

MARTIN L. WEST

PHRYGIAN METRE

Over the last hundred years there have been several attempts to find metre (usually of a Greek type) in certain of the Phrygian inscriptions, especially the Neo-Phrygian ones. Sir William Ramsay wrote that 'it is certain that numerous traces of metrical arrangement are seen in the inscriptions'.¹ In inscription 31 he saw three hexameters, while W. M. Calder analysed the same text as an elegiac couplet, 'scanned roughly according to accent'. Calder found an elegiac also in 15, and 'rough iambic metre' in 58.² Forty years later Otto Haas presented an analysis of 31 that was different again: two tetrameters and two pentameters of spondaic feet in which either of the longs could be replaced by two shorts.³ None of these attempts was at all convincing.

Vladimir Orel in his recent corpus scents metre in four Old Phrygian inscriptions.⁴ In W-08 he finds four verses of five syllables each; he marks the quantities of a few syllables, but does not attempt to define a metrical scheme. In W-10 he recognizes three verses of eight,

¹ W. M. Ramsay, *Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts* 8 (1905), Beiblatt, 85.

² Ramsay, *op. cit.*, 90; Calder, *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 31 (1911), 173, 180, 202. The numeration of the Neo-Phrygian inscriptions follows that of O. Haas, *Die phrygischen Sprachdenkmäler* (Sofia 1966), 113–29 (nos. 1–110), supplemented by C. Brixhe, *Études néo-phrygiennes*, *Verbum* 1 (1978), 3–21 (nos. 111–14), C. Brixhe and M. Waelkens, *Un nouveau document néo-phrygien au musée d'Afyon*, *Kadmos* 20 (1981), 68–75 (no. 115), and C. Brixhe and G. Neumann, *Découverte du plus long texte néo-phrygien: l'inscription de Gezler Köyü*, *Kadmos* 24 (1985), 161–84 (no. 116). That of the Old Phrygian ones follows C. Brixhe and M. Lejeune, *Corpus des inscriptions paléophrygiennes* (Paris 1984), where a prefixed letter is used to denote the area of provenance (W- = West, G- = Gordion, etc.).

³ *Revue Hittite et Asiatique* 53 (1951), 12 ff.; *Die phrygischen Sprachdenkmäler*, 103 f.

⁴ V. Orel, *The Language of Phrygians. Description and Analysis* (New York 1997), 48 f., 52, 227, 355.

eight, and six syllables respectively; in G-229 two verses, of six and eight syllables; and in his Th-01, a rock-cut inscription from Thrace which he claims represents a newly discovered Phrygian dialect, two verses each of nine + six syllables. Nearly all of this seems to be as arbitrary and ad hoc as much of the exegetical material in Orel's useful but unsatisfactory work. He fails to identify any recurrent patterns, or metres with an identity validated by other comparisons.

The most plausible attempt to detect metrical composition is that of A. Lubotsky.⁵ He finds it in the curse formula that occurs again and again in the Neo-Phrygian tomb inscriptions. It is subject to variations of wording and spelling and to the optional addition of extra phrases, but the commonest formulation is

ιος νι σεμουν κνουμανει κακουν αδδακετ (or αββερετ) με
δεως κε ζεμελωσ κε τιε τιττετικμενος ειτου.⁶

This is agreed to mean something like: 'Whoever does harm to this tomb, among gods and men let him be (damned)'.⁷

⁵ New Phrygian metrics and the δεως ζεμελωσ formula, in J. Jasanoff, H. C. Melchert, L. Oliver (edd.), *Mír Curad. Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins* (Innsbruck 1998), 413–21.

⁶ See the surveys of variants in Haas (1966), 74–96; I. M. Diakonoff and V. P. Neroznak, *Phrygian* (New York 1988), 77–84; Lubotsky 417. A. H. Sayce (quoted by Ramsay [1905], 85) had used a different version of the curse to reconstruct two hexameters.

