

# The Phrygian god Bas

BARTOMEU OBRADOR-CURSACH, *University of Barcelona*\*

Among the gods identified in the Phrygian corpus, Bas stands out because of the lack of a Greek counterpart. Indeed, *Matar* equates, more or less, to Κυβέλη, *Ti-* to Ζεύς<sup>1</sup>, *Artimitos* (B-05)<sup>2</sup> to Ἄρτεμις,<sup>3</sup> Διουνσιν (88) to Διόνυσος, and Μας (48) to Μήν.<sup>4</sup> Yet Bas remains without a clear equivalent and seems to only appear in Phrygian texts. He occurs almost eight times in different contexts of both the Old Phrygian (OPhr.) and New Phrygian (NPhr.) corpora. This makes Bas

the third most referenced god after *Ti-* (the Phrygian Zeus, documented almost exclusively in NPhr. curses) and *Matar* (the Mother-Goddess, exclusively in OPhr. monuments). The high number of references allow for the analysis of his purpose and the identification of the origin of his name in the light of our increasing knowledge of Phrygian and the general Anatolian framework.

The oldest occurrence of this theonym is documented in the Luwian city of Tuwanuwa in Cappadocia (called Τύανα in Greek, and currently called Kemerhisar). The name of Bas can be read on a fragment of a severely damaged stele discovered in 1908 (T-02b). Although most of the monument is lost, its shape is believed to be parallelepiped with a semi-circular summit, similar to the Neo-Assyrian style.<sup>5</sup> C. Brixhe interpreted the significance of this document as a signal of Phrygian suzerainty of this country in the late eighth century BC.<sup>6</sup> In that case, the historical

\* This paper was funded by the research project Los dialectos lúvicos del grupo anatolio en su contexto lingüístico, geográfico e histórico (Ref. FFI2015-68467-C2-1-P) granted by the Spanish Ministry of Economy, Industry, and Competitiveness.

<sup>1</sup> A. Lubotsky, "The Phrygian Zeus and the problem of the 'Lautverschiebung,'" *Historische Sprachforschung* 117 (2004): 230–31.

<sup>2</sup> The enumeration and readings of the Old Phrygian inscriptions (transcribed in the Latin alphabet) are given according to C. Brixhe and M. Lejeune, *Corpus des Inscriptions Paléo-Phrygiennes I. Texte* (Paris, 1984) (abbreviated here as CIPPh) and its supplements. The enumeration and readings of New Phrygian inscriptions (in the Greek alphabet) are given according to the traditional enumeration developed from the works of W. M. Ramsay. In the case of recent findings, I use the system established by O. Ligorio and A. Lubotsky, "Фригийский язык," in *Языки мира, Реликтовые индоевропейские языки Передней и Центральной Азии*, ed. Ю. Б. Коряков and А. А. Кибрик (Moscow, 2013), 182.

<sup>3</sup> C. Brixhe, "Corpus des Inscriptions Paléo-phrygiennes. Supplément II," *Kadmos* 43 (2004): 55–56.

<sup>4</sup> A. Lubotsky, "New Phrygian Inscription No. 48, Palaeographic and Linguistic Comments," in *Frige e Frigio. Atti del 1° Simposio Internazionale. Roma, 16–17 ottobre 1995*, ed. R. Gusmani, M. Salvini, and P. Vannicelli (Roma, 1997), 122 n. 10.

<sup>5</sup> CIPPh, 253–68. Another very similar stele was found in modern times also in Tyana (T-03): see A. Çınaroğlu and E. Varinlioğlu "Eine neue altphrygische Inschrift aus Tyana," *Epigraphica Anatolica* 5 (1985): 5–11. Phrygian contacts with Tyana are also evident in the İvriz relief, where the king Warpalawas (known to be ally of Midas) is depicted wearing Phrygian ornaments (his belt, fibula and, very likely, his tunic). See C. Brian Rose, "Fieldwork at Phrygian Gordion, 2013–2015," *American Journal of Archaeology* 121 (2017): 159.

<sup>6</sup> C. Brixhe, "Les inscriptions paléo-phrygiennes de Tyane: leur intérêt linguistique et historique," in *La Cappadoce Méridionale*

background of the Phrygian presence in such a place must be Midas' campaigns for hegemony over the Syro-Hittite states, and against Sargon II as recorded by Assyrian sources.<sup>7</sup> Despite the opaqueness of this fragmented text, T-02b contains the highest number of words readable in all fragments from Tyana, and is the only known preserved and datable text contemporaneous to King Midas in which he is mentioned (l. 3). The fragment reads as follows:

[- - -]  
 [- - -] *ṭumida* : *memenis* : [- - -]  
 [- - -] *a* : *tesan* : *aṭion* : *v*[- - -]  
 [- - -] *oitumen* : *miḍa*[- - -]  
 [- - -] *n* : *aṭios* : *mi*[- - -]  
 [- - -] *n* : *batan* : *e*[- - -]

Unfortunately, little can be said about this inscription. The sequence *tesan* was dubiously identified as borrowed from the Lydian *tašē-*, “stele,”<sup>8</sup> agreeing with the adjective *aṭion* in sg. acc. However, this Lydian word must be read as *taiēv*,<sup>9</sup> and Phrygian *tesan* can be considered a pronominal cluster similar to *esai=t* (W-01b, sg. dat.),<sup>10</sup> and analyzed as *t=esan* (sg. acc.), if not an *a*-stem noun. In addition, perhaps [- - -] *ṭumida* is a personal name in sg. acc. followed by the term *memenis*, attested as *memenis* in M-01b and M-02 (in both inscriptions, a possible patronymic). In any event, these interpretations are precarious because of the lack of parallels, and because the sole verifiable information of T-02b is the reference of Bas appearing for the first time in a Luwian country.

This god perhaps appears in two other OPhr. inscriptions. The first one, the inscription B-04 (from Bithynia, fifth or fourth century BC), seems to contain

the accusative of this theonym, but the text is hard to read and its context is unclear.<sup>11</sup> The other inscription from a little bit later (fourth century BC), the graffito G-221 incised on a sherd from Gordion, could be adduced here, but the pertinent sequence is read as *bata'm* by CIPPh,<sup>12</sup> and the meaning of the whole text remains unclear.

The other seven occurrences of the theonym Bas are recorded in the NPhr. sub-corpus, from the second and third century AD. He is featured six times as the agent of three different curses against tomb desecrators, always mentioned in their apodoses.<sup>13</sup> Note that curses are by far the most common kind of text in the NPhr. corpus, since only 13 of the 117 known inscriptions contain anything more than a curse.<sup>14</sup> Two inscriptions contain the first imprecative formula mentioning Bas, 33 and 36, both found in Sinanlı:

- (33) αὐτοῦ κε οὐα κε ῥοκα γεγαριτμενος ας Βαταν  
 τευτους  
 (36) αὐτοῦ κ' οὐ|α κ' οροκα [γ]εγ[αριτ]με[ν] ο[ς] α Βαταν  
 τ|ευτους

The meaning of this text roughly translates to: “and let him and his οροκα (offspring?) be at the mercy of Bas τευτους.” Some of these words are comprehensible: αὐτοῦ equates to Greek αὐτός, κε is the copulative conjunction (< PIE *\*k<sup>e</sup>e*, “and”), οὐα is the 3sg.fem. possessive pronoun (< PIE *\*sue-*), and γεγαριτμενος is the masc.sg.midd.-pass.part. (parallel to Greek κεχαρισμένος with specific imprecative sense found in Anatolia). However, οροκα remains obscure as well as τευτους, which does not seem to have a good explanation. The latter has been equated to the discussed word *\*teutéh<sub>2</sub>-*, “people,” attested only in the Italian, Celtic, German, and Baltic branches of Indo-

*jusqu'à la fin de l'époque romaine. État des recherches. Actes du Colloque d'Istanbul (Institut Français d'Études Anatoliennes) 13–14 avril 1987*, ed. Le Guen-Pollet and O. Pelon (Paris, 1991), 45–46.

