



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

## A historical grammar of Phrygian

Sorgo, A.

### Citation

Sorgo, A. (2026, March 24). *A historical grammar of Phrygian*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4297594>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4297594>

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

## IV The Pronominal System

The pronominal forms which are attested in Old and New Phrygian are best analysed as belonging to the following basic pronoun types: a demonstrative pronoun *si-/so-*, a demonstrative pronoun *i-*, an anaphoric pronoun *to-*, a relative pronoun *yo-*, an indefinite pronoun *ko-*, an interrogative/indefinite pronoun *ki-*, reflexive pronouns *avto-*, *ve-*, and *ibe-*, the possessive pronoun *vo-*, and an enclitic pronoun *(y)o-*.<sup>329</sup>

### IV.1 The types of pronominal endings in Phrygian

Phrygian distinguishes between three basic types of pronominal endings: the *i*-type, the thematic type, and the *e*-type. Each Phrygian pronoun is characterized by taking its inflectional endings from one of these three types (*contra* PhL 88, who assumes a different system).

The pronouns that take *i*-type pronominal endings are: *si-* (masc. and neut.), *ki-*, *i-*.

The pronouns that take the thematic type of pronominal endings are: *sa-* (fem.), *σo-* (New Phrygian only), *to-*, *avto-*, *jo-*, *ko-*, *vo-*.

The pronouns that take *e*-type pronominal endings are: *ve-*, *ibe-*.

---

<sup>329</sup> These descriptions of the functions of the pronouns should not be taken as absolute. Especially by the New Phrygian era, there is significant functional overlap between some of these pronouns.

Every attested pronominal form will be independently analysed, but for convenience, the attested pronominal endings of Phrygian are given here.

<b>i-type endings</b>				<b>e-type endings</b>	
	masculine		neuter	masculine/feminine	
	Oph	NPh		Oph	NPh
nom. sg.	<i>-is</i>	-ις	<i>-i</i>	<i>-is</i>	-ις
gen. sg.					
dat. sg.		-εμουv		<i>-ey, -imun</i>	-ε
acc. sg.	<i>-in</i>	-ιv, -εμουv		<i>-en</i>	-ιv

Table #32: The *i*- and *e*-type pronominal endings in Phrygian.

<b>Thematic type endings</b>						
	masculine		neuter		feminine	
	Oph	NPh	Oph	NPh	Oph	NPh
nom. sg.	<i>-os</i>	-ος		-ο, -εμουv	<i>-a</i>	-α
gen. sg.	<i>-ovo</i>	-ου				-ας <sup>?</sup>
dat. sg.	<i>-oi</i>	-εμουv			<i>-ai</i>	-α(ι)
acc. sg.	<i>-on</i>	-ον, -εμουv		-ο, -εμουv	<i>-an</i>	-αv
nom. pl.			<i>-a</i>			
dat. pl.		-ως				-ας
acc. pl.			<i>-a</i>			

Table #33: The thematic type pronominal endings in Phrygian.

## IV.1.1 The PIE anaphoric pronoun \*h<sub>1</sub>i-/h<sub>1</sub>e- and the *i*-type pronominal endings

I reconstruct the inflection of the Proto-Indo-European anaphoric pronoun \*h<sub>1</sub>i-/ \*h<sub>1</sub>e- as follows:<sup>330</sup>

	masculine		feminine	
	singular	plural	singular	plural
nom.	*h <sub>1</sub> is	*h <sub>1</sub> ei	*h <sub>1</sub> ih <sub>2</sub>	*h <sub>1</sub> ih <sub>2</sub> es
gen.	*h <sub>1</sub> eso	*h <sub>1</sub> esom	*h <sub>1</sub> eseh <sub>2</sub> s	
dat,	*h <sub>1</sub> esmōi	*h <sub>1</sub> eimus	*h <sub>1</sub> eseh <sub>2</sub> ei	
acc.	*h <sub>1</sub> im	*h <sub>1</sub> ins	*h <sub>1</sub> ih <sub>2</sub> m	*h <sub>1</sub> ih <sub>2</sub> ns
loc.	*h <sub>1</sub> esmi	*h <sub>1</sub> eisu	*h <sub>1</sub> eseh <sub>2</sub> i	
inst.	*h <sub>1</sub> ei	*h <sub>1</sub> eib <sup>h</sup> i		
abl.	*h <sub>1</sub> esmōd	*h <sub>1</sub> eios		

Table #34: The declension of the PIE anaphoric pronoun \*h<sub>1</sub>i-/h<sub>1</sub>e- (adapted from CIEL 225-9).

Alternative reconstructions for the most part differ only in the reconstruction of the nominatives, accusatives and genitives (cf. Szemerényi 1996: 206-7; Sihler 1995: 391-3; Meiser 1998: 159-61). The

<sup>330</sup> I reconstruct the strong stem of the pronoun as \*h<sub>1</sub>i- instead of the \*i- found in CIEL (229), which is reflected in the table. I base the reconstruction with \*h<sub>1</sub> on the likely origin of the relative pronoun \*h<sub>1</sub>io- as a thematization of the anaphoric pronoun (CIEL 231) and the Greek conjunction ἵνα (for which see here below in the same section). The rough breathing in both is regular if we assume the development proposed by Bozzone (2013), ie. \*h<sub>1</sub>i- > \*h<sub>1</sub>i- > Gr. ἵ- and \*h<sub>1</sub>jV- > \*h<sub>1</sub>V- > Gr. ῑ-. The other Greek forms cited below which ultimately derive from \*h<sub>1</sub>i- are only known from psylotic dialects, where the lack of rough breathing is expected.

masculine nominative singular is reconstructed as *\*is* in all these sources; Beekes and de Vaan disagree (CIEL 227) on the basis of Indic data and propose to reconstruct *\*hie*.

The declension of this pronoun is characterized by *i*-vocalism in the strong cases (i.e. NSg and ASg) and *e*-vocalism in the weak cases. This type of pronominal declension exists in other PIE pronouns as well (cf. CIEL 230).

In Phrygian, this type of pronominal declension is present in some inherited pronouns (i.e. *ki-/κι-* < PIE *\*k<sup>w</sup>i-*, *i/e-* < PIE *\*hi/e-*, *si-* < PGPh. *\*ki/e-*).

It is unclear how the feminine forms of the pronoun were treated in Proto-Phrygian and beyond. By attested Phrygian, *si-*, the only *i*-type pronoun that has attested forms in the feminine gender, had already shifted the declension of its feminine to the thematic type endings.

## IV.1.2 The thematic type endings

For the most part, the thematic type endings are declined identically to the thematic nominals, i.e. masculines and neuters decline as *o*-stems and feminines decline as *a*-stems. The only major difference is that neuter nominative-accusative singular has the ending *-o* < *\*-od*, as opposed to its *o*-stem counterpart *-on* < *\*-om*.

One peculiarity is the development of the demonstrative pronoun between Old and New Phrygian. As the originally *i*-type pronoun *si-* began to shift into the thematic type, the masculine dative singular stem <sup>+</sup>*sem-* < *\*sesm-* was preserved and extended to the accusative singular, with both eventually surfacing as the attested *σεμουν* (cf. PhL 88). This development is

described more fully in §IV.3.2. The rest of the pronouns with thematic type endings do not show any such variance in the stem.

### IV.1.3 The *e*-type endings

The *e*-type endings are an innovative type of Proto-Phrygian used for the newly-minted pronouns *ve-* and *ibe-*, no doubt under the influence of the likewise innovative nominal *e*-stems, with whom they seem to share the endings.

The primary characteristic of this type is the pervasive vocalism *e* throughout the paradigm, though it appears the nominative and accusative singular were beginning to shift into the *i*-type by the Middle Phrygian period.<sup>331</sup>

## IV.2 The pronoun *i/e-* in Phrygian

The nominative singular of the pronoun *i/e-* was likely preserved in °116<sup>W</sup> as ις twice, though the immediate contexts cannot currently be satisfactorily analysed.<sup>332</sup>

If the word *isyos* (°B-07) can be taken at face value, it is likely to represent a bound pronoun or a pronominal chain *is=yos* (with the second part being

---

<sup>331</sup> Previous scholarship did not acknowledge the existence of distinct *e*-type endings and paid little attention to the unexpected *e*-vocalism of certain accusative singular pronominal forms, specifically *ven* and *iben*. See further below in §IV.10.

<sup>332</sup> The context in which they appear is ις αργμενα οε αυται οπαρικο ις κε εν τοισινιοι ... For a rudimentary analysis of the first clause, see §IV.5.

the nominative singular masculine of the relative pronoun *yo-*).<sup>333</sup> It is possible that the element *is* was the nominative singular of the reflex of the PIE anaphoric pronoun *\*h<sub>1</sub>i/e-*. If *isyos* represents a pronominal chain, it must be analysed as a simple sequence of two pronouns, *i-* and *yo-*, the former of which would have a demonstrative function. If the sequence *isyos* is to be read as a bound pronoun, it is better understood as an emphatic variant of the indefinite pronoun (otherwise simply *yo-*) introducing an indefinite conditional relative clause, functionally similar to the use of *yosyos*.<sup>334</sup>

The common interpretation of the sequence *isyos*, on the other hand, is that *is* resulted from the syncopation of the *o* in reduplicated *yosyos* (which is attested as such in °B-03) (CIPP2: 82).<sup>335, 336, 337</sup> In this case, *isyos* < *\*yosyos* would have introduced an indefinite conditional relative clause. While it is true that the relative pronominal form *ioç* appears in a syncopated or spelling variant *iç* several times in New Phrygian, this is

---

<sup>333</sup> A bound pronoun is a single pronoun composed of multiple pronominal elements; a pronominal chain is a sequence of pronouns. For a more detailed explanation, see §IV.13 below.

<sup>334</sup> For a syntactic analysis of the sentence including *isyos*, see §IV.6.

<sup>335</sup> New Phrygian *ioç* did have a syncopated or spelling variant *iç* in °4b<sup>W</sup>, °5<sup>W</sup>, °120<sup>W</sup>, °121<sup>W</sup>. This is usually explained by drawing a parallel to the *-io-* > *-i-* development found in Greek inscriptions from Roman Phrygia (Brixhe 1987: 50-51 *apud* PhL 95). The form *isyos* is several centuries earlier than this development, however. If *isyos* did originate from *yosyos*, its syncopation of *o* would need to have been an independent phenomenon of an apparently sporadic nature.

<sup>336</sup> PhL (95) suggests that NPh. *ioç* °37<sup>SW</sup> (in the place of expected *ioç*) could likewise find its origin in a reduplicated *\*ioçioç*, with *io* > *i* in the first syllable and a simplification *sy* > *ç*. We may propose another possibility: if *isyos* °B-07 was indeed a bound pronoun, *ioç* °37<sup>SW</sup> may well be its New Phrygian continuation (once again with *sy* > *ç*, either graphic or phonetic). Of course, neither of these options can be confirmed as correct, since the form may simply be the result of scribal error (as already tacitly assumed by Haas (1966: 119)).

<sup>337</sup> Contrast Obrador-Cursach (2021b: 51), who argues that *is* belongs to the previous clause *meros ke manes*. Inscription °B-07 marks word boundaries, however, so it is not clear why there would be no boundary between *is* and *yos* if they belonged to different clauses.

likely the result of a late areal development, whereas Old Phrygian spelling is considerably more stable, with vowel syncope being exceedingly rare. For this reason, an unmodified reading of *isyos*, i.e. with *is* genuinely representing the nominative singular of the pronoun *i/e-*, is preferred here, though it is by no means guaranteed.

Attested Greek appears to have eventually entirely lost the PGPh. *i/e-* pronoun in its original function. Certain Greek forms do ultimately derive from it: Cyprian *iv* derives from the accusative *\*h<sub>1</sub>im* (Chantraine: 464), the pronoun *ιός* of psylotic dialects is a thematization *\*h<sub>1</sub>i-o-* (Chantraine 466), the conjunction *iva* is derived from the form *\*h<sub>1</sub>i-na* (*ibid.* 464),<sup>338</sup> and, finally, the conjunctions *ει* ‘if’ and *αι* ‘id.’ (the latter also found in Phrygian as *ay* ‘if, when’) both likely derive from the locative singular of the masculine and the feminine, *\*h<sub>1</sub>e-i* and *\*h<sub>1</sub>eh<sub>2</sub>-i*, respectively (*ibid.* 316).

Outside of fossilized forms in Greek and Phrygian, the Phrygian enclitic anaphoric pronoun *io-/o-*,<sup>339</sup> and the possible Phrygian forms *is/ις*, one other known remnant of the PIE anaphoric pronoun *\*h<sub>1</sub>i/e-* in the Graeco-Phrygian branch can be found in the PGPh. proclitic element *\*e* appended to the beginning of the demonstrative pronoun *\*ki/e-* (Greek *ἐ-κεῖ*, *ἐ-κεῖνος* and Phrygian *e-s-* (as found in *esai* °W-01b)).

While the synchronic status of this pronoun in Phrygian remains uncertain, the forms we have listed in Greek and Phrygian do suggest that the reflex of the PIE anaphoric pronoun *\*h<sub>1</sub>i/e-* still existed in Proto-Graeco-Phrygian

<sup>338</sup> With the *\*-na* element presumably originally being some kind of an adverbial suffix.

<sup>339</sup> For which see below in §IV.9.

as a synchronically productive pronoun *\*i/e-*, albeit with its meaning shifted to a demonstrative function.

### IV.3 Demonstrative pronoun *si-/so-*

The attested forms of the demonstrative pronoun *si-/so-* are:

	masculine		feminine		neuter	
nom. sg.	<i>ses</i> <sup>?</sup>				<i>si</i>	
gen. sg.				σας <sup>?</sup>		
dat. sg.		σεμουv	<sup>+</sup> <i>sai</i>	σαι		
acc. sg.	<i>sin</i>	σεμουv		σαν	<i>si</i>	σεμουv
nom. pl.						
gen. pl.						
dat. pl.		σως		σας <sup>?</sup>		
acc. pl.						

Table #35: The attested forms of the demonstrative pronoun *si-/so-* in Phrygian.

#### IV.3.1 Development of the stem

The origin of the initial element *s-* in the demonstrative pronoun has long been a matter of debate. On the one hand, it has been proposed to derive from the nominative singular masculine form of the PIE demonstrative pronoun, i.e. *\*so*, that subsequently spread throughout the paradigm (Haas 1966: 75; endorsed by Lejeune 1969b: 296). Since it is now clear that a PIE

\*s- in initial prevocalic position is lost in Phrygian (see §II.3.1.2.5 above and LL 1823; PhL 69), this explanation is not tenable.

Another proposal (as given in Pokorny 1959: 609-10) was based on the assumption that Phrygian was a *satəm* language and thus derived the initial *s-* from the particle \**ke*/\**ki* ‘here’ (also reflected in, e.g. Greek κείνος and Proto-Slavic \**s<sub>6</sub>*), which would have undergone a regular development \**ke/i* > *se/i*. While the assumption that Phrygian was a *satəm* language and thus underwent an unconditioned palatalization of PIE \**k* is incorrect, the identification of the form where the *s-* originated is in essence correct if we uphold the Phrygian palatalization law (PhL 88).<sup>340</sup>

Ligorio & Lubotsky (LL 1826) argue that the initial *s-* of the pronoun derives from the addition of the anaphoric pronominal stem \**i/e-* to a pronominal stem \**ki-*, whose reflexes they identify in Gothic *hi-*, Lith. *ši-*, and Greek σ-/τ- < \**k<sub>i</sub>-V-* (as in σήμερον ‘today’ < \**kj-āmeron*).<sup>341</sup> A compounding of the reflexes of PGPh. pronouns \**ki/e-* and \**i/e-* in Proto-Phrygian would have most likely produced the attested Phrygian forms; Proto-Phrygian \**ki-* + \**i/e-* > PPh. \**kji/e-* > Old Phrygian *si/e-*. The assumption that such a pronominal compound was created in Proto-Phrygian is, however, unnecessary, if one upholds the Phrygian

<sup>340</sup> See further in §II.3.2.3.4 above.

