

## A NOTE ON THE SAMOTHRACIAN LANGUAGE

VERY little can be said about the texts found in Samothrace. Confronted with such a discovery, one is acutely aware of our ignorance concerning the ancient languages of the Balkan region.

One negative result, however, is apparent: these texts are certainly not Etruscan, nor are they in any way connected with that language. Etruscan, as is well known, had no voiced occlusives (*g, d, b*) nor had it voiced aspirates nor the sound *o*. Both voiced occlusives and the vowel *o* are rather frequent in our inscriptions.<sup>1</sup> Even the Lemnian stele<sup>2</sup>—granted that it may be somehow related to Etruscan, though it is certainly not Etruscan *tout court*—has no voiced occlusives, although it has several *o*'s.<sup>3</sup>

In the new Samothracian inscriptions there are, as it seems, only three examples of aspirates<sup>4</sup> ( $\chi$  in the form of  $\Psi$  and  $\Psi$ ; one  $\odot$ ) but, after all, the material is not

<sup>1</sup> Samothrace was, in fact, never occupied by the Etruscans—or Tyrrhenians. See, Fredrich, *R.E., s.v.*, Samothrake, col. 2225: "Als Bewohner folgten auf die Karer, deren Sprache der Name der Insel angehört [? G. B.], Thraker vom Stamme der Saier, die auch am Festlande gegenüber sassen; nach ihnen wurde die Insel auch  $\Sigma\alpha\acute{o}\nu\eta\eta\sigma\sigma\omicron\varsigma$  oder  $\Sigma\alpha\omega\kappa\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  genannt und der höchste Berg  $\Sigma\acute{\alpha}\omicron\varsigma$ ,  $\Sigma\acute{\alpha}\omicron\nu$  oder  $\Sigma\acute{\alpha}\omega\kappa\eta$  (IG XII 8, p. 37; dort sind auch die andern mythischen Namen der Insel aufgezählt). . . . . Die Tyrsener nahmen Samothrake nicht; das beweisen auch Terrakotten samischer Art (*Ath. Mitt.* XXXIV, 23) und das Relief im Louvre." See, also, Kern, *R.E., s.v.* Kabeiros, col. 1401: "Tyrsener haben aber nie auf Samothrake gesessen, wohl aber Lemnos und Imbros um 700 erobert; vgl. Fredrich, IG XII 8, 36 f." Brandenstein expresses a different opinion, though with considerable hesitation (*R.E., s.v.* Tyrrhener, col. 1913: "für Samothrake gibt es nur einen Indizienbeweis" [for "Tyrrhenians" G. B.]). A sharp distinction should be made anyhow between Tyrrhenians and Pelasgians; they have nothing to do with each other.

<sup>2</sup> See, also, Brandenstein, *R.E.*, suppl. vol. VI, col. 178; Della Seta, "Iscrizioni tirreniche di Lemno," *Scritti in onore di Nogara*, Città del Vaticano, 1937, pp. 119 ff., with bibl. Della Seta also publishes four new inscriptions on vases of the VIIth and VIth centuries B.C.:  $\alpha\rho\lambda\iota\rho$  (or  $\alpha\rho\lambda\iota\rho$ ),  $\alpha\lambda\alpha\lambda$ ,  $-\pi\alpha\ \omicron\lambda\ \alpha\lambda\epsilon\ \pi\epsilon\rho\lambda\epsilon\rho\lambda\omicron\chi$ :  $\text{Ho, } \nu\alpha\rho\theta\alpha\mu\epsilon\lambda\alpha-$ . The alphabet has no relation whatsoever to the Etruscan alphabet (p. 132). Phonetically, the new inscriptions agree with the Lemnian stele in ignoring all three voiced occlusives ( $\gamma, \delta, \beta$ ), but having  $\omicron$ , which Etruscan lacks (p. 133). On the stele see, also, now Brandenstein, *R.E., s.v.* Tyrrhener, cols. 1919 ff. and Kretschmer, *Glotta*, XXIX, 1942, pp. 89 ff.; XXX, 1943, pp. 216 ff. Brandenstein believes the four new Lemnian texts to be Thracian, not "Tyrrhenian" (col. 1918) because of their date, which he takes to be IXth-VIIIth centuries B.C. For historical sources concerning the Tyrrhenians at Lemnos, see, *ibid.*, col. 1912.