<sup>7</sup> These campaigns are recorded in Assyrian texts from Sargon II's reign (722–705 BC), where the Phrygian king is called *1Mitā šār māt Muški*, “Mitā, king of the land of the Muški.” In these texts, he is accused of being behind conspiracies of two tributary states of the Assyrians (in 718 BC with Kiakki of Šinuhūtu, and in 717 BC with Pisiri of Karkamiš), and he is further said to have conquered the cities of Ḫarrua and Ušanis, and influenced Tabal. These hostilities continued until almost 709 BC, when he is said to have sent presents as a tribute to Sargon II on his own initiative.

<sup>8</sup> See V. Orel, *The Language of Phrygians. Description and Analysis* (Delmar, NY, 1997), 310 and 461.

<sup>9</sup> D. Schür, “Zu lykisch *θθῆ* und seiner etymologischen Interpretation,” *Indogermanische Forschungen* 121 (2016): 123–30.

<sup>10</sup> See Ligorio and Lubotsky, “Фригийский язык,” 184.

<sup>11</sup> Brixhe, “Corpus des Inscriptions Paléo-phrygiennes. Supplément II,” 41.

<sup>12</sup> CIPPh, 179.

<sup>13</sup> A common curse can be divided into two different parts: protasis and apodosis. Protases indicate who the potential addressee of the curse is. A standard protasis in NPhr. says as follows: *ιος νι σεμουν κνουμανει κακουν αδδακετ. . .* (“who[ever] does harm to this tomb. . .”). Apodoses mention the punishment considered to happen to the addressee of the curse, and very often name a god or group of gods as the agent(s) of that punishment (normally *Ti-*, only substituted by Bas as we will see, and once by Dionysos). A common NPhr. apodosis reads in this way: *με δεως κε ζεμελως κε α Τιε τιτετικμενος ειτου* (“let him be accursed by Zeus in the sight of gods and men”).

<sup>14</sup> These inscriptions, nos. 9, 15, 18, 30, 31, 48, 57, 69, 98, 116, 128, and 130, only represent 11% of the whole corpus.

European languages.<sup>15</sup> For this reason, this Phrygian word has been often considered a borrowing from Galatian.<sup>16</sup> Since these two inscriptions, as indicated above, were found in Sinanlı in the most northeastern point where NPhr. texts are documented, on the border with Galatia,<sup>17</sup> this explanation seems likely. However, in light of the few occurrences of this word in the poorly-attested language of the Galatians (see, e.g., the tribal names *Ambitoutus*, established near Gordion according to Plin. HN 5.146, and *Toutobodiaci*, associated to *Tectosages* according to Plin. HN 5.146), which shows that in this language *\*teut-* became *tout-*, this suggested borrowing can easily be refuted. Consequently, a new interpretation must be given. Because it appears in a position where a verb in the imperative mood is expected (see, e.g., 88: τυγ|γεγαριτμενος ιτου), very likely τευτου=ς is the verb of this imprecative apodosis.<sup>18</sup> Thus, the sequence -του corresponds to the 3sg.impv. ending, although its attached sigma and meaning remain unexplained. Either way, τευτου is the only word of this apodosis which can be interpreted as a verb.

The second imprecative apodosis with references to Bas is contained on two inscriptions, found in two cities near by one another in the north of the NPhr. epigraphic area, Güney and Erten respectively:

(86) Βα[ς] | ιοι βεκος με βερε[τ]

(111) Βας ιοι βεκος με βερετ

The components of this apodosis are relatively clear: the sg.nom. *Bas* is the subject, ιοι is a pronoun in sg.dat., βεκος is the word for ‘bread’ (a neut.sg.-acc.), με is the prohibitive particle,<sup>19</sup> and βερετ the verb

in 3sg.pres.subj. which goes back to PIE *\*b<sup>h</sup>er-*, “to bear” (LIV<sup>2</sup> 76–77).<sup>20</sup> Regarding the meaning of this apodosis, during the last Phrygian Conference (early November of 2015 in Eskişehir), A. E. Hämmig<sup>21</sup> adduced suitable Greek parallels found in Anatolia and collected by J. H. M. Strubbe:<sup>22</sup>

μηδὲ γῆ καρποφορήσοιτο αὐτῷ. . . (76);  
οὐτ’ ἢ γῆ αὐτ<ῶ> καρπὸν ἐνενέκη. . . (121);  
μ[ῆτε] ἢ γῆ καρποφόρος. . . (122);  
μὴ γῆ . . . καρποὺς δοίη (153);  
μὴ γῆ καρπὸν ἐκφέρει. . . (155);  
μηδὲ γῆ καρπὸν. . . (357);  
[μῆτε γῆ] . . . καρπὸν φέροι (368);  
μῆτε γῆ ἐνέγκαι αὐτῷ . . . καρπὸν (369);  
μηδὲ γῆ . . . καρπὸν <α>ὐτῷ ἐνινκαίτω (374);  
μὴ <ἐ>νέγκῃ [ἢ γῆ αὐτῷ] καρπὸν (377); and  
μῆτε γῆ καρπὸν ἐνένκαι (385).

According to Hämmig, βεκος can be equated to καρπὸν, βερετ to φέροι, με to μῆ, and Βας to γῆ.

Although this interpretation is convincing, the equation Βας ~ γῆ, first argued by Haas,<sup>23</sup> is, as she admits, difficult to support from a linguistic point of view. The Greek word is not a *t*-stem noun, and the correspondence between Phrygian β and Greek γ is not defensible (note that Greek γυνή, “woman,” corresponds to Phrygian *knays*). Of course, this parallel is not necessarily phonetic, but only semantic regardless of the etymologies. However, these expressions look like a specific formula from Caria (76, 121, and

<sup>15</sup> R. S. P. Beekes, “The origin of Lat. *aqua*, and of *\*teutā* ‘people,’” *The Journal of Indo-European Studies* 26/3–4 (1998): 461–65.

<sup>16</sup> First proposed by W. M. Ramsay, “Neo-Phrygian Inscriptions,” *Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Institutes in Wien* 8 (*Beiblatt*) (1905), 97, it was still considered by Ligorio and Lubotsky in “Фригийский язык,” 194.

<sup>17</sup> A third occurrence of this word might be τευτωσι (NPhr. 116), found in an obscure sentence of a funerary stele not related to the imprecative part of the text.

<sup>18</sup> This possibility was suggested to me by an anonymous reviewer of this paper whom I would like to thank. However, I must add that a second anonymous reviewer was not convinced by this possibility because of the “enigmatic” -ς attached to τευτου.

<sup>19</sup> In the light of the Phrygian shift *\*ē / \*ch<sub>1</sub> > ā* and the preposition με (in the formula με δεως κε ζεμελως κε), the *communis opinio* considers με (B-05) / με a preverb against O. Haas’s previous identification of it as inherited from the PIE particle *\*meh<sub>1</sub>*

(*Die phrygischen Sprachdenkmaler* [Sofia, 1966], 95). Nevertheless, during the last Phrygian Conference, Hämmig and I argued that before the verbs of the imprecative apodoses, με makes more sense as the Phrygian counterpart of Greek μῆ, Sanskrit *mā*, Tocharian A and B *mā*, etc. Even OPhr. *mekos* (B-07, the Phrygian stele from Daskyleion) can be analyzed as the combination of the prohibitive particle with the indefinite pronoun *kos* (< PIE *\*k<sup>o</sup>as*) with the meaning “no one, nobody” (I will return to this issue in my forthcoming PhD dissertation). It must be said, however, that the reason why the Phrygian shift *\*ē / \*ch<sub>1</sub> > ā* did not operate here (instead of *\*mā*) remains unclear.

<sup>20</sup> H. Rix, *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben* (Wiesbaden, 2001<sup>2</sup>) (abbreviated here as LIV<sup>2</sup>).

