

KRZYSZTOF TOMASZ WITCZAK

TWO BITHYNIAN DEITIES
IN THE OLD AND NEW PHRYGIAN INSCRIPTIONAL TEXTS

1. *The Bithynian God Tiyes* vel *Ζεύς Πάπας*¹.

The god **Tiyes** in the nom. sg. (or voc. sg.) is clearly attested in the Old Phrygian inscription M-04 from the "Midasstadt", where this god bears the title **Modrovanak**. Dating from the first half of the sixth century B.C., the inscription M-04 is engraved on Kybele's throne with the utmost care and is perfectly legible except for a few mutilated letters. The inscription has been edited and analyzed several times, but the proposed interpretations are unsatisfactory and there is not even a consensus about the name of the god **Tiyes** and his title.

C. Brixhe and M. Lejeune in their standard monograph on the Old Phrygian inscriptions [1984: 23] give the following reading of text M-04: **akinanogavan:tiyes modrovanak:[?]avara[?]**

The first word of the inscription, **akinanogavan**, can be the acc. sg. of an *ā*-stem, a feminine variant of the same word, which appears also as **akenanogavos** in the inscription M-01a² and twice in W-01³. The word **akenanogavos** applies most probably to a religious functionary and not a secular one. According to Lubotsky's opinion [1988: 12], the feminine variant **akinanogava** is a title of the Great Goddess herself. It is well known that Kybele is often mentioned as a bearer of a religious title (a high priestess or an oracle) in Phrygia.

As the sentence starts with an object in the acc. sg., it is most probable that two further words can be recognized as nom. sg., and **?avara?** as a verbal form. This syntactic structure, Obj. — Subj. — Verb, is well known in Phrygia [Lubotsky 1988: 16].

I accept Lubotsky's interpretation [1989a: 85], according to which **Tiyes** is a theonym bearing the title **Modrovanak** "king of Modra", where **Modra** (**Μόδρα**) is a Bithynian town [Neumann 1986; Bayun-Orel 1989: 180] and **vanak** is the noun meaning "king", cf. NPhr. **ουανακταν** (acc. sg.), Gk. Att. **ἄναξ** "king, lord", Myc. **wa-na-ka**, Toch. A **nātāk** "lord" (all from IE. ***w̥n̥Akt-s** "king, lord" [Winter 1970: 53-54])⁴.

It seems likely that the Bithynian town **Τίειον** (also **Τίον**) is named after this god, cf. the remarks of Stephanus Byzantius:

Δημοσθένης δ' ἐν Βιθυνιακοῖς φησὶ κτιστὴν τῆς πόλεως γενέσθαι Πάταρον ἐλόνται Παφλαγονίαν, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ τιμᾶν τὸν Δία Τίον

νοοσαγορεύσαι (cf. on this passage Haas 1966: 67 and 172; Lubotsky 1988, fn. 13; 1989a: 85).

It should be emphasized that Steph. Byz. connects the name of the god Tiyes with the Bithynian town Τίειον / Τίον (for parallels, see such examples as Ἀπολλωνία: Ἀπόλλων, Ἀθήναι: Ἀθήνη, Δίον: Ζεύς, Ἡρακλεία: Ἡρακλῆς, etc.) and that in the Old Phrygian inscription M-04 the god Tiyes is ascribed as 'the king of (the Bithynian town) Modra'. This implies a Bithynian origin of the god.

The name Τίειον contains the suffix -eyo-, which is frequently used for the formation of adjectives (not only in Phrygian⁵). The same adjective occurs in the New Phrygian inscription No. 58, where the sequence τιηιον εγησιτ γεγοιμενον is translated by O. Haas [1966: 67] "er soll das göttliche Vorbestimmte tragen". This curse is a variant of a frequent New Phrygian malediction γεγοιμεναν εγεδου Τιος ουταν "let him get the established punishment of (the god) Tiyes" (*vel. sim.*), which contains the gen. sg. of the name Tiyes, cf.

- γεγοιμεναν εγεδου Τιος ουταν (No. 32; 34; 36; 60; 105)
- γεγ < ρ > ειμεναν εγεδου Τιος ουταν (No. 33)
- γεγοιμεναν εγεδ[ου Τ]ιος ου < τ > αν (No. 59)
- γεγοιμεναν κ' εγεδου Τιος ουταν (No. 76)
- γεγοιμε[ναν εγεδ]ου Τιος ουτ[αν] (No. 108).

