevnevey* of the so-called Myso-Phrygian inscription, published for the first time by Cox and Cameron (1932) and included by Friedrich in his *Kleinasiatische Sprachdenkmäler* (1932: 140). Cox and Cameron transliterate this word as *anevneves* (Friedrich as *anevnevez*), but Lejeune (1969: 47) proposed to transliterate the final sign of this word as a yod. The division *eti-tevtevey* being confirmed by *anevnevey*, we may restore *t/evtevey* at the beginning of line 2 of the same inscription B-03 (the end of line 1 is illegible).

- [ετιτ]ετικ[μ]ε/[νος α]τ τι αδε/[ι]του (11); Calder (1911: 170) reads [τι]τετικ[μ]ε/[νος].
- ιος σεμου κνου/μανει κα[κον] <αδδακετ> ετιτετεικμενος ειτο[υ] (19). The scribe apparently left out a part of the inscription, so that we do not know where the lacuna ends.
- ιος νι σεμουν κν[ου]/μμανει κακουν [α]/δδακεττ [α]ικ[α]ι [ε]/ τιτ τετικμεν[ος]/ ας τIAN ειτου (53) (for αικαι cf. Brixhe 1979: 180); restoration of the ε at the end of line 3 is unnecessary.
- [ι]ος σας του σκερεδ/ριας κακουν δακετ [.] / ειττετικμενος [.../] αττιε ειτου (56). This is the text given by Haas (1966: 122), who remarks: "Wohl doch [ε]/[τ]ιττετικμενος". According to Calder's drawing (1911: 199), however, the τ of δακετ stands exactly under the δ of the previous line (σκερεδ), so that it is probable that the line ends with δακετ. The first letter of the next line looks like σ or ε in the drawing, but it could also be a τ. The rest of the line seems to be intact, so that I read: [ι]ος σας του σκερεδ/ριας κακουν δακετ / τῖτ τετικμενος / αττιε ειτου.
- αττι/η [ετ]ιτ[τ]ετικμενο[ς αδ]ειτου (65). According to Calder's drawing (1911: 211), there is no room for two letters at the beginning of line 2. Calder reads Αττι/η [θ]ιτ[τ]ε[τ]ικ-μενο[ς and remarks: "the second letter in line 2 is almost certainly O, not E". We may perhaps read αττιη θιτ [τ]ετικμενο[ς and assume that θ is a mistake for the usual τ. This inscription is found in Kurşunlu, to the north of Iconium, in which region alternations between tenuis and aspirata are usual (for Cilicia cf. Neumann 1986: 82, for Lycaonia Laminger-Pascher 1984: 14).
- ιος νι <σ>εμ[ον κνου]μανε κα]/κουν αδακε[] /ετι[τ]τετικ[μενος ειτου] (68). The right side of the stone is absent (cf. Calder 1913: 98). Calder restores the second line as /κουν αδακε[τ, δεως ζεμελως]. However, the restoration of the first line requires 13 or 14 omitted letters rather than 12, as given by most scholars, because σεμουν is preferable in view of κακουν, which most frequently has the same form as the preceding pronoun (cf. Neumann 1970: 212f.), and κνουμανει occurs more often than κνουμανε. I would therefore propose the following restoration: ιος νι <σ>εμ[ουκνου]μανε κα]/κουν αδακε[τ δεως ζεμελως κ]/ε τι[τ] 81
τετικ[μενος ειτου]. See further ad c.
- τις κ εγερε[τ ε]/τιττετικμ[ε]νοι ιννου (71); the restoration is uncertain.
- ...]/ε[τι]/ττετικμενος ειτο[υ] (91); the part of the inscription, preceding the ε, is illegible, so that the restoration is uncertain.

b. In two cases the reading of the inscription must be corrected:

- με διω[ς ζ]ομολω ετιτετικμενος ητον (5); as both ε and σ have a round shape in this inscription, the reading ζ]ομολωσ τι τετικμενος is not only possible (cf. Ramsay 1905: col. 79ff.; Brixhe 1978b: 1, fn. 2), but even preferable because δεως and ζεμελωσ in nine of the eleven occurrences have the same ending (Brixhe 1979: 185, fn. 27).
- ις ετιτετουκμενου ειτου (28) must be read ιος τι τετουκμενου ειτου (cf. Brixhe 1978a: 17, who follows Calder's reading in 1933: 89, cf. also the photograph on pl. 52).