<sup>21</sup> A. E. Hämmig, “The Language of the Phrygians and its On-going Decipherment,” in G. R. Tsatskhadze, ed., *The Phrygian Lands Over Time* (Leuven, forthcoming).

<sup>22</sup> J. H. M. Strubbe, APAI EPIITYMBIOI. *Imprecations against Desecrators of the Grave in the Greek Epitaphs of Asia Minor. A Catalogue* (Bonn, 1997); the numbers of these Greek inscriptions are given according to this catalogue.

<sup>23</sup> Haas, *Die phrygischen Sprachdenkmaler*, 95.

122) and, especially from Lycia (357, 368, 369, 374, and 377) with only two occurrences in Pontus (153 and 155). Indeed, it is never attested in Phrygia. Moreover, the only γῆ featured in a Greek imprecation is Strubbe's no. 223, which shows a similar idea, but gets expressed in a different way: οὗτος μὴ ἐγῆς καρπὸν ἀνέληται, "and may he not take up fruit from earth." Here the subject is not the earth, and this is an essential detail. In Phrygia, the earth never appears personified, and the provider of crops is Zeus, as will be seen below. Thus, Bas is somehow related to Zeus rather than to earth. Nevertheless, the Greek parallels adduced by Hämmig are useful to understand the Phrygian formula (leaving aside the question of "earth"), and Βας ιοι βεκος με βερετ can be translated as: "may Bas not produce food to him."<sup>24</sup>

Following our analysis, another apodosis type from Erten shows Bas related to bread:

99 με κε οι | τοτοσσειτι Βας βεκος

The words are more or less the same; they only differ in the presence of the copulative conjunction κε (< PIE *\*k<sup>e</sup>*) and the verb τοτοσσειτι, 3sg.pres.subj., whose root has been recently identified by Hämmig as going back to *\*deh<sub>3</sub>-*, "give."<sup>25</sup> Consequently, the meaning of this sentence is: "and may Bas not give him bread." Here, "bread" also refers to "food" via synecdoche.

In addition, if Hämmig's likely new reading of NPhr. 18 is accepted, then in this kind of apodosis, Bas is once substituted by the obscure word σαρναν: βε<κ>οις ιοι με τοτοσσειτι σαρναν (instead of βε<κ>οις ιοι με τοτοσσ' ευγισαρναν). Since σαρναν fits as a nominative singular (-ēn, see, e.g., *iman*, *imēnos*), it could be considered an epiklesis of the same god. Recently, A. Avram has equated this name to Ζεύς Σαρνεδηνος, read in Greek inscriptions from northeast Phrygia / northwest Galatia (with one occurrence in Bithynia and Dacia).<sup>26</sup> However, its meaning remains unclear.

<sup>24</sup> During the last Phrygian Conference, I analysed this formula in the light of Semitic and Hieroglyphic Luwian curses: the bilingual inscription from Tell Fekherye (Assyrian 28–29 and Aramaic 17–18) and KARKAMIŠ A11a §27, respectively (B. Obrador-Cursach, "The Luwian origin of the Phrygian imprecations," forthcoming in Tsetskhladze, ed., *Phrygian Lands Over Time*). However, I operate with Hämmig's parallels because they are closer in time and place.

<sup>25</sup> She argued this very convincing identification during the last Phrygian Conference.

<sup>26</sup> A. Avram, "Two Phrygian gods between Phrygia and Dacia," *Colloquium Anatolicum* 15 (2016): 70–83. I would like to thank

The last imprecation featuring the god Bas is found on the inscription 128:

με δδεω με ζεμε|λος τιτετικμενος | ειτου | ας Βαταν  
Ορουεναν κε.

As one of the most common formulae, the meaning of this passage is generally accepted, although it is the only occurrence of the kind in which there are two guarantees: "let him be accursed in the sight of gods and men by Bas and the Keeper(?)." Here the accusative is governed by the preposition ας (< PIE *\*h<sub>1</sub>ns*), and replaces the more common ας Τιαν ("by Zeus").<sup>27</sup> Moreover, it is also coordinated with the sg.acc. ορουεναν, whose sg.nom. is ορουαν, attested in NPhr. 48. In this last text, a quasi-bilingual Greek-Phrygian, this term has been equated to the Greek πατήρ, "father," by Lubotsky,<sup>28</sup> who reconstructed it as *\*sorwēn*, a form related to Greek οὔρος "watcher, guard(ian)," < *\*sor-uo*. According to Lubotsky, it is an epithet of Phrygian Zeus.<sup>29</sup> The formula με δεως κε ζεμελωσ κε τιτετικμενος ειτου, as Lubostky suggested, follows a Luwian apodosis attested in KARKAMIŠ A 2+3 §24: *wa/i-sa-'* |DEUS-na-za |CAPUT-tá-za-ha |\*366-na-na | (DEUS) TONITRUS-tá-ti-i | (LOQUI)ta-tara/i-ia-mi-sa i-zi-ia-ru, "let him be made accursed by Tarhunzas in the sight of(?) God and men!"<sup>30</sup> Additionally, during the last Phrygian Conference, I adduced a Greek text contemporary to the NPhr. one,<sup>31</sup> an inscription found in a house at Seferihisar (Sevri Hissar), near ancient Teos (Ionia): καὶ γενήσεται παρὰ | θεοῖς καὶ ἀνθρώποις ἐπικατά|ρατος, "and let him become accursed in the sight of gods and men": (Strubbe, no. 32). This curse confirms the unclear meaning of the Luwian *\*366-na-na* and Phrygian με through its equivalent position to Greek παρὰ + dative.

Finally, the last occurrence of Bas appears in NPhr. 48, in a short list of three divine names mentioned in the Greek part as τοῖς προ|γεγραμμένοις θε|οῖς, "the inscribed gods":

the author for kindly sending me a draft of this paper prior to its publication.

<sup>27</sup> 14 τιτετικμενος α|ς Τιαν [ειτο]υ, 53 τιτετικμεν[ος] | ας Τιαν ειτου, 99 τιτετικμενος | ας Τιαν ειτου, "let him be accursed by Zeus."

<sup>28</sup> Lubotsky, "Phrygian Zeus": 127–28.

<sup>29</sup> Th. Drew-Bear, A. Lubotsky, and M. Üyümez, "Three New Phrygian Inscriptions," *Kadmos* 47 (2008): 115–16.

<sup>30</sup> Bauer, *Morphosyntax of the Noun Phrase*, 131.

<sup>31</sup> Obrador-Cursach, "Luwian origin of the Phrygian imprecations."



Table 1—Inflection of Bat- in comparison with nevos

Case	Bas	nevos	PIE endings
Nom. Sg.	Βας	nevos	*-t-s
Acc. Sg.	Batan / Βαταν	nevotan	*-t-m

Μιτραφατα | κε Μας Τεμρογε|ιος κε Πουντας | Βας  
κε ενσταρνα

Here, Bas appears in the nominative and is qualified with the word Πουντας (probably related with the Pontic region, a genitive of this toponym?). According to Lubotsky, Bas—as well as Μιτραφατα and Μας Τεμρογειος, the latter epithet probably deriving from the region of the Tymbris—is the subject of the verb ενσταρνα, which traces back to the PIE root *\*steh<sub>2</sub>-*, “stand, make stand” (LIV<sup>2</sup> 590–92; see, e.g., ἐνίστημι, “to be in, to stand in, to be appointed”).<sup>32</sup> Consequently, partially applying Lubotsky’s interpretation, the approximate meaning of this sentence is: “Mitrafata and the Tem(b)rogic Mas and the Pontic Bas were appointed.”

