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The onager kings of Anatolia: Hartapus, Gordis, Muška and the steppe strand in early Phrygian culture
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Abstract: The article discusses a complex of questions associated with the king Ḫartapus and early culture of the Phrygians. §§ 1–3 revise the evidence of the newly discovered HLuw. inscription TÜRKMEN-KARAHÖYÜK, arguing that the correct reading of king’s name in the first line is AQUILA+r/i-tá-pu-sa = Ḫartapus, and (once again) that the king is not a conqueror, but a native king of Masa or Muška, who reigned in the late 2nd millennium BC. In §§ 4–5 it is suggested that HLuw. Ḫartapus conceals an early Phrygian name preserved in the toponym *Γαρδιβιον (*Γαρδυβιον) attested in the inscriptions of the Xenoi Tekmoreioi. §§ 6–11 argue that the name *Gardabos is connected with Sanskrit gardabhá- ‘donkey’, that it corresponds semantically to the west-Anatolian names Tarkasnawas and Tarkašnalliš, and that donkey ears of King Midas are a late ‘refraction’ of this fact. § 12 discusses the morphological structure of *Gardabos, revising the PIE suffix *-bʰo- and suggesting new cognates for Skr. gard- ‘shout’ (Armenian kard- and Baltic gerd-). §§ 13–14 discuss a probable steppe background of the ‘donkey-names’. In § 15 it is suggested that Phrygian name Gordis is based on the same root as *Gardabos, and some relevant Phrygian epigraphical evidence is presented. § 16 discusses a further probable Anatolian ‘donkey-name’, Mugallu and its likely cognate μύκαλος. §§ 17–18 touch upon the etymology of the ethnic names Masa and Muška, connecting them with the word for ‘mule’ preserved in the modern Balkan languages (Alb. mushk(ë) etc.), and, more speculatively, with the old Balkan word for ‘horse’ (*me(n)za-). § 19 argues that the ethnic name Φρύγες may have a similar original meaning, going back to another Balkan term for ‘donkey’, βρικός.
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In summer 2019, a new Hieroglyphic-Luwian inscription mentioning king Ḫartapus was discovered near the large settlement hill Türkmen-Karahöyük.¹ The hill is situated just to the north of the region of Kızıldağ and Karadağ in Central Anatolia where the main group of the monuments associated with the name of this king is located. The new inscription, dubbed TÜRKMEN-KARAHÖYÜK 1 (further: TKH), is somewhat longer than the previously known inscriptions of Ḫartapus, containing what seems to be a short narrative part, and brings up important – even if not as unambiguous as one would like to have them – clues for the reign of this king. Probably the most intriguing piece of evidence immediately identifiable in the text is the name of the land Muška found in the first line (§ 1). The name is found in combination with the verb mu(wa)- ‘conquer’, ‘subjugate’ or ‘wield power over’, i.e. in exactly the same syntactical context in which the name of the land Masa is found in two previously known inscriptions of Ḫartapus. As Muška is known as one of the ethnic names for the Phrygians – at least those of Central Anatolia in the 8th century BC³ – the evidence proves to be immediately relevant for the question of a possible ethnocultural association of Ḫartapus with the early Phrygians argued in Oreshko 2017. Anticipating a fuller discussion of the new inscription elsewhere, the first part of the present contribution will address several important points raised by the editio princeps of TKH: the reading of the name Masa in other inscriptions of Ḫartapus; the reading of the name of the king in the new inscription; the implications of the appearance of Muška instead of Masa in the new inscription and, once again, the idea expressed by the verb muwa-; and dating of the inscriptions of Ḫartapus. In the second part of the paper there will be presented linguistic observations on the name of the king

¹ The clause comes from the so-called ‘Babylonian Theodicy’ (VI: 59), cf. Lambert 1996: 74–75 (whose translation somewhat differs in wording). The last part of the line is broken, but the word ṣeri can be restored with confidence, given the usual association of the wild ass with the ‘steppe’ (cf. CAD: s. v. sirrimu).

² For the circumstances of the discovery and the site see Osborne et al. 2020.