<sup>341</sup> Ligorio and Lubotsky assume the existence of a Proto-Indo-European pronominal stem \**ki/e-*, as opposed to the Balto-Slavic, Germanic, Anatolian, and Graeco-Phrygian pronouns derived from \**ki/e* all being separate developments (as is argued in Kortlandt 1983), which is the position cautiously assumed by this work. While the question is relevant from a broader Indo-European perspective, it has little bearing on the immediate pre-history of the Phrygian forms: as we will see, whether inherited or innovated, we should assume that a pronoun \**ki/e-* did exist in Proto-Graeco-Phrygian. Greek σήμερον ‘today’ cited by Ligorio and Lubotsky has the same explanation in both frameworks, i.e. being a regular phonetic development of Proto-Greek \**k<sub>i</sub>=āmeron* ‘this=day’.

palatalization law, in which case OPh. *si/e-* would simply be the regular phonetic development of PGPh. *\*ki/e-*.<sup>342</sup>

Thus, the likeliest conclusion is that the stem of the Phrygian demonstrative pronoun *si/e-* is the regular reflex of the stem of an older demonstrative pronoun *\*ki/e-* and that initial *s-* is the result of the effects of the Phrygian palatalization law.<sup>343</sup>

The Greek pronoun (ἐ)κεῖνος ‘that (one)’ provides crucial evidence that the pronoun *\*ki/e-* must have existed in Proto-Graeco-Phrygian. For the origin of this pronoun, different analyses have been proposed. An older view is that of Pokorny (1959: 609-610), who holds that (ἐ)κεῖνος is composed of the PGr. pronoun *\*ένο-* prefixed by the reflex of the PIE adverb *\*ké* ‘here’ > PGr. *\*κε*, yielding PGr. *\*(έ)-κε-ενο-* from which the associated adverb ἐκεῖ ‘there’ was back-formed on the basis of adverbs like πεῖ ‘where’. Nowadays, it is more commonly assumed that (ἐ)κεῖ in fact represents an old locative or instrumental PGr. *\*(έ-)κε-ι* of the pronoun *\*(έ-)κι/ε-* < PGPh. *\*(e-)ki/e-* (Chantraine 1999: 329, EDG 397).<sup>344</sup>

The progression of the developments is clear: the oblique stem *\*κε-* of an original PGPh. demonstrative pronoun *\*ki/e-* or a fossilized locative form *\*κει* of the same pronoun were extended with the suffix *\*(ε)νο-*, thereby

<sup>342</sup> The reason Ligorio and Lubotsky proposed that the antecedent of OPh. *\*si/e-* must have been a pronominal compound PPh. *\*ki- + \*i/e-* in the first place is due to the fact that they did not assume a conditional palatalization of the type assumed in this work (and elaborated on in §II.3.2.3.4) ever affected Phrygian, but rather assumed that the initial *s-* of the pronoun was the result of iotation *\*k̑i- > s-*. Ligorio (p.c.) has since cautiously endorsed the proposal of a Phrygian palatalization.

<sup>343</sup> *s-* is the regular reflex of PGPh. *\*k* before a front vowel. See §II.3.2.3.4.

<sup>344</sup> Also note that the conjunction εἰ ‘if’ was originally a case form of the anaphoric pronoun *\*hi/e-*, PGPh. LSg *\*h<sub>i</sub>ei* ‘\*at that > \*when > if’ (cf. Chantraine 1999: 316), which confirms the existence of a PGPh. pronominal desinence *\*-ei*.

producing a new PGr. pronoun  $*(\acute{\epsilon}\text{-})\kappa\epsilon(1)\text{-}(\epsilon)\nu\text{-}$  > Gr.  $(\acute{\epsilon})\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ .<sup>345</sup> Regardless of which scenario one upholds, both require the previous existence of a pronoun  $*ki/e\text{-}$  to explain either the existence of the oblique stem  $*\kappa\epsilon\text{-}$  or the existence of a locative form  $*\kappa\epsilon\iota$ .<sup>346</sup>

Thus, since we find evidence for the existence of  $*ki/e\text{-}$  in the prehistories of both Greek and Phrygian, it is clear that the pronoun  $*ki/e\text{-}$  must have existed at the Proto-Graeco-Phrygian stage already. Its subsequent development in Greek and Phrygian is also mostly clear.<sup>347</sup> Whether the Proto-Graeco-Phrygian pronoun  $*ki/e\text{-}$  could have been inherited from PIE

<sup>345</sup> The existence of this pronoun in Proto-Greek is supported by its existence in all the dialects of Greek.

<sup>346</sup> Assuming that Greek never possessed a pronoun  $*ki/e\text{-}$  in its pre-history severely complicates matters with little explanatory benefit. In that case,  $(\acute{\epsilon})\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$  would need to be a late adjectivization of  $*\acute{k}\epsilon$  (as in the scenario suggested by Pokorny),  $\sigma\acute{\eta}\mu\epsilon\rho\nu/\tau\acute{\eta}\mu\epsilon\rho\nu$  would need to be a nominal phrase composed of an adverb  $*ki$  (which would need to have co-existed in parallel to  $*ke$  until Proto-Greek) and a noun (with the semantic development being ‘here day’ > ‘today’, which is syntactically suspect),  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\iota$  would need to be an adverbial back-formation, and the Phrygian pronoun  $si\text{-}$  would need to be an independent innovation of Proto-Phrygian. In addition, the parallel between Gr.  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\epsilon\text{-}/\kappa\epsilon\text{-}$  and Phr.  $esi\text{-}/si\text{-}$  would either need to be accidental or the result of an earlier co-existence of adverbial variants with two different onsets,  $*ek\text{-}$  and  $*k\text{-}$  (which would obviously be the likelier option). Since we would already need to reconstruct two variants of the adverb meaning ‘here’ on the basis of Greek, i.e.  $*ke$  and  $*ki$ , the two onsets now multiply the number of forms. To explain all the forms in Greek and Phrygian, we would now need a total of four variants of the same adverb meaning the same thing, ‘here’, at the Proto-Graeco-Phrygian stage:  $*ki$ ,  $*ke$ ,  $*eki$ ,  $*eke$ . It is difficult to see how such a scenario could be reasonably entertained.

<sup>347</sup> If one rejects the palatalization law in Phrygian, however, the scenario becomes considerably murkier. The likeliest explanation for Phrygian  $s\text{-}$  would then see it derived from  $*kjV\text{-}$  <  $*ki + *i/e\text{-}$  (as argued for in LL 1826). There are in principle two options in this case. The first is that both the  $*ki/e\text{-}$  and  $*kji/e\text{-}$  pronouns would need to have existed in parallel in Proto-Graeco-Phrygian. The second option is that the  $*kj\text{-}$  pronoun was an innovation of Proto-Phrygian. In either case, it is puzzling why an agglutination of the  $*ki/e\text{-}$  and  $*i/e\text{-}$  pronouns would have adopted the strong stem  $*ki\text{-}$  for the first element: the first element in a compounded pronoun tends to adopt the oblique stem (cf. PGPh.  $*e = < *h_1e\text{-}$ ). Still, even if one were to ignore this discrepancy, both options require the assumption of an additional morphological innovation, while none is needed in the framework where the Phrygian  $s\text{-}$  originated simply due to the effects of the Phrygian palatalization before front vowels.

is a matter of debate. Similar looking pronouns or traces of it are found in a number of other IE languages: OCS *sb*, Lithuanian *šìs*, Gothic acc. *hina*, Hittite *kās* ‘this’ (CIEL 226), Latin *cis* (Fortson 2004: 130). Whether these are independent creations (as assumed by, e.g., Beekes (CIEL 226)) or inherited from a PIE pronoun *\*k̑i-* (as assumed by, e.g., Fortson (2004: 129-130)) is contentious.

If we assume that the PGPh. pronoun *\*ki/e-* was newly created, the adverb *\*k̑i/e* ‘there’ must have only supplied the initial consonant *\*k̑-* to the pronoun and not its full form.<sup>348</sup> Such a development in Proto-Graeco-Phrygian would have a clear parallel in Proto-Slavic, where the demonstrative pronoun *\*sb* emerged as the result of the deictic particle *\*k̑i/e* being extended by the inflectional forms of the anaphoric pronoun *\*hi/h<sub>i</sub>e-* (Kortlandt 1983: 314-315). As we would need to assume for PGPh, the deictic particle must have likewise only provided the initial consonant in Proto-Slavic and not its full form *\*k̑i/e*; otherwise, one would expect different vocalism in the attested nominative singular of the newly created pronoun. The creation of the pronoun *\*sb* was apparently an independent Proto-Slavic development that took place after the period of Balto-Slavic unity (*ibid.*). The Slavic comparison can then serve to illustrate the non-exceptional character of such a development in Proto-Graeco-Phrygian.

One striking similarity between the descendants of the PGPh. pronoun *\*ki/e-* in Greek and Phrygian is the apparent co-existence of two forms, one

---

<sup>348</sup> The pronoun could not have been built by an agglutination of pronominal endings to the full adverb *\*k̑i* or *\*k̑e*, since Gr, (ἐ)κ̑εῖ would have then surfaced as *\*\* (ἐ)σ̑εῖ < \*ki + \*ei* or *\*\* (ἐ)κ̑η < \*\*k̑e + \*ei*.

with an added initial \*e-, and one without: Greek ἐκεῖνος and κεῖνος, Phrygian *esai* (dat. sg. fem., °W-01b) and *σαι* (*id.*, °35<sup>E</sup>) (LL 1826, PhL 91, 90). The Phrygian form with *e-* is isolated and it is uncertain whether it represents the retention of a PGPh. \*e-ki- pronoun variant or is a later creation.<sup>349</sup> Etymologically, the Greek ἐ- and Phrygian *e-* are most likely to be reflexes of the oblique stem of the PIE anaphoric pronoun, PIE \*h<sub>1</sub>e- > PGPh. \*e- > Phr. *e-*, Gr. ἐ- (PhL 91).<sup>350</sup>

### IV.3.2 Masculine and neuter forms

The *o*-stem endings of the pronoun appear to be limited to the New Phrygian period (LL 1826), whereas the Old Phrygian forms clearly do not belong to this type. This indicates that the Old Phrygian inflection, following the *i*-type, was supplanted by that of the *o*-stems sometime before the beginning of the New Phrygian era. This was likely due to a number of

---

<sup>349</sup> Neumann's (1986: 81) suggestion that New Phrygian *εἰαν* is to be understood as deriving from \*e-san cannot be correct (*contra* LL 1826 and PhL 91 who still admit the possibility), since loss of intervocalic \*s in Proto-Phrygian affects only original \*s inherited from PIE and not those that arose later from other sources. There are no grounds for assuming a second loss of intervocalic *s* between Old and New Phrygian. While it is possible that the *ε* in *εἰαν* is genuine (ie. represents an etymological *ε*, presumably the same as in OPhr. *e-sa-* and Gr. ἐ-κεῖνος) and this is thus another example of a compounded pronoun (though not one related to \*ki/ke), the possible existence of a spelling *εἰος* for *ιος* (in °12<sup>S</sup>) and the other spelling substitutions of *εἰ* for *ι* found in New Phrygian texts seem to indicate rather clearly that this is simply a spelling variant of *ιαν*.

<sup>350</sup> The Phrygian forms with an initial *e-* may serve as an additional argument against a reconstruction of the *s-* of the pronoun as deriving from a sequence \*kj-. It now appears likely that a Proto-Phrygian unaccented \*e was raised to \*i when followed by two consonants (for which see §II.3.4 and §IV.10); an initial pronominal \*e- was likely to have been unaccented, as suggested by *ibe-* and *ivi-* (*ibid.*). In this light, we would expect an earlier sequence \*e<sub>[-accent]</sub>=kji/e/ā- to surface as Old Phrygian \*\**isi/e/a-*, which is evidently not the case. On the other hand, it is by no means certain that such a pre-form, if it would have ever existed, would not have been remodelled in some way to preclude this development from taking place; e.g. by replacing the long reflex of \*kj with \*s taken from word-initial position.

other pronouns inflecting thematically. The feminines inflected as *a*-stems in Old Phrygian already, and the associated masculines and neuters to feminine *a*-stems in nominal formations were *o*-stems, which, in addition to providing additional pressure, may serve to explain why *si*- was replaced by *so*-, whereas  $\kappa\iota$ - < *ki*- < PIE \**k<sup>w</sup>i*-, which did not have a separate feminine in PGPh., managed to resist this transfer.<sup>351</sup>

Nominative singular masculine: *ses* °P-02

The form *ses* is somewhat anomalous. The context does suggest its reading as a nom. sg. form of the demonstrative pronoun: *ses=t bugnos vasos* (gen. sg.) *kanutiivanos* (gen. sg.) ‘this is Bugnos of-Vasus of-son-of-Kanuti’ = ‘this is Bugnos, son of Vasus, grandson of Kanuti’ (PhL 90-91). The element =*t* would then be the emphatic particle commonly found after the demonstrative pronoun (cf. *sin t(i)* B-05,  $\sigma\epsilon\mu\omicron\upsilon\nu\ \tau V$  common).

The problem with the form *ses* is its vocalism: for the nominative singular case, we would expect this form to show the *i*-vocalism that is expected of pronouns following the *i*-declension (cf. nom. sg. *si* B-01, M-01b,  $\kappa\iota\varsigma$  W-11,  $\upsilon\iota\varsigma$  W-11, *is* B-07<sup>2</sup>,  $\iota\varsigma$  °116<sup>W</sup>). Nevertheless, inscription °P-02 is syntactically clearly best understood if we assume that the syntagm *ses=t bugnos* is in the nominative singular. Obrador-Cursach (PhL 91) is then most likely correct in suggesting a “hesitation between *e* and *i*”.

Most of the spelling inconsistencies between a mid-high and a high vowel in Phrygian are not random, however, but betray some underlying phonetic reality.<sup>352</sup> A vacillation in spelling between <*e*> and <*i*> usually suggests

<sup>351</sup> This may then suggest that *oe*- < PPh. \**ve*- likewise never had a feminine separate from the masculine.

<sup>352</sup> By far the most common are variations before final nasals, which is evidently not the case here. Another cause of such variation is the presence of an accent before a resonant or lack of an accent before a sequence of two consonants, which likewise does not apply here.

that the actual vowel being written is /ē/.<sup>353</sup> While there is no explicit vacillation in spelling between a <ses> and <sup>+</sup><sis>, the spelling <ses> for what we would expect to be [sis] (if directly descended from \**kis*) is anomalous in the system of pronominal declension types, both from a synchronic and a diachronic perspective. As such, <ses> is exceedingly unlikely to spell [sis]. We may explain the spelt *e*-vocalism in one of two ways, then: 1) the vocalism was secondarily adopted from a case form that would have shown *e*-vocalism (most likely the genitive case); or 2) the spelling with <e> actually renders /ē/.

