

Joseph Azize

University of Sydney, Sydney

THE "BYBLOS 13" INSCRIPTION, "KING OG" AND "ATHENA OGGA"

Abstract:

Phoenician evidence is adduced to support David West's suggestion that Pausanias and certain Greek language authors were correct to see "Ogga" as a Semitic name. In Greece, it was an epithet of the Greek goddess "Athena". The Greek material is found to be useful in understanding the sparse Phoenician evidence, and may provide us with evidence of a hitherto unknown Phoenician adjective. It appears that scholars were correct to link the deity known as "the Og" in Phoenicia to King Og of the Hebrew Bible. However, the connection is perhaps more complex than previously thought, and the chains of tradition and transmission are not clear.¹

In *Some Cults of Greek Goddesses and Female Daemons of Oriental Origin*, David West presented evidence for his contention that three of the Greek goddess Athena's epithets were derived from a Semitic language. These are:

- (a) Athena referred to as the bird Anopaia (Ἀνόπαια).²
- (b) The epithet Pallas (Παλλὰς).³
- (c) The epithet Onga (Ὀγγα).

¹ I thank Ms Lucy Davey and Dr Ian Young of the University of Sydney for their invaluable assistance.

² D. West (1995) 156-162.

³ D. West (1995) 162-166.

West observed that the third of these epithets is found in the forms Ὀγκα, Ὀγκαία and Ὀγγα.⁴ Noting that ancient Greek writers were almost unanimous that this name was a Phoenician name, West did not consider any evidence from Phoenicia, but derived Ὀγγα from the Akk. adjective, *aggu*, 'angry'. This essay falls into several parts:

1. A review of West's contention.
2. An examination of the relevant evidence from the Phoenician royal funerary inscription known as "Byblos 13".
3. A brief consideration of the relevant material from the Ugaritic and Hebrew cultures.
4. A brief examination of some miscellaneous evidence.

1. Review of West's Study

In *Some Cults of Greek Goddesses and Female Daemons of Oriental Origin*, D.R. West addresses himself, *inter alia*, to the figure of "Athena Ogga".⁵ West marshals the Greek sources: Aischylos, Stephanos of Byzantium, Hesychios, Nonnos, Pausanias, and the scholiasts on Aischylos.⁶ He concludes:

These texts tell us that there was an important cult of Athena at Thebes, with a temple dedicated to her. The origin of this was connected with the myth of Kadmos. There were at least three forms of Athena's cultic epithet, which was believed to be either Phoenician or Egyptian in origin. Under this epithet, Athena seems to have been worshipped as a helper in battle ...⁷

West then discusses some possible Greek etymologies of the epithet, and in particular, Schachter's work on Boiotian cults. West considers, but rejects, Schachter's view that the epithet may have had some connection with a war-cry.⁸ As West notes, "Ogga" is an articulate word, and even Schachter is not so confident as to argue that the epithet was, as a matter of fact, derived from a battle cry.⁹

⁴ D. West (1995) 166.

⁵ For the variants of this name, see West (1995) 166.

⁶ West (1995) 166-168.

⁷ West (1995) 169.

⁸ Schachter (1981) 131.

⁹ West (1995) 170.

The most important of the Greek sources is Pausanias 9.12.1-3, where Pausanias recounts the story of how Kadmos was guided from Delphi by a cow with white markings reminiscent of the full moon. In the place where the cow was exhausted and sank down, Kadmos was to make his home. At that place, too, is an open altar and an image of Athena. Significantly, Pausanias goes on to state:

τοῖς οὖν νομίζουσιν ἐς γῆν ἀφικέσθαι Κάδμον τὴν Θηβαίδα Αἰγύπτιον καὶ οὐ Φοίνικα ὄντα, ἔστιν ἐναντίον τῷ λόγῳ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ταύτης τὸ ὄνομα, ὅτι Ὀγγα κατὰ γλῶσσαν τὴν Φοινίκων καλεῖται καὶ οὐ Σαῖς κατὰ τὴν Αἰγυπτίων φωνήν.

For those who think Kadmos to have come to the Theban land being an Egyptian and not a Phoenician, the name of this Athena is a contradiction to the doctrine, for she is called Ogga according to the Phoenician language and not Sais according to the Egyptian speech.¹⁰

The name "Ogga" is also found in Aischylos' *Seven Against Thebes*, at lines 164, 487 (Ὀγκας Ἀθάνας) and at 501-2 where she is referred to as Ὀγκα Παλλάς. Stephanos of Byzantium states that the Ὀγκαῖαι are the gates of Thebes, and that Ὀγκα is "Athena among the Phoenicians": Ὀγκα γὰρ ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ κατὰ Φοίνικας.¹¹ Nonnos uses the form Ὀγκαία four times, and on each occasion it is associated with Kadmos: 5.1-15, 44.38-41, 45.65-69 and with an etymology at 5.70-73. As West remarked, the epithet is linked to Thebes and the Kadmos myth. The etymology of 5.70-73, (ἐκ βοὸς ὀγκηθμοῖο) "from the honk of cattle",¹² was probably influenced by the high profile allowed to the guiding cow in the story of Kadmos at Thebes. In particular, in the opening of Book 5, Nonnos lavishes significant attention upon the cow and its sacrifice.

West noted that the scholiasts to *Seven Against Thebes* tell approximately the same story of Kadmos as is to be found in Pausanias.¹³ The scholiasts say that Kadmos' father was Agenor the Tyrian and that Kadmos travelled to Greece in search of his sister Europa. The scholiasts of 486a and 486b begin speaking of Agenor but then speak of Phoinix. The scholiast of 486c consistently refers to Agenor and does not introduce Phoinix, indicating that some of the scholiasts probably uncritically copied erroneous notes. This makes one rather more confident in amending their reference from "Egyptian" to "Phoenician" when these three scholiasts say that Ogka was an *Egyptian* word.¹⁴ As West notes, the scholiast

¹⁰ Paus. 9.12.2. If anything, West understates how emphatic Pausanias is that this is a Phoenician name.