³ For the name Muška/i see below §§ 17–18 with further references. A fuller discussion of the problem of the relationship between the western (Anatolian) Muška and the eastern Muška attested in Northern Mesopotamia will be presented elsewhere (Oreshko in preparation).
and its possible cognates and parallels in Anatolia and elsewhere. The final part of the paper will address the problem of the origin of the ethnic names Masa and Muška, as well as that of Φρύγες.

§ 1. The four signs constituting the name Mu-sà-ka(REGIO) found in TKH are seen entirely clearly, and their interpretation raises little doubt. In contrast, the shapes of the signs rendering the land name in KIZILDAĞ 4, § 2c are less clear and, worse than that, it is not immediately obvious how many signs actually constitute the name. Long ago, Piero Meriggi read the name as Ma-s3-ka-nKUR (1965: 314–315) or Mu?-s3-ka-nKUR (1975: 271), thinking that the name somehow refers to the Muška/i of the Assyrian sources. The former reading of the signs was still followed in Hawkins 1992: 264–265 (Ma-sà-ka?-na(REGIO)). The reading Ma-sà(REGIO) has been proposed by Massimo Poetto in 1998. Poetto recognized in the problematic sign following <sà> a representation of an eagle’s protome and proposed to read it together with the following sign as a separate group ar-i-(= AQUILA-na) interpreting it as ‘forever’. This was followed in Hawkins 2000: 441 and Oreshko 2017: 50. The reading of the land name in KARADAĞ, § 2, spelled here with a special logogram *468, remained for a long time without any sensible interpretation whatever, and its phonetic reading MASA could be suggested only by combining several strands of evidence, notably the probable identity of *468 with *511 found in YALBURT block 7, § 2b in the name *511-sâ.(REGIO) (Oreshko 2017: 51–53).

Now, the evidence of TKH has made Goedegebuure et al. revise the reading of the land name in KIZILDAḠ 4, § 2c once again. They dismissed Poetto’s interpretation of the signs and proposed to return to Meriggi’s reading Mu?-sà-ka-na(REGIO); the evidence of KARADAḠ, § 2 was simply left out of consideration. Addressing the strange ‘eagle-shaped’ <ka> (Poetto’s ar-i), the editors pointed out that a sign closely corresponding to it can now be identified also in the first line of TKH in the first attestation of Ḥartapus’ name (out of two in the inscription). They proposed to read the name here as ka-ra/i-tá-pu-sa, considering it to be a phonetic variant of Ḥartapus. If this interpretation is to be accepted, then Ḥartapus would turn out to be a conqueror of the land of Muška/i, i.e. Phrygia, and the topic of Masa would prove to be quite irrelevant to his story.

However, the ‘new old reading’ of the name in KIZILDAḠ 4 cannot be upheld. The good photos given in Poetto 1998: 479 and Hawkins 2000: pl. 239 leave no doubt that the sign following <sà> indeed represents a protome (or simply a head) of a bird of prey. Contra the claims of Goedegebuure et al., the identification of the sign as <ka> is quite impossible: the latter sign, well attested already in the Empire Period (cf. SÜDBURG, YALBURT or seal impressions), has absolutely nothing to do with either bird or animal heads. The sign is the shape of a blunt short bullet with several protrusions in the back part, the upper being signifi-
cantly longer than the others, and, in the earliest variants, has no inner details. In the Early Iron Age Luwian inscriptions, the sign <ka> assumes a more elongated shape and usually appears adorned with one or two vertical strokes inside, but no attestation of the sign in any inscription gives hints on its ‘bestial’ background. Also in TKH itself, the sign <ka> found in Mu-sà-ka(REGIO) looks quite different from that used to write the first syllable of the king’s name in the first line. On the other hand, one should stress that the reading of the first sign of the land name in KIZILDAĞ 4 as mu’ is an entirely ad hoc idea: the curve of the horn is seen clearly enough to be sure that we are dealing with a representation of the head of a sheep, i.e. <ma>. The sign has no similarity with either <mu(wa)> seen in mu(wa)-tâ nor with the first sign of Mu-sà-ka(REGIO) in TKH. Last but not least, the alleged writing of the name of the king as ka-ra/i-tâ-pu-sa in the very same inscription in which it is further spelled Ḫā-ra/i-tâ-pu (second line) looks more than suspicious: the interchange k/ḫ is extremely rare in Hieroglyphic Luwian and is possibly a purely graphic phenomenon, but even if it is not, it is highly unlikely that it would show up in two different lines of the same inscription.