c. In nine inscriptions we find κετι(τ)τετικμενος, which is mostly divided κ' ετι(τ)-τετικμενος with elision of κε. However, the division κε τι(τ) τετικμενος is not only possible, but preferable, as the elision of κε in the position before ε- does not take place everywhere and was probably facultative. The ε is elided in γεγρειμεναν/-ον κ' εγεδου (76, 106), cf. γεγρειμεναν εγεδου (32, 33, 34, 36, 59, 60, 105), but, on the other hand, we find κε εν σταρνα in 48 (Brixhe 1878a: 11), εναρκε ερμωλος and κε εγτοισινιοι in 116. The division of κεροκα (33) and κοροκα (36) is unclear.

- [δεως κε ζεμελωσ κ]ε τι ετιτετικμενος ειτου (3); for the restoration cf. Brixhe 1978a: 12; for the second ετι see below, sub e.
- ζειρα κε οι πειες κε τιτ τετικμενα αττι[ε] αδειττου (12).
- διοσ [κ]ε σζεμελωσ κε τιτ [τ]ε[τ]ικμεν[οσ] ειτο[υ] αττιη κε αδειτου (39).
- δεωσ ζεμελωσ κε τιτ τετικμενος ειτου (40).
- αικαν αττιη κε δεωσ κε τιτ τετικμενος ειτου (62).
- [ζεμ]/ελωσ{ι} κε δεωσ [κε αττιε] κε τι τετικμ[ενος ειτου] (92).
- με δεωσ κε ζεμελωσ κε τι τετικμενος ειτου (96).
- με ζε<με>λωσ κε δεωσ κε τιετιτετικμ[ενος ειτου] (97); for the second ετι see below, sub e.
- με σζεμελωσ κε δυωσ κε τιτ [τετικμενος ειτου] (113).

d. Twice ετι(τ)τετικμενος is found after αττι, where we must rather read αττιε τι τετικμενος ειτου, cf. for this formula τι(τ) τετικμενος αττιε αδειτου (45, 61, 70, 100) or αττιε ειτου (56):

- αττιε τι τετικμενος ειτου (94). 82
- [ατ]τιε τι τετικμενος ειτ[ου] (102); the restoration of Calder 1956: 21f., No. 108, cf. the drawing on p. 228.

e. The remaining material is confined to ten occurrences after τι(τ) (for which see below, §§ 8ff.), where the division τιε τιτ(τ) τετικμενος seems preferable (see further § 3):

- τιε τιτ [τ]ετικμενος ειτου (2).
- [δεωσ κε ζεμελωσ κ]ε τιε τιτ τετικμενος ειτου (3); for the first ετι see above, sub c. 82
- τοσ νι με ζεμελω κε δεωσ [κ/ε] τηη τιτ τετικμενος ε[ιτ]ου (6); for the reading cf. Brixhe 1978b: 1.
- δεωσ κε ζεμ[ελω...]ακε οι ειροια τιε τιτ τ[ετικμενοι ειττ]νου (7); for ειροια cf. Brixhe 1978b: 9; alternatively, one may divide to read ειροι ατιε (see further ad d).
- τιε τιτ τετικμενος ειτου (26).
- ζεμελωσ ιτε τιτ τετικμενος ειτου (75); Brixhe 1978a: 10-1 proposes to see in ιτε a mistake for τιε.
- με ζε<με>λωσ κε δεωσ κε τιε τι τετικμ[ενος ειτου] (97); for the first ετι see above, sub c.

- με δεως τιε τιτ τετικμενος ειτου (112).
- τη τι τ[ετικμενο]ς ειτου (114).
- τιε τιτ τετικμενος ειτου (115).