¹¹ Stephanos of Byzantium 482.

¹² In W.H.D. Rouse's translation of Nonnos 173.

¹³ D. West (1995) 167.

¹⁴ The scholiasts' notes are set out in Smith (1982) 220-221.

of 487a has the name as Phoenician. The scholiast writes: Ὀγκαν προσαγορεύσας τῇ Φοινίκων διάλεκτῳ: "Addressed (as) Ogka in the language of the Phoenicians".¹⁵ We do not know how old the scholiasts' sources were.

West also cited Hesychios, who states that the name Ogga is current among the natives of Thebes,¹⁶ (or in the revised edition of Hesychios, that Ogga is the native eponym – ἐν Θήβας, ἐπιχώριον ἐπώνυμον ἔχουσα). Hesychios also informs us that:

Ὀγκας Ἀθηνᾶς τὰς Ὀγκυγίας πύλας λέγει

Ogka Athena means the Ogygian gates.¹⁷

Next, West proposed to derive Ὀγγα from the Akkadian adjective, *aggu*, 'angry'. In support, he noted that the goddess Ištar was sometimes described as an angry deity, and that Ištar and Athena (especially in her manifestation as Athena Ogga) were associated with battle.¹⁸ Considering the alteration in the epithet from *aggu* to Ὀγγα, West contended:

The first vowel of the form Ὀγγα has altered from α- probably under the influence of Gk. words with similar phonemes. ... We explain the final Gk. α as a fem. termination, appropriate as an epithet for a goddess.¹⁹

Finally, West collected the evidence touching the toponym Ὀγκιον, near Thelpousa on the Ladon in Arcadia, where Pausanias 8.25.4-6 placed a sanctuary of Δήμητηρ Ἐρινύς, 'Demeter Fury', at Thelpousa. West suggests that Ὀγκιον may have been:

... named after the epithet Ὀγκᾶ, then translated by the Gk. epithet Ἐρινύς, 'angry'. This may all ultimately be derived from the Akk. adjective *aggu*, 'angry'²⁰

That is, Athena Ogga may be equivalent to Demeter Erinus at Ogkion.²¹ With some abbreviation, this is West's argument. I note that neither Aischylos nor Nonnos provide any statement directly touching upon whether Ogga is

¹⁵ Smith (1982) 221.

¹⁶ D. West (1995) 166 cites Hesychios 172.32 in Albert's 1861 edition. The revised edition (1966) is that of Latte, also at line 32 *sub* O.

¹⁷ The text is identical in each edition for this definition from l. 36. West's quotation from the 1861 edition is accurate: nothing of significance has been omitted.

¹⁸ D. West (1995) 170-171.

¹⁹ D. West (1995) 171.

²⁰ D. West (1995) 172.

²¹ D. West (1995) 172.

a Phoenician word. The scholiasts to Aischylos are inconsistent, providing support for both a Phoenician and an Egyptian etymology. Hesychios appears to favour a solely Phoenician etymology. Stephanos' statement is unequivocal, but he is much later than Pausanias, who is the most important of these witnesses.

The Ἑλλάδος Περιηγησέως, or *Touring Description Of Greece*, is only tenuously connected with Pausanias, (born c. 115), who probably wrote it between about 155 and 174 or even 180 AD.²² Pausanias met at least one very proud Phoenician; he states that at a sanctuary of Asklepios near Eileithyia, he had a conversation with a Sidonian, and that the two of them argued over whether the Phoenicians or the Greeks had the better conception of the gods. Pausanias met the Sidonian's argument by accepting the correctness of his ideas of the divine, but asserting that the contentions were as Greek as they were Phoenician.²³

Pausanias, therefore, is not one to invent a Phoenician etymology if a Greek derivation is available. That he accepted the Phoenician etymology for the epithet Ogga is significant. Incidentally, Pausanias was writing at a time when some Greeks recalled the Phoenician connections of the distant past; thus he also recounts a conversation with some Thasians who told him that they were originally Phoenician and worshipped Tyrian Herakles in Thasos, but eventually adopted the cult of Herakles son of Amphitryon.²⁴ I cannot conjecture why such an account would have been invented. Pausanias had some further acquaintance with Phoenicians: he discussed with one how the diet of Phoenician snakes aggravated the lethality of their venom,²⁵ and from another he heard a story about the curiosity of a Roman governor of Egypt.²⁶

Pausanias may have known that the goddess' name was Phoenician even without any extensive understanding of the Phoenician language, for the names of deities can persist long after the language is no longer spoken. For example, many of our contemporaries know the Greek names of deities and that the names are Greek, but have little or no further comprehension of the language. Even later than Pausanias' time, however, Eusebius states that the modes of addressing the gods in Phoenician religion had survived into his own day:

τὰ καὶ ποιητῶν ἀπάντων καὶ λογογράφων πρεσβύτερα περιέχουσαι τό τε πιστὸν τῶν λόγων ἐπαγόμεναι ἀπὸ τῆς εἰσέτι δεῦρο ἐν ταῖς κατὰ Φοινίκην πόλεσιν τε καὶ κώμας κρατούσης τῶν θεῶν προσηγορίας τε καὶ ἱστορίας τῶν τε παρ' ἐκάστοις ἐπιτελουμένων μυστηρίων,

²² Habicht (1985) 8-12.

²³ Paus. 7.23.7-8.

²⁴ Paus. 1.25.12.

²⁵ Paus. 9.28.2.

²⁶ Paus. 10.32.18.