In fact, the evidence of TKH has quite an opposite effect to that envisaged by Goedegebuure et al., since it brilliantly confirms Poetto’s identification of the sign in KIZILDAĞ 4 – but not the interpretation he suggested. The Hittite word for ‘eagle’ is Ḫāran- (nom. sg. Ḫāraš) and there are good reasons to think that it had a close phonetic form in other Anatolian languages, cf. the CLuw. bird name Ḫaran- and the Lyc. PN Xerēi.⁵ The phonetic interpretation of the sign as ara/i presupposing a loss of the laryngeal is in fact an ad hoc assumption. It finds support neither in the historical phonetics – the laryngeals are stable in Luwic – nor in the epigraphy, since ara/i is invariably rendered by a different bird sign (*133–*134) in all other Luwian inscriptions, including the earliest (cf. YALBURT block 14, § 3). The latter sign represents a bird with a wing stretched forward, and there are no features which would make its identification as ‘eagle’ in any way compelling. The appearance of the latter sign in TKH, § 2 once again demonstrates that the sign AQUILA is not <ara/i>. In fact, if the sign AQUILA is recognized as depicting indeed an ‘eagle’, then its phonetic reading should be Ḫara/i or the like. Now, this phonetic reading of the sign in the name of the king proves to be more than appropriate, since it exactly corresponds to the first part of the name Ḫartapus which is spelled elsewhere as Ḫâ-ra/i or, in BURUNKAYA, with *417 = ḪARA/I

⁴ The phenomenon, attested only in a few inscriptions (e.g. SULTANHAN, §§ 16, 38–39, 44 or KULULU 2, § 5), is restricted to the interchange between signs REL = <kwa/i> and <ḫu(i)> which have a very similar general shape. Even if it is not a purely graphic phenomenon, the interchange would only imply a certain assimilation of the articulation of k and Ḫ in the position before y.

⁵ Cf. Kloekhorst 2008: s. v. Ḫāran- with further references.
The onager kings of Anatolia (cf. Oreshko 2016a: 2–5). This proves Poetto’s identification and eliminates the problem of the alleged by-form *Kartapus.

As a result, the king’s name in the first line of TKH can now be read AQUILA-ra/ťá-pu-sa = Ḫartapus, and the signs in KIZILDAĞ 4, § 2c, now as before, as Ma-šà(REGIO) AQUILA-na. However, as AQUILA-na now turns out to be not identical with ara/i-na, its interpretation as ‘forever’ should be abandoned. Instead, a likely parallel to AQUILA-na can be identified in a passage of KULULU 4, § 3: AQUILA-wa/i-mu DEUS-ni-i-zi (LITUUS)á-za-ta ‘The gods loved me …’ In both inscriptions AQUILA(-na) appears to be an adverb, and nothing precludes taking it literally as ‘like an eagle’ (cf. Hitt. ḧāranili), i.e. ‘having keen eyes and being strong and swift’. This appears to be an apt characteristic both for a king keeping his land in a powerful grip and the gods protecting their human favorite.

§ 2. As a result, the reading Ma-šà(REGIO) in KIZILDAĞ 4, § 2c can be maintained, and with it the identification Ma-šà(REGIO) = MASA(REGIO).OMNIS, ‘the whole land of Masa’ proposed in Oreshko 2017. The appearance of Muška is TKH in exactly the same syntactical position as Masa in the latter two texts has two important implications. First, as it is quite unlikely that Ḫartapus has first conquered Masa and then Muška, but ‘forgot’ to mention Masa in TKH (or Muška