<sup>3</sup> See the text in Friedrich, *Kleinasiatische Sprachdenkmäler*, Berlin, 1932, p. 144. Lemnian has nothing to do with Thracian according to Kretschmer, Della Seta (*op. cit.*, p. 139), and Brandenstein, *op. cit.*, col. 1922. Della Seta also lists the differences between Thracian and Lemnian. For the bibliography of Lemnian up to 1948 see, also, D. C. Swanson, "A Select Bibliography of the Anatolian Languages," *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, New York, 1948, pp. 21 ff.

On the Thracian language see the bibliography here below in note 15.

<sup>4</sup> Since, in Thracian, the Indo-European aspirates *\*gh, \*dh, \*bh* lose their aspiration and fuse with Indo-European *\*g, \*d, \*b* (Jokl, *Reallex. der Vorg.*, s.v. Thraker, col. 289), we should



extensive. Even these examples are *not* certain. Otherwise, we find all Greek sounds with exception of ζ, the absence of which may be merely accidental, and including Ϝ (w). The Η of the stele and of No. 33 is probably long ē, not *h*. Diphthongs (αι, ει, ευ; perhaps ηι, No. 33) are certainly present; they are a well-known feature of Indo-European languages.

One characteristic that strikes me as important is the high frequency of vowels in proportion to consonants. In the first nine fragmentary lines of the stele—the last three may be Greek, as Professor Lehmann says<sup>5</sup>—I count nineteen consonants and twenty-six vowels, including Η=η.<sup>6</sup> The respective percentages in Sanscrit, Greek, Latin, and Gothic follow according to Hirt:<sup>7</sup>

	Sanscrit	Greek	Latin	Gothic
Consonants:	58	54	56	59
Vowels:	42	46	44	41

In the modern Germanic languages, the percentage of consonants is certainly even higher than it was in Gothic.<sup>8</sup> Professor Lehmann has already observed<sup>9</sup> that all the endings of the lines on the stele are vowels,<sup>10</sup> a phenomenon rather rare in the world (compare Italian, Old Church-Slavic, Old Rumanian, Japanese). But, of course, this may be purely accidental in the present instance.

theoretically find no aspirates in Thracian (cf., in fact, the ὄρνιτο for ὄρνιθι in the words of the Thracian, Aristophanes, *Birds*, 1679). But the voiceless stops of Indo-European (\**k*, \**t*, \**p*) are sometimes transcribed with aspirates (cf. Jokl, *ibid.*). This seems to correspond to a special articulation of these two series of sounds which is preserved in modern Albanian (Jokl, col. 290).

<sup>5</sup> Above, p. 100.

<sup>6</sup> The proportion varies in favor of the consonants, if we include all the other inscriptions and the two remaining words of the stele. We find there 79 consonants and 71 vowels; the total for Samothrace remains, however, 98 consonants and 97 vowels—a very high percentage of vowels in any case. I should add that the restoration of an ο in δειτ. λε is quite certain.

<sup>7</sup> *Indogermanische Grammatik*, I, Heidelberg, 1921, p. 253, with bibl. I also take from Hirt's book the percentages of each vowel for Greek (see note 14 below).

<sup>8</sup> According to G. Dewey, *Relativ (sic) frequency of English sounds*, Cambridge, Mass. and London, 1923, p. 125 ("A classified quantitative analysis of the commoner words and syllables of every sound of 100,000 words of representative English") the relative frequency for English sounds is (in percentages): consonants 62.10, diphthongs 2.58, vowels 35.32; therefore vowels + diphthongs 37.90. Since, however, every diphthong contains *two* vowels (according to the general opinion), the percentage of the vowels should be higher: making the necessary proportional changes, I reach: consonants 60.5, vowels 39.5 (in the *spelling* the percentages are different, because of the many silent vowels as in *shake*, *mouse*, etc., and of the double writings such as *dead*, *deed*, *food*: consonants 58.1, vowels 41.9).

<sup>9</sup> Above, p. 100.

<sup>10</sup> It is very interesting to observe that, according to most and the best manuscripts, the Thracian (Triballian) who is massacring Greek in Aristophanes, *Birds*, always ends his words in a vowel; here are the words with the verses:

1615 νά βαισατρῆ (or: ναβαισατρῆ? βαβοὶ σατρῆ? βαβακατρῆ? βαβαὶ σατρῆ? μαβαισατρῆ?)