In all inscriptions, only two forms of the theonym Bas are documented: the nominative Βας (48, 86, 99, and 111) and the accusative Batan (almost in T-02b) / Βαταν (21, 33, 36). Despite the scarce number of preserved cases, its accusative shows that this is a *t*-stem noun. Indeed, its ending *-t-an* must go back to *\*-t-m*, with the preservation of the final nasal sound and the change *\*-m > -n*. A suitable parallel is the recently identified word *nevotan* (B-04) < PIE *\*népotm*, the accusative form of the nominative *nevos* (B-05) < PIE *\*népōts*.<sup>33</sup> Moreover, this nominative also shows the shift *\*-t-s > -s*, so Βας must be understood as a simplification of *\*bat-s* (see Table 1).

Therefore, the inflection of this theonym has been identified, but its etymology is uncertain. Until now, only three possibilities have been suggested. First, Haas<sup>34</sup> argued the similarity between Bas and the PIE root *\*b<sup>h</sup>eh<sub>2</sub>-*, “speak” (LIV<sup>2</sup> 69–70), e.g., Greek φημί, φάναι, “id.” or Latin *for* / *fari*, “id.”. Nevertheless, Haas compared Βας with the Greek γῆ, “earth.” As indicated, this comparison is not supported by our accepted knowledge of Phrygian. On the other hand, I. M. Diakonoff and V. P. Neroznak adopted Haas’

interpretation,<sup>35</sup> and even Brixhe has considered this possibility, although he was not entirely convinced by this interpretation, and ultimately abandoned it.<sup>36</sup> K. Witczak introduced into the discussion two obscure Mycenaean terms: *pa-de-i* and *pa-de*.<sup>37</sup> He read them as \*Φας, Φαδος, and equated them to Old Polish *Boda* and dubiously with Old Indian *Bhadra*. The result of his comparison reverted the translation to the reconstructed root *\*b<sup>h</sup>ad-*, “fortunate, happy, prosperous; good” (IEW 106), and attributed a Bithynian origin of this theonym in order to avoid the phonetic problems of his etymological proposal. However, Lubotsky dismissed Witczak’s argumentation as ungrounded.<sup>38</sup>

With these inconclusive interpretations, and having verified that the word *Bas* does not exist in surrounding languages, only determining the internal reconstruction remains in order to identify the origin of this theonym. Thus, I propose that the theonym Bas is a Phrygian derivative *t*-stem from the PIE root *\*b<sup>h</sup>eh<sub>2</sub>-*, “shine” (LIV<sup>2</sup> 68–69).<sup>39</sup> According to its inflection, it can be a primary *t*-stem formation, but it only fits with the acrostatic type, e.g., PIE *\*nók<sup>u</sup>-t-* / *\*nék<sup>u</sup>-t-*, “night.” Therefore, the form *\*b<sup>h</sup>óh<sub>2</sub>-t-* / *\*b<sup>h</sup>éh<sub>2</sub>-t-* can be assumed as the origin of this theonym. However, the nom. Βας presents a problem. If the laryngeals in Phrygian work in the same way as they seem to in Greek, a nominative *\*\*βως* and accusative *\*\*βωταν* would be predictable. Nevertheless, the nominative and accusative root vowel may have been levelled from oblique cases, where *e*-grade is expected. Unfortunately, they are not attested. However, this is not the only levelling assumed in Phrygian, since A. Kloekhorst recently argued such a levelling for the word

<sup>35</sup> I. M. Diakonoff and V. P. Neroznak, *Phrygian* (Delmar, NY, 1985), 97.

<sup>36</sup> Brixhe, “Les inscriptions paléo-phrygiennes de Tyane,” 42. See also C. Brixhe, “Du paléo- au néo-phrygien,” *Académie des Inscriptions & Belles-Lettres. Comptes rendus des séances de l’année 137/2* (1993): 331, and “Les clitics du néo-phrygien,” in *Frigi e Frigio. Atti del 1° Simposio Internazionale. Roma, 16–17 ottobre 1995*, ed. R. Gusmani, M. Salvini and P. Vannicelli (Roma, 1997), 51.

<sup>37</sup> K. Witczak, “Two Bithynian Deities in the Old and New Phrygian Inscriptional Text,” *Folia Orientalia* 29 (1992–1993): 67–68.

<sup>38</sup> Lubotsky, “New Phrygian Inscription No. 48,” 123 n. 12.

<sup>39</sup> Note that very often *\*b<sup>h</sup>eh<sub>2</sub>-*, “speak” (LIV<sup>2</sup> 69–70), is considered to be the same root with a semantic development: see G. E. Dunkel, “Latin *iubar* and *fās*,” in *Sound law and analogy: papers in honor of Robert S. P. Beekes on the occasion of his 60th birthday*, ed. A. Lubotsky, (Amsterdam, 1997), 31. However, this issue does not pertain to the proposal of this paper.

<sup>32</sup> Lubotsky, “New Phrygian Inscription No. 48,” 123–24.

<sup>33</sup> A. E. Hämmig, “*Nevotan niptiyan*. Die Fluchformel der Stele von Vezirhan,” *Indogermanische Forschungen* 118 (2013): 134–38.

<sup>34</sup> Haas, *Die phrygischen Sprachdenkmäler*, 97.

*petes*, “feet” (pl.nom.),<sup>40</sup> where the expected *o*-grade of the PIE root has been substituted for the *e*-grade of the oblique cases (neither attested). Additionally, these morphological considerations fit the context. These formations are considered verbal abstracts in origin, which often become concrete nouns, e.g., PIE \**doh<sub>3</sub>-t-*, “giving” > Latin *dōs*, *-ōtis*, “dowry.” Therefore, the development from “shining” into “the shine” and later “the shining one” can be considered, forming a suitable name for a god.

Here, the Greek word φώς, φωτός, “man, hero,” can be adduced to support this new interpretation. K. Brugmann and B. Delbrück<sup>41</sup> equated this word with the Vedic *s*-stem *bhās-*, “light, splendor, power,” and assumed that the Greek word was indeed a secondary *t*-stem noun, as well as many others in this language. After a century during which this explanation remained more or less unaccepted,<sup>42</sup> M. Peters improved the formal analysis of this etymology and opened the possibility of an ancient *t*-stem agent-noun without excluding an original radical noun.<sup>43</sup> On its meaning, he considered that the word developed from “shining,” adducing some Indo-European formulae which associate this concept with heroes (consequently, the meaning “man” is a secondary one). He also considered the Greek personal names in -φως, -φοος, and -φωσσα, equivalent to Old Persian *-farnah-* and Avestan *-xvarnah-*, in order to show this association. More recently, A. Vijūnas has argued that this Greek word originated from a primary *t*-stem,<sup>44</sup> the same kind of formation suggested here for the Phrygian word (see also NIL 7–11),<sup>45</sup> where the whole Greek paradigm has levelled the *o*-grade of the root from the nominative and accusative singular (the opposite way of the Phrygian word, see Table 2).

<sup>40</sup> A. Klockhorst, “The Old Phrygian word for ‘feet’: new readings in the ‘podas’-inscription (G-02),” *Kadmos* 54.1 (2016): 115.

<sup>41</sup> K. Brugmann and B. Delbrück, *Grundriss Vergleichenden Grammatik der Indogermanischen Sprachen* 2.1 (Berlin, 1897–1916): 536.

<sup>42</sup> Pierre Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: histoire des mots* (Paris, 1968–1980), 1238.

<sup>43</sup> M. Peters, “Beiträge zur Griechischen Etymologie,” in *Miscellanea Linguistica Graeco-Latina*, ed. L. Isebaert (Namur, 1993), 101–108; see also Dunkel, “Latin *iubar* and *fās*,” 32.

<sup>44</sup> A. Vijūnas, *The Indo-European primary t-stems* (Innsbruck, 2009), 72–76.

<sup>45</sup> D. Wodtko, B. Irslinger and C. Schneider, *Nomina im Indogermanischen Lexikon* (Heidelberg, 2008) (abbreviated here NIL).