6 It is noteworthy that the separation of AQUILA = Ḫāra(n)- from <ara/i> may have important implications for the question of the reflection of PIE *h₁ in Anatolian. As the phonetic value of the bird-sign ara/i is not derived from ‘eagle’, a likely alternative would be to derive it from a Luwian word corresponding to Greek ὄρνεον/ὄρνις ‘bird’, which can be traced back to PIE *h₁ern- (see, e.g., Beekes 2010: s. v.). Prima facie, this produces a good example of the loss of PIE *h₁ before *e in word-initial position in Luwian (and possibly Anatolian in general). This affects quite a delicate balance in the question of retention/loss of PIE *h₁ in Anatolian, since the word for ‘eagle’ was commonly cited as one of the most secure examples of its retention (for detailed discussion see Kloekhorst 2006: 85–95 with further references, cf. Kloekhorst 2008: 75–82 for the general situation concerning laryngeals in Anatolian). Of course, it does not completely undermine the idea of the partial retention, but possibly urges one to take another glance at it. However it is, the Luwian evidence seems to imply that, ironically, PIE ‘eagle’ is not (a) ‘bird’, and, consequently, there is every reason to separate Greek ὄρνεον/ὄρνις from different words for ‘eagle’ in other IE languages (e.g., Goth. ara, OE ear, Lith. arėlis/erėlis, OCS orъ vb etc.) and reconstruct the PIE word for ‘eagle’ rather as *h₁er(-on)-.

7 The sign AQUILA seems to be found also in KAYSERİ § 13, where it is probably followed by <na>, and possibly § 14 in a broken context (cf. Hawkins 2000: 473 with pl. 262), as well as in KARKAMIŞ A1a, § 1 also in a broken context. The eagle plays a notoriously important role in the Anatolian ideology and mythology, being associated first of all with swiftness and keen eyesight, cf. Collins 1989: 103–136, esp. 112–114 for the eagle symbolism. In the context of KIZILDAĞ 4, the symbolic connection of the eagle with the king, which is most clearly reflected in the Hittite rituals associated with kinship (CTH 820: ‘Benedictions for Labarna’ and CTH 414: ‘Foundation Ritual for a Palace’) is especially important.
in the other two inscriptions), the parallelism of the muwa-clauses in the three inscriptions strongly implies that Muška and Masa represent two different names for (nearly) the same country or people. Given the possible connection of Masa with Muuo (and Moio), one may assume that Muška is a secondary derivative based on the root Mus- (Mas-/Mois-). This type of derivation finds several good parallels first of all in the Balkan region (see in detail below, § 17), and in combination with the fact that Muška in an Anatolian context arguably refers to the Phrygians, this confirms the identification of the Masa as more or less close relatives of the Phrygians (cf. Oreshko 2017: 64–65).

Second, the evidence of TKH makes the interpretation of Ḥartapus as a ‘conqueror’ coming from outside Masa or Muška even less likely. The new inscription not only adds the third instance of the formula ‘who muwa-ed (the entire land of) Masa = Muška’ immediately following the cartouche with the name, but also produces a narrative part which tells the story of a victorious ‘conquest’ of thirteen kings. This narrative part once again confirms that the relative clause with the name Muška or Masa has a different function than to indicate a ‘conquest’. Rather, it reveals the name of Ḥartapus’ own country. As already pointed out earlier (Oreshko 2017: 53–55), the verb muwa- is immediately connected with the noun muwa- which probably means simply ‘power, strength’, and its basic meaning is thus ‘to (have/gain) power (over)’, which makes it a close counterpart of Greek κρατέω or Persian xšay-. To translate kwis muwata as ‘who conquered, subdued’, understanding it as rendering a dynamic action in the past, or as ‘who wields power over’, understanding muwata as a perfective form, is finally a matter of taste: it is hardly possible to make a sound choice without knowing the circumstances of Ḥartapus’ road to power and the specifics of his use of verbal forms. It is possible or even probable that he did resort to violence in ascertaining his right to be the king of Masa/Muška. However, whether he really ‘conquered’ his kingdom ‘from scratch’, being originally an ordinary tribal leader, or he inherited his kingdom from his father and only strengthened his position by ‘pacifying’ the land, remains unclear. It is noteworthy that the re-interpretation of AQUILA-na proposed above does not seriously affect the argument about the exact interpretation of the verb (cf. Oreshko 2017: 50–51), as its interpretation as ‘forever’ played only a secondary role in the definition of the meaning of muwa-. ‘As an eagle’ fits well both with ‘conquer’ and ‘rule over’. Whichever is the case, in the moment captured in his inscriptions, Ḥartapus is simply the king of Masa/Muška. In the absence of any indication to the contrary, there is every reason to think that the ethnolinguistic identity of Ḥartapus corresponded to that of the people he ruled over. In other words, Ḥartapus can be identified as an early Phrygian king – with the proviso that ‘Phrygian’, as used by the Greek authors, is an umbrella term for a vast ethnocultural complex found predominantly in the
central parts of Anatolia rather than a name of a single ‘people’ or ‘tribe’. Its ethnolinguistic homogeneity cannot be taken for granted.