And the oldest of all the poets and logographers support the veracity of their words by reference to the present day survival in the cities and villages through Phoenicia of the manner of addressing the gods and the stories about these which are found in their mysteries.²⁷

Thus there is no reason to doubt Pausanias' testimony, and with that, West's Akkadian etymology must *prima facie* appear attractive. Before leaving this section, I must acknowledge that Deacy and Villing, in their introduction to a volume of studies touching the goddess Athena, assert that West's work is "seriously flawed", but provide no details of in what these flaws might consist.²⁸ A search of *L'Année Philologique* and journals such as the *Classical Review* located but one review of West's book, and that was only a notice and summary of contents.²⁹ It would seem that there are sound grounds to accept West's overall conclusion of a Semitic origin for the epithet "Ogga", even if it is odd that the stated *Phoenician* origin of the name should be supported only by *Akkadian* evidence. This is probably because the vast bulk of Phoenician literature has disappeared (having been written on papyrus, which is preserved only in very dry areas, such as Egypt), whereas a good deal of Akkadian evidence has survived, and Akkadian and Phoenician are both Semitic languages. However, as we see in the next section, West was probably unaware that a Phoenician inscription which lends support to his thesis has, in fragments, survived.

2. The Evidence of Byblos 13

The significance of this text is that it mentions a Phoenician deity, "Og". The evidence from Israel and Ugarit, which I shall review later, provides grounds to see this deity as having been much older than the date of Byblos 13. This fragmentary text, dated to about 500 BC, was found on a broken white marble block in 1957, and was first published in 1969.³⁰ Röllig provided an extensive commentary upon it in 1974.³¹ The first two lines, as they survive, read in the *editio princeps*:³²

²⁷ Eusebius, *Evangelica Praeparatio*, 1.10.55.

²⁸ S. Deacy and A. Villing (2001a) 14 n. 14.

²⁹ M. Köckert, untitled notice, *ZAW* 110 (1998) 482.

³⁰ Starcky (1969)

³¹ Röllig (1974).

³² Starcky (1969) 262.

- (1) ...].n 'nk lhdy wkn hn 'nk škb b'rn zn 'sp bmr wbd/[h
- (2) ... lpth 'lt 'rn zn wlgz 'šmy h'g ytbqšn h'dr wbkl d[...

In Starcky's translation, these lines read:

- (1) ... moi, je suis tout seul, et ainsi, voici que je repose dans ce sarcophage, recueilli dans la myrrhe et le bdellium ...
- (2) ... pour ouvrir] ce sarcophage et pour troubler mes os, le "Og me cherchera, le Puissant, et dans tout ... [

Röllig's translation of virtually the same text reads:

- (1) [... in in dem Sarkoph]ag für mich allein. Und siehe, so liege ich in diesem Sarkophag, "eingesammelt" in Myrrh und in Bdel[l]ium ...
- (2) [... zu öffnen ü]ber diesem Sarkophag und zu stören meine Gebeine, der mächtige Og wird mich rächen und unter allen Geschl[echtern ...

Since then, there have been two main trajectories of interpretation: those who read the name "Og" with Starcky and Röllig, and those who do not, either because they amend the text or they have another opinion on how to arrange the letters into words.

Of the second line of interpretation, it suffices to take Cross's reading. Cross restored lines 1 and 2 as follows:

- (1) ['nk (PN and titular) škb b'rn] zn 'nk lhdy wkn hn 'nk škb b'rn zn 'sp bmr wbd/[h
- (2) w'm kl 'dm ybqš lpth 'lt 'rn zn wlgz 'šmy h'gzt bqšn h'dr wbkl de [bn 'lm

Cross's reconstruction of line 1, is not controversial here. It is quite likely correct. In respect of line 2, he states "... it is clear that we have a conditional sentence followed by a petition to the gods to punish anyone who disturbs the tomb ... The infinitives also need to be governed by a verb; *bqš* serves perfectly and is familiar in this context. Further, the key term *bqšn* plays on the theme: the seeker will be sought out."^{33 34}

Cross goes on to say: "The expression *h'g* is bizarre and cannot be correct. *ybtqš* does not exist in Canaanite, and if it did it would be reflexive and intransitive, making the suffix *-n* a further anomaly, and the meaning unthinkable.

³³ Cross (1979) 41.

³⁴ Cross (1979) 42.

... *h'ḏr* must be a shortened form of *Ba'l 'Addir*, found in precisely the same context in Šipit-ba'l (KAI 9B, 5), with the article used as a vocative particle." However, his solution may raise as many problems as it solves, for Cross proposes that *šmy* is qualified as *h'gzt*, reading a *z* for Starcky's *y*, "and then after a clear space, *bqšn*."³⁵ He thus translates this passage: "and if anyone seeks to open] this sarcophagus or to disturb my mouldering bones, seek him out O (Ba(l) Addir and with the assembly [of the gods ..."³⁶

With respect, this translation is unlikely, if not only because the bones in question were probably preserved in myrrh and bdellium, as stated in line 1. Further, in none of the other references to "bones" in Phoenician funerary inscriptions, is there such an adjective. As Cross notes, this adjective is not known in Canaanite: he has found it in Arabic.³⁷ Indeed, given the frequent references to "bones" in the inscriptions, it may be that the preservation of those bones was one of the most significant aims of sarcophagus burial.³⁸ Further, to judge by the photograph published in *MUSJ*, it is not apparent that Starcky was wrong to read this letter as *y*, neither does the spacing seem as unequivocal as Cross would have it. However, as Cross notes, the inscription is damaged at this point,³⁹ and the spacing is uneven, and so one cannot be dogmatic.

If, however, *Og* is an epithet of a Phoenician deity, then another reading is possible. The relevant words may be arranged:

h'gy tbqšn h'ḏr

O my *Og* (i.e. my avenger), seek him out. O (Ba'l) 'Addir ...