3. I thus propose to divide *τιε/ητι(τ)τετικμενος* of the last ten inscriptions as *τιε/η τι(τ)τετικμενος* and translate 'let him become accursed by (the god) Tiyes'.³ The formula *τιε/η τι(τ)τετικμενος* is then comparable to *αττιε τι τετικμενος ειτου* (94, 102) or *αττιη κε τι τετικμ[ε]/νος ειτου* (86), only without the preposition *αδ* (on these formulae and the god Tiyes cf. below, §§ 5-6). There are several considerations in favour of this analysis:

a. The alternation *τιε ~ τη* strongly recalls that of *αττιε ~ αττιη*. If we look at the distribution of *η* in the NPhr. inscriptions, we see that *η* practically does not appear in word-initial position:

as word-initial: *ητον* (5) "für sonstiges *εitou* (angelehnt an griechisch ἦτω)" (Haas 1966: 202);

in inlaut: *μαιμαρηαν* (31), *τηιον* (58);

in the ending *-ης*: *δεκμουταης* (31 vs. *δεκμουταις* in 9), *παρτης* (42, 87), *αλενπατης* (69), *μανκης* (86), *πατερης* (98), *δ.κερης* (116);

as word-final: *δη* (4), *Ξευνη* (15 vs. *Ξευνε* 31, 69), *κνουμανη* (115 vs. *κνουμανε(ι)* or *κνουμανι* *passim*), *εκατη* (or *εκατης*, 116), and *αττιη* (39, 62, 65, 86 vs. *αττι(ε)* *passim* and *ατι* 87, 103⁴);

uncertain: *σιβη[* (30), *αυτω αυτα ηκετ αν...* (30; so Haas 1966: 111, but Calder 1956: 39, No. 195, reads *ακκολταηκεταν*, which rather points to division *ακκολταη κε ταν*), *]τη[* (42), *]εμερη[* (72).

One can agree with Haas that "der Buchstabe *η*, der im Griechischen bereits annähernd = *i* lautete, bezeichnet ein stark geschlossenes *ε*. Er wird besonders dann verwendet, wenn *i* im Spiele ist" (1966: 202). The distribution of *η* thus shows, that the analysis of *ητιττετικμενος* in 6 and 114 as *ητι-* with *η-* instead of *ε-* is improbable.

b. It is striking that in ten inscriptions with *τιε/ητι(τ)τετικμενος* we find no *αττιε/η* or *αστιαν* formulae, whereas the vast majority of the *τετικμενος* curses do contain them. This indicates that the god is already mentioned in *τιε/ητι(τ)τετικμενος*.

c. The NPhr. malediction formulae generally make explicit by whom the violator of the tomb will be cursed: we find constructions with *αττιε* and *αστιαν*, with *δεως ζεμελως*, etc. It

³ When the present paper had already been written, I learned that Prof. M.N. van Loon had reached the same conclusion several years ago in an unpublished article 'Some Remarks on the Phrygian Inscriptions'.

⁴ If the reading of 103 is correct, one may probably divide *ατιατιτικμενος* as *ατια τιτικμενος*, *ατια* being an unusual spelling for *ατιε/η*.

seems significant that in the whole corpus there are but four more or less complete inscriptions, viz. 10, 28, 71, 82, where τετικμενος is used without a complement.

d. Only in two inscriptions, viz. 67 and 78, is τετικμενος not preceded by τι(τ), so that the analysis of the text with τι(τ) immediately preceding τετικμενος is *a priori* more probable. For the problem of gemination see below.

4. The fact that formulae with τιε/η and with αττιη alternate is not an argument against our analysis. We find more formulae which are used with or without a preposition. A well-known example is δεως ζεμελωσ next to με δεως ζεμελωσ and even once δη δεως ζεμελωσ (4). In the same way, we may analyze inscription 62 as ατ τη κε δεως κε τιτ τετικμενος ειτου "let him go, cursed, to Tiyes and the gods" *uel sim*. Cf. also § 5 on ατ τι(ε/η) vs. ας τιαν.

Also the asyndetic constructions ζεμελωσ [τι]ε τιτ τετικμενος ειτου (75) and με δεως τιε τιτ τετικμενος ειτου (112) are not without parallel, cf. δεως ζεμελωσ τι τετικμενος ειτου (93) or με διω[ς ζ]ομολωσ τι τετικμενος ειτου (5) (cf. Brixhe 1978b: 1).