§ 3. Although there is no possibility of re-addressing the question of the dating of Hartapus’ inscriptions here in full, it is necessary to add a brief rejoinder to the claim that TKH can be dated only to the 8th century BC presented by Goedegebuure et al., since it has some relevance for the questions discussed below. The editors base this claim on the observation of the forms of, initially, five signs which, in their opinion, bear on the dating: <sa> (*415), <ka> (*434), <kwa/i> = REL (*329), INFANS (*45) and <wa/i> (*439). They immediately dismissed the first one as irrelevant. In fact, three other signs are no more probative. First, the elongated shape of <ka> is not specific enough to suggest at present anything beyond that it probably post-dates the Empire Period (cf. above). As for <kwa/i>, its shape in TKH, although being somewhat simpler, in general closely corresponds to that found in KIZILDAʻA 4 and KARADAʻA (in the latter inscription the top may be slightly more pointed). Although it is true that in Hartapus’ inscriptions the top part of the sign is more rounded than it is found in the longer Late Bronze Age inscriptions, as SÜDBURG, YALBURT and EMİRGAZİ, there are strong doubts that the degree of roundness of the ‘chisel’ can be used as a dating criterion. In the Late Bronze Age inscription of KARAKUYU (line 2) one finds <kwa/i> with a round top part, and the general shape of this sign practically exactly corresponds to the sign in KIZILDAʻA 4. Thus, we are clearly dealing with a stylistic and not chronological variation.

The next sign, INFANS, is somewhat more specific. However, it is not clear on what criteria Goedegebuure et al. build the claim that ‘similar forms are only attested in mid-late 8th inscriptions’. From a structural point of view, the sign, consisting of two ‘crampons’ (= Empire period VIR₂) set above and below MANUS (‘hand’), seems to be indeed later than the Empire period, where one finds only MANUS.VIR₂. However, VIR₂.MANUS.VIR₂ is attested already in KARKAMIŞ A4b which is one of the earliest inscriptions of the Karkemish group, dating probably to as early as the 11th century BC (cf. Hawkins 2000: 80). However, one may even doubt that TKH uses precisely this form. As a matter of fact, in two other inscriptions of the group, KIZILDAʻA 3 and 4, the sign INFANS has its usual Empire form (MANUS.VIR₂). This implies that what we have in TKH may in fact be ‘VIR₂, INFANS’, i.e. the usual Empire Period form of INFANS incidentally preceded by VIR₂/‘crampon’.

As for the shape of MANUS, it practically exactly corresponds

---

8 The usage of VIR₂ in the function of ‘personal determinative’ is attested already in the Empire Period, see in detail Hawkins 2010. It is noteworthy, however, that ‘crampon’ is used in TKH also
to that found in the Empire Period inscriptions, for instance, YALBURT or KÖLÜ-TOLU and, if adduced as a dating criterium, suggests an early date.

The last sign, <wa/i>, represents in fact the only sign which might indicate a late dating. In using the shape of the sign (two rectangular elements divided by a vertical stroke with a hook at the top) as a chronological marker, Goedegebuure et al. follow d’Alfonso – Payne 2016, who claimed this to be a late development arising only around 800 BC. Although the main tendencies identified by d’Alfonso and Payne seem to be correct, there are several methodological problems implicitly present in their study which warn against putting too much weight on details. First, their chronological scheme is built to a degree on circular argumentation. As the absolute majority of the HLuw. monuments have no secure archaeological dating, the authors use for the most part the relative dating as presented in Hawkins 2000, which is often based on the more or less intuitive perception of the style of a given inscription, including its sign shapes.

Second, the authors do not pay sufficient attention to the distinction between stylistic and chronological variation in the sign shapes, and in particular to the question of the relief vs. linear styles of execution. The absolute majority of early post-Empire HLuw. monuments is executed in monumental and rather crude relief style, in which small and secondary details could be easily omitted. The hook of <wa/i> clearly is just such a small secondary detail. Inter alia, this is demonstrated by the evidence of PORSUK: while at the beginning of this inscription the scribe used three times the variant *439/13 (with a hook), in the second part he used six times <wa/i> without a hook (cf. a photo in Hawkins 2000: pl. 302, cf. Oreshko forthcoming a, § 6). The dispensability of the ‘hook’ practically eliminates it as a chronological criterion; without it, the shape of <wa/i> found in TKH is identical to the Empire period shapes.