Furthermore, this god appears in two New Phrygian apodosis formulae τιτ τετικμενος ας Τιαν ειτου (where Tiyes occurs in acc. sg.) and Τιη/ε τιτ τετικμενος ειτου (where Tiyes occurs in dat. sg. and/or abl. sg.). Both formulae mean "let him become accursed by Tiyes" *vel. sim.* For these occurrences, see below:

- τι τετικμενος ας Τιαν [ειτ]ου (No. 14)
 - τιτ τετικμεν[ος] ας Τιαν ειτου (No. 53)
 - τι τετικμενος ας Τιαν [ε]ιτου (No. 99)
- and also
- Τιε τιτ [τ]ετικμενος ειτου (No. 2)
 - [κ]ε Τιε τιτ τετικμενος ειτου (No. 3)
 - τοσ νι με ζεμελω < σ > κε δεοσ [κ]ε Τιη τιτ τετικμενος ε[ιτ]ου (No. 6)
 - δεοσ κε ζεμ[ελωσ κε ...]α κε οι ειροια Τιε τιτ τετικμενος ειτου (No. 7)
 - Τιε τιτ τετικμενος ειτου (No. 26; 115)
 - ζεμελωσ Τιε τιτ τετικμενος ειτου (No. 75)⁶
 - με ζε < με > λωσ κε δεωα κε Τιε τι τετικμ[ενοσ ειτου] (No. 97)
 - με δεωσ Τιε τιτ τετικμενος ειτου (No. 97)
 - Τιη τι τ[ετικμενο]σ ειτου (No. 114).

From the above data it can be clearly seen that the case endings of the theonym Tiyes are those of a consonant-stem, cf. nom. / voc. sg. Tiyes (1 attestation)

- gen sg. Τιος (9 occurrences)
- acc. sg. Τιαν (3 ×) / Τίον (Steph. Byz.)
- dat. / abl. sg. Τιε / Τιη (10 ×).

On the basis of the above mentioned forms, A. Lubotsky [1988, fn. 13;

1989a: 85] proposes to reconstruct a s-stem, namely nom. sg. *TiH-es, gen. sg. *TiH-s-os, etc. His analysis is, however, hard to accept for a number of reasons. Firstly, the ancient data suppose that the god Tiyes was of Bithynian (not Phrygian) origin. Secondly, both the so-called *interpretatio graeca*, mentioned by Stephanus Byzantius (τὸν Δία Τίον προσαγορεύουσαι), and the parallelism of the declension of the Greek Ζεύς and the Bithynian Tiyes (see below) suggest that these two theonyms are of the same Indo-European origin, cf.

nom. sg.	<u>Tiyes</u> = <u>Ζεύς</u>	(< IE. <u>*Dyēus</u>),
gen. sg.	<u>Τιος</u> = <u>Διός</u> , Myc. <u>di-wo</u>	(< IE. <u>*Dīwós</u>),
acc. sg.	<u>Τιαν</u> = <u>Δία</u>	(< IE. <u>*Dīwm̥</u>),
dat. sg.	<u>Τιη/ε</u> = <u>Δίι</u> , Myc. <u>di-we</u>	(< IE. <u>*Dīwei</u>).

In such case the theonym Tiyes cannot be ascribed as genuine Phrygian for a number of reasons. First of all, Phrygian had no *Lautverschiebung* [Lejeune 1979; Brixhe 1983: 121–122]. Second, IE. *w was preserved not only in Old Phrygian, but also in New Phrygian (cf. OPhr. vanak, dat. sg. vanaktei "king" = NPhr. acc. sg. ουανανκταν < IE. *w̥nAkt-s "id."; see above). Third, the monophthongization of the diphthong *eu did not take place in Phrygian (cf. Phrygian ζεῦμαν τὴν πηγὴν. Φρύγες < IE. *ghéum̥n n. "spring, source", cf. Gk. χεῦμα n. "id.", Skt. hóman- [Gusmani 1958: 863 (= 1959); Neronak 1978: 155; Brixhe 1982: 244]. On the other hand, it is possible that these three processes (IE. *d > t; IE. *w > zero; IE. *eu > e) were typical of the Bithynian language⁷.

If the Bithynian god Tiyes is an equivalent of Greek Ζεύς, as Stephanus Byzantius supposes, he was mentioned in numerous Greek inscriptions of Bithynia as Ζεύς Πάπας (i.e. 'Sky-god the father', cf. Gk. Ζεύς πατήρ, Vedic Dyáuh pitā, Latin Iūpiter (voc.), Umbrian Iūppater (voc.) and Iuvepatre (dat.), Epirotic Δειπάτωρος⁸, all from IE. *Dyēus pātér "id"). Thus it is likely that Tiyes was the greatest god of the Bithynian pantheon.