This high vocalic percentage appears again in the only known Thracian inscription, on the ring of Ezerovo which is contemporary, being of the Vth century; we find there 31 vowels and 30 consonants within a total of 61 letters; i. e., more than half are vowels. The frequency of individual vowels on the ring from Ezerovo is as follows:  $\epsilon$  (10),  $\eta$  (3),  $\alpha$  (10),  $\iota$  (5),  $\omicron$  (2),  $\upsilon$  (1). It is interesting to compare the vocalism of our language with that of other languages of the area, using the statistics of Della Seta.<sup>11</sup> The total figures for all the Samothracian inscriptions (reading  $\text{H}$  as  $\eta$ , not  $h$ ) with the exception of the stele are:<sup>12</sup>

$\alpha$	$\epsilon$	$\iota$	$\omicron$	$\upsilon$	$\eta$	$\omega$
9(7)	24(21)	26(24)	7	2(1)	1	1

For the stele, the figures are:

$\alpha$	$\epsilon$	$\iota$	$\omicron$	$\upsilon$	$\eta$	$\omega$
7	9	2	9	1	2	—

I keep the stele apart from the other inscriptions for, in the latter, the repetition of the same formula or formulas may give a distorted picture of the vocalic system. In fact, the surprising frequency of  $\iota$  is not found on the stele and may, in the other texts, result from such repetition. Listing the letters in order of frequency, we obtain in these inscriptions the following order:  $\epsilon$ ,  $\iota$ ,  $\alpha$ ,  $\omicron$ ,  $\upsilon$ ,  $\eta$ ,  $\omega$ , and in the stele  $\epsilon$ ,  $\omicron$  (both in equal number),  $\alpha$ ,  $\iota$ ,  $\eta$  (?),  $\upsilon$  ( $\omega$  is not represented). The total for all the Samothracian inscriptions is:

$\alpha$	$\epsilon$	$\iota$	$\omicron$	$\upsilon$	$\eta$	$\omega$
16(14)	33(30)	28(26)	16	3(2)	3	1

or, including  $\eta$  under  $\epsilon$  and  $\omega$  under  $\omicron$ :

$\alpha$  16(14),  $\epsilon$  36(33),  $\iota$  28(26),  $\omicron$  17,  $\upsilon$  3(2).

The order in frequency of use is  $\epsilon$ ,  $\iota$ ,  $\omicron$ ,  $\alpha$ ,  $\upsilon$ .

Della Seta lists the frequency of occurrence in other "Aegean" languages as follows:

1628 f.  $\sigma\alpha\upsilon \nu\acute{\alpha}\kappa\alpha \beta\alpha\kappa\tau\hat{\alpha}\rho\iota \kappa\rho\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha$  (=  $\sigma\omicron\upsilon \nu\acute{\alpha}\kappa\eta\nu \beta\alpha\kappa\tau\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\iota \kappa\rho\omicron\upsilon\sigma\omega$ )

1678 f.  $\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\nu\iota \kappa\acute{\omicron}\rho\alpha\nu\nu\alpha \kappa\alpha\iota \mu\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha \beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\iota\nu\alpha\upsilon \delta\rho\nu\iota\tau\omicron \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\mu\iota$  (=  $\kappa\alpha\lambda\eta\nu \kappa\acute{\omicron}\rho\alpha\nu \kappa\alpha\iota \mu\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\nu \beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu \delta\rho\nu\iota\theta\iota \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\mu\iota$ ).

See, especially, the edition of Fr. H. M. Blaydes (Halis Saxonum, 1882) with the variants and the commentary at the end, and the Belles Lettres edition, by V. Coulon and H. Van Daele (Paris, 1940). Cf., on the other hand, the "broken Greek" of other, non-Thracian peoples (Scythian, Persian), *Acharnians*, 100 ff., *Thesmoph.* 1001, 1005, 1082 ff., 1176, which admits final consonants. See also J. Whatmough, *Cl. Phil.*, XLVII, 1952, p. 26.—Notice the frequency of  $\alpha$  in these passages.

<sup>11</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 139.

<sup>12</sup> The numbers in parenthesis are the readings that are absolutely certain.