This has the *prima facie* advantage of accepting the text without amendment. That the first person singular possessive suffix can be attached to a divine epithet is proved in KAI 10, the Yehawmalik inscription, where the phrase *rbty* "my lady", in respect of Baalat lady of Byblos, appears four times.⁴⁰ The *h* before *'g* was read by both Starcky and Rölli as the definite article. As Cross notes for its second occurrence, it may be the vocative particle. The epithet may mean something like "the angry one", or perhaps to fit the context, "the avenger". Although it may be

³⁵ Cross (1979) 42.

³⁶ Cross (1979) 41.

³⁷ Cross (1979) 42.

³⁸ I am aware that there was an analogous view in Israel, at least at certain times.

³⁹ Cross (1979) 42.

⁴⁰ Twice each in lines 3 and line 7: Gibson (1983) 92.

thought odd to speak of "my angry one", the suggestion fits the context.⁴¹ Remembering D. R. West's conjectures about "Demeter Fury",⁴² it may well be that here we have an analogous position. I am not suggesting that the Greek concept of the Furies was taken from Phoenicia.

On my reading, we no longer have a difficult verb *yibqšn*. We now have the second person prefixing form of the verb *bqš*, "request" in the *qal* and "seek, look for", in the *pi''el*.⁴³ The final "n" would appear to the writers to most likely be the form of the *modus energicus*.⁴⁴

An adjective *'g* is not hitherto known in Phoenician. Neither Krahmalkov or Tomback have any entry for it in their dictionaries. *DNWSI* has an entry, and notes the Byblos 13 inscription, but while it cites all of the relevant scholarly works, observes that the word is of uncertain meaning.⁴⁵

A name *'Og* is, however, known from the Hebrew Bible, and some scholars reading this word in Phoenician have done so in the light of the Hebrew text.⁴⁶ The Hebrew evidence is useful in suggesting the vocalization. But King Og of Bashan rejoices in a proper name. If I am correct that this is a Phoenician adjective, and if Ogga is a Phoenician title, it is not the only occasion on which a Phoenician adjective was used as a title for both gods and goddesses. In this same line of Byblos 13, we find *'ḏr* ("great, mighty") in the masculine. However, it was also used in the feminine to refer to a goddess.⁴⁷ The word *'g* fits Pausanias' statement nicely. As a Phoenician word feminized in Greek, it would, as David West stated, end with "a" and thus produce the form "Ogga".⁴⁸ It is known to have been applied to a deity, and West's exercise in comparative Semitic etymology proves its worth.⁴⁹ If the word does mean "angry", then it also illuminates the reading of Byblos 13.

⁴¹ The problem with Schiffmann's suggestion of "Lärm" or "noise" for this word, is that it hardly fits the passage: Schiffman (1976) 174.

⁴² D. West (1995) 172.

⁴³ Krahmalkov (2000) 124. *DNWSI* 188.

⁴⁴ Segert (1976) 196 and Friedrich and Rölli (1999) 191 accept that Phoenician knew such a form. Krahmalkov (2001) is silent on the topic.

⁴⁵ *DNWSI* 824. Similarly Teixidor (1972).

⁴⁶ Starcky (1969) 265. Rölli, (1974) 6.

⁴⁷ Krahmalkov (2000) 38.

⁴⁸ West (1995) 171.

⁴⁹ West would also find support in Cohen (1994) 6 *sub* 'GG. The readings in Cohen for this root are so diverse that they do not affect our thesis. On the contrary, they tend to make the suggestion of a hitherto unknown Semitic root *'G*, "angry", an attractive one.

That the Akkadian word *agga* commences with an *aleph*, while the Phoenician adjective commences with an *ain* is no impediment to this thesis. While it is often said that when Proto-Semitic *ain* disappears from Akkadian, an “a” vowel becomes a “e”, and there is no doubt at all that this often happens, the rule is not invariable. Kogan has demonstrated that the loss of *ain* in Akkadian can leave an “a” vowel unchanged, and cites examples from several Semitic languages.⁵⁰ I provide two examples of initial *ain* in specifically Phoenician words where *aleph* with an “a” vowel is found in their Akkadian cognates:

Phoenician	Akkadian
‘gl, ‘calf	agalu, ‘an equid ⁵¹
‘d, ‘until, while, even’	adi ‘until’ etc. ⁵²

Og, then, was invoked to seek out those who might desecrate the coffin. The epithet Ogga may well have originally been Phoenician as the Greek evidence states, and has a cognate in an Akkadian cluster of words for “angry”. If so, we have an addition to the Phoenician lexicon.

3. Og of the Hebrew Bible

Scholars have invoked the ‘g of Byblos 13 in their studies of the enigmatic biblical King Og of Bashan. A full treatment of the biblical Og, King of Bashan (the region drained by the Yarmuk and its tributaries),⁵³ is beyond the scope of this article. For my purposes, it is sufficient to note that just as the Hebrew Og was one of the Rephaim, it is possible if not even likely that the Phoenician Og was, also, for Phoenician and Israelite concepts share several features.

A recent review has it that the name is “of unknown etymology”.⁵⁴ If the instant thesis is correct, then it means that attempts to derive his name from the words for “man” in Osa, Soqotri and Hatraean, are unnecessary.⁵⁵ Although the Hebrew Bible spells the name as ‘wg in 21 of the name’s occurrences, it is

⁵⁰ Kogan (2001) 263-264.

⁵¹ Tombaek (1978) 238. CDA, 6, defines it as “donkey” in Akkadian.

⁵² Tombaek (1978) 238. CDA, 4, defines it as “until, as far as” (and similarly) in Akkadian

⁵³ The Bashan is the most northerly area of the Transjordan: Bartlett (1970) 265.

⁵⁴ *del Olmo Lete*, “Og” in DDD.