⁷ *τετικμενος* is plausibly connected to Greek *στίζω* 'prick', Skt. *téjate* 'be sharp'. As regards the semantics, it might be relevant that the related adjectives *tigmá* and *tíkṣṇá* 'sharp, pointed' are used of Indra's (thunderbolt) weapon (Rgv. 1.130.4, 7.18.18, Atharvav. 12.5.66); he sharpens it (Rgv. 1.55.1 *téjase*). But one could also think of the stabbing of an enemy's image in magic, which might have led to the verb's acquiring the sense 'condemn to perdition'; for this practice cf. A. Audollent, *Defixionum Tabellae* (Paris 1904), lxxix f.; E. G. Kagarow, *Griechische Fluchtafeln* (Eos Suppl. 4, Lwów 1929), 12–16; F. Graf, *Magic in the Ancient World* (Cambridge Mass.–London 1997), 138–46. In one magical papyrus (P. Mag. 16.15 and 64) *στίξαι* is used in a prayer for the victim's heart to be pierced. – On the prefix *τιτ* see below. – *Τιε* is evidently a form of the divine name that appears elsewhere in the genitive *Τιος* and accusative *Τιαν*. In 62 it is coupled with *δεως*: *αικανατ Τιη κε δεως κε τιττετικμενος ειτου*. But in 6 *με ζεμελω κε δεος [κ]ε Τιη τιττετικμενος ει[τ]ου* (and similarly 3, 6, 97), the absence of a connecting *κε* after *Τιη/Τιε* means that it cannot be parallel to the preceding nouns. It may be an instrumental, 'by (the agency of) *Tis'. Cf. 2, 7, 26, 75, 112, 114, 115. But in *ατ Τιη κε αδειτου* (39, cf. 11, 12, 45, etc., *ατ Τιε* or *ατ Τι' αδειτου*) it is rather dative-locative, 'let him belong to T.' *ας Τιαν ειτου* (14, 53, 67, 99) must mean something similar. For the god *Tis cf. Haas, 67, 86; A. Heubeck, *ZVS* 100 (1987), 79 f.; A. Lubotsky, *Kadmos* 28, 1989, 84 f.; id. in R. Gusmani, M.

The Hellenizing grapheme <ου> in the Neo-Phrygian texts (it occurs only once in the Old Phrygian) presumably represents not a diphthong but the vowel [u], whether long or short.⁸ In the neuter singular *κακουν* it will denote *-ŭn* < **-on*. In the first syllable of *κνουμανει* short scansion may be possible if the root is the same as that of Greek *κνύω* in the zero grade.⁹ Lubotsky accordingly sees in the protasis a sequence of four dactyls,

yos nī sēmum knūmānei kākūn addākēt (or *abberet*).¹⁰

In the apodosis, taking the variant word order *με ζεμελωσ κε δεωσ κε*, he finds a complete hexameter:

me (d)zemelōs ke deōs ke Tiyē ti tetikmenos eitū.

We do not know how Phrygian <ζ> was pronounced, but as in *ζεμελωσ* it comes from an ancient complex **d^hg^h-* or **g^hd^h-*, it is plausible that it should represent a complex sound capable of lengthening the preceding syllable.¹¹ To fill out the first line to a matching hexameter, Lubotsky searches among the additions to the protasis that some inscriptions include, and comes up with the words *αυι ατεαμας* (102, 112), ‘or the monument(?)’. So behold, two hexameters:

Salvini, P. Vannicelli (edd.), *Frige e Frigio* (Rome 1997), 127; C. Brixhe, *ibid.* 42–7; Orel, 463. Heubeck regards *Τιαν*, *Τιος* as ‘phrygisierte Lehnformen aus griech. Διός und Δία’, only why should the /d/ be devoiced? The Phrygians may rather have taken over an older Anatolian form of the name, cf. Palaic *Tiyat-* ‘sun, day’ (from proto-Anatolian **dīwot-*, according to H. C. Melchert, *Anatolian Historical Phonology* [Amsterdam–Atlanta 1994], 231, 240, 253).

⁸ It is not certain that there was any opposition of long and short vowels in Phrygian, but for the sake of hypothesis we will assume that there was. Lubotsky 414 points out that the non-casual use of *ω* besides *ο* suggests a separate phoneme, associated with etymological /ō/ and perhaps actually distinguished by length. The isolated spelling *αας* in inscr. 20 may be a further point in favour of quantitative distinctions.