Lemnian:	α	ι	ο	ε	υ
Phrygian:	α	ε	ο	ι	υ
Carian:	ε	α	ο	υ	ι
Lycian:	ε	ι	α	υ	(ο)
Lydian:	α	ι	ε	υ	ο
Thracian (Ezerovo):	ε	α	ι	ο	υ <sup>13</sup>
Eteocretan:	α	ε	ι	ο	υ
Greek:	ε	ο	α	ι	υ <sup>14</sup>

with which we compare:

Stele:	ε	ο	α	ι	υ
All the other					
inscriptions:	ε	ι	α	ο	υ
General average:	ε	ι	ο	α	υ <sup>15</sup>

Two characteristics are common to the stele, the other Samothracian inscriptions and the ring from Ezerovo: ε is the most frequent and υ is the least frequent of all vowels. ο occupies the same (third) place in the average of all the Samothracian texts, a position not very far from that (second) in the inscription on the ring. While there is a strong divergence in the frequency of ι between the two classes of Samothracian documents (fourth place on the stele, second place in the other texts), ι occupies an intermediary place (the third) in the inscription from Ezerovo.

<sup>13</sup> I believe the reader will like to have the text here in transcription (from Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 148): ρολιστενεασν—ερενεατιλ—τεανησκοα—ραξεδαομ—εαντιλεζυ—πταμηραζ—ηλτα. It is written in an Ionian alphabet of the Vth century B.C. It may have two hexameters. There is no division of words.

<sup>14</sup> The numerical percentages for Greek are: ε 32 (ε 19 and η 13), ο 19 (ο 13 and ω 6), α 17, ι 7, υ 6; for Sanscrit (where ā has absorbed Indo-Eur. \*ē and \*ō) a 19.78, ā 8.19, ī 4.85, ṛ 1.19, u 2.61, ū 0.73. Cf. W. D. Whitney, *Sanscrit Grammar*, 3d ed., Leipzig and Boston, 1896, p. 26; *Idem.*, *Journal Am. Or. Soc.*, X, p. 150; Förstemann, *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*, I, 1852, pp. 163 ff., II, 1853, pp. 35 ff. and Whitney, *op. cit.*, also give data for the consonants, which I have not counted. For the Romance languages see S. Pușcariu, *Die rum. Spr.*, Leipzig, 1943, pp. 89-92; for Spanish in particular, T. Navarro Tomás, *Manual de pronunc. esp.*, 4th edit., Madrid, 1932, pp. 74 f., 114 f.

<sup>15</sup> This rather high percentage of ο in comparison to α, and the word κόςης, κόας (see, below, p. 109; η becomes α in many Thracian dialects), seem to indicate that the Samothracian dialect did not change Indo-Eur. \*ō to \*ā. Some Thracian dialects preserved ō, some changed it to ā. See N. Jokl, *Reallex. der Vorg.*, s.v. Thraker, p. 285, 1; Brandenstein, s.v. Thraker, Sprache, col. 410. Probably the \*ō > ā wave, which engulfed Iranian, Slavic, Baltic, Germanic and, partly, Celtic, reached only the northern Thracian and Illyrian area. It did not reach the southernmost languages, Greek, Phrygian, Latin, and Italic at all. Note that κόας, κόςης appears in southern Bulgaria and, it seems, in Samothrace, that is, in the southern section of the Thracian area. On Thracian personal names see also G. Matescu, *Ephemeris dacoromana*, 1, 1923, pp. 57 ff. I was unfortunately unable to see D. Detschew, *Charakteristik der thrakischen Sprache*, Sofia, 1952.

Diphthongs and groups of vowels are frequent both in Thracian and in Samothracian, as one would, indeed, expect in a language having such a very high percentage of vowels. We have in the inscription from Ezerovo:

εα (5), οα (1), ιηε (1)

and in Samothrace:

ευ, αε, αιε (twice), ααια (?), νε, αση, εηο, ιε, ει, ιο, νο.

In general, the vocalic structure of Samothracian is similar—though I should hesitate to call it a striking similarity—to that of the Thracian inscription on the ring from Ezerovo.

As to consonants, the inscription on the ring has the clusters σκ, σν, στ, λτ, ντπ; Samothracian has χβν (or ξβν?), ντ (in *διντολε* several times but, also, in one instance, on the stele), λδ (No. 24; 7?), ρκ, τλ, σφ, λχ, λν, βλ (stele), τρ (stele), ψ (?stele, possibly a χ?). The clusters βλ and βν are particularly remarkable. All in all, consonantic clusters are certainly not uncommon in either language—nor, of course, in Indo-European, in general. The μμ in No. 35 is dubious.