More problematic is the syntax of [δεως κε ζεμελωσ κ]ε τιε τιτ τετικμενος ειτου (3), 84
τος νι με ζεμελω κε δεως [κ/]ε τη τιτ τετικμενος ε[ιτ]ου (6), and με ζε<με>λωσ κε δεως κε τιε τι τετικμ[ενος ειτου] (97), as the construction with three members and two times κε (X κε Y κε Z) is otherwise unknown in Phrygian. In constructions with two members, κε is found either after the second member (X Y κε), e.g. δεως ζεμελωσ κε τιτ τετικμενος ειτου (40), or, more frequently, after each member (X κε Y κε), e.g. με δεως κε ζεμελωσ κε (96) (Brixhe 1978b: 1f.). In constructions with three members we would also expect κε after each member, and Brixhe (*ibid.*: 2) believes he finds X κε Y κε Z κε in two inscriptions, but both cases are uncertain, cf. [ζεμ]ελωσ{ι} κε δεως [κε αττιε] κε τι τετικμ[ενος ειτου] κε οτ εκτει[(92), which is based on restoration, and [ζε]μελωσ κε [δ]ε[ω]ς με κοννου κε ισνιο[υ] αι παρτης (42), where Brixhe proposes to change με to κε. Consequently, there seems to be no clear counter-example to the syntax X κε Y κε Z.

I believe we must rather assume a mixture of two formulae, viz. με ζεμελωσ κε δεως κε τι(τ) τετικμενος ειτου and τιε τι(τ) τετικμενος ειτου.

5. The analysis of τιε/ητι(τ)τετικμενος as τιε/η τι(τ) τετικμενος, proposed above, provides further support for the view which I have defended elsewhere (Lubotsky 1988: fn. 11), viz. that two NPhr. apodosis formulae αττι(ε/η) (αδ)ειτου and αστιανειτου must be analysed as follows:

αττι(ε/η) (αδ)ειτου = prep. αδ + dat.sg. τι/τιε/τη + 3 sg.impv. (αδ)ειτου

αστιανειτου = prep. ας + acc.sg. τιαν + 3 sg.impv. ειτου.

Both formulae mean 'let him become cursed by Tiyes' *uel sim*. The difference between these formulae is thus explained by the different prepositions: $\alpha\delta$ + dat. vs. $\alpha\varsigma$ (< * $\bar{e}s$ < * $\bar{e}ns$) + acc. This syntax is confirmed by other inscriptions. For $\alpha\varsigma$ + acc. cf. $\alpha\varsigma$ σεμουν κνουμαν (31), $\alpha\varsigma$ βαταν (33), $\alpha\varsigma$ αναν (35) (cf. Neumann 1986: 83). The only other attestation of the preposition $\alpha\delta/\alpha\tau$ is probably 14 [ι]ος νι σεμουν κνο[υ]μανει κακιν αδδακετ αιν' $\alpha\delta$ ατεαμας ... 'whoever brings harm to this grave or to (α)τεαμας ...' where it is used in order to emphasize the dative of (α)τεαμας, which is indeclinable, cf. ιος νι σεμουν κνουμανει κακουν αδδακετ αινι τιαμας... (87) or ιος νι σεμον κνουμανει κακον αδδακετ αινι σα τ[ο]υ τεαμας (115).

The analysis of $\alpha\sigma\tau\iota\alpha\nu\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon$ as $\alpha\varsigma$ τιαν ειτου was already proposed by R. Meister (Xenia Nicolaitana, p. 168, which was inaccessible to me) and accepted by Calder (1956: XXIX) and Heubeck (1987: 79f.), who, however, stick to the view that the $\alpha\tau\tau\iota(\epsilon/\eta)$ formulae contain the name of the Phrygian god Attis. However, if our analysis of $\tau\iota\epsilon/\eta\tau\iota(\tau)\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\kappa\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ is correct, the theory operating with Attis in NPhr. inscriptions can definitively be rejected.

85

6. The name Tiyes in the nom.sg. is probably attested in the OPhr. inscription M-04. *akinanogavan* : *tiyes* / *modrovanak* : [?]avaṛa[?], where it bears the title *modrovanak* 'King of Modra' (cf. Neumann 1986a).