We may question the first option for the following reasons: a) other *i*-type declension pronouns all show the vocalism /i/ in the nominative singular; b) the accusative singular form of the *i*-type declension pronouns seems to consistently reflect an inherited \**i* as /i/, *sin* °B-05 being a particularly notable example. Thus, if we wish to uphold the *e*-vocalism of <ses> as secondarily adopted from the oblique cases, the *si*- pronoun itself must have behaved somewhat differently from other *i*-type pronouns. This is not necessarily problematic, since we know that at least the accusative singular form *sin* was replaced by σέμουv, whereas nothing similar took place in the other *i*-type pronouns.

On the other hand, if we assumed that the *e*-vocalism of <ses> actually spells [sēs], we still need to explain the vocalism: there is no way that \**kis* would have developed into \**sēs*, meaning that the /ē/ vocalism would likewise need to have been adopted from some other source.

Thus, we seem to arrive at an impasse: the spelling <ses> suggests that the nominative singular of the demonstrative pronouns either adopted /e/-

---

<sup>353</sup> Cf. <-si> ~ <-se-> for /-sē/ < \**-sih<sub>1</sub>*-. See further in §II.3.2.2.

vocalism (the *e*-adoption strategy) or / $\bar{e}$ /-vocalism (the  $\bar{e}$ -adoption strategy) from some other form.

More likely is the *e*-adoption strategy: we have already suggested that the mostly consistent spelling of  $\sigma\epsilon\mu\omicron\upsilon\nu$  with  $\langle\epsilon\rangle$ , even though we etymologically expect  $\bar{e}$ -vocalism in the first syllable, which is not spelt with  $\langle\epsilon\rangle$  in New Phrygian, is the result of a late adoption of *e*-vocalism into the dative/accusative singular from the genitive case (see §II.3.4). If *e*-vocalism was spreading through the paradigm, as suggested by this example, it may well have spread into the nominative singular in the Old Phrygian era already.

On the other hand, if we assume the  $\bar{e}$ -adoption strategy, this vocalism would have spread from the dative singular case (where  $*-e-sm- > -\bar{e}m-$ , as still preserved and spelt with  $\langle i \rangle$  in *ivimun* °B-05 and with  $\langle \iota \rangle$  in  $\sigma\iota\mu\omicron\upsilon\nu$  °25<sup>SW</sup>). In that case, the nominative singular may have escaped the later regularization of *e* in the oblique cases.

The accusative singular form *sin* °B-05 is compatible with both scenarios: if the underlying vowel were *e*, we are dealing with regular raising before a final nasal, and if the underlying vowel were  $\bar{e}$ ,  $\langle i \rangle$  is one of the two ways that phoneme could be spelt.

Dative singular masculine and neuter:  $\sigma\epsilon\mu\omicron\upsilon\nu$  (very common) (LL 1826, PhL 89-90)

$\sigma\epsilon\mu-$  developed from an earlier  $*sehm-$  < EPh.  $*kehm-$  <  $*\acute{k}e-sm-$ ; the element  $*-sm-$  was added to some masculine/neuter oblique pronominal case forms in PIE already.

The attested forms are all from the New Phrygian period and show the reflex of the expected dative singular *o*-stem ending, PIE  $*-\bar{o}i > OPh. +\bar{o}i$

> *ou*, with the addition of an element *-v*, which was taken from the accusative *o*-stem ending *-ouv*. This is the result of case syncretism between the dative and the accusative.<sup>354, 355</sup> The most likely dative singular masculine form of the pronoun *si-* in Proto-Graeco-Phrygian was *\*kehmōi*, which eventually developed into *\*sēmōi* within Proto-Phrygian. The spelling *σιμουν* °25<sup>SW</sup> likely confirms that the form still had *ē*-vocalism in the first syllable in at least part of the speech community by the New Phrygian era, but the far more common spelling *σεμουν*, noting that <ε> is not known to have been used to spell /*ē*/, suggests that *e*-vocalism was secondarily spread into this form for the majority of speakers, presumably from the genitive singular (PPh. *\*sevo* < *\*ke-so*).

Accusative singular masculine: *sin* °B-05:1,8, *śit=t* °G-12; *σρνν*? °W-11:8; *σεμουν* (very common) (LL 1826)

The sequence *sin=t imenan* in °B-05:1, and repeated as *sin ti imenan* in °B-05:8, where the masculine noun *iman* is in the accusative form *imenan*, secures the interpretation of *sin* as the accusative masculine form of the pronoun in Old Phrygian (PhL 88). *t* and *ti* are forms of the emphatic particle.<sup>356</sup> In °G-12, the form appearing as *śit=t* is likely to also be the ASg

<sup>354</sup> As was proposed to me by Sasha Lubotsky (p.c.). PhL (89-90) suggests that *\*-n* was originally a postposition, citing a Sabellic parallel provided by Untermann 2000: 223-225), where the final nasal encodes a frozen ablative. Haas proposes (1966: 75-6) that we are dealing with movable-*v*, but there is no other form in the corpus that would support its existence in Phrygian. Brixhe (2002: 264) assumes the addition of a parasitic nasal (ie. hypercorrection), but all other examples of hypercorrect final nasals he proposes are not tenable (Šorgo 2019).

<sup>355</sup> Do note that Obrador-Cursach (PhL 89) and Hämmig (2013: 149) are correct in identifying a dative singular ending akin to NPh. *-εμουν* in *ivimun* °B-05, even if we are in disagreement over the question of which pronoun the ending belongs to. This suggests that the dative singular of *i*-type pronominal endings was already extended with the element *-n* by the end of the Old Phrygian era in at least some part of the speech community (with inscription °B-05 dating to the 5<sup>th</sup> century BCE and originating in the northwestern area of Phrygia).

<sup>356</sup> For which see §VI.2.4.

masculine form of the demonstrative pronoun followed by the emphatic particle *t*, though with assimilation of final *-n* to the following *-t* (Oreshko 2023: 68-69).

The copiously attested New Phrygian form ASg σεμουν is identical to its dative counterpart: probably, the dative stem *semo-* replaced the accusative stem *si-* (as found in *sin*), producing the attested σεμουν. Since both acc. sg. *sin* and what is likely to be a dat. sg. *ivimun* (= *\*-mō(i)n*) appear in the same inscription, °B-05, the adoption of *\*-n* into the dative singular case form from the accusative singular must have preceded the replacement of the accusative stem and its transfer to the thematic declension.

The segmentation of lines 7 and 8 in Middle Phrygian inscription °W-11 (ιος κοροαν δετουν σουνομαστα ομνισιτους) is unclear, so one cannot be sure whether the correct reading is σουν ομαστα or σου νομαστα, where σουν would be the expected thematic accusative singular form of the pronoun *so-*, and σου would be the expected genitive. Brixhe (2004: 24) does suggest that, since the following word begins with ομ-, the preferable reading is σουν ομαστα, meaning the syntagm ομαστα ομνισιτους can be understood as poetic alliteration, which is the interpretation adopted here. Semantically, σουν would begin a new clause having the function of a direct object: [πεννιτι ιος κοροαν δετουν] [σουν ομαστα ομνισιτους] ‘[walks-by whoever girl placed] [him *omasta* ought-to-*omni*]’ = ‘[whoever walks by the interred girl] [may the *omasta omni* him].

If the segmentation as σουν is the correct one and the form encodes an accusative singular of the demonstrative pronoun, this suggests that the replacement of the OPh. acc. sg. *sin* either: a) took place in two phases, i.e. *sin* >> σουν >> σεμουν; b) produced two innovative competing forms, σουν and σεμουν, of which the latter eventually won out.

Nominative-accusative singular neuter: *si* °M-01b, °B-01 (LL 1826)

The neuter pronoun *si* appears in the corpus twice, as part of the phrase *si keneman* ‘this niche’ in °B-01, and as part of the phrase *si bevdos* ‘this statue’ in °M-01b. Both the nouns it modifies are neuters (PhL 89) in the accusative case.<sup>357</sup>, <sup>358</sup> The form is entirely expected: due to the loss of final stops in Proto-Graeco-Phrygian, the inherited Core PIE ending *\*-id* developed into PGPh. *\*-i* > PPh. *\*-i*, OPh. *-i*.

Dative plural masculine: σως °130<sup>NW</sup> 2x

The ending is clearly identical to the dative plural ending of nominal *o*-stems (Avram 2015: 210), which is a regular reflex of the PIE DPl ending *\*-ōis* > OPh. *-ois* > NPh *-ως*. The pronoun in inscription °130<sup>NW</sup> appears as part of the phrase σως ... γουμεις, where the nominal element is likewise in the dative plural.<sup>359</sup> The identification of this form is thus secure (*contra* PhL 91).

It is currently fruitless to speculate what the form of the pronoun was before its transfer to the *o*-stem declensional type.

---

<sup>357</sup> *keneman* is built with the nominal suffix *\*-mη*, which creates neuter nouns (see §III.3.6.1), while *bevdos* was loaned into Greek as the neuter βεῦδος ‘woman’s dress’ (Lubotsky 2008: 96ff.), and can thus hardly be anything other than a neuter.

<sup>358</sup> PhL (89) suggests that this form of the demonstrative pronoun may also appear in the sequence *sit kraroy veao dis* °G-11, but notes an unclear agreement and the obscurity of the text. If the first word of the sequence is actually *si*, the form certainly could not have ended in a dental stop; rather, the sequence *sit* would then likely be composed of the demonstrative pronoun and the emphatic particle: *si=t(V)* (cf. *sin t(i)* B-05, σέμουν τV). In any case, the text is currently too poorly understood to permit a proper analysis.

<sup>359</sup> A nominal ending *-εις* can only be understood as a dative plural of the *e*-stems. See §III.2.2.7.

### IV.3.3 Feminine forms

The feminine forms of the demonstrative pronoun had the stem *sa-* (PhL 89-90). The original nominative singular of the pronoun *\*ki-* in the feminine was presumably *\*k-ih<sub>2</sub>* (i.e. Proto-Graeco-Phrygian *\*kja*), which would have regularly developed into <sup>+</sup>*sǎ*. The original Proto-Phrygian accusative must have likewise had a yod or *\*i* following the initial *\*k-*, which would have thus likewise developed into initial *\*s-*.<sup>360</sup>

The development of the oblique cases is less clear: parallel to the element *\*-sm-* in the masculine/neuter pronominal declension, the feminine pronominal declension in PIE had an element *\*-sĵ-* (CIEL 227). In contrast to the masculine *\*-sm-*, which was preserved in Phrygian, there are no traces of the element *\*-sĵ-* in feminine pronouns anywhere in the Phrygian corpus. In attested Phrygian, the oblique cases simply decline identically to the *a*-stems (PhL 90), so *\*-sĵ-* must have been lost at some point. Since Greek likewise shows no evidence for its preservation in any of its pronouns, it is possible that the feminine pronominal endings were remodelled on the basis of the nominal *ā*-stems already in Proto-Graeco-Phrygian. In that case, the oblique cases of the feminine *ki*-pronoun in Proto-Phrygian would have originally had an initial *\*k-* (since pre-Proto-Phrygian *\*k-eh<sub>2</sub>-* > *\*kā-*, not *\*\*sā-*), which would then be replaced with *\*s-* on the basis of the nominative, accusative, and the masculine and neuter forms of the pronoun.

Alternatively, Proto-Phrygian might have initially preserved the *\*-sĵ-* of the oblique cases, in which case the oblique stems would originally have the

---

<sup>360</sup> Depending on the form of the accusative singular in Proto-Graeco-Phrygian, which would have been either PGPh. *\*ki(j)an* (from the Sievers variant *\*kiih<sub>2</sub>m* or from a vocalization *\*kiĥ<sub>2</sub>m*) or *\*kjan* if the stem was simply taken from NSg *\*kja* < *\*kiĥ<sub>2</sub>*.

stem *\*ke-sj-eh<sub>2</sub>-* > *\*se-sj-ā-*,<sup>361</sup> which would subsequently become simplified into *\*sā-* on the basis of the nominative and accusative stem *\*sā̃-*.

Since we have no attestation of a nominative singular and neither the Old nor the New Phrygian script distinguish vowel length, it is impossible to determine when, if ever, the original short *ǎ* of the nominative (and possibly the accusative) was replaced with its lengthened counterpart to produce a regular *ā*-stem declension found in the nominals. The length of *ā* in the oblique cases is fairly firmly established by the New Phrygian dative singular forms, which points to an earlier presence of the long diphthong *-āi*, which regularly developed into *-a*.

Genitive singular feminine:  $\sigma\alpha\varsigma$  °W-11:1' (LL 1826)

In °W-11, the identification of the pronoun and its case depends on the segmentation and analysis of the sequence  $\mu\alpha\nu\kappa\alpha \mu\epsilon\kappa\alpha\varsigma \sigma\alpha\varsigma \kappa\omega\iota\nu$ . The first term,  $\mu\alpha\nu\kappa\alpha$  'stele', is a known *a*-stem feminine noun in what appears to be the nominative singular case.  $\mu\epsilon\kappa\alpha\varsigma$  'great, big' is an adjective of the masculine/feminine gender. Most likely, it modifies the preceding noun, and is in the nominative singular case:  $\mu\alpha\nu\kappa\alpha \mu\epsilon\kappa\alpha\varsigma$  'big stele'. It is also possible that the form is that of the genitive singular and is indeterminate for gender. The pronominal form  $\sigma\alpha\varsigma$  is unexpected. Obrador-Cursach (PhL 90) analyses it as a nominative singular feminine form of the demonstrative pronoun and translates the entire sequence  $\mu\alpha\nu\kappa\alpha \mu\epsilon\kappa\alpha\varsigma \sigma\alpha\varsigma$  as 'this big stele', and assumes that the final *-ς* is either the result of dittography or was authentic and the result of an adoption from the masculine pronominal system.

<sup>361</sup> The Phrygian reflex of an earlier sequence *\*-sj-* is not known.

Another possibility is that  $\sigma\alpha\zeta$  is a form encoding the genitive singular case form of the feminine pronoun. This seems to be the preferable solution for the following reasons: 1) the adoption of  $-\zeta$  into the nominative singular of a pronominal form which otherwise seems to behave as an  $a$ -stem is difficult to motivate, especially knowing that the pronoun  $si-$  would become an  $o$ -stem by the New Phrygian era; 2)  $\sigma\alpha\zeta$  is the expected feminine genitive singular form of the demonstrative pronoun (from pre-PGPh.  $*\acute{k}eh_2s$  with levelling of the first consonant from the masculine/neuter stems); 3) there is no syntactic reason to assume nominative over genitive – in fact, a demonstrative pronoun in grammatical agreement with some noun generally precedes that noun; 4) dittography should only be used as a solution of last resort.

Interpreting  $\sigma\alpha\zeta$  as a genitive singular form, we may translate the first three words of  $^{\circ}W-11$ ,  $\mu\alpha\nu\kappa\alpha \mu\epsilon\kappa\alpha\zeta \sigma\alpha\zeta$ , as ‘stele big of-her’ = ‘her big stele’ or, if we are dealing with a nominal sentence, ‘The big stele is hers.’; in any case, the pronoun refers to a female figure. The penultimate clause suggests that the stele was in fact placed for the benefit of a girl:  $\pi\epsilon\nu\nu\iota\iota \iota\omicron\zeta \kappa\omicron\rho\omicron\alpha\nu \delta\epsilon\tau\omicron\nu\nu$ , ... ‘walks-by whoever girl placed’ = ‘whoever walks by the interred girl, ...’

