

## 32nd Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference,

Royce Hall, UCLA, Los Angeles, California, USA, November 2021.

### Remarks on the Neo-Phrygian Funerary Curse Apodosis

#### ΜΕ ΔΕΩΣ ΚΕ ΖΕΜΕΛΩΣ ΚΕ ΤΙΗ ΤΙΤΤΕΤΙΚΜΕΝΟΣ ΕΙΤΟΥ

*Milena Anfosso*

Lubotsky (1998:420), followed by Obrador-Cursach (2019:147–9; 2020:143; 2021:49), noticed a similarity between a passage from the Hieroglyphic Luwian inscription KARKAMIŠ A3, l. 4 (Hawkins 2000:108–12) and a phrase attested in more than forty Neo-Phrygian inscriptions (even with different spellings) from the 2nd and the 3rd centuries CE (see, e.g., Haas 1966 nos. 2, 3, 6, 7, 12, 14, 25, 26, 39, 44, 45, 50, 51, 53, 56, 57, 61, 62, 65, 67, 68, 70, 72, 73, 75, 77, 80, 85, 87, 92, 94, 97, 101, 102, 108, 112, 114, 120, 123, 127, 131):

Luw.	10th/ early 9th century BCE	<i>wa/i- sá-</i>	DEUS- <i>na-za</i>   CAPUT- <i>tá-za-ha</i>	*336- <i>na-na</i>	(DEUS)TONITRUS- <i>tá-ti-i</i>	(LOQUI) <i>ta- tara/i-ia-mi-sa</i>	<i>i-zi-ia-ru</i>
Phr.	2nd–3rd centuries CE	(τος)	δεως κε ζεμελωσ κε	με	τιε	τιτετικμενος	ειτου
Eng.		him	gods and men	among (με)/ in the sight of, before (*336- <i>na-na</i> )	by Tarhunzas/Ti-	accursed	be made

The parallel between the Luwian and the Neo-Phrygian curse apodosis has been commented on as an astonishing example of continuity despite the temporal distance separating the Luwians and the Phrygians (Lubotsky 1998:420). Obrador-Cursach (2020:143) defined the Neo-Phrygian formula as “a calque of a Luwian imprecative apodosis,” since both curses:

- Present the binomial expression “among/before/in the sight of gods and men;”
- Invoke, according to Lubotsky (1998:420) and Obrador-Cursach (2019:147–9; 2021:49), the same divinity: Tarhunzas and Ti-, comparable to Greek Zeus (Lubotsky 2004:230–1).

The goal of this paper is to evaluate the validity of these arguments.

- The formulaic binomial “among gods and men” derives directly from Indo-European (West 2007:124–5) and finds exact parallels in many other Indo-European languages (Greek, Vedic, Italic, Celtic, etc.). Given its universality in the Indo-European world, its usage in both Luwian and Phrygian should not be a surprise.

b) Concerning the invocation to Tarhunzas and Ti-, a more thorough analysis of the context is required. The Luwian inscription is a protective curse forbidding the removal of the artisans donated by Katuwas, ruler of Karkamiš, to the temple of Tarhunzas (Hawkins 2000:109, 111). The invocation to Tarhunzas is contingent, since it is *his* temple: if the building was dedicated to another divinity, Tarhunzas would not be invoked. Conversely, the presence of Ti- in a great amount of Neo-Phrygian funerary curse apodoses suggests that Ti- had a precise role in the funerary cursing process and he could not be substituted with another deity.

A few funerary inscriptions are attested in the Hieroglyphic Luwian Corpus (Hawkins 2000) and they are concentrated in the surroundings of the Syrian border (Tabal, Tuwana, Karkamiš), where the Semitic influence was strong. The deities invoked vary (unspecified gods in TILSEVET and KARKAMIŠ A18 h; “Queen of the Land” – probably Kubaba – in SHEIZAR; Santa and the *Marwainzi*-deities in KULULU 2). Thus, in the Luwian tradition, there was not a deity specifically connected to funerary curses as it was the case in the Phrygian tradition. There was, however, a Luwian divinity specifically connected to the act of cursing. Tiwat-, the Sun-god, with his all seeing eye, could easily curse any evildoers throughout his daily journey across the sky.