⁹ It is plausible that a verb meaning ‘scrape, scratch’ in Greek could have meant ‘dig, excavate’ in Phrygian. The formation of *knū-man* would be parallel to that of Gk. *χῦμα*, *ὑπ-έν-δῦμα*, etc.

¹⁰ *αδδακετ* is apparently an injunctive form, with a present stem *dāk-* derived, like Latin *fac-*, from the IE aorist **dhēk-* (which gives Gk. *ἔθηκα*, Lat. *feci*). This is a noteworthy Phrygian-Italic isogloss.

¹¹ Lubotsky 416, ‘[dz] or some other double consonant’. *Zem-eloi* ‘earthlings’ is based on the same root as Hitt. *tēgan*, Skt. *kṣāḥ*, Av. *zā*, Gk. *χθών*, Lith. *žėmė*, Slav. *zem-lya*, Lat. *hum-us*, etc. In 39 and 113 the word is spelt *σζεμελωσ*, which tends to confirm the lengthening property of the ζ.

yos ni semun knumanei kakun addaket [or abberet] ain'
ateāmās,
me (d)zemelōs ke deōs ke Tiyē ti tetikmenos eitū.

This is certainly easier to believe in than the verses advertised by Haas and Orel. It is, however, open to some objections. In most cases the curse formula has nothing in the protasis after the verb; where there is an addition, it is in half a dozen instances unmetrical as a hexameter ending.¹² The order ζεμελωσ κε δεωσ κε is less common than δεωσ κε ζεμελωσ κε, and also, as Lubotsky admits, less natural, both on Behaghel's principle that shorter items precede longer and because in all Indo-European languages one normally says 'gods and men' rather than 'men and gods'. Lubotsky puts the inversion down to metrical constraint. And finally, what he reads as a particle τι is in the inscriptions nearly always written τιτ. It evidently belongs with τετικμενος and is the same verbal prefix as in 88 τιγ-γεγαριτμενο ειτου. It is plausibly equated with Latin *dis-*, Germanic *zer-*, implying that the action of the verb has a deleterious outcome. Haas may have been right to recognize it also in the word τιδρεγρουν, which in another version of the curse (33, 76, 108) describes what the offender's food is to become for him: /δρεγ/ could correspond to Gk. τρεφ- (if < **dhreg^{hw}-*), so that **tis-dreg-ro-* would mean 'malnourished'.¹³ In any case it is hardly legitimate to scan τιττετικμενος as
 ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡.

If the use of hexameters were to be established for these inscriptions, there would in theory be two possible explanations for the Phrygians' acquaintance with the metre. As Phrygian is closely related to Greek, and the Phrygians' Bronze Age ancestors lived somewhere near those of the Greeks, and as the Greek hexameter can be argued to have existed already in the Mycenaean period, it might be imagined that the Phrygian hexameter was an independent survival from that era. Alternatively the Phrygian-speakers of the Roman period might have borrowed this metre from the Greeks, as the Romans had done. The second alternative would be very much more probable than the first. Phrygia was after all exposed to Greek culture from the Archaic period on. The language was infected with Greek loan-words. The inscriptions in question are in many cases accompanied by Greek

¹² αινη μανκα or μανκης, 18, 26, 86; αινη οι θαλαμειδη, 4; [αι]νη κορου ουγ[, 92; αινη σας μδυει, 73.

¹³ Haas (1966), 67, 84, 237. τιδρ- will be simplified from **tiddr-*. It does not seem possible to identify *tis-* with IE **dus-*.

inscriptions. So even if Lubotsky is right, we should not imagine we have learned anything about native Phrygian versification.

There is, however, another approach that raises a somewhat better prospect of doing so. The phrase in the curse formula that I have quoted as $\mu\epsilon \delta\epsilon\omega\varsigma \kappa\epsilon \zeta\epsilon\mu\epsilon\lambda\omega\varsigma \kappa\epsilon$ occurs in several instances without the preposition $\mu\epsilon$, the case-ending alone carrying the meaning.¹⁴ It also occurs without the first $\kappa\epsilon$ or asyndetically without either of them. And it occurs with a longer (older) form of the termination on the second noun: $[\zeta\epsilon\mu]\epsilon\lambda\omega\sigma\iota$ (92). The archetypal text therefore might have been $\mu\epsilon \delta\epsilon\omega\varsigma \zeta\epsilon\mu\epsilon\lambda\omega\varsigma \tau\eta$, or (without $\tau\eta/\tau\iota\epsilon$, which is sometimes absent) $\delta\epsilon\omega\varsigma \kappa\epsilon \zeta\epsilon\mu\epsilon\lambda\omega\sigma\iota \kappa\epsilon$. Now, anyone familiar with Greek lyric verse who reads the phrase in either of those forms, followed by $\tau\iota\tau\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\kappa\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma \epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon$, cannot help being struck by the similarity to the very common Greek sequence of glyconic + pherecratean, that is,