For the time being, then,  $\sigma\alpha\zeta$  being a feminine genitive singular form seems to be the analysis that best accounts for the facts.<sup>362</sup>

The ending  $-\alpha\zeta$  is the expected reflex of the PIE genitive singular ending  $*-eh_2s > PGPh. *-ā\bar{s}$ .

---

<sup>362</sup> Do note that not all options have been thoroughly exhausted. For example, one cannot entirely exclude the unlikely possibility that  $\mu\epsilon\kappa\alpha\zeta$  could be a genitive singular form as well, that  $\mu\alpha\nu\kappa\alpha \mu\epsilon\kappa\alpha\zeta$  is not actually the phonetic realization of an underlying  $\mu\alpha\nu\kappa\alpha\zeta \mu\epsilon\kappa\alpha\zeta$  in the genitive case (cf.  $\iota\omicron \nu\iota$  for usual  $\iota\omicron\zeta \nu\iota$  in  $^{\circ}4b^W$ ), that the forms  $\mu\epsilon\kappa\alpha\zeta$  and  $\sigma\alpha\zeta$  are not actually dative plural forms (i.e.  $/mekāis/$  and  $/sāis/$ ; for the spelling compare  $\sigma\alpha$  for  $/sāi/$  in the following line), etc. No such alternative or any of their possible combinations are compelling enough, in my opinion, to merit an in-depth discussion.

Dative singular feminine: (e)sai °W-01b; σα °W-11:3; σαι °35<sup>E</sup> °69<sup>SE</sup>; σα °21<sup>C</sup> °67<sup>SE</sup> °82<sup>C</sup> °115<sup>W</sup> °124<sup>C</sup>, °91<sup>W?</sup>; [σ]α °94<sup>S</sup>, °129<sup>W</sup> (LL 1826)

Old Phrygian (e)sai is part of what appears to be a pronominal chain *yos=e(=)sai=t* and it is unclear whether *e-* is a separate pronominal element or a relic of the \**eki/e-* variant of the Proto-Graeco-Phrygian pronoun \**ki/e-* (cf. Gr. ἐκεῖ),<sup>363</sup> but the element *sai* is clearly in the dative singular (PhL 90) and is correlated with the feminine dative singular *materey*. The rest of the attested forms are likewise correlated with feminine nouns in the dative singular case. The exceptions are in inscription °69<sup>SE</sup>, where σαι correlates with the accusative μανκων, suggesting case syncretism, inscription °91<sup>W</sup>, where the nominal element is not known due to damage to the inscription, and inscription °115<sup>W</sup>, where σα correlates with τεαμας (which always unexpectedly appears with this ending).

Since the expected outcome of Old Phrygian *-āi* in New Phrygian is simply *-α* (PhL 90), the two spellings with σαι are puzzling. Both, however, appear in inscriptions where the dative singular of *ā*-stem nouns is likewise spelt with *-αι* instead of the usual *-α*. Since all New Phrygian inscriptions that have a spelling *-αι* for *ā*-stem nouns in the dative singular, which includes °35<sup>E</sup> and °69<sup>SE</sup>, are found in the peripheral areas of Phrygia, this is almost certainly a dialectal development of some kind.<sup>364</sup>

Accusative singular feminine: σων °60<sup>E</sup> (LL 1826)

In its only attestation, the pronoun σων is likely correlated with the feminine dative singular μανκαι (PhL 90). We are dealing with a conflation of the cases, likely brought on by the fact that the two correlated elements are not

<sup>363</sup> Obrador-Cursach (PhL 91) treats *esai* as a single compounded form.

<sup>364</sup> See further in §II.3.3.3.

adjacent and that  $\sigma\alpha\nu$  precedes an accusative (...  $\sigma\alpha\nu$   $\kappa\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu\nu$  ...  $\mu\alpha\nu\kappa\alpha\iota$  / ...).<sup>365, 366</sup>

Dative plural feminine:  $\sigma\alpha\zeta$  °56<sup>E?</sup>, °73<sup>W?</sup> (*contra* LL 1827, PhL 90)

In °56<sup>E</sup>, the pronoun  $\sigma\alpha\zeta$  is correlated with the feminine noun  $\sigma\kappa\epsilon\rho\epsilon\delta\rho\iota\alpha\zeta$  '(part of the grave)'. Syntactically, we are dealing with an indirect object and thus expect the elements to be in the dative case. In °73<sup>W</sup>,  $\sigma\alpha\zeta$  is correlated with the noun  $\mu\delta\nu\epsilon\iota$  '(part of the grave)', which seems to be in the dative singular, so the two elements do not directly match, but since the inscription is damaged immediately following this point, one might read  $\sigma\alpha\zeta$   $\mu\delta\nu\epsilon\iota[\zeta]$ , with the noun being in the dative plural.

The dative plural ending of the *a*-stems in nouns would have been created through analogy: masc. DSg  $*-\bar{o}i$  : DPl  $*-\bar{o}is$  = fem. DSg  $*-\bar{a}i$  : DPl X, X =  $*-\bar{a}is$ . The shortening of long diphthongs after Old Phrygian would have likely resulted in a New Phrygian DPl ending  $-\alpha\zeta$ .<sup>367</sup> In this case, both  $\sigma\alpha\zeta$   $\sigma\kappa\epsilon\rho\epsilon\delta\rho\iota\alpha\zeta$  and  $\sigma\alpha\zeta$   $\mu\delta\nu\epsilon\iota[\zeta]$  would be nominal phrases in the dative plural: 'to-these  $\sigma./\mu.$ '.<sup>368</sup>

<sup>365</sup> Curiously, the use of an accusative singular for the dative singular appears in °60<sup>E</sup> as  $\sigma\alpha\nu$  ...  $\mu\alpha\nu\kappa\alpha\iota$ , i.e. in the pronoun, and in °69<sup>SE</sup> as  $\sigma\alpha\iota$   $\mu\alpha\nu\kappa\alpha\nu$ , i.e. in the noun. Why this otherwise rare conflation appears twice in a phrase including the same noun is unclear.

<sup>366</sup> The conflation of the dative and the accusative singular of the *a*-stems can be partially understood in perceptual terms: the DSg ending  $-\alpha(i)$  [ $-a(j)$ ], especially when realised without the glide, would have been acoustically very similar to  $-\alpha\nu$  [ $-\tilde{a}$ ].

<sup>367</sup> By way of  $*-\bar{a}is > *-\bar{a}s > -as$ . Compare the *o*-stem development:  $*-\bar{o}is > -\rho s < \omega\zeta >$ .

<sup>368</sup> The alternative and less elegant explanation is that the cases were conflated when expressing an indirect object (as assumed by PhL 90); in these two instances, the genitive singular would be used in place of the dative singular.  $\sigma\alpha\zeta$   $\sigma\kappa\epsilon\rho\epsilon\delta\rho\iota\alpha\zeta$  would then see both elements as being in the genitive singular, whereas  $\sigma\alpha\zeta$   $\mu\delta\nu\epsilon\iota$  would have the pronoun in the genitive and the noun in the dative singular. While we have clear evidence that the dative and accusative were occasionally conflated, these examples would be the only cases of the genitive and the dative also being conflated. In contrast to the conflation of the datives and the accusatives, which can be explained through the acoustic similarity of their desinences, i.e.  $-\alpha(i)$  [ $-a(j)$ ] and  $-\alpha\nu$  [ $-\tilde{a}$ ], no such mechanism can be proposed for the conflation of  $-\alpha\zeta$  [ $-as$ ] and  $-\alpha(i)$  [ $-a(j)$ ].

### IV.3.4 *si* as a proclitic

A neuter nominative/accusative singular form *si* of the demonstrative pronoun appears twice in the Phrygian corpus (PhL 89). In °B-01, it appears as part of the phrase *s[i] bevdos* ‘this statue’ (Lubotsky 2008: 96-7). In °M-01b, it appears in *sikeneman* ‘this niche’; while all other words in the inscription are separated with the use of two vertical dots, the syntagm *sikeneman* is written without any separator (Gusmani & Polat 1999: 155), which indicates that *si* does not function as a prosodically independent element.

There are three instances of an unexpected initial *s-* element in Old Phrygian: *smateran* (ASg fem. ‘mother’) in °M-01d (PhL 91), *smanes* (NSg masc. ‘Manes (PN)’) and *smanin* (ASg masc. ‘*id.*’) both in °B-07 (*ibid.*). In this latter inscription, *s=manes* ‘this=Manes’ is not the same person as the *manes* ‘Manes’ who is also mentioned in the inscription.<sup>369</sup>

It seems clear that this initial *s-* must be in some way related to the definite pronoun *si/e-* (CIPP2 77; Gusmani & Polat 1999: 154-55; PhL 91). Most likely, the word-initial element *s(i)* imparts a meaning of definiteness on the following noun. It is prosodically dependent on the following word, as indicated by the occasional syncopation of *i*.<sup>370</sup>

<sup>369</sup> The entire sentence appears to be composed of three clauses: *smanes [...] estaes, va knais manuka odeketoy, meros=ke manes*: ‘*s*-Manes [...] erected, his wife *manuka* made, and *meros* Manes (also made)’. It is unlikely that the name would be repeated in the third clause if it were referring to the same individual. Rather, there are two persons named Manes, *this*-Manes (i.e. the one buried at the site) and another Manes who is not present, most likely his son.

<sup>370</sup> Compare also the loss of final *\*-i* in the preposition  $\alpha\delta < *adi < *a-d^hi$  (see §VI.1.1).

## IV.4 Anaphoric pronoun *to-*

The attested forms of the pronoun *to-* are:

	masculine		feminine		neuter	
nominative		τος				το
genitive	<i>tovo</i>	του				
dative				τα / ται		
accusative				ταν		
nominative					<i>ta</i>	
genitive						
dative				τας		
accusative						

Table #36: The attested forms of the anaphoric pronoun *to-* in Phrygian.

The pronoun *to-* descends from the PIE demonstrative pronoun *\*so/seh<sub>2</sub>/tod*. The initial *t-* of the nominative singular τος must have spread from the oblique cases (PhL 91).

Functionally, the pronoun τo- appears to have an anaphoric meaning in New Phrygian (LL 1827). This can be clearly seen in those instances where it appears as part of the apodosis of a curse formula, referring back to the subject of the previous clause, such as in ιος ... αδδακετ, τος ... ε[ι]του °6<sup>w</sup> ('whoever ... does, he ... may-be') (PhL 91).

Its precise meaning in Old Phrygian is less clear. In the instances where it appears (see below), there is no clear antecedent to which it would

unambiguously refer, and seems to function more as a demonstrative pronoun. Indeed, in New Phrygian inscription  $\circ 2^W$ , the nominal phrase in the dative singular  $\tau\alpha \mu\alpha\nu\kappa\alpha\iota$ , if the reading is to be trusted, appears in place of expected  $**\sigma\alpha \mu\alpha\nu\kappa\alpha\iota$ , indicating some overlap in meaning. Thus, the anaphoric function of the pronoun *to-* must be a secondary development from an original demonstrative function. The original distinction between Proto-Phrygian demonstrative pronouns *\*si-* and *\*to-* was likely one of proximity, ‘this’ and ‘that’ *vel sim.* respectively.

Nominative singular masculine:  $\tau\omicron\varsigma \circ 6^W \circ 25^{SW} \circ 69^{SE} \circ 103^C \circ 129^W$

The PIE masculine nominative singular *\*so* would have regularly developed into Phrygian *\*o*. As stated above, the initial  $\tau-$  must have spread from the oblique stem *\*to-* (PhL 91). The final  $-\varsigma$  of the nominative must be a secondary addition, taken from any one of the plethora of masculine nominative forms that end in *-s*.

Nominative/accusative singular neuter:  $\tau\omicron \circ 116^{W?}$  (LL 1827)

The nominative/accusative singular pronoun  $\tau\omicron$  is regularly descended from the PIE neuter nominative/accusative singular *\*tod*. Its identification in inscription  $\circ 116^W$  is based purely on its correspondence to the expected reflex of PIE *\*tod*. Its function is unclear; it is possible that it functioned as a demonstrative pronoun modifying the neuter noun  $\alpha\pi\omicron\varsigma$ , but the two elements are separated by such a long string of text (at least 46 letters) that this is quite unlikely.

Genitive singular masculine/neuter: *tovo* °G-02; *του*<sup>?</sup> °87<sup>W</sup> (LL 1827)

The Old Phrygian genitive form *tovo* is regularly descended from the PIE genitive singular *\*toso* (*ibid.*).<sup>371</sup> The New Phrygian form is *του*, which would have presumably developed through the contraction of *-ovo* into *†-ō* and subsequently into *-ov*.

Dative singular feminine: *τα* °2<sup>W</sup>, *ται* °18<sup>W</sup>, °116<sup>W</sup> (LL 1827)

The New Phrygian datives *τα* and *ται* developed from the PIE feminine dative singular *\*teh<sub>2</sub>ei* (PhL 91). For the unexpected development of Old Phrygian *-āi* into *-ai* (instead of expected *-a*) in *ται* °18<sup>W</sup>, °116<sup>W</sup>, see above under *sāi* (§IV.3.3) and further in §II.3.3.1.

As noted above in this section, the function of *τα* in °2<sup>W</sup> is simply demonstrative (*ιος τα μανκαι κακουν αδδακετ, ...* °2<sup>W</sup>), which suggests that the old demonstrative meaning of the pronoun was still marginally preserved by the New Phrygian era, likely reinforced through contact with Greek, where the oblique cases of the definite article would have begun with *τ-* (in this specific case, cf. Gr. Dsg *τῆ*).

Accusative singular feminine: *tan*= °W-01c, *ταν* °15<sup>NW</sup> °18<sup>W</sup> °30<sup>S?</sup> °116<sup>W</sup> (LL 1827)

The feminine accusative singular pronoun *tan/ταν* regularly developed from the PIE feminine accusative singular *\*teh<sub>2</sub>m* (PhL 91).

In °W-01c *tan* is followed by a verb in final position without an intervening word separator, despite those being used to separate the other words, suggesting that it was not prosodically independent.

---

<sup>371</sup> As suggested by Ligorio and Lubotsky (*ibid.*) *\*-oso* regularly developed into *\*-oho* > *\*-o.o*, with the *-v-* of *-ovo* emerging as a hiatus filler before a rounded vowel.

In °W-01c and in °30<sup>S</sup> the antecedent can be identified (*ataniyen kuryaneon* in °W-01c, and most likely ουεβαν in °30<sup>S</sup>, though the former of these does not correspond in terms of grammatical gender).

Inscription °18<sup>W</sup> is too poorly understood to provide further insight.

Inscriptions °15<sup>NW</sup> and °116<sup>W</sup>, however, show ταν with a purely demonstrative function without an antecedent (ταν ... σεσταμεναν μανκαν °15<sup>NW</sup>, ταν σαυναμαν °116<sup>W</sup>).