The involvement of Tiwat- in the act of cursing is so firmly rooted in Luwians’ perception that they derived a denominative verb from his theonym: *tiwatani-(ti)-*, ‘to swear by the Sun-god, to utter a curse’ (Watkins 1993:470; Melchert 1993:230; Rieken 2017:242–43; Sasseville 2020:278). In light of these observations, the role of Ti- in the Neo-Phrygian curses is more similar to Tiwat-’s one in the Luwian curses, rather than to Tarhunzas’ one. This can be inferred also from other Neo-Phrygian inscriptions where a divinity other than Ti- is mentioned, i.e. Bas (see, e.g., Haas 1966 nos. 86 and 99):

- 1) Ti- must generically curse the violators of the tombs;
- 2) Bas must not “bring bread” to them, i.e. he must make their fields infertile (following Hämmig 2019:294, subsequently accepted by Obrador-Cursach 2020, *contra* Obrador-Cursach 2019).

Among the Luwians, Tarhunzas is the god responsible for fertility, since he was in charge of the various manifestations of the weather: he decided whether there would be fertile fields and good harvests, or drought and famine. The function of Bas in the Phrygian pantheon, as inferable by the Neo-Phrygian funerary curses, is equivalent to Tarhunzas’ one in the Luwian pantheon. On the other hand, the function of Ti- in the Phrygian pantheon, as deductible by the Neo-Phrygian funerary curses, is connected with an omniscient knowledge that allows him to instantly detect and curse all tomb violators. From this perspective, his role is equivalent to Tiwat-’s one in the Luwian pantheon. In line with these observations, the correspondence Tarhunzas / Ti- highlighted by Lubotsky and Obrador-Cursach is no longer tenable.

In conclusion, the parallel between KARKAMIŠ A3, l. 4, and the Neo-Phrygian inscriptions is only formal and somehow dictated by chance: it does not imply the direct survival of a Luwian formula in Roman Phrygia.

**References:**

- Haas, Otto. 1966. *Die phrygischen Sprachdenkmäler*. Sofia: Académie bulgare des Sciences.
- Hämmig, Anna Elisabeth. 2019. Deciphering Phrygian: blind alleys and viable ways. In: Gocha R. Tsetskhladze (ed.), *Phrygia in Antiquity: From the Bronze Age to the Byzantine Period*. 287–304. Leuven: Peeters.
- Hawkins, J. D. 2000. *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions. Vol. 1. Inscriptions of the Iron Age*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Lubotsky, Alexander. 1998. New Phrygian Metrics and the δεως ζεμελωσ Formula. In: Jay Jasanoff, H. Craig Melchert, and Lisi Oliver (eds.), *Mír curad: Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins*. 413–21. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- . 2004. The Phrygian Zeus and the problem of the “Lautverschiebung.” *Historische Sprachforschung* 117:229–37.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 1993. *Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon*. Chapel Hill: self-published.
- Obrador-Cursach, Bartomeu. 2019. The Luwian Origin of the Phrygian Imprecations. In: Gocha R. Tsetskhladze (ed.), *Phrygia in Antiquity: From the Bronze Age to the Byzantine Period*. 145–60. Leuven: Peeters.
- . 2020. *The Phrygian Language*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2021. The closing formula of the Old Phrygian epitaph B-07 in the light of the Aramaic KAI 318: a case of textual convergence in Daskyleion. *Anatolian Studies* 2021:47–58.
- Rieken, Elisabeth. 2017. Schimpfen und Fluchen im Luwischen. Zur Etymologie von kluw. arrahḫani(ya)-. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 122:241–51.
- Sasseville, David. 2020. Luwian and Sanskrit action nouns in \*-i-eh₂-. *Indo-European Linguistics* 8:275–88.
- Watkins, Calvert. 1993. Some Anatolian Words and Forms. In: Gerhard Meiser (ed.), *Indogermanica et Italica., Festschrift für Helmut Rix zum 65. Geburtstag*. 469-478. Innsbruck: Die Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- West, Martin L. 2007. *Indo-European Poetry and Myth*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.