⁵⁵ These words are cited by *del Olmo Lete*, DDD 638.

spelled ‘g in 1 Kings 4:19, exactly as in Byblos 13.⁵⁶ Further, the presence of the *mater lectionis* in Hebrew and its omission in Phoenician should not occasion any surprise, as this is one of the recognised differences in their orthography. Indeed, as Krahmalkov notes of Phoenician spelling: “Instances of the use of the letters *waw* and *yod*, even in spelling of foreign names, are exceedingly few ...”.⁵⁷

King Og is associated with Ashtaroth in Joshua 9:10 and with Ashtaroth and Edrei in Deuteronomy 1:4, Joshua 12:4 and 13:12 and 31. In Deuteronomy 1:4 Ashtaroth is said to be in Edrei, but in all three of the Joshua references, Ashtaroth and Edrei are clearly separate places. Deuteronomy 3:11 would have it that he was a giant, and that his bed was (in today’s measurements) 13 by 5.8 feet.⁵⁸ Bartlett contends that two persons of the name Og must have been known to different groups of Israelites. To him, the Og whose massive bed subsists in Ammon is not the Og of a “definite historical and geographical setting in the Yarmuk valley”.⁵⁹ The problem with this reconstruction and bifurcation of Ogs is that Deuteronomy 3:11 which provides the details of his giant bed describes him as King of Bashan. Thus, the only basis for separating out a historical Og from a legendary one is the very assumption that they must be distinct. As we shall see, the more one examines the material, the more the “historical Og” appears to be inextricably linked to the “legendary Og”.

Og is explicitly said to be *mytr hrp’ym* – “among the remainder of the Rephaim” (Deuteronomy 3:11 and Joshua 12:4 and 12:12). The Rephaim are known in Phoenicia where they are mentioned in line 8 of the Tabnit inscription and line 8 of the Ešmunazor II inscription.⁶⁰ By itself, this might only mean that some long defunct kings were absorbed into legend. But the Rephaim were also known in Ugarit before the time of the writing of *Joshua*. While the Rephaim have occasioned a substantial amount of scholarly comment, it is sufficient for our purposes to commence with Wyatt’s authoritative summary of the Ugaritic term *rpum*:

Various translations: ‘saviours’ (de Moor), ‘divine rulers’ (Aistleitner), ‘hale ones’ (L’Heureux), ‘shades’ (Caquot; Lewis), untranslated (del Olmo). In view of the fact that they are apparently divinised dead kings, have a soteriological

⁵⁶ The other 21 occurrences of the name Og are in Numbers 21:33 and 32:33; Deuteronomy 1:4; 3:1, 3, 4, 10, 11 and 13; Joshua 2:10; 9:10; 12:4; 13:12, 30 and 31; Nehemiah 9:22; and Psalms 135:11 and 136:20.

⁵⁷ Krahmalkov (2001) 16.

⁵⁸ Millard (1988) 484.

⁵⁹ Bartlett (1970) 268.

⁶⁰ There is some Punic evidence, which I shall pass over as being rather late.

function in maintaining society and appear ... in parallel with *ilnym*, 'divinities' ('minor gods'), 'saviours' seems an appropriate translation. The technical sense applied to 'heroes' in Greek cultic contexts may also be appropriate.⁶¹

The Rephaim appear to have names. KTU 1.20 may name Danel as their ruler, or as among their number,⁶² and in KTU 1.108, the deity Rapiu is said to be "King of Eternity".⁶³ Rapiu is said to enjoy "rule" and "splendour" among the Rephaim of the underworld (*b ḥtkh . b nmrth . l r/[p]i . arš ...*).⁶⁴ Most pertinently for us, it is stated that Rapiu rules in Athtarath (which becomes Ashtaroth in Hebrew)⁶⁵ and Edrei.⁶⁶ Another Ugaritic funerary deity is associated with Athtarath.⁶⁷ Pardee has demonstrated that it is "highly likely" that the Phoenician deity Milkashtart (*mlk^c šrt*) was not a double deity, the god *mlk* and the goddess *šrt*, but rather a combination of the divine name *mlk* and a geographical name. The place in question is Ashtaroth in the Transjordan, and the name thus meant "Milku of Ashtaroth".⁶⁸

It is not surprising that scholars have tried to elucidate the links between these figures. Pope concluded:

The mythical character of Og, King of Bashan, the last of the Rephaim, is indicated by a Phoenician tomb inscription which invokes the Might (sic) Og to visit the grave robber⁶⁹ ... That the biblical Og has the same address as RPU

⁶¹ Wyatt (1998) 315 n. 1. Naccache suggests that the Arabic should also be considered, so that the Rephaim may be the tranquilly resting ones: Naccache (1995). I do not see why the name could not have several associations.

⁶² Wyatt (1998) 317 n. 18.

⁶³ Wyatt (1998) 395.

⁶⁴ Spacing as found in KTU 1.108 rev. lines 23/24, 126.

⁶⁵ This would appear to follow from the entry in del Olmo and Sanmartín (2003) 195.

⁶⁶ KTU 1.108, lines 2/3.

⁶⁷ The relationship of the Hebrew Bible Og to various entities in North West Semitic literature is the subject of a "heftige Diskussion": Dietrich and Loretz (1991) 88. I disagree with some of their views. Dietrich and Loretz argue that the Ugaritic text refers to three deities and so is not relevant to the Hebrew Bible. But the three, if they are distinct, are mentioned one after the other in the same functional context, and so closely that many scholars have taken them to be one. It is surely legitimate to investigate possible connections, but not to assume that the references are to identical entities.

⁶⁸ Pardee (1988) quoting 67. See also 62-66.

⁶⁹ Pope is referring to the text now known as "Byblos 13".

MLK OLM⁷⁰ does not mean that they *must* be identical. Og appears to be a minor figure among the Rephaim, while RPU and / or MLK are ranking deities. That RPU and MLK also are both located at Ashtaroth, does not necessarily mean that they are one and the same deity, but it seems likely that this is the case.⁷¹

I might add that the evidence concerning the Rephaim and Og is so sparse that we cannot be certain that Og cut only a "minor" figure in that solemn company.