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \times & \times & - & \cup & \cup & - & \cup & \times \\ \times & \times & - & \cup & \cup & - & - & . \end{array}$$

If one then looks at the protasis, one immediately sees another glyconic in the words $\kappa\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\nu\epsilon\iota \kappa\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu\nu \alpha\delta\delta\alpha\kappa\epsilon\tau$ (or $\alpha\beta\beta\epsilon\rho\epsilon\tau$), whether the first syllable of $\kappa\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\nu\epsilon\iota$ be scanned long or short. As for the four preceding syllables, $\iota\omicron\varsigma \nu\iota \sigma\epsilon\mu\omicron\nu\nu$, it may be observed that a glyconic is sometimes preceded by a four-syllable measure, normally of the form $\times - \cup -$ (iambic metron).¹⁵

Similar metres are characteristic of the Rigveda. One of the commonest is an octosyllabic verse of the form $\times \circ \circ \circ \cup - \cup \times$. ($\circ \circ \circ$ denotes a sequence of positions in which two successive short syllables are avoided.) This often produces lines that correspond exactly to a Greek glyconic; ten out of thirty lines in the hymn 6.54 are of this type. There also occurs a seven-syllable verse, $\times \times \circ \circ \cup$

¹⁴ The $-\omega\varsigma$ ending is interpreted as a dative (Calder and others) or dative/instrumental plural (Diakonoff–Neroznak, 12 f.), derived from $*-\bar{o}is$ or $*-\bar{o}isi$. I suspect that it represents a locative, though of course locative and dative may have merged in Phrygian. In the Rigveda ‘among the gods’ is regularly expressed by the locative $devēṣu$ (< $*deiwoisu$). For ‘among gods ... among men’ cf. 5.25.4 $devēṣu ... mārteṣu$, 4.2.1 $mārtyeṣu ... devēṣu$, and especially 4.54.3 $devēṣu ca Savitar mānuṣeṣu ca | tuvām no ātra suvatād ānāgasah$, ‘so sollst du, Savitṛ, vor Göttern und Menschen bestimmen, daß wir daran schuldlos sind’ (trans. Geldner).

¹⁵ Alcaeus 70.10 $\chi\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu \delta\epsilon \tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \theta\upsilon\mu\omicron\beta\acute{o}\rho\omega \lambda\acute{\upsilon}\alpha\varsigma$; 386; Simonides 555.1 $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\tau\iota \delta' \epsilon\upsilon \pi\acute{\alpha}\iota\varsigma$ ‘Ερμᾶς ἐναγώνιος; Pindar, Paean 9.2; Sophocles, Ajax 600 ~ 612, 622 ~ 635.

– ×, which corresponds to the Greek pherecratean. The other most common types are eleven- and twelve-syllable verses, which are like the seven- and eight-syllable ones with four extra syllables at the beginning. As they have a regular caesura after either the fourth or the fifth syllable, a basic structure of 4 + 7 or 4 + 8 (with optional displacement of caesura by one syllable) can be postulated. The second and fourth syllables tend to be long, and the third short, so that the initial ‘metron’ shows a vague urge towards iambic rhythm.

By comparing these Greek and Vedic metres Antoine Meillet was able to make the first persuasive deductions about the forms of Indo-European metre.¹⁶ In a study published just fifty years after Meillet, I built on his conclusions, taking account of Roman Jakobson’s work on Slavic metre and Calvert Watkins’s on Old Irish.¹⁷ There (p. 169) I drew up a schematic list of Indo-European prototypes, in which the four-syllable protasis was represented as ‘4 |’, the glyconic-type octosyllable as ‘G’, and its catalectic heptasyllabic counterpart as ‘G_Λ’.