Furthermore, the Phrygian town Τίειον is named after this god, cf. the remarks of Stephanus Byzantius: Δημοσθένης δ' ἐν βιθυνιακοῖς φησὶ κτιστὴν τῆς πόλεως γενέσθαι Πάταρον ἐλόντα Παφλαγονίαν, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ τιμᾶν τὸν Δία Τίον προσαγορεύσαι (cf. on this passage Haas 1966: 67). The name Τίειον contains the suffix *-eio-*, which is frequently used in Phrygian for the formation of adjectives. The same adjective occurs in NPhr. inscription 58 $\tau\iota\eta\omicron\nu$ εγεσιτ γεγριμενον, translated by Haas (ibid.) 'er soll das göttliche Vorbestimmte tragen'. This curse is a variant of a frequent NPhr. malediction $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\rho\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\nu$ εγεδου Τιος ουταν 'let him get the established punishment of Tiyes' *uel sim*., which contains the gen.sg. of the name Tiyes.

The case endings of the name Tiyes are those of a consonant stem, and I would propose to reconstruct an *s*-stem (for *-s* > *-h* > *-∅*- see Lubotsky 1988: 19f.):

nom.sg. *tiyes* < **tiH-es*

acc.sg. $\tau\iota\alpha\nu$ < **tiH-(e)s-m̄*, cf. ουανακταν (88)

gen.sg. $\tau\iota\omicron\varsigma$ < **tiH-s-os*, cf. κ<v>ουμινος (5)

dat.sg. $\tau\iota(\epsilon/\eta)$ < **tiH-s-ei*, cf. κνουμανει/ι/η, βρατερε (31)

7. Accordingly, we may conclude that $\epsilon\tau\iota(\tau)\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\kappa\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ does not exist in NPhr. and that the only NPhr. $\epsilon\tau\iota$ is the conjunction 'and' or adverb 'besides, in addition to', which is very close to the use of Greek $\epsilon\tau\iota$. The consequences of our analysis are discussed in the following section.

II. τι

8. The word τι is found in most NPhr. malediction formulae, cf., for instance, ιος νι σεμουν κνουμανει κακουν αδδακετ τι τετικμενος αττι αδειτου (57), or ιος νι σεμον κνουμανε κακογ αδακετ δεως ζεμελωσ τι τετικμενος ειτου (93). The distribution of NPhr. τι was meticulously analysed by Brixhe in a recent study (1978a: 8ff.), and his conclusions can be summarized as follows:

a. NPhr. τι generally stands in the apodosis of the malediction formulae, immediately preceding the participle (τ)τετικμενος 'cursed' or the adjective (?) δρεγρουν in the formula ακκε οι βεκος ακκαλος τι δρεγρουν ειτου, found in 33, 76, and 108. This distribution refutes the hypothesis of Haas (1966: 81ff. *et passim*) that τι is an indefinite pronoun 'irgendein' belonging to κακουν in the protasis and reflecting PIE **k^wid*. 86

b. NPhr. τι is a particle, reinforcing the following participle.

c. NPhr. τι, which is attested three times in the protasis:

ιος νι σ[εμ]ον τ[ου] κνουμαν[ε] κακουν τι [αδ]δακετ (39),

ιος σα τι σκελεδριαι κακουν δακετ (67),

[ιος] σεμον τι κνουμανι κ[ακον α]βερετ (103),

is probably of a different origin and is a variant of τ, το, του, occurring frequently after demonstrative pronouns, cf. σεμιν τ κνουμανει (76), σεμον το (27), σεμουν του (10); σασ του σκερεδριας (56), σα του μανκα (82), σα τ(ο)υ τεαμας (115).

d. The etymology explaining τι is a variant of ετι, which was proposed by Dressler (1968: 48) and Gusmani (1967: 325) on the ground of the parallelism of two constructions, viz. τι ετι(τ)τετικμενος and ετι ετι(τ)τετικμενος, is improbable because the latter construction with the reduplicated ετι does not exist. The apparent occurrences of ετι ετι(τ)τετικμενος go back to τι ετι (τ)τετικμενος (but cf. above, §§ 2ff.).

e. The particle τι is probably based on the pronominal stem **to-*.

f. NPhr. τι is mostly followed by a geminated consonant, cf. τι τετικμενος (*passim*) and τι γγεγαριτμενο<ς> (88) vs. ε/οροκα γεγαριτμενος (33, 36).