Summing up, we may conclude that the god Tiyes was not native in the Phrygian pantheon and that the historical and linguistic data, mentioned above, suggest his Bithynian origin. We can find exact equivalents of Tiyes in Greek (Ζεύς / Ζεύς πατήρ), Old Indic (Dyáuh / Dyáuh pitā), Latin (gen. Iovis, voc. Iūpiter), Oscan (dat. Diúvei), Umbrian (dat. Iuvepatre, voc. Iūppater), Epirotic (voc. Δειπάτωρος), Messapic (Zis), Hittite (ši-u-uš), Lydian (Lefs, Levs) and possibly in Phrygian (Μα-ξεύς⁹), see Pokorny [1959: 184].

2. The Bithynian goddess Bas.

I believe that the Phrygians borrowed from the Bithynian pantheon not only the 'Sky-god', Tiyes, but also other deities. It seems plausible to propose the Bithynian origin of the deity Bas (acc. sg. Batan).

The goddess Bas is mentioned among other deities in the New Phrygian inscription No. 48: Μιτρα Φατα κε Μας Τεργουειος κε Πουντας Βας κε...¹⁰. The above mentioned names are no doubt theonyms, as implied by the Greek

part of the same inscription: *παρεθέμην τὸ μνημεῖον τοῖς προγεγραμμένοις θεοῖς καὶ τῇ κώμῃ ταυθ' ὁ πατήρ Ἀσκληπίος*.

The deity **Baš** in the acc. sg. is twice attested in the New Phrygian inscriptions No. 33 and 36 (*γεγαυριμενος ας βαταν τευτους*) and once in the Old Phrygian inscription T-02b (*batan*)¹¹. The parallelism of two constructions, *τιτ τευκιμενος ας Τταν ειτου* (No. 14, 53, 99) "let him become accursed by Tiyes" *vel sim.* (for which see above) and *γεγαυριμενος ας βαταν τευτους*, suggests that *ας Βαταν* must be analysed as the preposition *ας* + acc. sg. of a deity, whereas *τευτους* is a verbal form (so already Gusmani [1958: 903 (= 1959)], more recently Lubotsky [1989b: 149]).

The name of Bas also occurs in the apodosis formula with *βεκος* "bread", cf.

- Ba[σ] ιοι βεκος με βερετ (No. 86),
- με κε οι τοτοσσει τι Βας βεκος (No. 99),
- Βας ιοι βεκος μα βερετ (No. 111).

In my view, the deity **Bas** (i.e. **Bat-s**) can be successfully equated with the Mycenaean Greek deity ***Φας**, attested in dat. sg. ***Φαδεῖ** in the Knossos tablets: *pa-de* (KN Fp 1.4, Fp 48.2, Fs 8, Ga 456) and once *pa-de-i* (KN F 953 + F 955), see Kazanskene & Kazanskij [1986: 143]. If the connection between **Bat-** and Myc. Gk. *pa-d-* (i.e. ***Φαδ-**) is a real one, it is necessary to assume that both consonantal correspondences (**B-** = Gk. **Φ-** and **-t-** = Gk. **-δ-**) are very typical of Bithynian, but not of Phrygian, in which the consonantal shift ("*Lautverschiebung*") does not appear at all, i.e. IE. ***d** yields Phrygian **d** and not **t** (see Lejeune 1979). In this situation the deity **Bas** as well as **Tiyes** must have been borrowed by the Phrygians from the Bithynian pantheon.