A word that looks rather familiar to every Indo-European scholar is the *βεκα* (so separated from the preceding word by a dot) of line 7 of the stele, as Professor Lehmann observed independently of me. It looks very much like the *βέκος* attested by Herodotos, II, 2 to be Phrygian and having the meaning “bread” and, possibly, etymologically related to English “bake.”<sup>16</sup> It also appears in a verse by Hipponax (fr. 80 Bergk; fr. 75 Diehl):

Κυπρίων βέκος φαγοῦσι κ' Ἀμαθουσίων πυρόν

which also proves the word to be Cypriote—and Cyprus is not very far from Phrygia. The word occurs twice in Neo-Phrygian inscriptions<sup>17</sup> for which I give the translations offered by O. Haas.<sup>18</sup>

(33, part): ακκε οι βεκος ακκαλος, τιδρεγρουν ειτου

“Brot und Wasser sollen ihm ungenieszbar worden”

(the Inscr. Friedrich 76 is identical in this passage).

(86, part): οι βεκος μεβερετ αττιη κ' επιττετικμενος ειτου

“*ei panem ne ferat sit* [?G.B.] *stigmatiasque itato*”

(Instead of *sit* which makes no sense, I should prefer, with Pisani, to write *hinc*).

<sup>16</sup> For the etymology of *βέκος*, see Bonfante, *Armenian Quarterly*, I, 1946, pp. 88 f., with bibl.; Marstrander, *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap*, II, 1929, p. 299 (who proposes a different Indo-European etymology: Arm. *bekanem* “I break,” etc.).

<sup>17</sup> Friedrich, *Kleinasiatische Sprachdenkmäler*, Nos. 33 and 86.

<sup>18</sup> *Wiener Zeitschrift zur Kunde des Morgenlandes*, XLV, 1938, pp. 128 f.

W. M. Calder in *M.A.M.A.*, I, 1928, p. 212, reads βα[κ]ιοι βεκος μεβερε[ν] (“or με βερε[ν]”) and translates “may he eat [βακιοι, cf. Gr. ἔφαγον?] the bread (? of slavery),” but with no explanation whatsoever.

Curses aiming at the prevention of eating and drinking are found in several languages.<sup>19</sup> One must admit that Haas's interpretation is little more than guesswork. But the meaning of βέκος as bread seems to be documented. I think, in agreement with Professor Lehmann,<sup>20</sup> that the character of the stele and the probably poetical form of the text indicate rather a religious hymn than a curse. The latter are written on tombs and on less conspicuous material.<sup>21</sup> In this instance, for example, we might consider an invocation to the gods to grant “bread”—something like the Christian “*panem nostrum quotidianum da nobis hodie*.” Certainly βεκα, whether a feminine singular, a neuter plural, or a collective plural (cf. Lat. *locī: loca*), can well be morphologically related to Phrygian βέκος. If accepted as such, it offers a link between Samothracian and Phrygian. Another connection with Phrygian will be mentioned later.

I do not dare to attempt any interpretation of these poor remnants. One may consider the possibility that such forms as -εβνευσαντο (No. 1), -δεντο (? No. 3), διντο- (No. 2), -πιτο- (No. 26), -δασητο (No. 40), -εβλοσητο (*ibid.*), -ντο (No. 40) may be verbal forms of the type of Greek ἐγένεο, ἐγένετο, ἐξεύξαντο. βεκα, -ολειτρα, -υελα, -ντολα (2) could possibly be nominative feminine in *ā*. The -τρα of -ολειτρα could be the frequent Indo-European instrumental suffix *-trā*. -αρκαιε (No. 30), -εκαιε (No. 31) and -καε (No. 1) look as if they were related forms. As for εποτεχ (No. 1) on a drinking vessel,—if we isolate that as a word, which is only a guess—one might think of Lat. *pōtus*, Greek ποτήριον etc.<sup>22</sup>

Besides these new inscriptions and the gloss παυρακίς: πέμπτη,<sup>23</sup> we know of the “Samothracian” language the names of four gods which, according to the Schol. Apoll. Rhod. I, 917, are, Ἀξίερος (= Δημήτηρ), Ἀξιοκέρσα (= Περσεφόνη), Ἀξιόκερσος (= Ἀιδης), to which προστιθέμενος τέταρτος Κασμίλος ὁ Ἑρμῆς ἐστίν ὡς ἰστορεῖ Διο-

<sup>19</sup> See, for example, C. D. Buck, *A Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian*, 2nd ed., Boston, 1928, p. 244; Buecheler, *Rheinisches Museum*, XXXIII, 1878, pp. 40 ff., and Ovid's *Ibis*. For these inscriptions see, also, Calder, *J.H.S.*, XLVI, 1926, pp. 22 f.; Ramsay, *Öst. Jahreshefte*, VIII, 1905, Beiblatt, col. 95.