To conclude this section, it appears, given the connections between the Phoenician and the Israelite "Ogs", that the Og of Byblos 13 may well have been – indeed, probably was – one of the Rephaim.

4. Other supporting evidence.

In a recent article, Annus makes out a plausible case that the Greek names Meropes and Titanes are derived from the West Semitic *rp'* and *ditānu* respectively.⁷² Annus specifically cites and strengthens Noegel's arguments (see below), and shows the extent to which the concept of the *Rephaim* (known as Meropes) spread in ancient Greece. Thus, the movement of Og of the Rephaim into Greece should occasion no surprise.

The context for the cult of Athena Ogga is interesting. As we have seen, the Greeks saw it as originating from one incident within the Kadmos narrative. Kadmos of Tyre and founder of Thebes, it will be recalled, was the son variously of Agenor or Phoinix, and thus the nephew (or the nephew's son) of Belos. Phoinix was the father of Adonis, and the legendary eponym of the Phoenicians.⁷³ M.L. West observes:

Adonis, like Belos, is a Semitic divine title equipped with a Greek ending: Ugaritic *adn*, Phoenician *ʾdn*, Hebrew *ʾdōn* 'lord', *ʾdōnāy* 'my Lord (God)'. Unlike Belos, he had an actual cult in Greece, at least by the time of Sappho.⁷⁴

⁷⁰ That is, "Rapiu the King of Eternity" in the translation used here: the translation is not without contention, but the writers agree with Wyatt's reading, cited above, in this respect.

⁷¹ Pope (1977) 171.

⁷² Annus (1999) *passim*.

⁷³ M.L. West (1997) 448. For a recent treatment of the Kadmos myth in its Mediterranean setting, see Edwards (1979) esp. 19-38.

⁷⁴ M.L. West (1997) 448.

It has been observed for over 350 years, that the name 'Kadmos' has a good Semitic etymology: it derives from the root *qdm*.⁷⁵ Words derived from this root were widely used in Ugarit, and one of these words referred to the *rpim*, to whom I shall refer by their more familiar biblical name as the *Rephaim*. I return to the *Rephaim* later.

Bernal contends that the names 'Og (Hebrew), and Ogygos and Ogyges (Greek) may be related, all being ultimately derived from a Semitic root 'wg, meaning "to draw a circle". He explores the possibility of a connection with the Late Egyptian *wg*, being a "type of water or flood".⁷⁶ It may well be that there are two different roots operating here: 'g and 'wg. For reasons which appear from the entire thrust of this essay, I contend that in respect of the Hebrew 'Og, my own suggestion is simpler and accounts for the evidence touching Athena Ogga. Bernal is, in my view, correct to see that the character of Ogygos is involved in the entire discussion and may well be correct in respect of the etymology of his name.

The issues are advanced by Noegel's research into Ogygos of Boiotia, Og of Bashan, and the Og of Byblos 13.⁷⁷ It is beyond the scope of this article to review all of Noegel's arguments.⁷⁸ On balance, I am of the view that he has made out his case, although more research is required – as he himself states. It is worth adding to Noegel's arguments what any Semitist will know, but which may puzzle a classicist, that biliteral Semitic roots can become trilateral, and one way in which they frequently do so is by reduplicating the last consonant. Thus Semitic words based upon a root *md* can be found vocalised around *md* itself and around *mdd*. It may be added that Noegel did not apparently know of West's research into Ogga. Had he done so, it might have aided his study of the etymological connections between the names.⁷⁹ In other words, I see West's and Noegel's scholarship as complementary.

One matter which Noegel mentions and should be developed here is that a Talmudic tractate identifies Ahiyah (a Leviathan) as Og's father.⁸⁰ While the Talmud is quite late, it is not known how old some of its sources may be. What is interesting is the connection with Leviathan, for the River Ladon in Greece is plausibly stated to have taken its name from this creature.⁸¹ The names may not

⁷⁵ M.L. West (1997) 448-449.

⁷⁶ Bernal (1991) 83-85.

⁷⁷ Noegel (1998) *passim*.

⁷⁸ Astour (1967) 212 had concluded that "Ogygos" was Semitic. However, Noegel's research places Astour's conclusion upon a firmer basis.

⁷⁹ Noegel (1998) 413-414. It is unlikely that D. West's published work would have been available to Noegel before he had completed his research.

⁸⁰ Noegel (1998) 419.

⁸¹ Wyatt (2001) 73.

appear similar, especially when we are comparing the English transliteration of the Hebrew noun. However, the Hebrew and the Greek alike are probably developments of an original form *ltn* which is amply attested in Ugarit as the name of a sea dragon.⁸²

Further, in some accounts, Ogygos had a wife: Thebe, which Astour contends is based upon the north West Semitic word "ark" (*tbh*), and came to be taken as the name of the city. I note further that "Ogygian" was another epithet of Thebes.⁸³ All in all, Astour found 14 Semitic connections in the Kadmos myth and concludes:

Each of these rapprochements may seem unimportant and fortuitous by itself, but taken together, added together to the great Cadmid cycle, this agglomeration of Semitic elements in one relatively small area cannot fail to make a certain impression.⁸⁴

However, Astour had difficulty in finding a convincing Semitic etymology for Ogga – a matter of regret since he noted that Pausanias affirmed it to be a Phoenician name.⁸⁵ However, now that West has offered a plausible Semitic etymology, Astour's work provides reciprocal support for West: the agglomeration has increased.