**Table 2**—Proposed development of PIE \**bhóh<sub>2</sub>-t-* in Phrygian and Greek

Case	PIE	Phrygian	Greek
Nom. Sg.	* <i>bʰóh<sub>2</sub>-t-s</i>	Βας	φώς
Acc. Sg.	* <i>bʰóh<sub>2</sub>-t-ŋ</i>	Batan / Βαταν	φῶτα
Gn. Sg.	* <i>bʰéh<sub>2</sub>-t-s</i>	-	φωτός

Although in ancient times φώς, φωτός was related to “light” (as Apollonius the Sophist showed),<sup>46</sup> this etymology is not commonly accepted. Some scholars refute it because they consider it “semantically implausible.”<sup>47</sup> Indeed, no satisfactory explanation of this suggested semantic development has been proposed and, what is worse, it seems that there is no synchronic evidence which points out the semantic shift “light” > “hero” > “man.” Therefore, in order to accept the suggested etymology, the meaning of the development of φώς, φωτός from the proposed prehistoric meaning “the shining one” to “hero, man” must be explained.

It is clear that φώς, φωτός is basically a poetic word rarely occurring in prose. It means that the use of this noun was restricted to the elevated style of epic or tragedy, far from common language usage. Certainly, the two usual meanings, “hero” and “man,” are inferred from the context. Φώς means “hero” when it is used to qualify some characters such as Achilles (*Iliad* 2.239), although in other occurrences it clearly conveys the meaning “man, mortal,” e.g., εἴμα δ’ ἔχ’ ἄμφ’ ὤμοισι δαφονεὶδὸν αἵματι φωτῶν, “the clothing upon her shoulders showed strong red with the men’s blood” (*Iliad* 18.538).

Sometimes this noun appears in apposition to personal names, similar to epithets, especially in two formulas. The first one is ἰσόθεος φώς, “godlike man,” said of Euryalus (*Iliad* 2.565 and 23.677), Priam (*Iliad* 3.310), Menelaus (*Iliad* 4.212 and 23.569), Ereuthalion (*Iliad* 7.136), Patroklos (*Iliad* 9.211 and 11.644), Sokos (*Iliad* 11.428), Aias (*Iliad* 11.472 and 15.559), Meriones (*Iliad* 16.632), Odysseus (*Odyssey* 1.324), and Telemachus (*Odyssey* 20.124). The second

<sup>46</sup> In his Λέξεις Ὀμηρικαί we can read as follows: φῶτες· οἱ ἄνθρωποι, ἀπὸ τοῦ φωτίζειν τὰ νοούμενα πάντα διὰ τοῦ λόγου, “*phōtes* [refers to] humans because they illuminate all thoughts through the reason.” However, this association might be given because of the similarity with φώς, φωτός, “light.”

<sup>47</sup> R. S. P. Beekes, *Etymological Dictionary of Greek* (Leiden, 2010), 1602, similar to the expression used by Chantraine, “*Dictionnaire étymologique*,” 1238.

formula is the patronymic scheme  $\phi\omega\tau'$  [name in genitive]  $\nu\acute{\iota}\delta\alpha\nu$ , where  $\phi\omega\theta'$  is always found in the beginning of a verse: e.g.,  $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\ \delta\eta\ \Delta\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \nu\acute{\iota}\delta\alpha\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\phi\acute{\iota}\kappa\epsilon\tau\omicron\ \kappa\alpha\rho\tau\epsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\theta\upsilon\mu\omicron\nu$ ,  $\phi\omega\theta'$   $\text{Ἡρακλῆα, μεγάλων ἐπίστορα ἔργων}$ , “when he came to Zeus’s son, the mighty-hearted man Heracles, a master of monstrous deeds” (*Odyssey* 21.25–26); or  $\text{Ταλθύβι' ὅτι τάχιστα Μαχάονα δεῦρο κάλεσσον φῶτ' Ἀσκληπιοῦ υἷον ἀμύμονος ἱητῆρος}$ , “Talthybios, with all speed go call hither Machaon, a man who is son of Asklepios and a blameless physician” (*Iliad* 4.193–94).

Finally, in some contexts  $\phi\omega\varsigma$  is clearly opposed to women, e.g.,  $\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\ \acute{\rho}\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\alpha\iota\omicron\ \pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\ \chi\rho\acute{\omicron}\iota\ \mu\acute{\eta}\delta\epsilon\alpha\ \phi\omega\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$  “to pull over his body to cover his man’s genitals” (*Odyssey* 6.129), although in a few instances (although never in Homer) it refers to a couple of man and woman, e.g.,  $\omicron\acute{\iota}\kappa\tau\rho\acute{\omega}\ \phi\omega\tau\epsilon$ , “to two pitiable humans” (Euripides, *Helen* 1094, in dual, referring to Helen and Menelaus).

In light of this last context, it is clear that the word was not comprehensible to the audience of the Homeric poems. Moreover, it can be deduced that the original meaning is not the generic “human,” because it is never said of a woman, so it likely means “man.” However, in many contexts it is used to refer to warriors and, especially in singular, to the important ones. Thus it can be concluded that this word, despite its poetic value, is a semantically empty archaism.

Before explaining the consequences of such a conclusion, a similar case can be adduced. There is another archaism understood as “men” despite the lack of a clear etymology:  $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\pi\epsilon\varsigma$ . Although its original meaning is unknown,<sup>48</sup> in Homer it is always used in the plural as an epithet of  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\iota$ , “men” (e.g., *Iliad* 18.288) and, sometimes, of  $\beta\rho\tau\omicron\iota$ , “mortal men” (*Iliad* 2.285). In other texts, it is attested with  $\lambda\alpha\omicron\acute{\iota}$ , “men, people” (Aeschylus, *Suppliant Women* 90). In such cases, it was understood as “mortal.” However, in the works of tragic authors and later poets, the word occurs as a noun with the meaning “men.” Finally, it is reported to be the name of a bird (Aristoteles, *History of Animals* 615b.25). Leaving aside this bird name, it is evident that  $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\pi\epsilon\varsigma$  did not have a clear meaning for ancient Greek speakers, and the meaning “men” is only inferred from its relation with  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\iota$  in Homer.

The same could then be said of  $\phi\omega\varsigma$ : its original meaning was unclear, but it was understood as “men” or “hero” because it appeared in relation to them. Indeed,

what happened here is a well-established phenomenon called “productive misunderstanding” by M. Leumann, “iconism” by M. S. Silk (from a literary perspective) and, equating it to modern languages, “irrational resemanticization” or “irrational polysemy” by Méndez Dosuna.<sup>49</sup> Certainly it has been claimed for archaic words in Homer which later speakers misunderstood, but, because of the importance of their literary tradition, were still used with a new meaning deduced from context. It is the case for many adjectives and (especially) epithets, since they play a peripheral role in sentences.

A good example of this process is found in the adjective  $\alpha\acute{\iota}\omicron\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ , which combines the meaning “quick, nimble, shimmering” with “variegated, colorful,” two meanings not conceivable with a natural semantic shift. According to Méndez Dosuna, it originally meant “variegated, colorful”<sup>50</sup> and, as a later invention of the glossographoi, it was understood also as “quick.” Another paradigmatic example of such a misunderstanding is  $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\mu\beta\alpha\chi\omicron\varsigma$ , earlier used as a technical noun (“crest of a helmet”), and later as an adjective (“falling head-first”).<sup>51</sup>

Nevertheless, there is a significant difference between  $\phi\omega\varsigma$  and  $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\pi\epsilon\varsigma$ . Indeed, while the latter is far from being etymologically explained,  $\phi\omega\varsigma$  can be analyzed as an inherited PIE word with a primary meaning: “shining, radiance.” Thus, its unnatural semantic shift is a parallel process to the meanings of  $\alpha\acute{\iota}\omicron\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ .

As it has been said, it seems that there is no synchronic evidence in Greek for the meaning “shining, radiance.” That is why M. Peters needed to adduce the Old Irish collation *lúan láith*, “hero’s light” as a semantic parallel of his proposal.<sup>52</sup> Nevertheless, this

<sup>49</sup> M. Leumann, *Homerische Wörter* (Basel, 1950), 231–33; M. S. Silk, “LSJ and the problem of poetic archaism: from meanings to iconyms,” *Classical Quarterly* 33 (1983): 303–30; J. Méndez Dosuna, “La polisemia del gr.  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\gamma\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$  (‘blanco’, ‘veloz’),” *Nova Tellus* 30/2 (2012): 11–37, and “Glosografía griega y polisemia irracional: la verdadera historia de  $\alpha\acute{\iota}\omicron\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ ,” in *Ianua Classicorum: temas y formas del mundo clásicos. Actas del XIII Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos (Logroño, 18–23 de julio de 2011)*, ed. J. de la Villa Polo et al. (Madrid, 2015), 357–94.

<sup>50</sup> Méndez Dosuna, “Glosografía griega y polisemia irracional.” He refutes that synesthesia worked here by analyzing the Greek data and the parallels in other languages.

<sup>51</sup> Leumann, *Homerische Wörter*, 231–33; Silk, “LSJ and the problem of poetic archaism,” 305–306; Beekes, *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*, 801.

<sup>52</sup> Peters, “Beiträge zur Griechischen Etymologie,” 105.

<sup>48</sup> Beekes, *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*, 933.

parallel is unclear<sup>53</sup> and unnecessary. Indeed, the image of a hero imbued with a shining appearance is explicitly depicted in some passages of the *Iliad*. See, e.g., *Iliad* 5.4–6, where Diomedes' helmet shines due to the intervention of Athene:

δαῖε οἱ ἐκ κόρυθός τε καὶ ἀσπίδος ἀκάματον πῦρ  
ἀστέρ' ὀπωρινῷ ἐναλίγκιον ὅς τε μάλιστα  
λαμπρὸν παμφαίησι λελουμένος Ὠκεανοῖο:

[Athena] made weariless fire blaze from his shield and helmet, like that star of the waning summer who beyond all stars rises bathed in the ocean stream to glitter in brilliance.<sup>54</sup>

A similar scene is found related to Achilles in *Iliad* 18.205–14:

ἀμφὶ δέ οἱ κεφαλῇ νέφος ἔσπεφε δῖα θεάων  
χρύσειον, ἐκ δ' αὐτοῦ δαῖε φλόγα παμφανόωσαν.  
ὥς δ' ὅτε καπνὸς ἰὼν ἐξ ἄστεος αἰθέρ' ἵκηται  
τηλόθεν ἐκ νήσου, τὴν δ' ἦϊοι ἀμφιμάχονται,  
οἳ τε πανημέριοι στυγερῶ κρίνονται Ἄρηι  
ἄστεος ἐκ σφετέρου: ἅμα δ' ἡελίῳ καταδύντι  
πυρσοί τε φλεγέθουσιν ἐπήτριμοι, ὕψοσε δ' αὐγὴ  
γίνεται αἴσσουσα περικτιόνεσσιν ἰδέσθαι,  
αἱ κέν πως σὺν νηυσὶν ἄρεως ἀλκτῆρες ἵκωνται:  
ὥς ἀπ' Ἀχιλλῆος κεφαλῆς σέλας αἰθέρ' ἵκανε.

. . . and [Athena], the divine among goddesses, about his head circled a golden cloud, and kindled from it a flame far-shining. As when a flare goes up into the high air from a city from an island far away, with enemies fighting about it who all day long are in the hateful division of Ares fighting from their own city, but as the sun goes down signal fires blaze out one after another, so that the glare goes pulsing high for men of the neighbouring islands to see it, in case they might come over in ships to beat off the enemy; so from the head of Achilles the blaze shot into the bright air.

Consequently, the “shining warrior” can be considered a Homeric motif which provides a context in which heroes are φῶτες, “the shining ones.” As

is shown in these two instances, the divinity (here Athena) gives to the warriors an attribute which is considered divine: brightness. Certainly, the Greek gods are known to be imbued with a brilliant aura when they appear in their true form.<sup>55</sup> A good description of this feature is found in the *Homeric Hymns*. See, e.g., how Demeter is depicted at Keleos' house (*Hymn to Demeter*, 187–88 and 277–80):

ἦ δ' ἄρ' ἐπ' οὐδὸν ἔβη ποσὶ καὶ ῥα μελάθρου  
κύρε κάρη, πληῆσεν δὲ θύρας σέλαος θείοιο.

[. . .]

ὁδμή δ' ἱμερόεσσα θυγέντων ἀπὸ πέπλων  
σκίδνατο, τῆλε δὲ φέγγος ἀπὸ χροὸς ἀθανάτοιο  
λάμπε θεᾶς, ξανθαὶ δὲ κόμαι κατενήνοθεν ὤμους,  
αὐγῆς δ' ἐπλήσθη πυκινὸς δόμος ἀστεροπῆς ὥς:

But the goddess walked to the threshold: and her head reached the roof and she filled the doorway with a heavenly radiance. [. . .] Beauty spread round about her and a lovely fragrance was wafted from her sweet-smelling robes, and from the divine body of the goddess a light shone afar, while golden tresses spread down over her shoulders, so that the strong house was filled with brightness as with lightning.

Also Apollo is described in a similar way when he enters into his temple in Delphos for the first time (*Hymn to Apollo* 440–45):

ἔνθ' ἐκ νηὸς ὄρουσε ἄναξ ἐκάεργος Ἀπόλλων,  
ἀστέρι εἰδόμενος μέσφ' ἡματι: τοῦ δ' ἀπὸ πολλὰι  
σπινθαρίδες πωτῶντο, σέλας δ' εἰς οὐρανὸν ἵκεν:  
ἐς δ' ἄδυτον κατέδυσε διὰ τριπόδων ἐριτίμων.  
ἔνθ' ἄρ' ὅ γε φλόγα δαῖε πιφασκόμενος τὰ ἅ κῆλα:  
παῖσαν δὲ Κρίσην κάτεχεν σέλας

Then, like a star at noonday, the lord, far-working Apollo, leaped from the ship: flashes of fire flew from him thick and their brightness reached to heaven. He entered into his shrine between priceless tripods, and there made a flame to flare up bright, showing forth the splendor of his shafts, so that their radiance filled all Crisa.

<sup>53</sup> On this Old Irish collation see Brend, *Heroic saga and classical epic in Medieval Ireland* (Cambridge, 2011), 222–23. Leaving aside the textual problems related to *lián láith*, it could be lately influenced by Classical literature.

<sup>54</sup> Translation of *Iliad* and *Odyssey* passages are given according to *The Chicago Homer* (Lattimore's and Huddleston's, respectively): <http://homer.library.northwestern.edu/>.

<sup>55</sup> See M. L. West, *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth* (Oxford, 2003), 113–16. West compares it to other gods from the ancient Near East. The examples from the *Homeric Hymns* adduced here are taken from this book. However, the following translations are given according to Hugh G. Evelyn-White.



In consideration of these passages, the formula ἰσόθεος φώς must be reexamined. Although it has been interpreted as “godlike man,” it very likely means “the godlike shining one, he who shines like gods.” A complement to this occurrence is Menelaus’ speech in *Iliad* 17.96–105, in which he is afraid of attacking Hector, considered a superior warrior:

Τρῶας δ’ ἐνθάδε πάντας ἄγει κορυθαίολος  
Ἔκτωρ.