<sup>20</sup> Above, p. 100.

<sup>21</sup> See, for example, Audollent, *Defixionum Tabellae*, Paris, 1904.

<sup>22</sup> The ceramic inscriptions show frequent repetition of the same word or formula, appearing sometimes as δεντ(ολε) sometimes as διντ(ολε); this obvious oscillation between *ē* and *ī* before nasals appears perhaps in Thracian (Tomaschek, *Sitzungsber. Wiener Akad.*, 128, 1893, p. 44), certainly in Phrygian, Armenian and in several “Aeolic” dialects (*lato sensu*) that were once in close contact with those peoples in Thessaly and Macedonia (s. Bonfante, *Armenian Quarterly*, I, 1946, p. 94, n. 17). Cf., above, p. 96.

<sup>23</sup> See above, p. 93 and note 3.

νυσόδωρος.<sup>24</sup> We have here an old group of three divine names beginning with 'Αξιο— which, of course, recalls the name of the river 'Αξιος; but after all these do not seem to be river-gods.<sup>25</sup> A Greek etymology was proposed for 'Αξιόκερσος and 'Αξίερος by E. Maass<sup>26</sup> and another by M. C. Waites.<sup>27</sup> But Kretschmer wisely observes: <sup>28</sup> “Ob mit mehr Recht, ist zweifelhaft; denn man darf bei den Kabiren nicht ihre fremde un griechische Herkunft vergessen, die es offen laesst, ob hier nicht un griechische Namen verliegen.”<sup>29</sup>

The name of the fourth god Κασμίλος or Καδμίλος<sup>30</sup> is certainly related to Κάδμος.<sup>31</sup> Kadmos, too, is closely connected with Samothrace.<sup>32</sup> But Kadmos is obviously an Illyrian hero. Furthermore, in Samothrace, the presence of such an Illyrian hero as Dardanos<sup>33</sup>—one might add Elektra, too—definitely points to an Illyrian element on the island.<sup>34, 35</sup>

<sup>24</sup> For Dionysodoros, see E. Schwartz, *R.E.*, vol. V, col. 1004, Nr. 15.

<sup>25</sup> The second part of the names 'Αξιό-κερσος, 'Αξιο-κέρσα may contain the root of Sanscrit *kárṣati*, Avest. *karšaiti*, “to furrow,” for which see, for example, Walde-Pokorny, *Vergleichendes Indogermanisches Wörterbuch*, I, p. 429: a not unfitting name for vegetation gods. Since Thracian is certainly a *satəm* language, the κ is quite in order. Prof. Lehmann rightly calls to my attention the name of the Thracian king Κερσο-βλέπτης (*R.E. s.v.*; Tomaschek, *Sitzungsber. Wiener Akad.*, 131, p. 47).

<sup>26</sup> *Archiv für Religionsw.*, XXIII, 1925, pp. 221 ff.

<sup>27</sup> *A.J.A.*, XXVII, 1923, pp. 25 f.

<sup>28</sup> *Glotta*, XVII, 1928-29, p. 244.

<sup>29</sup> See, also, *R.E., s.v.* Axieros and Kabeiros, col. 1402; Hemberg, *Die Kabiren*, pp. 88 ff.; Kretschmer, *Glotta*, XXX, 1943, p. 98.

<sup>30</sup> Καδμίλος is probably nothing but an (Indo-European!) diminutive of Κάδμος (note the *i*!); the two names are certainly identical—see Lycophron, 219 and Kretschmer, *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*, LV, 1927-28, p. 84; *Glotta*, XXX, 1943, p. 98.