The suggested Indo-European deity (presumable goddess) ***Bhad-s** is attested not only in Bithynian (**Βας**, acc. sg. *Βαταν* / *Batan*) and Mycenaean Greek (dat. sg. *pa-de-i* / *pa-de*), but also in Slavic (OPol. *Boda*¹², with a secondary reformation of the stem¹³, and possibly in Indic (? *Bhadra* f., also *Bhadrakālī* f., the name of a goddess, originally "Glück schaffend" [Mayrhofer 1963: 466–467]). The theonym ***Bhad-s** (f.) is undoubtedly derived from the Indo-European root **BHAD-** "fortunate, happy, prosperous; good" (see Pokorny [1959: 106] s.v. *bhad-* "gut"), which is well preserved in Indic (cf. Skt. *bhadra-* adj. "good, fortunate, blessed, delightful", *subhadra-* adj. "segensreich, heilvoll", etc.), Iranian (cf. MPers. *bahr* "beauty, grace, charm", Av. *hu-badra-* adj. "fortunate, prosperous, happy", MPers. *hu-bahr* = Skt. *su-bhadra-*), Germanic (cf. goth. *batiza* "better" / *batista* "best"; OIcel. *betre* / *betstr*; OE. *beter(a)* / *betst*; OHG. *bezzir(o)* / *bezzist*, G. *besser* / *best*; see also OIcel. *bati* m. "Verbesserung, Heil", OFris. *bata* m. "Voteil", etc.) and probably in Slavic (if OChSl. *dobrŭ* adj. "ἀγαθος, καλός", Rus. *dobryj*, Pol. *dobry* "good" reflect Slavic **dobrŭ* adj. "id." and IE. **bhadró-* adj. by metathesis of the consonants). This would suggest that the Bithynian **Bas**, as well as her Indo-European ancestress, was "the goddess of prosperity, happiness and fortune". If this be true, it would be quite understandable why this goddess occurs in the New Phrygian malediction formulae.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- BAYUN, L. S. / OREL, V. E.
1989 *Jazyk frigijski x nadpisej kak istoričeskij istočnik* [= La langue des inscriptions phrygiennes en tant que source historique], "Vestnik drevnej istorii" (VDI), 1989, No. 1, pp. 173–200, and No. 4, pp. 132–168.
- BRIXHE, Claude
1978 *Etudes néo-phrygiennes I*, "Verbum" 1/1, pp. 3–21.
1982 *Palatalisations en grec et en phrygien*, "Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris", vol. 77/1, pp. 209–249.
1983 *Epigraphie et grammaire du phrygien: état présent et perspectives*, [in:] *Le Lingue indoeuropee di frammentaria attestazione. Die indogermanischen Restsprachen* (ed. by E. Vineis), Pisa, pp. 109–131.
- BRIXHE, C. / LEJEUNE, M.
1984 *Corpus des inscriptions paléo-phrygiens*. 2 vols. Paris.
- BRÜCKNER, Aleksander
1985 *Mitologia słowiańska i polska* [= The Slavic and Polish Mythology], Warszawa. (In Polish).
- GUSMANI, Roberto
1958 *Studi sull' antico frigio. La popolazione, le glosse frige presso gli antichi and Le iscrizioni dell' antico frigio*, "Rendiconti dell' Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere (Classe di Lettere)", 92 pp. 835–869 and 870–903.
1959 *Studi frigi*, Milano.
- HAAS, Otto
1966 *Die Phrygischen Sprachdenkmäler*, Sofia (= Linguistique Balkanique, vol. X).
- KAZANSKENE, V. P. / KAZANSKIJ, N. N.
1986 *Predmetno-ponjatijnyj slovar' grečeskogo jazyka, Kritomikenskij period*, Leningrad.
- KILLEN, F. H.
1983 *Mycenaean Possessive Adjectives in -e-jo*, "Transactions of the Philological Society" 1983, pp. 66–99.
- LEJEUNE, Michel
1979 *Regards sur les sonores i.e. en vieux phrygien*, [in:] *Florilegium Anatolicum*. Mélanges offerts à Emmanuel Laroche. Paris, pp. 219–224.
- LUBOTSKY, Alexander
1988 *The Old Phrygian Areyastis-Inscription*, "Kadmos" 27/1, pp. 9–26.
1989a *New Phrygian ετι and τι*, "Kadmos" 28/1, pp. 79–88.
1989b *The Syntax of the New Phrygian Inscription No. 88*, "Kadmos" 28/2, pp. 146–155.
- MAYRHOFFER, Manfred
1963 *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen (Band II)*, Heidelberg.

NEROZNAK, V.P.

1978 *Paleobalkanske jazyky* [= Ancient languages of the Balkans], Moskva.

NEUMANN, Günter

1986 *Modrovanak*, "Epigraphica Anatolica" 8, p. 52.

POKORNY, Julius

1959 *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Bern/Münich.

WINTER, Werner

1970 *Some Widespread Indo-European Titles*, [in:] *Indo-European and Indo-Europeans. Papers Presented at the Third Indo-European Conference at the University of Pennsylvania* (ed. by G. Cardona, H.M. Hoenigswald and A. Senn), Philadelphia, pp. 49—54.

WITCZAK, Krzysztof T.

1993 *Greek Aphrodite and her Indo-European origin. With an excursus on Myc. Pe-re-wa₂ and Pamph. Πγευα*, [in:] *Miscellanea linguistica Graeco-Latina* (ed. by L. Iseabert), Namur, pp. 115—123.

NOTES:

¹ I would like to take the opportunity to express my gratitude to Prof. Dr. Günter Neumann (Würzburg, Germany) and Prof. Ignacy Ryszard Danko (Łódź, Poland) for comments on a preliminary version of this paper, and to Prof. Dr. William C. Brice (Manchester, England) for valuable criticism of the present version and for taking the effort of checking my English style. Understandably, I assume all the responsibility for any errors and shortcomings. I am also grateful to Prof. Dr. Roberto Gusmani (Udine, Italy) for sending a copy of his "Studi frigi", and to Alexander Lubotsky (Leiden, The Netherlands) for sending some offprints of his useful articles.