ἀλλὰ τί μοι ταῦτα φίλος διελέξατο θυμός;  
ὅππότε’ ἀνὴρ ἐθέλη πρὸς δαίμονα φωτὶ μάχεσθαι  
ὃν κε θεὸς τιμᾷ, τάχα οἱ μέγα πῆμα κυλίσθη.  
τὼ μ’ οὐ τις Δαναῶν νεμεσῆσεται ὅς κεν ἴδῃται  
Ἔκτορι χωρήσαντ’, ἐπεὶ ἐκ θεόφιν πολεμίζει.  
εἰ δέ που Αἴαντός γε βοὴν ἀγαθοῖο πυθοίμην,  
ἄμφω κ’ αὖτις ἰόντες ἐπιμνησαίμεθα χάρμης  
καὶ πρὸς δαίμονά περ, εἴ πως ἐρυσάιμεθα νεκρὸν  
Πηλεΐδῃ Ἀχιλῆϊ: κακῶν δέ κε φέρτατον εἴη.

Hektor of the shining helm leads all of the Trojans here. Then why does my own heart within me debate this? When a man, in the face of divinity, would fight with another whom some god honours, the big disaster rolls sudden upon him. Therefore, let no Danaan seeing it hold it against me if I give way before Hektor, who fights from God. Yet if somewhere I could only get some word of Aias of the great war cry, we two might somehow go, and keep our spirit of battle even in the face of divinity, if we might win the body for Peleïd Achilles. It would be our best among evils.

In this soliloquy, Menelaus is afraid of fighting with Hector because the Trojan hero fights with divine aid. Then in vv. 98–99 he states: ὅππότε’ ἀνὴρ ἐθέλη πρὸς δαίμονα φωτὶ μάχεσθαι ὃν κε θεὸς τιμᾷ, τάχα οἱ μέγα πῆμα κυλίσθη, “When a man [= ἀνὴρ], in the face of divinity, would fight with another man [= φωτὶ] whom some god honours, the big disaster rolls sudden upon him.” Note that here Hector is clearly equated to this φώς, who is honored by a god, and Menelaus to the plain ἀνὴρ, who cannot beat his great adversary.

In conclusion, what happened to φώς is that at one moment the use of this word was restricted to epic verses and later misinterpreted by Greek speakers. Nevertheless, because of its literary significance, φώς was reused with its apparent sense “hero, man.” According to this consideration, the etymology φώς < \*bʰóh₂-t-s, “shining,” is a valid one.

Leaving aside the Greek word, the interpretation suggested for the Phrygian theonym provides a suitable scenario which aligns with an Anatolian divinity. Indeed, common epithets of the Storm-God in Hittite texts are the adjectives *piḫaim(m)i-*, *piḫam(m)i-*, and *piḫaššašši-*, derived from a Luwian word *piḫa-* (attested in the Hieroglyphic Luwian inscription KARATEPE I §52).<sup>56</sup> According to CHD s.v. *piḫaim(m)i-*,<sup>57</sup> since sometimes these adjectives are placed in juxtaposition, their meaning must be different; but this distinction cannot be substantiated because all forms share origin and context. CHD then compares their meaning with the difference between English “joyful” and “joyous,” and interprets these epithets as “imbued with splendor/might.” Therefore, Phrygian Bas is very likely a calque of the Luwian epithets used to qualify Tarhunt.

At this point, it must be said that S. Bernd-Ersöz suggested that evidence existed for a Storm-God in Phrygian monuments,<sup>58</sup> and that this god was called

<sup>56</sup> F. Starke, *Untersuchungen ur Stammbildung des kelisch-luwischen Nomens* (Wiesbaden, 1990), 103–106, suggested that *piḫa-* was a derivative from the PIE root \*bʰeh₂-, “shine” (LIV<sup>2</sup> 68–69), a *vrddhi* formation where Eichner’s Law worked: \*bʰeh₂-o-. Although some people still operate with this etymology (see, e.g., H. C. Melchert, “Naming Practices in Second- and First-Millennium Western Anatolia,” in *Personal Names in Ancient Anatolia*, ed. R. Parker [Oxford, 2013], 34, or D. Schürr, “Zur Herkunft des Pegasos,” *Graecolatina et Orientalia* 35–36 [2014]: 114–16), Eichner’s Law is discussed and, consequently, Starke’s proposal is not accepted by all scholars. Thus, A. Kloekhorst, *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon* (Leiden, 2008), 674–76, claimed that a new etymology is to be found in other PIE verbal roots, and that the meaning of Luwian *piḫa-* must be established in the light of Phoenician ʕz, “power, strength,” the equivalent of “FULGUR”-*hā-sá* /*piḫas=sa*/ in the Phoenician version of the bilingual inscription KARATEPE I. However, this is not so easy, since the Luwian rendering of this inscriptions shows many inaccuracies (see I. Yakubovich, “Phoenician and Luwian in Early Iron Age Cilicia,” *Anatolian Studies* 65 [2015]: 46–48), and the expected equivalent for Phoenician ʕz, “might” is *muwatta-* (Melchert, pers. Comm., February 24, 2016). Recently, I. Yakubovich (“The degree of comparison in Luwian,” *Indogermanische Forschungen* 119 [2015]: 157 n. 5) considered that the cultural term *piḫa-*, “predetermined with FULGUR ‘lightning’, is akin in its meaning to the Akkadian *melammu-*, the mystic aura of gods, heroes, and kings.” This Akkadian concept is also equated to the brightness of the Greek gods by West, *East Face of Helicon*, 113–16.

<sup>57</sup> H. G. Güterbock and H. A. Hoffner, *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* (Chicago, 1997), 253 (abbreviated here CHD).

<sup>58</sup> S. Bernd-Ersöz, “In Search of a Phrygian Male Superior God,” in *Offizielle Religion, lokale Kulte und individuelle Religiosität. Akten des religionsgeschichtlichen Symposiums “Kleinasien und angrenzende Gebiete vom Beginn des 2. bis zur Mitte des 1. Jahrtausends v. Chr.”*

*Atas*.<sup>59</sup> Her argument starts with the fact that sometimes the so-called Phrygian idol, a schematic human depiction related to the Mother-Goddess, has another adjoining representation. According to her, the second idol could stand for the Phrygian Superior Male god (likely the Anatolian Storm-God) in the light of the mini-relief of the Mother-Goddess from Gordion, where also a bull, icon of the Storm-God, was represented (a common Anatolian iconographic motive). She suggested his name was *Atas*, arguing that, in Hittite, *atta-*, “father,” is sometimes used “for the Father of the gods or Father god,” and she considered that the Phrygian *Atas* meant “father,” too. Nevertheless, no occurrence of the Phrygian *Atas* happens in a context where a god is expected, and it is well attested as an anthroponym both in Phrygian and Greek inscriptions from Phrygia. *Atas* is the dedicatee of the inscription W-10,<sup>60</sup> since it occurs in the dative *Atai*. However, in the Phrygian corpus, many inscriptions are dedicated to men, and even the OPhr. M-01a, engraved on a façade (a kind of monument dedicated to the Mother-Goddess), is dedicated to the king Midas almost two centuries after his death. Moreover, despite the common etymology for this Lallname (the Anatolian word for “father”), in Phrygian it is never used as a common noun, while the inherited IE word *ph<sub>2</sub>tér* / *ph<sub>2</sub>tr-*, “father” (NIL 554–562), is twice attested in nominative plural (πατερης 48 and its syncopated variant πατρες 130) denoting “parents.” Consequently, perhaps for Phrygian speakers, it was a meaningless personal name as other Lallnamen, like *Baba* (M-01b and G-121) or *Tatas* (G-04). Despite these considerations, her identification between a Phrygian Storm-

God and some representations remain valid,<sup>61</sup> and only the name given to this deity must be changed.

As a concluding remark, the relation between *Baš* and *Ti-*, the Phrygian Zeus,<sup>62</sup> must be explained. Indeed, it is known that the Anatolian Storm-God was worshiped as *Zeùs Bροντῶν*, “Zeus Thunderer,” according to Greek inscriptions from Roman Phrygia.<sup>63</sup> It means that Tarhunt was assimilated to *Zeùs*. But what is the place of *Baš* here? The most economical explanation is to consider that the syncretism between the Anatolian Storm-God Tarhunt and *Zeùs*, his Greek counterpart, also happened between Tarhunt and *Ti-*, the Phrygian Zeus, in the beginning of the first millennium BC. Therefore, *Baš* and *Ti-* can be considered two epikleseis of the Phrygian Superior Male god. This elucidation explains two features related to *Baš* and *Ti-* in the Phrygian curses.