Nominative/accusative plural neuter: *ta* °B-01:4 (LL 1827), *ta* °B-07

The nominative/accusative plural pronoun *ta* developed regularly from the PIE neuter nominative/accusative plural/collective pronoun *\*th<sub>2</sub>*. It has a demonstrative function in inscription °B-01 and modifies the nominal form *spereta* ‘seed?’. The syntagm *ta spereta* ‘these *spereta*’ must be in the accusative case in light of the following *ayni kin telemi* ‘or some *telemi*’, where the pronoun *kin* is unambiguously in the accusative case (Lubotsky 1993: 97).

In inscription °B-07, the sequence *tat* appears at the very beginning and is marked as separate from the rest of the inscriptions by the two vertical dots. It is attractive to consider that the sequence ought to be segmented as *ta=t*, with *=t* being the intensive particle. In this case, *ta* may have been the NAPI neuter form of the pronoun with a demonstrative meaning such as “these”. The use of this pronoun at the beginning of the inscription would be an exhortation to the reader to pay attention: “These (things)! –“

Dative plural feminine: τας °116<sup>W</sup>

The dative plural pronoun τας is regularly descended from the Proto-Graeco-Phrygian feminine dative plural pronoun *\*tāis*, where the ending was analogically created through the proportion masc. Dsg *\*-ōi* : Dpl *\*-ōis*

= fem. DSg  $*-āi$  : DPl X, X =  $*-āis$ .<sup>372</sup> The contraction of  $*-āis$  to NPh  $-ας$  would have been regular.

The identification of  $τας$  as the dative plural is fairly secure, since it appears as part of a nominal phrase  $τας δ-κερης ονομανιας$  °116<sup>W</sup> ‘the named monuments?’, where the other two elements are likewise in the dative plural.<sup>373</sup>

## IV.5 Demonstrative/reflexive pronoun *avto-*

The attested forms of the demonstrative/reflexive pronoun *avto-* are:

	masculine		feminine	
nominative sg.		αυτος		
genitive sg.				
dative sg.	<i>avtoi</i>		<i>avtay</i>	αυται
accusative sg.	<i>avtun</i>	αυτον		

Table #37: The attested forms of the pronoun *avto-* in Phrygian.

The pronoun *avto-* is an innovation of Proto-Graeco-Phrygian, developed by the univerbation of the reflex of the PIE particle  $*h_2eu$  ‘again’ and the pronominal stem  $*to-$  (for which see §IV.4) (PhL 93).

<sup>372</sup> Compare also fem. DPl  $σας$ , §IV.3.3.

<sup>373</sup> An interpretation of this entire nominal phrase as being in the accusative case is unlikely for two reasons: 1) the ending  $-ης$  in consonant stems is only known in the nominative and dative plurals; 2) the feminine accusative plural ending of the  $a$ -stems ( $*eh_2ms$ ) has not been observed to contract as  $**as$ .

The pronoun *avto-* in its reflexive function was preceded by the reflex of PIE *\*swe* ‘self’ > PGPh. *\*hwe*, from PGPh. *\*hwe=auto-* ‘him/her/it-self’ > Gr. *ἑαυτό-*, Phr. *ve- avto-* (cf. LL 1827 and PhL 94). The two languages do differ in the fact that Greek eventually seems to have univerbated the particle-pronoun combination into a new pronoun, whereas Phrygian kept the two elements separate and declined both.<sup>374</sup>

The inflected forms of *avto-* are entirely predictable and follow the declension of the pronoun *to-*, simply with the addition of *av-* at the beginning (PhL 93). For this reason, the individual forms will not be analysed beyond their syntactic and semantic function.

The pronoun *avto-* appears to have been used in several different functions, at least demonstrative, reflexive, and intensive.

In its demonstrative function, it is commonly used to refer to some previously mentioned entity and seems to be more emphatic than the similarly used anaphoric *to-*. As an example, an addition to the standard curse formula in inscriptions <sup>o</sup>33<sup>E</sup> and <sup>o</sup>36<sup>E</sup> uses *αυτος* to refer to the potential wrong-doer who is to be cursed in some manner: *αυτος κε ουα κ ε/οροκα γεγαριμμενος ας βαταν τευτους* ‘both he and his *e/oroka* cursed by-Bas [will become?]’ (cf. PhL 93). As opposed to the anaphoric pronoun

---

<sup>374</sup> Obrador-Cursach (PhL 94) claims that the dat. sg. *οεαυται* shows its first element uninflected, identical to the structure of Greek *ἑαυτῆ*, and claims that this is the regular form. Historically, however, the lack of inflection in the element *\*swe* is a Greek innovation, and one that *ven avtun* suggests did not affect Phrygian. It is better to read *οεαυται* as representing a fully inflected dat. sg. /*uej aytaj*/ \**<οει αυται>* with a graphical omission of an intervocalic yod which would have presumably been predictable in context (cf. *γλουρεος* /*glurejos*/ <sup>o</sup>W-11 or the spelling of the dat. sg. of the enclitic pronoun as *οι* when following a vowel instead of *τοι* which is used following consonants (Lubotsky 1997)).

*to-*, which always appears in a clause immediately following the clause where the referent is initially mentioned (ιος ..., το ... ‘whoever ..., (he) ...’), *avto-* seems to be used when the referent is further syntactically removed,<sup>375</sup> though this was almost certainly not obligatory.

In its intensive function, the pronoun *avto-* appears as a nominal complement to the noun it is emphasizing. In inscriptions °W-01b and °130<sup>NW</sup>, the pronoun is used to emphasise a divinity: *avtay materey* ‘to/by/for/... Mother (Kybele) herself’ and αδ αυτον μεκαν τιαν ‘by the great Ti- himself’. In this function, the pronoun *avto-* behaves like an emphatic adjective (cf. PhL 93-94).

In the reflexive function, the pronoun *avto-* appears combined with the reflexive pronoun *ve-* (PhL 94). This is most clearly seen in inscription °W-01b (with the agent underlined): [[γος=e=sai=t materey eveteksetey ovevin onoman daΨet]] [[lakedokey ven=avtun avtay materey]] ‘[[whoever to-this *eveteksis* Mother *ovevin* name would-put]] [[may-he-be-seized himself by Mother herself]]’ ‘Whoever would put his own name on this Mother *eveteksis*, may he himself be seized by the Mother herself’. The verbal form *lakedo* is in the third person singular middle imperative; the subject of the verbal action is likewise its recipient. We may note that both the reflexive pronoun *ve-* and the pronoun *avto-* are declined.

The other example of a reflexive combination *ve- avto-* is less telling. In the poorly understood inscription °116<sup>W</sup>, the syntagm οε αυται in the feminine dative singular appears as part of this clause: ις αργμενα- οπαρικο

<sup>375</sup> In inscription °33<sup>E</sup>, the clause with αυτος is separated from the initial agent ιος by two intervening clauses: [[ιος νι σεμουν κνουμανει κακουν αδδακετ]] [[γεγρειμεναν εγεδου τιος ουταν]] [[ακ κε οι βεκος ακκαλος τι δρεγρουν ειτου]] [[αυτος κε ουα κ ε/οροκα γεγαριτμενος ας βαταν τευτους]].

οαν οε αυται.<sup>376</sup> The agent of the sentence is ις, the masculine nominative singular of the demonstrative pronoun *i-*, whereas οε αυται is feminine and in the dative case and as such not the patient. The situation is further complicated by an apparent lack of a verbal form, the lack of a legible ending in αργμενα-, and the inscrutability of οπαρικο. The following clause in the inscription also currently defies analysis. As such, no clear conclusions can be drawn from this example. We may for now simply conclude that the syntagm *ve- avto-* need not have been limited to those cases where the agent was also the (sole) beneficiary or patient of the verbal action.

The potential masculine/neuter dative singular forms *avtoi* and αυτω appear in a damaged or fragmentary context and cannot be syntactically or semantically analysed at this time (PhL 93).

## IV.6 Relative pronoun *jo-*

The pronoun *jo-* is one of the most copiously attested lexemes in Phrygian, yet is only known in two of its inflected forms, masculine nominative singular *yos/ιος* and feminine accusative singular ιαν (PhL 95).

The stem *jo-/ιo-* is directly descended from the PIE relative pronoun *\*h<sub>1</sub>jo-* (LL 1827), whence also Sanskrit *yá-* and Greek *ὄ-* (PhL 94).<sup>377</sup> The stem is

<sup>376</sup> For the argument that the element οε is likewise declined, see the second-to-last footnote.

<sup>377</sup> The Greek reflex is important for the purposes of identifying the initial consonantal segments: a simple PIE *\*jos* would have surfaced as Greek *\*\*ζός*. For a discussion of the reflexes of *\*h<sub>1</sub>i-* and *\*j-*, see §II.3.1.1.3.

invariable and its declined forms follow the pronominal thematic declension, i.e. the pattern also found in *to-* and *ko-* (PhL 94).

The nominative singular masculine form  $\iota\omicron\varsigma$  is copiously attested in New Phrygian (LL 1827, PhL 94ff.). The primary context in which it is currently known to appear is in the protasis of malediction formulae (PhL 94), where it has an indefinite meaning; the standard example is  $\iota\omicron\varsigma$   $\nu\iota$   $\sigma\epsilon\mu\omicron\upsilon\nu$   $\kappa\nu\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\nu\epsilon\iota$   $\kappa\alpha\kappa\omicron\upsilon\nu$   $\alpha\delta\delta\alpha\kappa\epsilon\tau$  ‘whoever would do harm to this grave, ...’.

The nominative singular masculine form is mostly spelt as  $\iota\omicron\varsigma$ , with a handful of exceptions (PhL 94-95).

The variant spelling  $\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$  most likely arose as a result of contemporary Greek spelling variation (PhL 94), where  $\iota$  and  $\epsilon\iota$  had come to represent the same phonetic value, [i] or [ī], which would be used to render a Phrygian [j]; it hardly seems necessary to postulate a compounded or variant pronoun  $\epsilon=\iota\omicron\varsigma$  of a type similar to  $e=si-$ . The latter is attested in Old Phrygian, seems to be supported by Greek cognates, and cannot be explained through a common spelling variation.<sup>378</sup> Furthermore,  $e-/ε-$  most likely encodes a proximal value, which is easy to apply to a demonstrative pronoun, while it is difficult to imagine why an indefinite pronoun would need to be encoded for a proximal value.

The variant  $\omicron\varsigma$  is either a graphical or phonetic simplification, quite likely under the influence of contemporary Greek  $\omicron\varsigma$  [os].

The variant  $\iota\varsigma$  is surely graphically simplified or reflecting a syncopated (perhaps dialectal or rapid) variant [is] or [jəs] (Brixhe 1987: 50-51 *apud* PhL 95, who noted a simplification of  $-\iota\omicron-$  >  $-\iota-$  in the Greek of Roman Phrygia). It is quite unlikely that  $\iota\varsigma$  could stand for the identical nominative

---

<sup>378</sup> See further in §IV.2.

singular masculine ις of the pronoun *i/e-*, since a demonstrative pronoun would be wholly inappropriate in this context: *\*\**'he would do harm to this grave, may he become condemned by Ti-'.<sup>379</sup>

The variant ιο, appearing in ιο νι (σ)εμον κνο[ °4b<sup>W</sup>, must likewise presumably be a graphical simplification or a reflection of a sporadic word-boundary assimilation ([jos ni] > [jo(n) ni] *vel sim.*).

A singular example exists where ιος is used in the apodosis of a malediction formula, apparently in place of the anaphoric pronoun form τος. Inscription °28<sup>SW</sup> reads: ιος νι σεμων κνουμανε κακουν αδακετ, ιος τιτετουκμενουν ειτου. This example is best disregarded, since it was evidently written by a scribe not well acquainted with writing Phrygian: next to the use of ιος for τος (which might as well be due to scribal error, the two only differing by a single horizontal bar), the medial participle τιτετουκμενουν (for expected τιτ(τ)ετικμενος) has the entirely unexpected ending -ουν (instead of the -ος we find elsewhere, though we might be dealing with a genitive plural with the meaning 'one of the condemned ones'), with the spelling of the participle itself being incorrect, its root element being spelt -τουκ- instead of -τικ-.<sup>379</sup>

---

<sup>379</sup> To the list of grievances against this specific scribe we may also add his decision to spell κνουμανε instead of the far more common κνουμανει and the lack of geminate spelling in αδακετ and τιτετουκμενουν. As has been argued in §II.2.3.2.2 and §II.2.3.2.3, the geminates were disappearing from spoken language in the New Phrygian era and in a number of cases seemed to have only been preserved graphically. The combined peculiarities of this inscription suggest it was written by someone who was either not a fluent speaker of Phrygian and simply transcribed what was dictated to them (with the ου spelling for ι possibly being some mistaken attempt at hypercorrection for what they might have perceived as closer to [y], possibly as a result of the nasal μ appearing in the following syllable), a novice scribe who was not familiar with the conventions of transcribing Phrygian, or possibly both. On the other hand, their spelling of ειτου with <ει>, at a time when Greek <ει> already represented [i], does suggest that Phrygian [ei] in at least non-final position was still pronounced differently than [i], which would be spelt far more naturally with <ι>.

In Old Phrygian, the nominative singular masculine form of the relative pronoun is *yos* 6x, *ios* 4x (LL 1827, PhL 94), apparently with an indefinite meaning.

The reduplicated variant *yosyos* °B-03 (LL 1827, PhL 95) is presumably used to emphasize the indefinite character of the pronoun.<sup>380</sup>

For *isyos* °B-07, there are in principle two possible interpretations: 1) we are dealing with a pronominal chain *is=yos*, i.e. the nominative singular masculine form of the demonstrative pronoun, *is*, followed by the indefinite/relative *yos*; 2) we are dealing with reduplicated *yosyos* that had its first element syncopated in the same manner as the New Phrygian variant ις. The former of these two options is preferred here, since Old Phrygian spelling is certainly more stable than New Phrygian and examples of vowel syncope, either graphic or phonetic, are few and far between in that era of Phrygian. As such, taking the form at face value seems the preferable of the two choices.

In a somewhat unexpected turn, following this reading, the *yos* in *isyos* can actually be understood as a relative pronoun introducing an embedded clause: [*is [yos (...) ordoinete(t)] (...) anivaΨeti smanin*] ‘[he, [who *ordoinet*’s], ought-to-*anivaks* Manes]’ ‘he, who *ordoinets*, ought to *anivaks* Manes’. In this case, *isyos* is a pronominal chain in the proper sense, consisting of elements that are semantically independent and prosodically linked (as suggested by the lack of word spacing between them), functioning in the same manner as *yos=esai=t* °W-01b.

An alternative syntactic analysis is [*isyos (...) ordoinete(t)*] [ *(...) anivaΨeti smanin*] ‘[he=whoever *ordoinet*’s], <sub>that-one</sub> ought-to-*anivaks* Manes]’

---

<sup>380</sup> Semantically we may probably compare the degrees in meaning to English *whoever* and *whosoever*, the latter being more emphatic.

“whosoever would *ordoinet*, he ought to *anivaks* Manes”. In this case, *isyos* must be understood as a bound pronoun consisting of inflectable elements *i-* and *yo-*; a bound pronoun being distinguished from a pronominal chain by virtue of a semantic interdependency between the two elements.<sup>381</sup> A bound pronoun consisting of the demonstrative *i-* and the relative/indefinite *yo-* would have presumably encoded a more emphatic variant of the relative/indefinite pronoun, functionally likely similar to *yosyos*.