I said earlier that I would return to West's comments about the river Ladon and the toponym 'Ογκειον. This is mentioned in Pausanias' account of Arkadia. West omitted to mention in his summary that the place name is also associated by Pausanias with a male: 'Ογκιος the son of Apollo.⁸⁶ This is significant for two reasons: first, given what the Greek authors state about the name "Ogga" it is likely that this name is also of Phoenician etymology, and thus provides us with a direct parallel to the name Og in Byblos 13. Secondly, the cluster of names with plausible Semitic but not apparent Greek derivation is again increased.

Then, as adverted to above, Annus has recently extended and strengthened some of Noegel's conclusions. In particular, Annus cites a fragment of the Greek historian Thallus which states that Belos, the king of the Assyrians, fought with the Titans against Greece, and that Ogygos (who seems to have been one of the defeated Titans) fled to the land now known as *Attika*, which he then ruled.⁸⁷ Over and above providing additional evidence of a Semitic complex being received

⁸² Astour (1967) 214.

⁸³ Paus. 9.5.1.

⁸⁴ Astour (1967) 217.

⁸⁵ Astour (1967) 217, n.2.

⁸⁶ Paus. 8.25.4.

⁸⁷ Annus (1999) 23.

into Greece, this occasions a reconsideration of the statement in Hesychios that "Ogka Athena means the Ogygian gates".⁸⁸

Why should the name of the goddess mean, or signify, those gates? It must be noted that in the *Phoenician Women*, Euripides mentions the Ogygian gates (l. 1112), of which the scholiast states that the names derives from the fact that Ogygos was buried there. Modern commentators have identified these gates with the gate of Athena Ogga.⁸⁹ We do not have enough evidence to conjecture with any confidence as to why Athena Ogga and Ogygos should be linked, but the fact of a close connection cannot be gainsaid. As a result, the basic thrust of Annus', Noegel's and West's research should be accepted as accurate.

If this hypothesis is correct, it may teach us of a previously unknown Phoenician word, and may shed a little indirect light on King Og of the Hebrew Bible and his ancient cognates.

Abbreviations

CDA	<i>A Concise Dictionary of Akkadian</i> , ed. Jeremy Black, Andrew George and Nicholas Postgate, Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden, 1995
DDD	<i>Dictionary of Demons and Deities in the Bible</i> , ed. Karel van der Toorn, Bob Becking, and Pieter van der Horst, E.J. Brill Leiden, (extensively revised edition), 1998
DNWSI	<i>Dictionary of North-West Semitic Inscriptions</i> , J. Hoftijzer and K. Jongeling, E.J. Brill Leiden, 1995 (in two volumes)
IEJ	<i>Izrael Exploration Journal</i>
KAI	<i>Kanaanäische und Aramäische Inschriften</i> , H. Donner and W. Röllig, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 1971-1976, in three volumes
KTU	<i>The Cuneiform Alphabetic texts from Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani and other places</i> , M. Dietrich, O. Loretz and J. Sanmartin, Ugarit-Verlag, Munster, 1995 (2 nd edition)
MUSJ	Mélanges de l'Université Saint Joseph
OLA	<i>Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta</i>
RSF	<i>Rivista di Studi Fenici</i>

⁸⁸ The text is identical in each edition for this definition from l. 36. The writers have checked this citation. West's quotation from the 1861 edition was accurate: nothing of significance has been omitted.

⁸⁹ Craik (1988) 234.

St Ph	<i>Studia Phoenicia</i>
UF	<i>Ugaritische Forschungen</i>
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
ZAW (ZATW)	<i>Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>

Bibliography

Ancient Sources

- Eusebius 1974. *La Préparation Évangélique, Livre I*, No. 206 in the series Sources chrétiennes, ed., trans. and annotated Jean Sirinelli and Édouard Des Places, Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf.
- Hesychios 1861. *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*, vol. III, I. ed. Albertum and M. Schmidt, Jena.
- Hesychios 1966. *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*, vol. II, ed. K. Latte, Munksgaard.
- Nonnos 1940. *Dionysiaca*, vol. 1, ed., trans. and annotated by W.H.D. Rouse, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Plutarch 1936. *Moralia*, vol. 5, trans. F.C. Babbitt, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Stephen of Byzantium 1849. *Stephani Byzantii Ethnicorum quae supersunt*, Tomus Prior, ed. and annotated by A. Meineke, Berlin: G. Reimer.

Modern Writers

- Annus, Amar 1999. Are there Greek Rephaim? On the Etymology of Greek Meropes and Titanes, *UF*, 31, 13-30.
- Astour, M.C. 1967. *Hellenosemitica*, 2nd edition, Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Bartlett, J.R. 1970. Sihon and Og, Kings of the Amorites, *VT* 20, 257-277.
- Bernal, Martin 1991. *Black Athena*, vol. II, New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Cohen, D. 1994. *Dictionnaire des racines sémitiques*, Fasc 1., Leuven: Peeters.
- Craik, Elizabeth 1988. *Euripides: Phoenician Women*, Wiltshire: Aris & Phillips Ltd.
- Cross, Frank Moore 1979. A Recently Published Phoenician Inscription of the Persian Period from Byblos, *IEJ* 29, 40-44.
- Deacy, S. and Villing, A. 2001a. Athena Past and Present: An Introduction, 1-25 in: Deacy and Villing (2001b).
- Deacy, S. and Villing, A. (eds) 2001b. *Athena in the Classical World*, Leiden: Brill.
- Dietrich, M. and Loretz, O. 1991. Zur Debatte über 'Funerary Texts and Beatific Afterlife in Ugaritic Texts and in the Bible, *UF* 23, 85-90.
- Edwards, R.B. 1979. *Kadmos the Phoenician*, Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert.
- Eslinger, M. and Taylor, G. (eds) 1988. *Ascribe to the Lord: Biblical and other Essays in Memory of Peter C. Craigie*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Tomasz Polański

