Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia
vol. 15 Kraków 2010

Robert WOODHOUSE (Brisbane)

REFINING PHRYGIAN DIACHRONIC PHONOLOGY: THE CASE OF PHRYGIAN (?) *γάλλος* 'PRIEST'

Sowa (2007: 157) casts doubt on the Diakonoff/Neroznak (1985: 109) derivation of alleged Phrygian *γάλλος* 'castrated priest of Attis and Cybele' from a PIE base *$*g_2^h\underset{\circ}{l}$-los*[1] 'cut short, shave', chiefly on the ground that the analysis of the word as an **l*-deverbative on this basis is "dubious".[2] Instead, Sowa tentatively suggests a connection with PIE **gelH-* 'gain power over', as reconstructed in LIV_2 (p. 185f.).[3] Since an appeal to the **l*-deverbative is the most obvious way of accounting for the medial geminate in both suggestions, which I shall refer to as [1] and [2], respectively, as well as being the most interesting from the point of view of my (2006) theory of Phrygian conditioned devoicing of mediae, my intention here is to assess the phonology of both suggestions in the light of that theory. Obviously for this purpose I am assuming the word is Phrygian.

An important initial difficulty with [1], which has also been highlighted by Sowa, is Diakonoff/Neroznak's unappetizing equation of the alleged Phrygian word with both Slav. *golъ* 'naked' and Balto-Slav. **galHwaH*[4] 'head'. Clearly the chief semantic focus of Diakonoff/Neroznak's comparison is the 'cutting short' and 'shaving' implied in the 'naked' word, which is usually reconstructed on the basis of Germanic **kalw-* and Armenian *kołr* as PIE *$*g_2$ol-*, and not the

---

1 I operate with a bitectal PIE containing prevelars *$*k_1$*, g_1, etc., which give rise to palatovelars and pure velars in satem languages and pure velars in centum languages, and backvelars *$*k_2$*, g_2, etc., which give rise to labiovelars and pure velars in centum languages and pure velars in satem languages (Woodhouse 1998, 2005); as a rule, reconstructions adopted from other authors are amended accordingly.

2 Haas (1966: 161) records similar misgivings over Olsen's (*IF* 38: 168) derivation from PIE *$*g^h\underset{\circ}{l}$no-* (with pure or indeterminate velar) which the latter finds also in ON *gelda* 'castrate'. Pokorny (1959: 434) reconstructs the same root with palatovelar initial, admitting that the connections are uncertain; if they are accepted, Olsen's protoform in my scheme would be *$*g_1^h\underset{\circ}{l}$-no-* and would yield Phryg. ***gel-* in the first syllable (see below).

3 Note that the root form "*$*gelH^0$-*" cited by Sowa (fn. 10) on the basis of LIV_2 is a misprint for *$*gelH$-^{0}*, the zero simply signalling a footnote.

4 Reconstruction based on Kortlandt's Slavic chronology §§5.2, 5.3 (e.g. 2007: 1).

'head' word, which is usually reconstructed with initial *g_2^h- on the basis of Armenian *glux* 'id.' (cf., e.g., Vasmer/Trubačev 1986-1987 s.vv. *gólyj*, *golová*). Thus the primary purpose behind the Diakonoff/Neroznak inclusion of the 'head' component in the etymology was clearly to satisfy these authors' belief in universal media devoicing in Phrygian, a belief evidently not shared by Sowa, nor of course by myself. Dispensing with the requirement to avoid a media initial is a first step towards putting the two suggestions [1] and [2] on a somewhat more equal footing.

My proposal to start with an **l*-deverbative in both cases is not without its problems. It will be recalled that I have suggested elsewhere (2006: 169-172) that in Phrygian consonantal **l* may be an actuator of devoicing, i.e. it may condition devoicing of a PIE media in the same word, particularly when it is within one intersyllabic node of the target consonant. Consideration of [1] and [2], both with media initials in their protoforms, may thus lead either to scrapping of **l* altogether as a conditioner of devoicing or to a refinement of the general conditions under which devoicing is predicted to occur. Scrapping **l* as a devoicer would clearly be the simplest procedure but also the least interesting. First, therefore, we shall endeavour to see what happens if we attempt to retain **l* as a devoicing actuator.

Clearly an elementary requirement is that in both suggestions the */l/ of the root must be vocalic, i.e. *$*\underset{\circ}{l}$*. Further, since previous research on the Hesychian item *γελαροϛ* (defined as *ἀδελφοῦ γυνή*) < *$*g_1\underset{\circ}{l}h_2$-(w)er-os* suggests that *$*g_1\underset{\circ}{l}$(H)-* > Phryg. *gel-* (Woodhouse 2006: 173), we must suppose the root initial in both suggestions is *g_2* and that the labiovelar that would have developed from this in early Phrygian did not yield ***b-* because it was delabialized beforehand by dissimilation against *$*\underset{\circ}{l}$*, much as **w* was lost by dissimilation against *$*\underset{\circ}{l}$* in *$*g_1\underset{\circ}{l}h_2$-wer-os*. Thus we might expect that at the time of media devoicing in Phrygian the by then delabialized initial **g-* in both proposed protoforms [1] *$*g\underset{\circ}{l}$los* and [2] *$*g\underset{\circ}{l}$Hlos* would undergo devoicing, unless we can refine the conditions in such a way as to avoid this.