<sup>31</sup> It, thus, seems possible that the mysterious ancient language of Samothrace mentioned by Diodoros as the language of the aborigines (above, p. 93) was Pelasgian, which I hold to be an Illyrian or “Proto-Illyrian” language. It would then be different from that of our inscriptions. (Cf., e. g., Kretschmer, *Glotta*, XXIV, 1935, p. 36, n. 3).

That Kadmos is an Illyrian hero one may conclude from an unbiased reading of the evidence available in Roscher (especially cols. 824 f., 849 ff., 888 f.) and *R.E.*, cols. 1466 ff.

<sup>32</sup> *R.E., s.v.*, Kadmos, cols. 1468 f.; Roscher, pp. 854 ff., 891.

<sup>33</sup> See, Roscher, *s.v.* Kadmos, col. 854; *R.E., s.v.* Dardanos, col. 2171.

<sup>34</sup> Herodotos tells us (II, 51) that: ὅστις δὲ τὰ Καβείρων ὄργια μεμύηται, τὰ Σαμοθρήκες ἐπιτελέουσι παραλαβόντες παρὰ Πελασγῶν, οὗτος ὡνὴρ οἶδε τὸ λέγω. τὴν γὰρ Σαμοθρήκην οἶκεον πρότερον Πελασγοί. . . . καὶ παρὰ τούτων Σαμοθρήκες τὰ ὄργια παραλαμβάνουσι. ὁρθὰ ὦν ἔχειν τὰ αἰδοῖα τὰγάλματα τοῦ Ἑρμέω Ἀθηναῖοι πρῶτοι Ἑλλήνων μαθόντες παρὰ Πελασγῶν ἐποιήσαντο. οἱ δὲ Πελασγοὶ ἱρόν τινα λόγον περὶ αὐτοῦ ἔλεξαν, τὰ ἐν τοῖσι ἐν Σαμοθρήκῃ μυστηρίοισι δεδῆλωται.

<sup>35</sup> See, also, Jokl, *op. cit.*, p. 283, 2: “Die ‘thrak.’ Insel Samothrake führt nach Strabo X, 472 ursprünglich den Namen Μελίτη, einen Namen, den wir auch in der Adria als Bezeichnung für eine dalmatische Insel und auf Kerkyra als Bergnamen wiederfinden, und den wir (s. *Albaner B.*, *Illyrier B.*) als illyr. kennen gelernt haben.” On the relationship between Thracian and Illyrian, see also, *ibid.*, p. 295. Μελίτη is also the ancient name of the island of Malta (see, *R.E., s.v.*) where, however, I cannot find other Illyrian traces. Σάμος is also Illyrian according to Brandenstein, *R.E.*, suppl.,

The Κάβειροι also seem to be Samothracian deities.<sup>36</sup>

Another conceivably Samothracian name appears in a prayer quoted by St. Hippolytus<sup>37</sup> which seems to come from Anatolia:<sup>38</sup> σὲ καλοῦσι . . . . . Σαμοθράκες Ἄδαμ[να] σεβάσμιον (Ἄδαμνα for Ἀδάμ is a restoration of Bergk). This we may connect with a Phrygian gloss of Hesychios, *s.v.* Ἀδαμνέιν: τὸ φιλεῖν. καὶ Φρύγες τὸν φίλον Ἀδάμνα λέγουσιν. It may be a taboo-name.<sup>39</sup> The Phrygian origin of the Kabeiric cult asserted by Stesimbrotos of Thasos and recently defended by O. Kern<sup>40</sup> cannot, therefore, be rejected *a priori*.<sup>41</sup> The connection of the Phrygian Κορύβαντες with Samothrace should be recalled, too.<sup>42</sup> A Thracian origin of the Samothracian (!) language and cult is not incompatible with these observations. We know that Thracians and Phrygians were closely related peoples.

We might add the priestly title κοίης or κόης (Hesychios, *s.v.* Κοίης: οἱ δὲ κόης: ἱερεὺς Καβείρων ὁ καθαίρων φονέα) as also possibly Samothracian. Pettazzoni has com-

vol. VI, col. 176 (and Σάμινθος too). Cf., also, Kretschmer, *Glotta*, XIV, 1925, p. 105; Pettazzoni, *La confessione dei peccati*, 2, 3, p. 208 (with the texts).