9. I believe that these results can hardly be contested. The only remaining problem is the gemination. On the one hand, "il est évident que la gémation a, en néo-phrygien, cessé d'être pertinente, cf. les doublets αδδακετ/αδακετ αββερετ/αβερετ, où la géminee est étymologique" (Brixhe 1978a: 14), which may account for some sporadic cases of unetymological gemination, cf. κνουμμανει (44, 53) vs. κνουμανει (*passim*, cf., however, also κνουμμανει 101, 105) or αινι μμυρα (25). On the other hand, the frequency of τι τετικμενος shows that this explanation probably does not hold here. Brixhe opts for an alternation between τετικμενος after a consonant (and after a strong boundary) and τετικμενος after a vowel, which accounts for τι τετικμενος and ετιτετικμενος.

Haas (1966: 88) explained the gemination after $\tau\iota$ by the assimilation of the final consonant of **tid* (according to him, < **k^wid*), but in order to account for the double $-\tau\tau-$ in $\epsilon\tau\iota\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\kappa\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$, he reconstructs the participle as **stetigmenos* < **ste-stig-menos* (to the root of Gr. $\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ 'steche, brandmarke'). This etymology is problematic both from the etymological (Phr. $-\kappa-$ vs. Gr. $-\gamma-$) and the semantic point of view (cf. Heubeck 1987: 74). Moreover, it seems strange that word-initial *st-* yields a geminate, whereas the same sequence in the middle of the word is simplified to $-t-$.

87

Heubeck (1987: 70ff) refers to an old idea of Torp (1884: 14) that the double consonant in $\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\kappa\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ reflects the accent of the preceding $\tau\iota$ (= $\epsilon\tau\acute{\iota}$), which is implausible from the phonetic point of view, and, moreover, this would be the only case where the accent is reflected by gemination.

10. Beyond any doubt, the most simple and straightforward explanation of the gemination is to assume with Haas that $\tau\iota$ ended in a consonant (most probably, $-\tau$ or $-\delta$), which was assimilated to the first consonant of the following word, cf. $\alpha\delta\delta\alpha\kappa\epsilon\kappa$ $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\rho\epsilon\iota\mu[\epsilon]\nu\alpha\nu$ (32) or $\alpha\delta\delta\alpha\kappa\epsilon\mu$ $\mu\alpha\nu\kappa\alpha\iota$ (35) for the usual $\alpha\delta\delta\alpha\kappa\epsilon\tau$, $\alpha\beta\beta\epsilon\rho\epsilon\tau$ for $\alpha\delta$ - $\beta\epsilon\rho\epsilon\tau$, or $\alpha\kappa\kappa\epsilon$ (33, 76, 108) for $\alpha\delta$ - $\kappa\epsilon$.

Nevertheless, both Brixhe (1978a: 8) and Heubeck (1987: 71) explicitly reject this explanation because of $\epsilon\tau\iota\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\kappa\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ where we find the same gemination, but after the preverb $\epsilon\tau\iota$, which ends in a vowel. As we have seen above, however, in all apparent cases of $\epsilon\tau\iota\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\kappa\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ the ϵ belongs to the previous word, so that here again we have $\tau\iota$, followed by gemination. This counter-example being dismissed, nothing prevents us from analyzing $\tau\iota\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\kappa\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ and $\tau\iota\gamma\gamma\epsilon\gamma\alpha\rho\iota\tau\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ as $\tau\iota\tau$ $\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\kappa\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ and $\tau\iota\gamma$ $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\alpha\rho\iota\tau\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$, respectively. For the simple $-\tau-$ instead of $-\tau\tau-$ cf. $\alpha\tau\iota$ (87, 103) instead of the usual $\alpha\tau\tau\iota$.