The apparent metrical sequences that have caught our attention in the Phrygian curse formula fit neatly with this scheme:

ιος νι σεμουν κνουμανει κακουν αδδακετ,	4 G
δεως κε ξεμελωσι κε	G
τιπτετιχμενος ειτου.	G _Λ

In inscription 4 the protasis is extended with another pherecratean:

ιος νι σεμον [κνουμανι] κακουν α(δ)δακετ	4 G
ανι οι θαλαμειδη,	G _Λ

‘this tomb or its chamber’. θαλαμειδη is a Greek loan-word, θαλαμῖς-ῖδος, attested in the Greek inscription that accompanies 115 (SEG 31.1126, accusative spelt θαλαμειδα). Here it is furnished with a Phrygian dative ending.

Is the existence of these metrical sequences merely fortuitous? If we look at some of the alternative forms of the curse, we find similar patterns there. In 32–34, 36, 59, and 105, it takes the form

ιος νι σεμουν κνουμανει κακουν αδδακετ,	4 G
γεγρεμεναν εγεδου Τιος ουταν.	4 G _Λ

¹⁶ A. Meillet, *Les origines indo-européennes des mètres grecs* (Paris 1923).

¹⁷ M. L. West, *Indo-European Metre*, *Glotta* 51 (1973), 161–87; cf. my *Greek Metre* (Oxford 1982), 2–4; *Introduction to Greek Metre* (Oxford 1987), 1–2.

The second line (also found in 60, 76, 108, cf. 106) is commonly understood to mean something like ‘let him pay the prescribed penalty of (the god) *Tis’. The translation is less than certain, but the syntactical structure seems clear. The *ā*-stem accusative endings in -αν should be long, and so should the final vowel of the imperative ending -εδου from *-etō(d) or possibly from a (middle) *-esdō or *-edwō parallel to Greek -έσθω. The metre then can be analysed as iambic tetrasyllable + pherecratean, with word division at the juncture, matching the first line apart from the catalectic ending.

In 33, 76, and 108 a further clause is added to the execration, either before or after γεγρεμεναν εγεδου Τιος ουταν. It is

ακκε οι βεκος ακκαλος τιδρεγρουν ειτου
‘and let his bread ... be malnouritious’.

ακκε οι βεκος ακκαλος is another perfect glyconic. The remainder, marked off by word division, is a pentasyllabic colon of the form × – ∪ – –. This too is a familiar unit both in Greek and in Vedic verse.¹⁸ In Greek it often occurs as a clausula, especially following a dactylic hemiepes (– ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ –). For its combination with a glyconic compare Ion of Chios, PMG 744.3, ἥδιστον πρόπολον βαρυγδούπων ἐρώτων. The strophe of Pindar’s Fourth Olympian ends with a similar sequence (one syllable shorter at the beginning), × – ∪ ∪ – ∪ – × – ∪ – –. In Vedic two pentasyllables are juxtaposed to form the *dvīpadā virāj* verse.

In 33 and 36 there is yet another clause:

αυτος κε ουα κεροκα (v.l. κοροκα) γεγαριτμενος ασβατ (v.l. αβατ) αντευτους.

The words ουα κεροκα (κοροκα) are understood as *wā kerokā* ‘together with his descendants’ (instrumental) or *wā k’ erokā* ‘and his descendants’ (nominative). The second interpretation is favoured, firstly by the occurrence of a similar vocable ειροια in a parallel context in 7,¹⁹ and secondly by the emphatic αυτος, balanced as it is against the syntactically parallel complementary phrase. The

¹⁸ Designated *pe* (for penthemimer) in my Greek Metre, 30; Introduction to Greek Metre, x. For Vedic cf. E. V. Arnold, Vedic Metre (Cambridge 1905), 14, 239 f.