² The text of the OPhr. inscription M-01a can be read as follows: ates: arkiavais: akenanogavos: midai: lavagtaei: vanaktei: edaes. Cf. Hass [1966: 187], Neroznak [1978: 71], Brixhe-Lejeune [1984: 6].

³ For the text of the inscription W-01 and its interpretation, see especially Lubotsky [1988]. Cf. vrekun: tedatoy: yostutut... a. m?noy: akenanogavos | aey || materan: areyastin || bonok: akenanogavos.

⁴ The title is differently interpreted by Neroznak [1978: 76] and Brixhe-Lejeune [1984: 23], who (mistakenly) compare the element Modro- with such adjectives as Lith. mandras, OChSl. modrъ "wise, sage".

⁵ For adjectives in -eyo- in Mycenaean Greek, see recently Killen [1983].

⁶ Originally ζεμελωσ ιτε..., but I agree with C. Brixhe [1978: 10—11], who proposes to see in ιτε a mistake for Τιε.

⁷ Bithynian was probably a 'consonant shift' language, related closely to Thracian. It should be noting that two processes, namely IE. *w > zero and IE. *eu > e, are also typical of Thracian, cf. for instance, (1) Thracian ΕΤΕΖΑ "years" < IE. *wétesā (nom. pl. neut.) "years", cf. Gk. Att. ἔτος n. "year" (pl. ἔτη); (2) Thracian ζετραία f. "pipkin" < IE. *gheutrayā f. "id.",

cf. Greek λύτρα f. "pipkin". It cannot be excluded, however, that the Thracian language had "Lautverschiebung" as well.

⁸ Cf. Δειπάτυρος. Θεός παρὰ Στυμφαίοις (Hesychius).

⁹ Cf. Μαζεύς. ὁ Ζεύς ὑπὸ Φρύγων (Hesychius). Unfortunately, the element Μα- has no satisfactory explanation.

¹⁰ It should be noticed that three deities are of the Iranian origin, namely (1) Μίτρα = Indo-Iranian *Mitra- m., cf. Skt. Mitrāh m. [Mayrhofer 1963: 633—4], Av. Miθra-, OPers. (= Median) Miθra-, Bactr. Μιροο, etc.; (2) Φατα = Indo-Iranian *Vāta- "Wind-God", cf. Skt. Vātāh m., Av. Vāta-, Bactr. Oαδο, etc.; (3) Μας = Iranian *Mās- "god (dess) of the moon", cf. Av. Māh- m., Scyth. Μεσ-πέλλη· ἡ Σελήνη παρὰ Σκύθαις (Hesychius), Bactr. Μας (Skt. mās "moon, month" [Mayrhofer 1963: 631—632], Av. māh- "id.", etc.). One can add that Τετρογείος is the god of a river, whereas the theonym Πουντας is still unclear.

¹¹ Unfortunately, OPhr. batan occurs in a fragment, the context of which is quite unclear.

¹² Boda is mentioned in Powieść o klasztorze Lysogórskim (from 1550 A.D.), see Brückner [1985: 38—9 and 226].

¹³ The transfer of the name *Bhād-s f. (consonant-stem) into the feminine ā-stem is characteristic of Slavic. For analogical reformation of a stem, see Lat. Aurōra f. (a-stem) "Dawn-Goddess" < IE. *Āwsós f. (s-stem) "id.", cf. Vedic Uśās- (nom. sg. Uśāh) f. and Greek Hom. Ἥως, Aeolic Αὔως, Attic Ἐως, Doric Ἀφώς "Dawn-Goddess". (For reasons of convenience, I suggest using the following notations: ē ā ō = e-/a-/o-colouring vocalized laryngeals i.e. ǝ₁ ǝ₂ ǝ₃ in the traditional symbolism; ǝ — any vocalized laryngeal or an undetermined vocalized laryngeal). It should be added that the development of IE. *āw- to Skt. -u- and Gk. -āf- is highly regular, cf. (1) Vedic Sūryah / Sūriyah m. "Sun-God" and Greek Hom. Ἥλιος, Doric Ἀφέλιος m. "id." (both from IE. *Sāwēliyas m. "Solar God") and (2) Vedic Pūšan- (nom. g. Pūśā) m. = Greek Arc. Πᾶν / Πάν, dat. sg. Πανόνι (both from IE. *Pāwāson m. "id."), cf. Witczak [1993: 121].