Both pronominal chains (*yos=esai*) and bound pronouns (i.e. *ve- avto-*) are attested in Phrygian, so we cannot use their presence to decide between the two analyses. At best, we may suggest the addition of a demonstrative pronoun to create a bound pronoun with an indefinite meaning would be somewhat unexpected for purely semantic reasons. As such, an interpretation of *isyos* as a pronominal chain is preferred.

In inscription  $\circ 31^S$  we find two instances of what might be case forms of the pronoun *jo-*. The initial part of the inscription reads:  $\alpha\varsigma \sigma\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu\nu \kappa\nu\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\nu$   
 $\alpha\delta\iota\theta\rho\epsilon\rho\alpha\kappa \xi\epsilon\upsilon\nu\epsilon\omicron\iota \delta\delta\iota\kappa\epsilon[\sigma]\epsilon\iota\alpha\nu$  (vac.)  $\mu\alpha\nu\kappa\alpha\nu \iota\alpha\nu \epsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\epsilon\varsigma \beta\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\epsilon \dots$

The sequence  $\delta\delta\iota\kappa\epsilon[\sigma]\epsilon\iota\alpha\nu$  has been interpreted a number of different ways. Neumann (1986: 82) reads  $\delta\delta\iota\kappa\epsilon\varsigma \epsilon\iota\alpha\nu$  and assumes  $\delta\delta\iota\kappa\epsilon\varsigma$  to be an aorist, which is problematic for its lack of an augment and the wholly bizarre initial geminate. He suggested that the initial  $\delta$  was due to scribal error and amended the sequence as  $(\epsilon)\delta\iota\kappa\epsilon[\varsigma]$ , which seems rather forced, since  $\Delta$  and  $E$  are hardly similar. Neumann (1986: 82) did assume that the following  $\epsilon\iota\alpha\nu$  was the accusative singular feminine form of the pronoun *jo-*, possibly with the same aberrant spelling as  $\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$ .<sup>382</sup>

<sup>381</sup> For more on pronominal chains and bound pronouns, see §IV.13.

<sup>382</sup> Neumann (1986: 81) interprets  $\epsilon\iota\alpha\nu$  as representing a reflex of an earlier  $*\epsilon=\sigma\alpha\nu$ , which is simply untenable in light of relative chronology and the development of *s*-initial

Rejecting an analysis of the sequence εἰαν as showing a form of the relative pronoun, Woudhuizen (2008-2009: 183) read (α)δικε[σ](α)ι, which does reasonably explain the initial ΔΔ as a misspelling of ΑΔ, but the reading of final -εἰαν as -αιαν is ungrounded. Finally, Obrador-Cursach (PhL 160-161) reads (α)δικε[σ]ει. He interprets the form αδικεσει as verbal but himself admits the ending -ει instead of -τι is unexpected.<sup>383</sup>

I propose that the sequence ought to be read as αδικεσειαν, i.e. with minimal emendation, and that it ought to be segmented as αδικεσ εἰαν. In this segmentation, I take αδικεσ to be a 3sg aorist form. The apparent lack of an augment is easily explicable if we take αδ to be a preverb. In that case, the verbal root was vowel-initial κ- and there are in principle two possibilities: 1) if there was an actual syllabic augment ε-, it would appear between αδ= and κ- and the resulting /adēkes/ < \*ad=e-ikes with the regular *ei* > ē development would be spelt as αδικεσ, which is in line with New Phrygian spellings of /ē/; 2) if Phrygian was more similar to Greek, the augment in vowel-initial roots may have been quantitative, i.e. the root initial vowel would have been lengthened to show that the form was augmented, in which case αδικεσ stands for /adīkes/.<sup>384</sup> Etymologically, if we compare the root κ- to Greek ἵκω ‘to come, arrive’, the first clause makes perfect sense: ας σεμουν κνουμαν αδιθρερακ ξευνεοι αδικεσ ‘to this grave Adithrerak for-Xeune arrived’ “Adithrerak came to this grave for Xeune”.

---

pronouns; Neumann’s \*εσαν would be PPh. \*e=san << PGPh. \*e=keh<sub>2</sub>m, but PPh. \*s < PPh. \*k / \_V[+front] was never lost.

<sup>383</sup> Following the framework established in §V.2.1, we could explain the verbal ending -ει as encoding the 3sg subjunctive. In light of the fact that the inscription continues with a reference to the μανκα that was already placed for a brother, however, a verbal form in the subjunctive, presumably used to express some proscription, expectation, or desire does not appear to be semantically fitting.

<sup>384</sup> Or, rather, /adēkes/ again, with /ē/ spelt as <ι>, since Phrygian did not seem to actually possess an /ī/ vowel.

If we follow this reading, εἰαν can hardly be anything other than the relative pronoun in the accusative singular of the feminine gender, with initial εἰ showing the same spelling as εἰος, as already suggested by Neumann. Since there is only one possible antecedent of the feminine gender in the previous clause, εἰαν must undoubtedly refer to Xeune herself. Unfortunately, there is a gap of approximately eight letters following εἰαν. Most likely, another verb and possibly some other element would appear in this lacuna.

The following clause is likely part of the same sentence: ἰαν εστᾱεξ βρατερε. In this clause, the syntax seems pretty clear. ἰαν functions as a relative pronoun in the feminine accusative singular (PhL 95). ἰαν apparently refers to the immediately preceding feminine accusative singular μανκαν: μανκαν ἰαν εστᾱεξ βρατερε ‘the stele, which he stood-up for-brother’.

Combining the three clauses, then, we may analyse the sentence as: ‘*to this grave Adithrerak came for Xeune, whom (vac.) the stele, which he erected for (his) brother*’.

Thus, inscription °31<sup>S</sup> includes two identifiable instances of the relative pronoun, the feminine accusative singular εἰαν and ἰαν. Their function in this context is very clearly relative, confirming that this was still one of the canonical functions of the pronoun in the New Phrygian era.

## IV.7 Indefinite pronoun *ko-*

The indefinite pronoun *ko-* in Phrygian is attested in only a single form, masculine nominative singular  $\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ .

The pronoun is used in an indefinite function; its primary distinction from the indefinite uses of *jo-* seems to be that it encodes the meaning ‘anybody, somebody’ as opposed to ‘whoever’. Nevertheless, in a few New Phrygian examples,  $\kappa\omicron\varsigma$  is used in place of the expected  $\iota\omicron\varsigma$ , having the meaning ‘whoever’. This suggests that the meaning of the two pronouns had begun to coalesce somewhat by that period.

Obrador-Cursach (PhL 278-9) argues that forms descended from the declension of the PIE pronouns *\*k<sup>w</sup>o-* and *\*k<sup>w</sup>i-* belong to the same pronoun in synchronic Phrygian, with  $\kappa\iota\nu$  being a neuter nominative-accusative singular belonging to the pronoun *ko-* (which has  $\kappa\omicron\varsigma$  as its masculine nominative singular form). No argument is provided in favour of this analysis. Note that this would be an otherwise unparalleled distribution of pronominal vocalism: nothing in the corpus suggests that the neuters would be somehow more resistant to absorption into a thematic-type declension. Since a masculine nominative singular form of the pronoun *ki-* has now been identified and is  $\kappa\iota\varsigma$ , rather than  $\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ , Obrador-Cursach’s proposal of a complete convergence of the two pronouns cannot be upheld.<sup>385</sup> Nevertheless, it is likely that there was significant semantic and functional overlap between the two pronouns, especially during the later stages of the language.

---

<sup>385</sup> See §IV.8 for  $\kappa\iota\varsigma$ .

Etymologically, the stem *ko-* is directly descended from the PIE interrogative/indefinite pronoun *\*k<sup>w</sup>o-* (Fortson 2004: 130; cf. PhL 95), which was preserved into Proto-Graeco-Phrygian as *\*k<sup>w</sup>o-*. In attested Greek, this pronoun is no longer productive, but a number of case-forms of its antecedent, as well as adverbial derivations from it, have become lexicalized as adverbs, particles, and question words (e.g. ποῖ, πῆ, πῶς, ποτε, πόθεν, ...).

Despite only a single case form being known, there is no reason to assume this pronoun would be declined any differently than the other thematic pronouns found in Phrygian, *to-* and *jo-*. Fossilized Greek forms confirm that Proto-Graeco-Phrygian *\*k<sup>w</sup>o-* (Chantraine 1999: 921-922) was declined identically to other Proto-Graeco-Phrygian thematic pronouns.

Masculine nominative singular κος appears instead of the expected relative pronoun ιος ‘whoever’ in the protasis of a funerary malediction formula as part of a syntagm αι(νι) κος ‘if anybody’ in three instances (PhL 96): αινι κος σεμουν κνουμανει κακουν αδδακετ αινι μανκα °18<sup>W</sup> “if anybody does something bad to this grave”, αι κος σεμουν του κνουμανει κακουν αδδακετ °64<sup>E</sup> ‘id.’, αινι κος κακην αδδακετ κορουμανη σως κη γουμεις °130<sup>NW</sup> “if anybody does something bad to this grave plot or these burial grounds”.

It is possible that the syntagm αι κος appears as part of a second malediction formula in the badly worn latter half of inscription °72<sup>E</sup>: [-]κος ι[-----]κκιτορ κε [-----]ε α[υ]τος ειτου, though this is impossible to confirm at present.

There are no other instances of this pronoun appearing elsewhere in the corpus.<sup>386</sup>

## IV.8 Interrogative pronoun *ki-*

The interrogative/indefinite pronoun *ki-* is attested a total of four times in the Phrygian corpus, twice separately, as *kin* and *κιν* (LL 1827), and twice as part of bound pronouns, in *κινιν* and *κισινις*.

Etymologically, the stem *ki-* is a regular reflex from the PIE interrogative pronoun *\*k<sup>wi</sup>/e-*, later Proto-Graeco-Phrygian *\*k<sup>wi</sup>/e-* (LL 1827). The Greek descendant of this PIE and PGPh. pronoun, *τίς* ‘who? (nom. sg. masc.)’, continued to be used in an interrogative meaning.

The precise meaning of this pronoun in Phrygian is more difficult to determine. In two instances it seems to function basically as a nominal complement (similar to the nominal-complement emphatic function of *avto-*) imparting an emphatic meaning of indefiniteness: *ιος νι σεμιν κνουμανε μουρουν δακετ αινι κακουν κιν*, ... ‘whoever to-this grave [a]

---

<sup>386</sup> Obrador-Cursach (PhL 96) and Hämmig (fthc.) segment *mekos* °B-07 as *me=kos*, with *kos* being another example of the masculine nominative singular of the pronoun *ko-* and *me* being the negative particle descended from PIE *\*meh<sub>1</sub>*. Leaving aside the problematic proposition of PIE *\*meh<sub>1</sub>* surfacing as *\*\*me* rather than *+mā*, the *kos* cannot have an indefinite function in this context: *\*\*“whoever X, somebody/anybody ought not Y”/“he, who X, somebody/anybody ought not Y.”* Even taking *me=kos* as a negated version of the indefinite pronoun, ostensibly meaning ‘nobody *vel sim.*’, the reading still does not make sense: *\*\*“whoever does X, nobody ought Y”/“he, who does X, nobody ought Y”*. The only way to make sense of this segmentation is to assume that *kos* had an anaphoric meaning, which is an entirely unwarranted assumption; see §VI.4. Rather, *mekos* is the adverb belonging to the adjective *meka-* ‘big, great’, meaning ‘greatly’, the syntax being the much clearer *“whosoever does X, greatly ought-to Y”/“he, who does X, greatly ought-to Y”*.

foolish? [thing] does or bad something / some bad-[thing], ...' °100<sup>E</sup> (PhL 96) and *yos tivo ta spereta ayni kin telemi* °B-01, which is more poorly understood, but presumably means something like 'whoever *tivo* these *spereta* or some *telemi*'.<sup>387, 388</sup>

The other two instances of the pronoun *ki-* both appears in the Middle Phrygian inscription °W-11 as parts of a bound pronoun *κi- vi-* (i.e. *ki- vi-*): *κiν* and *κiς*. The contexts in which they appear are unfortunately not understood. Nevertheless, the parallelism between *κiς* and *κiν* suggests that we are dealing with a bound pronoun with both of its pronominal elements declined in the same case. The likely identity of *vi-* with the Old Phrygian pronoun *ve-* then beckons us to explain the elements *κi* and *κiς* as pronouns of some kind, and the only reasonable interpretation is to see them as case forms of the attested Phrygian pronoun *ki-/κi-*.

With *κiς=viς* (i.e. *kis=vis*) there can be little doubt that we are dealing with the masculine nominative singular of the pronoun *ki-*.<sup>389</sup> The meaning of

<sup>387</sup> *telemi* is most likely not an adjective that modifies a quasi-nominal *kin* 'something *vel sim.*'. Indeed, *κακουν* in malediction formulae is used as a noun meaning 'a bad [thing]' (cf. Greek τὸ κακόν), so the syntagm *κακουν κιν* is more likely to directly translate as 'a bad-thing some = some bad-thing' rather than 'a bad something'. In the same vein, it is likely *telemi* is actually a noun.

<sup>388</sup> My native Slovenian may provide a parallel. The word *kaj* 'what' is generally the nominative-accusative neuter interrogative pronoun, which can, among other uses, also function as a less emphatic/defined variant of the noun *nekaj* 'something' (itself from *ne* 'not' + *kaj* 'what'). Cf. *Vzamem kaj*. 'I take something [undefined].' ~ *Vzamem nekaj*. 'I take something [unknown or irrelevant, but specific].'

<sup>389</sup> It is unclear whether this nominative singular form was limited to the masculine gender or whether it would have encompassed the feminine gender as well. In PIE itself, nominative *\*k<sup>v</sup>is* was used for both the masculine and feminine genders. Greek τίς was used for both the masculine and feminine genders, suggesting there was no distinction between the two genders in Proto-Graeco-Phrygian. Nonetheless, it is not unthinkable that a separate feminine form of this pronoun could emerge in Proto-Phrygian, presumably following the pattern of demonstrative masc. *\*is* ~ fem. *\*ja* >> *\*k<sup>v</sup>is* ~ *\*k<sup>v</sup>ja/k<sup>v</sup>a* > (potentially) *\*<sup>?</sup>sa* or *\*ka<sup>?</sup>*. No such cases are known to exist, but the possibility should be

the context is not known to us and, indeed, the sequence κισις appears at what seems to be the end of a verse; inscription °W-11 was separated into six seventeen syllable (i.e. hexametric) verses. The Greek hexameter itself, however, never required verse-lines to end with the ending of a clause, and even if that were the case, the composer of Phrygian inscription °W-11 apparently merely counted the number of syllables per line without paying attention to or being very knowledgeable of the Greek hexameter, at least in terms of metrics; a stylistically poor separation of clauses would then hardly be unexpected.

With κι=υιϵ, it seems clear on the basis of υιϵ that κι is likewise in the masculine accusative singular or the neuter nominative-accusative singular. Since the *i*-type pronouns seem to have the same ending both for both of these forms, with the neuter NASg adopting the masculine ASg ending,<sup>390</sup> the best explanation is that κιωιϵ is the surface realization of what would have been an underlying κιυ=υιϵ, with a simplification of the cluster [n̄u] into simply [u] = <v>.<sup>391</sup> Alternatively, perhaps by this point the original neuter nominative-accusative singular *i*-pronominal ending -∅ < \*-d, as found in *si* < \**kíd*, had not yet been wholly ousted by the masculine ASg ending -n. In that case, the pronoun *ki-* would have preserved the old state of affairs, i.e. neut. nom-acc. sg. κι < \**k<sup>w</sup>id*, while

---

borne in mind when interpreting future Phrygian texts. The specific instance of κισις discussed here, however, is unlikely to shed any light on this matter until a better analysis of inscription °W-11 is available.