¹⁹ εροκα and ειροια apparently contain the same root with different suffixes, -*kā* (as in μανκα ‘memorial’, where the root must be the well-known IE **men-*) and -*yā*. (Might ερο- be connected with Greek ἔρος/ἔρω, ἔραμαι?) If the word written ειροια was in fact scanned in the same way as εροκα, i.e. *eroyā*, another glyconic + pherecratean emerge in 7: *akke oi eroyā Tie | titt[etikmenoi eitt]nū*.

construction then proceeds with a masculine singular participle as if *αυτος* alone were the subject.²⁰ In *autos ke wā k' erokā gegaritmenos* we have once again the same metre as in the protasis: iambic tetrasyllable + glyconic, with word division at the join.

The residual words *ασβατ αντεντους* or *αβατ αντεντους*²¹ might be taken to form a pentasyllabic pendant, something like *τιδρεγγουν ειτου* above, though scanning differently. But here we must face the fact that there is much in these texts that resists metrical analysis. What we have identified as faultless verses in some inscriptions appear in others in unmetrical variants or with unmetrical additions. This does not mean that the whole exercise is in vain. The explanation is no doubt that those who carved individual inscriptions, or formulated their wording, were not themselves consciously attempting metrical composition, but operating with traditional phrases that had originally formed parts of metrical curses. Similarly in lower-class Greek epitaphs we often find metrical formulae and clichés derived from real funerary verse but not successfully put together to make a properly metrical text.²²

This is not the ideal situation. Nevertheless, we have found enough in the Phrygian inscriptions to justify the claim that they contain clear fragments of metrical composition. We have found, not a random collection of phrases in single texts, to be judged rhythmical *ad arbitrium*, but consistent patterns in the most frequent formulae, elements of a coherent system displaying remarkable correspondences with some of the commonest and most basic forms of archaic Greek and Vedic metre.

²⁰ Striking parallels are provided by Aristophanes, *Frogs* 587 f., *πρόρριζος αὐτός, ἡ γυνή, τὰ παιδιά | κάκιστ' ἀπολοίμην*, and 1407–9, *εἰς τὸν σταθμὸν | αὐτός, τὰ παιδί, ἡ γυνή, Κηφισιφῶν | ἐμβάς καθήσθω*; other Greek examples in Kühner–Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache (Satzlehre)*, I 80 f.; Schwyzler–Debrunner, *Griechische Grammatik* II 605, 611.

²¹ Even the division into words is speculative, let alone the sense. I surmise that *ασβατ* is the indispensable verb, and *αντεντους* an *o*-stem noun in the accusative plural (*-ūs* < **-uns* < **-ons*). *ασβατ* might be analysed as the preverb *as* + 3 sg. aorist injunctive (in imperative sense) from athematic *ba-*; *bat* would correspond formally to Greek *φῆ* < **bhāt*.

²² I do not rule out the possibility that familiarity with the Greek hexameter may now and then have led to the remodelling of a Phrygian verse in an approximation to this form, as in Lubotsky's *ιος νι σεμουν κνουμανει κακουν αδδακετ αν' ατεαμας*, or in 100 *ιος σεμιν κνουμανε μουρου[ν (αδ)δακετ αι]νι κακουν κιν*.

The question then arises, does this Phrygian metrical system represent Indo-European inheritance, or a borrowing of Greek practice? The Romans, after all, adopted Greek metres and abandoned their own traditional ones.

In the case of adoption from Greek, we should have to put the borrowing back some centuries before the date of the inscriptions, as glyconics and pherecrateans had long gone out of general use. They were used now and then by poets of the last few centuries BC,²³ but they are more typical of the archaic and classical periods, from the seventh to the fifth century. Cultural contacts in the eighth and seventh centuries would provide a possible setting in which Phrygians might have adopted Greek principles of versification, as they did a Greek alphabet.

However, it would be a thing worthy of remark if, out of all the metres used by Greek poets at that time, they happened to pick out especially those verse-forms which show the clearest relationship to the Vedic, and which thus appear most directly to continue Indo-European metrical tradition. There is moreover a technical feature that points towards the alternative hypothesis. The first two positions in the G and G_Λ verses were originally of indeterminate quantity, and might be filled by two short syllables as readily as by two longs. In Greek usage they became more regulated. A preference developed for having at least one of these positions long. The double-short option is still admitted occasionally by the Lesbian poets, Sappho and Alcaeus, but it is uncommon in them, and later poets avoid it almost entirely.²⁴ In the Rīgveda, on the other hand, it is perfectly common.²⁵ In the 4 | G and 4 | G_Λ verse-forms it is actually preferred. Now, in at least two of the three Phrygian verses of this longer type that we have found, those positions are both short: αὐτὸς κε wā κ' | ἐροῦν γεγαυτεμένος, and γεγεμενῶν | ἐγχεδου Τιος οὐτῶν. It may have been so also in the third: ιὸς νι σεμουν | κνονυμανει κακουν αἰδακετ. This looks like a survival of archaic Indo-European verse technique, preserved independently of Greek tradition.