Jagellonian University, Cracow

LOAN WORDS, FABLES AND PROPHETIC WRITINGS. ORIENTAL MIMESIS IN THE ALEXANDRA OF LYCOPHRON

After a hundred years of studies which have brought among works still as indispensable as Scheer's edition of the *Alexandra* with the scholia and other important contributions by B. Niebuhr, J. Konze, L. Hensel, U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, C. von Holzinger, K. Ziegler, and more recently by S. West, V. Gigante-Lanzara and G. Shade, one has the feeling that we are standing on the quite firm ground established by Lycophronic scholarship, and that we all share this feeling despite the residual ambiguities, doubts, and lack of a considerable part of the relevant literary, mythological, historical, linguistic and geographical material.¹ Two *RE* papers by Josifovič and Ziegler focus on the Western Mediterranean, and naturally for a good reason, because it is the West, Italy, Sicily and the Balkan region, their geography, mythology and

¹ This paper owes much to the encouragement, bibliographical information and printed materials sent to me by Stephanie West, Hertford College, Oxford; B. G. Niebuhr, Über das Zeitalter Lykophrons des Dunkels, *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* (= *RhM*) 1827 (1), pp. 108-117 (= *Kleine historische und philologische Schriften*, 1828 (1), pp. 438-450; E. Sheer, *Lycophronis Alexandra*, vol. 1-2, Berlin, 1881-1908; C. von Holzinger, *Lykophron, Alexandra*, Leipzig, 1895; V. Gigante-Lanzara, *Licofrone, Alessandra*, Milano 2000; U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *De Lycophronis Alexandra commentatiuncula*, Greifswald, 1883 (= *Kleine Schriften* 2, 12-29); L. Hensel, *Weissagungen in der alexandrinischen Poesie*, Giessen, 1908; J. Konze, *De dictione Lycophronis*, Monasterii 1870; S. Sudhaus, Die Abfassungszeit der *Alexandra*, *RhM* 63, 1908, pp. 481-487; J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*, III 2, Strassbourg 1893-1904, pp. 478 ff.; S. West, *Lycophron Italicized*, *Journal of Hellenic Studies* (= *JHS*) 104, 1984, pp. 127-151; V. Gigante-Lanzara, Le vie del mare. Eroi e città nei vaticini di Cassandra, in *La Parola del Passato* 328, 2003, pp. 12-60; G. Shade, *Lycophrons 'Odyssey': Alexandra 648-819*, Berlin, New York 1999; a review of the book, V. Gigante-Lanzara, *La Parola del Passato*, 319, 2001, pp. 308-312.

- Friedrich, J. and Röllig, W. 1999. *Phönizisch-Punische Grammatik*, revised by Amadasi Guzzo, M.G., Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico.
- Gibson, John C.L. 1982. *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions*, vol. III, Phoenician Inscriptions, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Habicht, Christian 1985. *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hutchinson, G.O. 1985. *Septem Contra Thebas*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Kogan, R. 2001. *ḡ in Akkadian, *UF* 33, 263-298.
- Krahmalkov, Charles R. 2000. *Phoenician-Punic Dictionary*, Leuven: Peeters.
- Krahmalkov, Charles R. 2001. *A Phoenician-Punic Grammar*, Leiden: Brill.
- Millard, A.R. 1988. King Og's Iron Bed and other Ancient Ironmongery. In: M. Eslinger and G. Taylor (eds), *Ascribe to the Lord: Biblical and other Essays in Memory of Peter C. Craigie*, 481-492, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Naccache, Albert F. 1995. 'Ammurafi' et ses cousins. In: M. Yon, M. Sznycer and P. Bordreuil, *Le pays d'Ougarit autour de 12000 av. J.-C.*, Ras Shamra-Ougarit 11, 263-268.
- Noegel, Scott 1998. The Aegean Ogygos of Boeotia and the Biblical Og of Bashan: Reflections of the Same Myth, *ZAW*, 110, 411-426.
- del Olmo Lete, G. and Sanmartin, J. 2003. *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition*, (two volumes), Leiden: Brill.
- Papadopoulou, T. 2001. Representations of Athena in Greek Tragedy, 293-310. In: Deacy and Villing 2001b.
- Pardee, D. 1988. A New Datum for the Meaning of the Divine Name Milkashtart. In: Eslinger and Taylor 1988, 55-68.
- Pope, Marvin H. 1977. Notes on the Rephaim Texts from Ugarit.. In: M. De Jong Ellis, *Essays on the Ancient Near East in Memory of Jacob Joel Finkelstein*, 163-182, Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books.
- Röllig, Wolfgang 1974. Eine Neue Phoenizische Inschrift aus Byblos, *Neue Ephemeris für semitische Epigraphik* 2, 1-15.
- Schachter, A. 1981. *Cults of Boiotia: 1 Acheloos to Hera*, London: University of London, Institute of Classical Studies.
- Schiffmann, I. 1976. Studien zur Interpretation der neuen phönizischen Inschrift aus Byblos (Byblos 13), *RSF* 4, 171-177.
- Segert, Stanislav 1976. *A Grammar of Phoenician and Punic*, Munich: C.H. Beck.
- Starcky, J. 1969. Une inscription phénicienne de Byblos, *MUSJ* 45, 259-273.
- Teixidor, J. 1972. Entry in *Bulletin d'épigraphie sémitique*, (published as an addendum to Syria, 49), 430-431.
- Tombback, Richard S. 1978. *A Comparative Semitic Lexicon of the Phoenician and Punic Languages*, Missoula: Scholars Press.
- West, David R. 1995. *Some Cults of Greek Goddesses and Female Daemons of Oriental Origin*, Neukirchener Verlag Butzon & Bercker Kevelaer.
- West, Martin L. 1997. *The East Face of Helicon*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Wyatt, Nicholas 1998. *Religious Texts from Ugarit*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Wyatt, Nicholas 2001. *Space and Time in the Religious Life of the Near East*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.