For [1] the required refinement would clearly be that where a normally actuating consonantal resonant is separated from the target consonant by the corresponding vocalic resonant, the consonantal resonant loses its ability to initiate devoicing, perhaps because the contrast between the voicing strengths of the two consonants is diminished by the general phonetic similarity of the intervening resonant.

For [2] the most appropriate refinement would be to assume that the laryngeal is voiceless (which in the view of many, though not all, would, I believe, narrow the choice to between *h_1* and *h_2*) and that such a voiceless consonant intervening between the target consonant and the would-be actuating consonant destroys the effectiveness of the latter as an actuator, a proposal that agrees well

enough with all the other data known to me that have a bearing on the question (see below). There remains then the small problem of what happens to the expected vocalic reflex of the laryngeal after dissolution of the syllabic resonant. The only suggestion I can make is that in the phonologically weak position of being sandwiched between identical segments, in this case **l*, either the laryngeal itself or its vocalic reflex is subject to syncope.[5]

Reviewing my evidence for conditioned devoicing I find the above proviso concerning the inhibiting effect of an intervening voiceless consonant contributes as follows. First it agrees with my (2006: 173) provisional proposal to abandon the connection of *τετικμενος* with Greek *δείκνυμι* in favour of one with Greek *στίζω*, *στίγμα* or with Old Irish *tongid*. Secondly, it supplies an alternative, and perhaps more plausible, explanation for the initial consonant of *δεκμουταη/ις* (cf. 2006: 162f.). Thirdly, it eliminates the possibility that the devoicing of the initial of *κολταμαν* (< **g*$_1$*olth*$_2$*m̥n*) is due to the medial **m* and thus simplifies the argument promoting this word and *κολταη* as evidence for **l* as an actuator of devoicing (cf. 2006: 169-172).

In addition, if **h*$_2$ is indeed voiceless, the new proviso may have some potential to simplify the discussion of *γελαρος* < **g*$_1$*l̥h*$_2$*-wer-os* by reducing the significance of the proposed medial **w* (cf. 2005: 226; 2006: 173), though on maturer reflection it is likely that the **w* would have been eliminated before the change of **sw-* to voiceless **(s)ẘ-*, otherwise we might have to consider the possibility of **-h*$_2$*w-* yielding **h*$_3$ or its voiceless analogue in prehistoric Phrygian.

The **s* reconstructed in the protoform **dwis-d*^{h}*reg*^{h}*-ro-* > *τιδρεγρουν* is no bar to the devoicing of the initial (cf. 2006: 166f.) because, as made explicit in my discussion of Old Phryg. *lakedo* (in press b §3), the medial cluster **sd*^{h}*r* would have been simplified to **d*^{h}*r* at the same time as the initial cluster **dw* was simplified to **d*, i.e. prior to the devoicing.

As far as I can see the new proviso raises no problems for any of the other data adduced in support of my conditioned devoicing proposal. Even in the ultimately fictitious derivation proposed for *πεις* (pl. *πειες*) < **g*$_2$*eywis* the laryngeal **h*$_3$ has been indicated as lost well before the putative devoicing (Woodhouse 2007: 198);[6] and even if it were to be regarded as somehow remaining until after the devoicing, this laryngeal is in my view characteristically voiced[7] and the voicedness of the laryngeal would no more inhibit the devoicing of the adjacent

---

[5] For other examples of weakening between phonologically identical segments, see Woodhouse in press a §5.1.

[6] The loss was no doubt by dissimilation against **g*$_2$ or **w* or both in PIE **g*$_2$*h*$_3$*eywis* or (with laryngeal metathesis) **g*$_2$*eyh*$_3$*wis* – a point somewhat neglected in my original treatment (as also ibid., p. 197).

[7] The idea that characteristically voiced consonants were not a feature of PIE is scarcely tenable even for the precursor dialects of the Anatolian languages and Tocharian (see Melchert 1994: 13-21, 117-119, 253-256; Adams 1988: 38, §3.43 a, b).

initial consonant than the voicedness of *n* and *m* inhibits the devoicing of adjacent **g* > *κ* in *κναικαν* and *τετικμενος*, respectively,[8] the nasals representing on the contrary significant factors (50% and 100%, respectively) contributing to the devoicing.

We thus have plausible ways of avoiding devoicing of the initial consonant by the medial **l* in both scenarios [1] and [2], so that neither rules out **l* as an actuating consonant for media devoicing in Phrygian. The fact that [2] demonstrably takes its point of departure from a verb and also contributes significantly to the devoicing theory, while [1] does neither, means that until such time as future research either proves that *γάλλος* does not originate in Phrygian or comes down definitively on the side of [1], preference must obviously go to [2].