The same might be suggested in regard to the four-syllable element ιὸς νι σεμουν, which, if the particle νι has a short vowel (as it

²³ See my Greek Metre, 141 f., 152 (with n. 38).

²⁴ See Greek Metre, 30, 57, 61.

²⁵ For example, 6.45.4c *sá hi nah̥ prámatir mahī*, 5b *avitā duváyor asi*, 6a *náyasíd u áti dvíṣaḥ*, all scanning ○ ○ – ○ ○ – ○ ○ ×.

is reasonable to assume),²⁶ scans – ◡ ◡ –. In this little colon too the quantities were originally free. In time, as indicated above, a preference developed for long syllables in the second and fourth positions and for a short in the third, so that an iambic profile became typical, as in αὐτος κε wā and γεγρεμενāv. But in the Rīgveda we can still find many examples of other patterns, including – ◡ ◡ –, as in 1.51.12c and 89.3c,

Indra yáthā sūtásomeṣu cākáno – ◡ ◡ – | ◡ ◡ – – ◡ ◡ –
Aryamānam Váruṇam Sómam Áśvínā – ◡ ◡ – | ◡ ◡ – – ◡ ◡ –

Except for the long eighth syllable, these lines scan identically to ιος νι σεμουν κνουμανει κακουν αδδακετ (if νι and κνου- are short).

On balance, then, there is a case for the thesis that the Phrygians in their south Balkan homelands in the Bronze Age, and subsequently in Anatolia, continued with great fidelity to preserve certain simple, archaic verse-forms which dated back at least to late Indo-European times. The content of the surviving verses can hardly be so old.²⁷ They do, however, contain one phrase, δεως κε ξεμελως κε, or asyndetically δεως ξεμελως, that to the Indo-Europeanist speaks of the highest antiquity. Like the etymologically parallel Gaulish *dvandva tevo-χtonion*, it continues the Indo-European opposition of gods and mortals as ‘celestials’ (**deiwós*) and ‘terrestrials’ (**dʰǵʰómīōs*).²⁸ It need not have been an exclusively poetic phrase, but it is a formal phrase, and would have been at home in poetry at any period.

²⁶ It is never written νει. It recalls the Greek particle -νύ, Thessalian -νε, -νι, attached to demonstrative pronouns (Schwyzer, Griech. Gramm. I 612). F. Solmsen, ZVS n.F. 14 (1897), 66, was reminded of the Russian use of НИ in ЧТО НИ ‘whatever’, etc. Pamphylian νι may reflect Phrygian: A. Thumb – A. Scherer, Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte II (Heidelberg 1959), 193.

²⁷ The Indo-Europeans had no writing and therefore no tomb-inscriptions. Still, as they did have tombs and perhaps marked them with uninscribed stelai, it is not inconceivable that a curse on potential tomb-violators could have been intoned or sung at a funeral.

²⁸ W. Schulze, Kleine Schriften (Göttingen 1966), 146; M. Lejeune, Recueil des inscriptions gauloises II.1 (Paris 1988), 36; W. Meid, Gaulish Inscriptions (Budapest 1994), 21 f.; K. T. Witzak, Studia Indogermanica Lodziensia 4 (2002), 103–5; J. N. Adams, Bilingualism and the Latin Language (Cambridge 2003), 188 f. Diakonoff–Neroznak, Phrygian, 102 and 136, are wrong to deny the derivation of δεως from **deiuos*. The earlier form *devos* occurs in the Old Phrygian inscription P-03; the /w/ later disappeared before /o/ and the first syllable was shortened in hiatus. The development was parallel to that of Latin *deus* < *deiuos*. On ξεμελως cf. above, n. 11.