<sup>36</sup> Κάβειρος can hardly be Greek, as Wackernagel admits, because the *k* of Sanscrit *Kubera* indicates a labiovelar for which we would expect *π* in Greek; the *β* = Scr. *b* would also be rather strange (Greek *β* usually derives from a labiovelar *\*g<sup>w</sup>*). Moreover, nobody will assert that the Κάβειροι are Greek divinities. Wackernagel admits that the word might belong to another Indo-European language—Phrygian or Thracian.

Bibliography on the name Kabeiros: Kern, *R.E.*, *s.v.*, col. 1400; Wackernagel, *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*, XLI, 1907, pp. 317 f.; Kretschmer, *Glotta*, VII, 1916, p. 353; Washburn-Hopkins, *Actes du 16<sup>e</sup> Congrès internat. des orientalistes*, 1912, pp. 53 ff., *Journal Am. Or. Soc.*, XXXIII, 1913-14, pp. 155 ff. More bibliography will also be found in Pettazzoni, *op. cit.*, 2, 3, index p. 258; B. Hemberg, *op. cit.*, pp. 318 ff. Most etymologies are pure fancy. See, also, Kretschmer, *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*, LV, 1927-28, pp. 82 ff., who believes the Kabeiros to have originally been "Aegean-Anatolian," not Indo-European (see, especially, pp. 88 ff.): they were assimilated and transported to the East by the Indians who are mentioned in the cuneiform Hittite inscriptions. They are mentioned there as foreign gods under the name *Habiri*, according to Brandenstein, *R.E.*, suppl. vol. VI, col. 178. See now also Kretschmer, *Glotta*, XXX, 1943, p. 116.

<sup>37</sup> *Refut. omn. haer.*, 5, 7, p. 99, 17 Wendland. See, H. Hepding, *Attis, seine Mythen und sein Kult*, Giessen, 1903, p. 34, 14.

<sup>38</sup> See, *R.E.*, *s.v.* Kabeiros, col. 1402.

<sup>39</sup> Vollgraff, *Mnemosyne*, N.S., XLIX, 1921, pp. 286 ff. ("De voce Thracia *αδαπταις*") connects with this the Thracian word *αδαπτα* (plur. dat. *αδαπταις*) which appears in an epigram of Dioscurides in the IIIrd century after Christ (*Anthol. Pal.*, VII, 485). It must mean something like *ἀγάπη* (in its two senses).

<sup>40</sup> *R.E.*, *s.v.*, cols. 1401 f.

<sup>41</sup> See Strabo, X, p. 472; also, Schol. Apoll. Rhod., I, 917 (Müller, *F.H.G.*, IV, 345) says that the Κάβειροι *ἐντεῦθεν* (that is from Phrygia) *μετενέχθησαν*. See, also, C. Fredrich, *Ath. Mitt.*, XXXI, 1906, p. 82, and P. Kretschmer, *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*, LV, 1927-28, p. 83.

<sup>42</sup> The Κορύβαντες, however, have (as it seems) an Illyrian suffix, just like, for example, the Ἀβαντες and Πενκερίαντες. See P. Kretschmer, *Glotta*, XIV, 1925, p. 105, XXVIII, 1940, p. 274; XXX, 1943, pp. 103 ff.; XXXII, 1953, p. 192 and also *R.E.*, *s.v.* Korybantes.



pared it with the Lydian title *kaveś* which, in turn, has been related to Vedic *kavi-ś*: "seer," "poet," "*uates*," cf. Greek *θυο-σκόος*, German *schauer*, etc. On a hydria found at Duvanlji in southern Bulgaria (!), one reads the word *koas* (*η* frequently becomes *ā*) over the figure of a priestess.<sup>43</sup> I see no reason to doubt that the word is both Thracian and Samothracian.<sup>44</sup>

In conclusion, the language of the new inscriptions and, in particular, of the stele may quite well be Indo-European, more specifically, Thracian—especially in its vocalism. The language is surely neither Greek nor Etruscan nor "Tyrrhenian"—whatever that means—unless we understand under the term Etruscan or "Tyrrhenian" something entirely different from the language documented in approximately ten thousand non-Latin inscriptions found in Etruria.

G. BONFANTE

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

<sup>43</sup> See, Ure, *J.H.S.*, LXXI, 1951, pp. 196 f., with bibliography.

<sup>44</sup> See, now, the important article by O. Masson, *Jahrbuch für kleinasiatische Forschung*, I, 1950-51, pp. 182 ff.; also, Pettazzoni, *op. cit.*, 2, 3, p. 259, index.