The first one is the presence of *Baš* in the implicative apodosis of NPhr. 128: *με δδεω με ζεμε|λος τιτετικμενος | ειτου | ας Βαταν Ορουεναν κε*. Here, the expected god is *Ti-* (Tarhunt in the Luwian equivalent) instead of the two theonyms *Βαταν*, “the Shining one,” and *Ορουεναν*, “the Keeper.” So these two designations can be considered two epithets denoting the ambivalence of this god: *Βαταν* as the Anatolian Storm-God and *Ορουεναν* as the inherited Phrygian Zeus, worshiped in a similar way to Greek *Zeùs πατήρ* or Latin *Iuppiter*. Moreover, the presence of two contiguous epikleseis of the same god is common in Anatolia from Hittite times to the Roman Imperial period. See, e.g., *Δὺ Β|ροντῶντι κὲ Σαουαδίω εὐ|χήν*, “vow for Zeus the Thunderer and the Sabadios” (SEG 8.1307A, from Avdan, near Dorylaion), or *Δὺ Περσῶν κ(αὶ) Βρον|τῶντι κ(αὶ) Ἀστράπτον|τι εὐ|χήν*,

(Bonn, 20.-22. Februar 2003), ed. M. Hutter and S. Hutter-Braunsar (Münster, 2004), and S. Bernd-Ersöz, *Phrygian Rock-Cut Shrines: Structure, Function, and Cult Practice* (Leiden, 2006), 161–66.

<sup>59</sup> Since the Phrygian alphabet does not mark geminate consonants and Greek occurrences of this personal name are written as *Αττας* (including two Hellenistic inscriptions from Gordion, L. E. Roller, “Hellenistic Epigraphic Text from Gordion,” *Anatolian Studies* 37 [1987]: nos. 48 and 50; see also L. Zgusta, *Kleinasiatische Personennamen* [Prag, 1964; abbreviated here KPN], 106–107 § 119–9), *Ata* and *Atai* must stand for /*Attas*/ and /*Attai*/. In OPhr. texts, the nominative does not take any ending: *Ata* is clearly read in G-107, G-118, G-224a, G-234, and HP-111. On the other hand, there is a variant of this personal name: *Ates* M-01a, W-08, G-123, HP-103, HP-104, HP-105, HP-106, HP-107, HP-108. It is also attested in Greek as *Ἄττης* (see KPN, 107–108 § 119–10).

<sup>60</sup> Still a very obscure text incised on the wall of a rock: *Aṭai edae lel/ravo | viṭe atevo atoios | alus siṭeto das*.

<sup>61</sup> I.e., the double idols and the bull from Gordion. Also, the strong possibility that the statue found in Kerkenes Dağ represents the Storm-God must be considered. On this find, see C. M. Draycott and G. D. Summers, *Sculpture and Inscriptions from the Monumental Entrance to the Palatial Complex at Kerkenes Dağ Turkey*, (Chicago, 2008), 10–21, who considered among other possibilities (i.e., a ruler or a goddess) that “it is also possible that the figure represents an elusive Phrygian god.” The mace, which this statue bears, can be equated to a common attribute of Tarhunt.

<sup>62</sup> The name of the Phrygian Zeus is attested in the accusative *Tiav* < \**djēm* (parallel to Greek *Zēn*), in the genitive *Tuos* < \**dijos* (Greek *Διός*, *Διός*) and in the dative *Ti*, *Tie*, *Tih* < \**dijei* (Greek *Δί*, *Διί*), its etymology and inflection where identified by Lubotsky, “Phrygian Zeus,” 230.

<sup>63</sup> On its cult, see Th. Drew-Bear and C. Naour, “Divinités de Phrygia,” *ANRW II* 18.3 (1990): 1992–2013.

“vow for Zeus of the Persians and the Thunderer and the Lightner” (from Nacoleia).<sup>64</sup>

The second feature explained by this interpretation is the relation between the god Βας and βεκος, “bread.” Indeed, the association of the Storm-God with crops and food is a common topos in the ancient Near East. It is explicit, e.g., in the Hittite myth of the missing Storm-God (CTH 325): [dIM-aš att]aš DINGIR<sup>MES</sup>-aš tarš(i)kkezzi | DUMU-YA=wa=kan [andan NU.GÁL] | [š]āet=war=an=za | nu=wa=z hūman ā[ššu pēdaš] | [halk]in <sup>a</sup>immarnin šalhanti[n manni]ttin išpiyatar=a pēdaš, “[The Storm God’s father] said: ‘My son [is not there]. He became angry and [carried off] everything good. He carried off grain, animal fecundity, abundance, plenty, and satiation.’”<sup>65</sup> It is even found in a similar apodosis to the Phrygian ones, in the inscription from Samʿal devoted to Hadad by Panamuwa I (first half of the eighth century BC): 𐎶𐎵𐎶𐎵 · 𐎶𐎶𐎶 · 𐎶𐎶𐎶 · 𐎶𐎶𐎶𐎶 · 𐎶𐎶𐎶𐎶𐎶, “and may [Hadad] not give to him to eat because of his rage.” This relation, explained by the vital importance of rainwater for irrigation purposes, is also found in the Greek inscriptions from Phrygia, where Zeus is invoked, e.g., as Ἀναδότης, “causing the plants to sprout,” Τελέσφορος “bringing fruits to perfection,” or Ἐκατοστήτης, “who

makes crops bear a hundredfold.”<sup>66</sup> It is even more explicit in the following hexametric prayer to Zeus from Dorylaion (AD 175):

[ - - - βρέχε γαῖ]αν, καρπῷ [ὅπ]ως βρί[θη] | [καὶ ἐν] ἰ σταχύεσσι τεθήλῃ. / τ[αὐτ]ά | [σε] Μητρεόδωρος ἐγὼ λίτομαι, Κρο|νίδα Ζεῦ, / ἀμφὶ τεοῖς βωμοῖσιν ἐπήρ|ρατα [= ἐπήρατα] θύματα ῥέζων.

[Zeus . . . wet the ea]rth, that she become heavy with fruit and flower with ears of corn. This I, Metreodoros, beg of you, Zeus son of Kronos, as I perform delightful sacrifice on your altars.<sup>67</sup>

In conclusion, considering the parallels of the Phrygian imprecations adduced here, where Bas occupies the same position of the Luwian Tarhunt or the Aramaic Hadad, the first occurrence of this god in the Luwian city of Tyana and the suggested etymology, shows that the god Βας fits very well as the Phrygian Storm-God, and that his name can be easily interpreted as a calque of Luwian epithets for this deity.

<sup>66</sup> I borrow this example from the useful compilation of the cults in Phrygia Epiktetos in the Roman Imperial period presented by M. Riel during the last Phrygian Conference (“Cults of Phrygian Epiktetos in the Roman Imperial Period,” forthcoming in Tsetschladze, ed., *Phrygian Lands Over Time*). I would to thank her kindness in sending me a draft of this paper prior to its publication.

<sup>67</sup> A. Körte, “Kleinasiatische Studien VI,” *MDAI(A)* 25 (1900): 421 no. 33; translated by M. Depew, “Reading Greek Prayers,” *Classical Antiquity* 16/2 (1997): 245.

<sup>64</sup> Th. Drew-Bear, *Nouvelles inscriptions de Phrygie* (Zutphen, 1978), 48 no. 25 = SEG 28.1186.

<sup>65</sup> Translated by H. A. Hoffner, *Hittite Myths* (Atlanta, 1998), 21.