<sup>390</sup> The evidence for this adoption is found in κικουιν κιν, if κικουιν is to be analysed as a neuter, and in the adoption of the masculine accusative singular σεμουιν for the neuter nominative-accusative singular in σεμουιν κνουιμαν °31<sup>S</sup>.

<sup>391</sup> Since no other examples of such a simplification are known, it might have been entirely regular or simply the result of dialectal or rapid speech. In either case, New Phrygian νενηερια in inscription °9<sup>W</sup> does not serve as a counterargument: inscription °9<sup>W</sup> is several centuries younger than °W-11 and, additionally, the word in question is a non-native personal name.

the *vi-* pronoun would have already received the neut. nom.-acc. sg. ending that eventually spread to *ki-* as well, neut. nom.-acc. sg. υiv << \**vi* < \**suid*. Until we have a better understanding of inscription °W-11, it is difficult to speculate on what the precise function of *ki-* was. The pronoun *vi-/vi-* seems to appear exclusively or at least predominantly with other pronominal elements, which at least seems to suggest that *ki-* in inscription °W-11 is to be taken as a syntactically pronominal element. It does seem unlikely that *ki-* would be used as an interrogative pronoun; the context of a funerary inscription would presumably not include any direct questions. Perhaps it was used in a relative or indefinite function, akin to *γος* and *κος*, with *vi-* serving an emphatic or reflexive function, though it would then be unclear why this specific pronoun was used at the expense of the others.<sup>392</sup> Perhaps, if we look at the function of *ki-* in New Phrygian inscriptions, this original pronoun might have become semantically nominalized as an indefinite adjective or noun used to mean ‘some/someone/something’, with *vi-* serving as an emphatic or reflexive pronominal affix; e.g. κισυις ‘someone, who himself’, κιωιυ ‘something itself’.

## IV.9 Enclitic pronoun (*j*)o-

The enclitic pronoun (*j*)o- is known to us only in the historically masculine dative singular form in New Phrygian, where it appears as either ιοι or οι (PhL 92).

Lubotsky (1997) clearly identified the distribution between ιοι and οι: the former variant only appears after a consonant and the latter variant only

---

<sup>392</sup> Consider the use of the interrogative *what* in English, where it can be used as a relative replacing “that which”: *I see what you are doing*.

after a vowel (also LL 1826). It is clear that (ι)οι is accentually dependent on other prosodic elements in the clause.

Etymologically, the enclitic pronoun was almost certainly built on the stem of the PIE *\*h<sub>1</sub>e/i-* pronoun (LL 1826). Lubotsky (1997) compared the use and desinence of enclitic (ι)οι to the dative enclitic pronouns in Sanskrit, i.e. *\*h<sub>1</sub>moi, toi* > Skt. *me, te*, with both also adopting the function of the genitive. It is uncertain whether any other case forms of the enclitic pronoun exist in Phrygian or whether (ι)οι has taken over the function of all the oblique cases.

In most instances, this pronoun appears to be used as a nominal complement with a possessive function that appears before the noun it modifies. The examples of the pronoun (ι)οι being used in a possessive function are: ιοι αναρ (nom.sg.) ‘her husband’ °15<sup>NW</sup>,<sup>393</sup> οι ουεβαν (acc.sg.) ‘his *veba*’ °48<sup>NW</sup>, οι θαλαμειδη (dat.sg.) ‘to its sepuchral chamber’ °4<sup>W</sup>, οι ειροι (nom.pl.) ‘his *eiroi*’ °7<sup>W</sup>, οι πετες (nom.pl.) ‘his feet’ °12<sup>S</sup>, οι παντα κενα (nom.pl.) ‘his all/every *kena*’ °35<sup>E</sup>.

In some cases, (ι)οι can also be analysed as having the function of an anaphoric pronoun with a dative role, referring back to someone or something already established previously.

Most unambiguously, this seems to be the case in inscriptions °18<sup>W</sup> (βε<κ>ος ιοι με τοτοσσειτι σαρναν) and °99<sup>NW</sup> (με κε οι τοτοσσειτι Βας βεκος). The two clauses are composed of the same fundamental elements: the agent is some divinity (Σαρναν or Βας) who should give away (με τοτοσσειτι) bread (βεκος). (ι)οι does not immediately precede a noun in either clause, and may thus be syntactically independent: *may Bas/Sarnan*

---

<sup>393</sup> The context in which this phrase appears is fragmentary, but the meaning of the phrase is rather clear.

give bread away from him. However, if the pronoun (ι)οι need not have appeared immediately before the noun in its possessive function, both clauses still make perfect sense: *may Bas/Sarnan give his bread away.*<sup>394</sup>

The other examples are not much clearer:

ακ κε οι βεκος ακκαλος τιδρεγρουν ειτου ‘may his *akkalos* bread become inedible’ or ‘may *akkalos* bread become inedible to him’

Βα[ς] ιοι βεκος μεβερε[τ] ‘may Bas take away his bread’ or ‘may Bas take bread away from him’

## IV.10 Reflexive pronouns *ve-* and *ibe-*

Phrygian appears to have possessed two pronouns that could be used with a reflexive meaning, *ve-* and *ibe-*.

These two pronouns differ from all other pronominal types in following a specific type of a pronominal declension, the pronominal *e*-declension, that was separate from both the usual *i*- and thematic pronominal declensions, though it appears some of the forms eventually began to coalesce with those of the pronominal *i*-declension. The pronoun *ve-* appears to have two variants, one used in the bound pronouns, and another used independently; the only attestation of the latter uses *i*-type endings.

---

<sup>394</sup> Presumably by first taking it or by giving away the allotted bread.

The attested forms of the pronouns *ve-* and *ibe-* are:

	<i>ve-</i>		<i>ibe-</i>	
	masculine	feminine	masculine	feminine
nominative	υις			<i>ibeya</i>
genitive				
dative	<i>ivimun</i> , οε	οε	<i>ibey</i>	
accusative	<i>ven</i> , υιυ		<i>iben</i>	

Table #38: The attested forms of the pronouns *ve-* and *ibe-* in Phrygian.

We may conclude that the declensional type followed by the *ibe-* pronoun and the bound variant of the *ve-* pronoun was different from the *i-* type on the basis of the dative and accusative cases in the singular: the dative singular masculine ending of the *i-* type had an intermediary element *-em-* (as in σεμουν) and was not simply identical to the athematic dative singular masculine nominal ending *-ey*, whereas *ve(y)* and *ibey* do seem to show this equivalence.

The accusative singular forms *ven* and *iben* do not show the characteristic *i-* vocalism we always find in the (old) accusatives of the *i-* type pronouns (cf. *sin*, *kin*, never *\*\*sen* or *\*\*ken*). The variant form υιυ shows allophonic raising of *e* before a final nasal; an underlying form ending in *-en* being written with *-in* is pervasive throughout Phrygian, whereas an underlying *-in* is never written as *\*\*-en*.

The forms υις and *ivimun* are the basis for our assumption that the comparatively more marginal *e-* type pronouns had some of their endings replaced by the more common *i-* type endings.<sup>395</sup>

<sup>395</sup> This was certainly facilitated by the similarity or outright identity of some of the *e-* type endings to their *i-* type counterparts: nom. sg. *\*-es* ~ *-is*, acc.sg. *-en* [en] ~ *-in*, gen. sg.

The fact that  $o\epsilon$  (=  $*vey$ ) is used as the feminine dative singular of  $ve-$  suggests it did not have separate forms for the masculine and feminine genders.  $ibe-$ , on the other hand, seems to have had a dedicated feminine stem  $ibeya-$ , which declined as a typical  $a$ -stem, whereas  $ibe-$  was used as the masculine (and likely neuter) stem.<sup>396</sup>

The etymological origin of the pronominal stem  $ve-$  is not difficult to ascertain: it can stem from the PIE reflexive particle  $*sue$  (LL 1827; PhL 97), which was reflected in Proto-Graeco-Phrygian as  $*h\mu e$ . Both Greek and Phrygian built pronouns on the basis of this particle: Greek created a possessive pronoun/adjective  $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{o}$ - ‘his, her’ by attaching  $o$ -stem endings to the particle (Chantraine 1999: 307). Phrygian, on the other hand, appears to have added athematic nominal endings to the particle itself ( $*hwe + *-s$ ,  $*(e)i$ ,  $*-n$ ), though, puzzlingly, did not initially adapt the resulting pronoun to the already existing pronominal types.

The origin of the stem  $ibe-$  is somewhat less clear. There can hardly be any doubt that the element  $-b-$  is a reflex of  $*b^h$  that is found in the PIE dative singular  $*seb^hio$  or  $*seb^hei$  (cf. CIEL 234-235); an ablaut variant of this dative form underlies the Greek plural personal and reflexive pronoun  $\sigma\phi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\zeta$ . Quite likely, the Phrygian sequence  $Vbe-$  reflects an earlier sequence  $*Vsb^he-$ .<sup>397</sup> In the same manner that  $ve-$  received its declensional endings,  $be-$  would have seen the stem  $be- < *sb^he-$  extended with athematic endings,

---

$*-evo \sim *-evo$ , etc. When these replacements took place is presently impossible to answer;  $\upsilon\acute{\iota}\zeta$  suggests that the replacement of the bound form of the pronoun in the nominative singular masculine must have happened before the Middle Phrygian period, whereas  $ivimun$  suggests that the transfer of the independent form of the pronoun was even earlier.

<sup>396</sup> See also further below in this section under the discussion of the form  $ibeya$ .

<sup>397</sup> With the cluster  $*sb^h$  undergoing the same type of simplification that resulted in PGPh.  $*sd^h > PPh. *d$ ; cf.  $lakedo < *sleh_2g^w-esd^h\acute{o}d$ .

giving acc.sg *\*be-* + *-n*, dat.sg. *\*be-* + *-(e)i*, etc. The parallel with Greek is relevant in this case: the pronoun σφεῖς ‘theirs’, though only having plural forms, sees the zero-grade stem *\*sb<sup>h</sup>e-* extended with various types of endings; in Attic, the forms are transparent enough: nom. pl. σφεῖς < σφέ + ες, gen. pl. σφῶν < σφέ + -ων, dat. pl. σφίσι << σφέ + -σι, acc. pl. σφᾶς < σφέ + -ας. In the other dialects, many of the declensional endings are clearly adopted from other types, but the situation is far from uniform; for instance, the accusative plural shows no ending in Epic σφέ, Aeolic ἄσφι, ἄσφε, and Doric σφέ/ψέ, and the Epic, Ionic, and Doric dative plural σφίν is clearly aberrant both in the form of the ending and the ι-vocalism.<sup>398</sup> The accusative in particular, seemingly appearing as the bare stem descended from *\*sb<sup>h</sup>e*, suggests that creation of the pronoun σφεῖς (and its variants) was only firmly established after the Proto-Greek period. The most that can be assumed for Proto-Greek itself is that the stem *\*sb<sup>h</sup>e* was only used with plural semantics. It thus follows quite clearly that the creation of the (*i*)*be*-pronoun was an independent innovation of Proto-Phrygian, though the fact that Greek likewise innovated a pronoun from the same stem does suggest that the embers of this creation were already present in Proto-Graeco-Phrygian.

We should note here that, while Greek only used PGPh. *\*sb<sup>h</sup>e* with plural semantics, there is no *a priori* reason to assume that the PGPh. form was used exclusively with a plural reference; Proto-Greek may have well specialised the original semantic scope to the plural in contrast to the prototypically singular *\*swe* > Proto-Greek *\*h<sub>2</sub>ue*. The fact that the Phrygian forms of *ibe-* are apparently all declined in the singular case supports this proposition; with both *\*swe* and *\*sb<sup>h</sup>e* forming the basis of

---

<sup>398</sup> With the entire form σφίν being due to some irregular development of the attested variant σφίσιν or its antecedent.

two new Phrygian pronouns, the differentiation between the pair was evidently not identical to its developments in Proto-Greek. What the difference between the two particles was in Proto-Graeco-Phrygian currently appears impossible to answer; we should simply note that PGPh. must have possessed a pair of particles, *\*h<sub>1</sub>ue* and *\*sb<sup>h</sup>e*, with the first inherited directly from PIE *\*s<sub>1</sub>ue* and the second extracted from the PIE dative singular *\*seb<sup>h</sup>ei vel sim.* (CIEL 234-235)

In PIE itself, the forms of the reflexive pronoun only seemed to have a *\*b<sup>h</sup>* element present in the dative singular case, whence it could then spread into other case forms (e.g. OCS gen.sg. *sebe* << dat.sg. *sebě* (CIEL 235)). Beekes and de Vaan (*ibid.*) suggest that a dative singular form *\*sb<sup>h</sup>ei* in Greek was first replaced by *\*σφί*, which was subsequently interpreted as a dative plural on the basis of the ending *\*-φι*, imparting the plural semantics characteristic of the Greek *σφε-* pronoun. This development would then need to be dated to the Proto-Greek period.<sup>399</sup>

The initial *i-* of the pronoun *ibe-* is best explained by assuming that we are dealing with a pronoun composed of the proclitic pronominal element *e-* < *\*h<sub>1</sub>e*, also seen in *esa-* (cf. Gr. ἐκεῖνος),<sup>400</sup> preceding either the indeclinable particle *\*sb<sup>h</sup>e* or the emerging pronoun *\*sb<sup>h</sup>e-*: *\*e=sb<sup>h</sup>é-* > PPh. *\*ezb<sup>h</sup>é* > PPh. *\*izbé* > *ibe-*. The initial *i* is the result of a regular development *\*e<sub>[-accent]</sub>* > *\*i / \_CC*.<sup>401</sup>

<sup>399</sup> While this scenario does seem to best explain how *\*σφε-* acquired its plural association in Greek, the specific development of the pronoun *σφε-* must be somewhat more complex: simply interpreting *\*σφί* as a dative plural *\*σ-* + *-φι* would presumably result in the interpretation of *\*σ-* alone as the stem-form if we were dealing with a simple back-formation. The interpretation of *\*σφί* as a plural must have happened while the language still possessed a particle *\*σφε*; in that case, *\*σφί* could actually be interpreted as underlying *\*σφ-φι*, from which the rest of the paradigm could be back-formed.

<sup>400</sup> See §IV.2 above.

<sup>401</sup> Cf. *nīptiyan* < *\*neptih<sub>2</sub>m* and *ivimun* < *\*h<sub>1</sub>e-sue-*. See further §II.3.4.

The declension of the pronoun *ve-* appears to differ depending on whether it appears as part of a bound pronoun (*ve-=auto-*, *ki-=ve-*, and *o=ve=ve-*) or if it appears as an independent element (*ivimun*). The pronoun *ibe-* is only attested on its own, though the specifics of its use and its precise semantics are difficult to ascertain on the basis of the poorly understood context.

Until the current material is better understood or more examples of either *ve-* or *ibe-* are found, no conclusive judgement can be made on how the two pronouns differed in function.