The new conditions for PIE media devoicing in Phrygian arising from our analysis of [2] can now be stated – taking a small plunge with respect to **l* – as follows:

(1) the target media is in the same word as and not more than one intersyllabic node distant from the nonfinal consonantal reflex of any of PIE **m*, **w*, **l*, $*b^h$, $*d^h$, provided that no voiceless consonant intervenes between the two consonants during the period of devoicing; or

(2) the target media is adjacent to consonantal **n* within the same word and in addition within one intersyllabic node of the reflex of a PIE tectal aspera (no doubt also provided no voiceless consonant intervenes, etc.); or

(3) the target media is adjacent to both word boundary and consonantal **n* in the same word.

The contrast proposed above between Phryg. *gel-* < $*g_{1\circ}lH$- and **gal-* < $*g_{2\circ}lH$- means that there is some tidying up to be done on the contents of stages 3-5 and 10 of my relative chronology of Phrygian sound changes as follows (some adjacent unchanged stages are reproduced in square brackets):

[1. $K_2 > K^o$]
[2. $uK^o > uK_1/(uK^o)$]
3. before *e*/*i*: $K_1 > c\ j\ j^h$
4. $K^o > K^w/K$, one mechanism for the delabialization being by dissimilation against *w*/$_\circ l$, thus $*g^o{}_\circ lHlos > *g_\circ lHlos$ *'one who has gained power'; also during the same period, dissimilative loss of **w* in $*g_{1\circ}lh_2weros > *g_{1\circ}lh_2eros$

[8] For discussion see Woodhouse (2006: 158-162); note that my agreement with the "tendency to weaken the voicing of *n* in the vicinity of certain stops" (p. 159) I now replace by asserting the universal tendency to weaken the voicing of nasals (or resonants in general) in the vicinity of voiceless stops and see this in the appropriate Phrygian cases as a consequence of the devoicing of the stop and not as a cause of it.

'brother's wife' (< 'husband's sister', perhaps with "spiteful" masc. suffix *-*wer*-, see Beekes 1976: 15f. with lit.)

5. $K_1 \underset{\circ}{l} > K\underset{\circ}{l}'$: $*g_1\underset{\circ}{l}h_2eros > *g\underset{\circ}{l}'h_2eros$
   and generally $K_1 > K$, thus merging with the reflexes of K_2 – at least before back vowels

[6. before *e*/*i*: $K > k' \acute{g} \acute{g}^h > k' \acute{g} j^h$
   otherwise $K > k\ g\ g^h$].

Then in stage 10 "$\underset{\circ}{l} > el$ …" is replaced by "$\underset{\circ}{l} > al$, $\underset{\circ}{l}' > el$".

It remains only to thank Professor Sowa for his stimulating suggestion.

Robert Woodhouse
School of Languages and Comparative Cultural Studies
University of Queensland
Brisbane QLD 4072, Australia
[r.woodhouse@uq.edu.au]
[jandrwoodhouse@bigpond.com]

References

Adams, Douglas Q., 1988, *Tocharian historical phonology and morphology*. New Haven, Connecticut: American Oriental Society.

Beekes, Robert Stephen Paul, 1976, Some Greek aRa-forms, *MSS* 34: 9-20.

Diakonoff, Igor M. and Neroznak, Vladimir P., 1985, *Phrygian*. Delmar, New York: Caravan Books.

Haas, Otto, 1966, *Die phrygischen Sprachdenkmäler* (Linguistique Balcanique 10). Sofia: Académie Bulgare des Sciences.

Kortlandt, Frederik, 2007, *On the relative chronology of Slavic accentual developments*, [www.kortlandt.nl].

LIV_2 = 2001, *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben: die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen*, unter Leitung von Helmut Rix, bearbeitet von Martin Kümmel, Thomas Zehnder, Reiner Lipp, Brigitte Schirmer, 2. erweiterte und verbesserte Aufl. bearbeitet von Martin Kümmel und Helmut Rix. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert.

Melchert, H. Craig, 1994, *Anatolian historical phonology*. Amsterdam / Atlanta, Georgia: Rodopi.

Pokorny, Julius, 1959, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 1. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Sowa, Wojciech, 2007, A note to "Phrygian" words in Greek, *SEC* 12: 153-170.

Vasmer/Trubačev = Fasmer, Maks and Trubačev, O. N., 1986-1987, *Ètimologičeskij slovaŕ russkogo jazyka*, 2nd ed., 4 vols. Moscow: Progress.
Woodhouse, Robert, 1998, On PIE. tectals, *IF* 103: 40-60.
———, 2005, Assibilative palatalization of tectals in Phrygian and the adequacy of bitectal frameworks for Proto-Indo-European, *IF* 110: 205-234.
———, 2006, Conditioned devoicing of mediae in Phrygian, *SEC* 11: 157-191.
———, 2007, New Phrygian *ζειρα(ι)*, *ζως*, *πεις* and *πειες*, *SEC* 12: 189-201.
———, in press a, The distribution of the reflexes of Proto-Slavic **ǫ* in the Freising Texts: an updated restatement, *HS*.
———, in press b, Devoicing of PIE mediae in Phrygian, *HS*.