These considerations also open new perspectives for the analysis of the so-called $\beta\epsilon\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ -formula, $\alpha\kappa$ $\kappa\epsilon$ $\omicron\iota$ $\beta\epsilon\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ $\alpha\kappa\kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ $\tau\iota\delta\rho\epsilon\gamma\rho\omicron\nu\nu$ $\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon$ (33, 76, 108), as $\tau\iota\delta\rho\epsilon\gamma\rho\omicron\nu\nu$ can now be analysed $\tau\iota\delta$ - $\rho\epsilon\gamma\rho\omicron\nu\nu$. I hope to return to this formula elsewhere.

As far as the origin of the particle $\tau\iota\delta$ is concerned, it is likely that this particle reflects the anaphoric pronoun **id* with added *t-* from the pronoun **so*, **sā*, **tod* (cf. the emphatic Skt. particle *íd*, which originally was the same pronoun, only without the added *t-*). For the formation compare also the neuter of the West Germanic demonstrative pronoun: OE *bis*, OS *thit*, OHG *diz*, which go back to **tid* (Beekes 1982-3: 218), and the Anatolian reflexive particle **-ti* (Hitt. $-\zeta$, Luw., HLuw., Lyc. $-ti$), which seems to have the same origin (ibid.: 213, cf. also Brixhe 1978a: 14).

References

- Beekes, R.S.P. 1982-3: On Laryngeals and Pronouns, *KZ* 96, 200-232.
- Brixhe, Cl. 1978a: Études neo-phrygiennes I, *Verbum* 1,1, 3-21.
- Brixhe, Cl. 1978b: Études neo-phrygiennes II, *Verbum* 1,2, 1-22.
- Brixhe, Cl. 1979: Études neo-phrygiennes III, *Verbum* 2,2, 177-192.
- Brixhe, Cl. – Lejeune, M. 1984: *Corpus des inscriptions paléo-phrygiennes*. 2 vols. Paris.
- Brixhe, Cl. – Neumann, G. 1985: Découverte du plus long texte néo-phrygien: l'inscription de Gezler Köyü, *Kadmos* 24/2, 161-184.
- Calder, W.M. 1911: Corpus inscriptionum neo-phrygiarum. *JHSt.* 31, 161-215.
- Calder, W.M. 1913: Corpus inscriptionum neo-phrygiarum II. *JHSt.* 33, 97-104.
- Calder, W.M. 1933: *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua* IV. Manchester.
- Calder, W.M. 1956: *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua* VII. Manchester.
- Cox, C.W.M. – Cameron, A. 1932: A native inscription from the Myso-Phrygian Borderland. *Klio* 25, 34-49.
- Dressler, W. 1968: Review of Haas 1966, *Die Sprache* 13, 40-49.
- Gusmani, R. 1958: Studi sull'antico frigio, *RIL* 92, 835-69, and Le iscrizioni dell'antico frigio, *RIL* 92, 870-903.
- Gusmani, R. 1967: Review of Haas 1966, *IF* 72, 232-238.
- Haas, O. 1966: *Die Phrygischen Sprachdenkmäler*, Sofia.
- Heubeck, A. 1987: Phrygiaka I-III. *KZ* 100, 70-85.
- Laminger-Pascher, G. 1984: *Beiträge zu den griechischen Inschriften Lycaoniens*. Wien.
- Lejeune, M. 1969: Discussions sur l'alphabet phrygien, *SMEA* 10, 19-47.
- Lubotsky, A. 1988: The Old Phrygian Areyastis-inscription. *Kadmos* 27, 9-26.
- Neumann, G. 1970: Das phrygische Pronomen σεμο-. *KZ* 84, 211-215.
- Neumann, G. 1986: Zur Syntax der neuphyrgischen Inschrift Nr. 31. *Kadmos* 25/1, 79-84.
- Neumann, G. 1986a: Modrovanak. *Epigraphica Anatolica* 8, 52.
- Ramsay, W.M. 1905: Neo-Phrygian Inscriptions. *Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Institutes in Wien* VIII (Beiblatt), 79-120.
- Torp, A. 1884: *Zu den phrygischen Inschriften aus römischer Zeit*. Christiania.