υις ‘nom. sg. masc. reflexive pronoun’

The form υις appears as part of a bound pronoun κισυις, composed of the nominative singular of the interrogative pronoun *ki-* (PIE < \**k<sup>w</sup>i-*), κις, and the nominative singular masculine of the reflexive pronoun *ve-*, υις. The *i-* vocalism of υις is most likely a replacement of an older \**ues* (< \**sue-s*) adopted from those pronouns that followed the pronominal *i-*declension.

οε = <sup>+</sup>*vey* ‘dat. sg. fem. reflexive pronoun’

The form οε appears as part of a bound pronoun with a reflexive meaning in the dative singular feminine case οε=αυται. Since it is evident from the example *ven=avtun* that the bound pronoun *ve-=auto-* has both of its constituent pronominal elements declined and since αυται can hardly be anything other than a dative singular feminine form of the demonstrative/reflexive pronoun *auto-*, the sequence οε must likewise be in the dative singular case and in the feminine gender. Thus, οε is a variant spelling for expected οει, <sup>+</sup>*vey* in Old Phrygian terms; the spelling

simplification of a dative singular desinence  $-\varepsilon\iota$  into  $-\varepsilon$  is a common fixture of New Phrygian inscriptions.

*ivimun* ‘dat. sg. masc. reflexive pronoun’

The form *ivimun* appears in °B-05 at what appears to be the beginning of a conditional sentence: *ivimun inmeney asenan daket torvetun* [...]. The desinence *-imun*, immediately reminiscent of New Phrygian dat. sg.  $-\varepsilon\mu\omicron\nu\nu$ , and the following word *inmeney* appearing in the dative case both suggest that we are dealing with some pronominal form in the dative singular (Hämmig 2013: 149). Hämmig (*ibid.*) has proposed that the initial *iv-* is a corruption of some kind, perhaps due to scribal error, and that the starting sequence *ivimun* ought to be divided as *iv imun*, to be closely compared to New Phrygian  $\iota\omicron\varsigma$   $\sigma\epsilon\mu\omicron\nu\nu$  ‘whoever to-this’. This is not necessary, however. If we read the clause in which *ivimun* appears as a conditional clause, it would be part of the second consecutive conditional sentence in inscription °B-05: [[*yos niy art sint imenan* (...)]*dedasitiy*]<sub>protasis</sub> [*tubetiv* (...)]<sub>apodosis 1</sub> [*mekas key koris abretoy* (...)]<sub>apodosis 2</sub>]<sub>conditional sentence 1</sub> [[*ivimun inmeney asenan daket torvetun* (...)]<sub>protasis</sub> [*mederitoy*]<sub>apodosis 1</sub> [*koris ke abretoy* (...)]<sub>apodosis 2</sub>]<sub>conditional sentence 2</sub> “[whoever would put (...) this monument]<sub>protasis</sub> [he will *tube* (...)]<sub>apodosis 1</sub> [and the big *koris* will be broken (...)]<sub>apodosis 2</sub>]<sub>conditional sentence 1</sub> [(whoever) to this-very monument would do *asen(a)* of the trees (...)]<sub>protasis</sub> [he will be bound]<sub>apodosis 1</sub> [and *koris* will be broken (...)]<sub>apodosis 2</sub>]<sub>conditional sentence 2</sub>

With two consecutive conditional sentences, it is entirely possible that the initial indefinite pronoun *yos* ‘whoever’ need not have been repeated, since it would be pragmatically understood in the second protasis. In this case, we may take the *ivimun* at face value as a single pronominal form. Since no other pronoun has the element  $\nu-$ , the likeliest option is that we are

dealing with a form of the *ve*-pronoun. Of all the other attested forms of the *ve*-pronoun, *ivimun* is the only form to appear independently, i.e. not as part of a bound pronoun.

The dat. sg. ending *-imun* belongs to the *i*-type endings, suggesting that the independent form of this pronoun had already switched to that type, in contrast to the bound forms of the pronoun *ve-*, which continue to utilize the *e*-type endings into the New Phrygian era.

The initial *i-* has the same origin as the *i-* of *ibe-*: the unaccented proclitic pronominal *e-* (cf. *esa-*) originally appeared before an original sequence of two consonants, *\*h<sub>2</sub>y-* < PIE *\*s<sub>2</sub>y-*, and underwent reduction to *i-*.<sup>402</sup> The presence of this pronominal *i-* < *\*e-* suggests that the form was in some way emphatic, which may serve to explain why *ivimun* behaves so differently from the bound versions of the *ve*-pronoun.

In terms of its meaning, the pronoun modifies *immeney* ‘memorial (dat. sg.)’, presumably the same memorial mentioned in the first protasis in the syntagm *sin=t imenan* ‘this memorial’ (acc. sg.). This suggests some kind of an anaphoric function for this pronominal form in the immediate context. The reflexive pronouns *iben* and *ibey* in the same inscription also appear to be used in an anaphoric function.

*ven*, υνν ‘acc. sg. masc. reflexive pronoun’

The form *ven* appears as part of bound pronouns *ven=avtun* and *o=ve=vin*. For an analysis of its use in combination with *avto-*, see §IV.5. The spelling *ven* in *venavtun*, which one would expect to appear spelt as *vin* in word-final position in Old Phrygian, demonstrates that: 1) the vowel of the stem was still underlyingly *-e-* and thus not influenced by the *i*-type pronominal

---

<sup>402</sup> For the process, see §II.3.4.

declension in this form; 2) *venavtun* functioned as a single prosodic word, i.e. *-en* was not word-final.

υiv, like υις in the same inscription, appears as part of a bound pronoun *ki=ve-*, though in the accusative case. While the nominative singular case of *ve-* had obviously been transferred to the *i*-type pronominal declension, it is slightly less clear what happened with the accusative singular; the spelling υiv could simply reflect the common pre-final-nasal raising of *e* commonly found in Old Phrygian texts. The segmentation of inscription °W-11 is very much uncertain, so it is impossible to give a definitive judgement, though sequences such as εvκε, presumably to be segmented as εv κε, would suggest that *e* was not raised before a final nasal, thus suggesting that υiv does actually represent a form that adopted *i*-vocalism in the masculine accusative singular from the *i*-type pronominal declension.

*ibey* ‘dat. sg. masc.?’ reflexive pronoun’

The form *ibey* is syntactically entirely isolated in its immediate context: °B-05 *koris abretoy nun ibey neyotan niptiyan sirun mireyun*; none of the other words in its vicinity have an ending that could be interpreted as a dative. Quite likely, then, *ibey* is used in a quasi-demonstrative/anaphoric function, referring to the beneficiary of a verbal action. Until the inscription is better understood, nothing can be added to this superficial analysis.

*iben* ‘acc. sg. masc.?’ reflexive pronoun’

As with *ibey*, no clear syntactic role is apparent for *iben*. It appears at the beginning of a line immediately following a badly damaged and uninterpretable end of the previous line. *iben* is presumably the direct object of a clause ending with the verb *edatoy*: °B-05 *sin=t imenān kalya titedat[oy .]edekm[...]meas? d' u' mīd iben edatoy*, with *iben* referring back

to *sin=t imenan* ‘this memorial (acc.sg.)’. Yet again it seems, then, that the pronoun *ibe-* was used in some kind of an anaphoric function.<sup>403</sup>

*ibeya* ‘nom. sg. fem. reflexive pronoun’

*ibeya* appears as part of a nominal phrase *matar kubeleya ibeya*, long translated as ‘Mother Kybele *ibeya*’, with *ibeya* understood as some type of an epithet. With the etymological origin of *ibe-* being more clear, it seems that *ibeya* is simply used as an emphatic addition to the phrase, meaning ‘herself’: *matar kubeleya ibeya duman ektetoy* ‘Mother Kybele herself religious-community caused-to-be-acquired’. The use of some kind of a pronoun as a way of more clearly specifying Mother Kybele has at least two parallels in Old Phrygian: [...]*esai=t materey eveteksetey* ‘to-this Mother *evetekset-*’ and *avtay materey* ‘by Mother herself’. The best course of action, then, is to interpret *matar kubeleya ibeya* as simply an emphatic phrasing used to make clear that the establishment of the religious community was indeed the result of her actions.

Syntactically, *ibeya* is used quite dissimilarly to *ibey* and *iben*; the latter two appear to function as anaphoric pronouns (though, presumably, with some hint of a reflexive meaning), whereas *ibeya* behaves fully as an adnominal element, functionally akin to an adjective. The use of pronouns in an adnominal function is not without precedent in Phrygian.<sup>404</sup> Nevertheless, one may note that *ibeya* is extended with a *ja-*suffix that is usually reserved for purely nominal feminine formations, with no other pronouns showing this extension for the feminine gender, if they even

---

<sup>403</sup> If one disregards the damaged section and assumes that the second line of the inscription begins a new clause, *iben edatoy dakeran atriya davoi okimakiva* [...] might potentially be interpreted as having *iben* modify the noun *dakeran* in the accusative singular, but a coordinated nominal phrase of this type being separated by a verb would be syntactically anomalous in the Phrygian corpus.

<sup>404</sup> Consider *avtay materey* (§IV.5) and the analysis of  $\kappa\upsilon\upsilon$  (§IV.8).

possess separate forms for it. The only other *e*-type pronoun, *ve-*, does not seem to have had any separate feminine forms at all. While it is possible that the *ibeya*-type is simply the normal feminine pronominal form of *ibe-* that adopted its marker *ja-* from the productive nominal feminine formations, we should also acknowledge the possibility that *ibeya* is in fact a *jo*-type adjective built from a pronominal stem *ibe-* with a meaning like ‘who is herself’. If *ibeya* was in fact a nominal element, it might well have been used as an epithet for Kybele.

## IV.11 Possessive pronoun *vo-*

The attested forms of the possessive pronoun *vo-* are:

	neuter	feminine
nominative		<i>va</i>
genitive		
dative		<i>vay</i>
accusative		<i>oav</i>
nom./acc. pl.	<i>ova</i>	

Table #39: The attested forms of the possessive pronoun *vo-* in Phrygian.

The possessive pronoun is apparently declined like the rest of the thematic pronouns in Phrygian.

The possessive pronoun is used to indicate that a noun is possessed by someone previously referred to. The antecedent is grammatically masculine in all unambiguous instances:

*Manes*, [...] *va knais* ‘Manes [...], his wife’,

ιος [...] κε ουα κ ε/οροκα ‘he [...], his *e/oroka*’,

ιος [...], υκε ακαλα οουιτετου ουα ‘he [...], and *akala* may-οουιτε his’.

In *vay niptiyay* ‘his<sup>2</sup> niece/granddaughter’ it is unclear who the possessor is, whereas the syntax of ις αργμενα[ οπαρικο οαν οεαυται currently defies interpretation.

It is presently unclear whether this means that *vo-* only indicates possession by a male antecedent, i.e. the meaning ‘his’, with the meanings ‘her’ and ‘its’ being expressed by some other means, or if it is unspecified for gender.

In etymological terms, the possessive pronoun is composed of the zero-grade of the PIE reflexive particle *\*s<sub>u</sub>e* extended with simple thematic endings (LL 1827). *\*s<sub>u</sub>o-* did not seem to exist in PIE, so its creation must be an independent Phrygian development. The Sanskrit possessive/reflexive pronoun *svá-* was formed in an identical manner to this Phrygian pronoun. Greek and Italic, on the other hand, formed their possessive pronouns from the full-grade of *\*s<sub>u</sub>e*: Gr. ἑός and Latin *suus*, both from *\*s<sub>eu</sub>-o-*.

## IV.12 Personal pronouns

Until very recently, no forms belonging to the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> person pronouns have been identified. With the discovery of the Idol at Seyitgazi, i.e. inscription °W-14, Lubotsky (in Tamsü Polat et al. 2020: 50) has identified *meu* as the enclitic first person pronoun in the genitive singular, meaning ‘of-me’; the clause in which it appears is *iman meu termos* ‘memorial of-me (is) a boundary-stone’.

*meu* is a reflex of the PIE genitive singular form *\*meso* > *\*me(v)o*, with a development of the sequence *\*evo* into *eu*. This is not an expected development (cf. *atevo* < *\*ateho* < *\*-e-so*) and is presumably the result of the enclitic nature of the pronoun. Epic Greek also possesses this same enclitic personal pronoun as  $\mu\epsilon\upsilon$ , a result of synaeresis *\*e.o* > *eu*, which is presumably the same process that created Phrygian *meu*.

## IV.13 Bound pronouns and pronominal chains

As in many other Indo-European languages, several pronouns and particles may appear in sequence at some point in a clause. It seems that, while the pronominal forms in such sequences were not clitics per se, they could form a unitary prosodic sequence. While New Phrygian does not use word divisions, this fact is evident in some Old Phrygian inscriptions, which, while marking divisions between full lexical words, would spell such pronominal chains in a single uninterrupted sequence, even though the individual pronominal elements had separate syntactic roles. The best example of such a pronominal chain is *yosesait*, to be segmented into three elements: *yos=esai=t* ‘whosoever to-this (indeed)’, the nom. sg. masc. relative pronoun *yos*, the dat. sg. fem. demonstrative pronoun *esai*, and the (likely enclitic) emphatic particle *-t*. Pronominal chains of this type were apparently exclusively used in clause-initial position.

On the other hand, Phrygian possesses a number of what are best referred to as ‘bound’ pronouns, composed of two pronouns immediately following each other, with both of them being declined and referring to the same

antecedent. Such bound pronouns would function as single units both syntactically and semantically, with the meaning of the bound pronoun being different from that of either of the constituent elements. The best example is *ve- = avto-*, attested in the acc. sg. masc. *venavtun*, and dat. sg. fem. *οεαυται*. While the interpretation of inscription °W-11 is rather uncertain, it seems to provide another example in *ki- = vi-*, attested in nom. sg. masc. *κιουις* and acc. sg. masc./nom.-acc. sg. neut. *κιουι*.

Etymologically, while the specific bound pronouns and their structures in Phrygian were only fully developed in Proto-Phrygian, Proto-Graeco-Phrygian pronominal compounding was far from marginal and must have provided the necessary model for the expansion and further development of bound pronouns.

A prominent example of such pronominal compounding is the Proto-Graeco-Phrygian pronominal stem *\*eki/e-*,<sup>405</sup> with the oblique stem of the *\*i/e-* pronoun (i.e. PGPh. *\*e-*) preposed to the proximal demonstrative pronoun *\*ki-*. It appears that old compounds prefixed with the oblique stem form *e-* were fully lexicalized in Proto-Graeco-Phrygian already and were not treated as bound pronouns in Phrygian, its initial element remaining undeclined (as in *\*esi-* < *\*eki-* and *ibe-* < *\*esb<sup>h</sup>e-*).

On the other hand, a comparison of Greek *ἑαυτό-* and the Phrygian bound pronoun *ve- = avto-* suggests that the Proto-Graeco-Phrygian syntagm *\*h<sup>w</sup>e auto-* < PIE *\*s<sub>1</sub>ye h<sub>2</sub>ey<sub>1</sub>=to-* was not yet lexicalized as a pronominal form of its own, resulting in different reflexes, with Greek *\*h<sup>w</sup>eaυτο-* being the result of univerbation and Proto-Phrygian forming a bound pronoun where both elements would need to have been inflected.

---

<sup>405</sup> Eventually giving rise to Greek *ἐκεῖνος* and Phrygian *+esi-*.