Third, a chronological analysis of only one sign without taking into consideration the shapes of other signs appears to be from a methodological point of view quite a dubious procedure, as it leaves out of consideration the question of general tendencies in the development of a script. To be able to use a certain feature as a reliable dating criterion one has to be able to demonstrate why this feature could have arisen only after a particular point in time and how it correlates with the developments in other signs. Otherwise, the alleged absence of earlier attestations can be attributed to gaps in the evidence. In sum, without
two times before verbs (PES.A and INFRA PONERE) in line 2, which seems to be an extension of the practice seen in YALBURT and KARAHÖYÜK. However, the very fact of the sporadic usage of crampon clearly speaks for a relatively early date.
creating a holistic paleography of the Luwian script, the features identified in d’Alfonso – Payne 2016 cannot be used at present as an absolute dating criterion.

The main problem with the analysis presented in the editio princeps of TKH is, however, not even the very cursory treatment of the sign shapes using vaguely defined criteria, but, again, the lack of a complex approach. Given that the extant HLuw. inscriptions are unevenly distributed in time and space, and there is no general study discussing Luwian paleography in detail, at present it is simply impossible to base the dating of an inscription – especially of such an unusual and important as TKH – on the analysis of one or five more or less arbitrarily chosen signs. To arrive at a balanced conclusion, one has to take into consideration not only all available evidence of paleography, but also philological and historical indications. This will be done elsewhere. Here it will suffice to emphasize once again that the inscriptions of Hartapus demonstrate quite a few striking features which genetically connect them with the Empire Period tradition – and look absolutely incompatible with a 8th century dating. One should point out especially the use of aedicula in the same way as it was done by the Hittite kings; the name of the Bronze Age polity Masa, and the sign used to spell its name (MASA) in KARADAĞ 1, which is attested elsewhere only in YALBURT; the sign OMNIS2 found elsewhere only in SÜDBURG, YALBURT, EMİRGAZİ and KARAKUYU-TORBALI; the Bronze Age titles *416-wa/i-ni and CANIS.ZU(WA) etc. (cf. Hawkins 2000: 434 and Oreshko 2017: 48–49). On a more general level, the text of TKH, presenting serious interpretative challenges, once again demonstrates how different from all other known inscriptions of Cappadocia the whole Hartapus’ group is, not only in terms of the sign repertoire and their shapes, but also in its very succinct narrative style, closely comparable with Empire Period monuments or such early texts as KARKAMIŞ A4b or KARAHÖYÜK. In fact, in terms of style, the inscriptions of Hartapus differ from the Luwian inscriptions of the 8th century no less drastically than Archaic Latin inscriptions differ from the speeches of Cicero. In sum, the most probable dating of his inscriptions, now as before, appears to be the 12th century BC, although the (early part of the) 11th century cannot be ruled out completely.

§ 4. Now, the ‘Phrygian’ identity of Hartapus being virtually ascertained by the association with Muşka, one may address the problem of exact phonetic and etymological interpretation of his name.⁹ The new inscription TKH has also here pro-

---

⁹ For considerations on the name of his father Mursilis which, contra earlier common assumption, may well represent not the Hittite name Muršiliš, but the ‘Aegean’ name Μύρσιλος, see Oreshko 2017: 59–62.
duced an additional useful clue: in line 2, the name is spelled with only three usual signs/ligatures ḫá+ra/i-tá-pu, thus building a graphically asymmetric group, the sign <tá> standing immediately under <ḫá+ra/i>. This spelling confirms two points: 1) that the sign <sa> found in all other cases indeed renders nom.sg. ending -s, as was commonly assumed, and not a part of the stem and 2) the usual reading Ḥar-ta-pu- is indeed the correct reading sequence (thus contra doubts in Oreshko 2017: 62, fn. 75). The first thing to note is that the u-stem of the name agrees well with the probable north-west-Anatolian origin of the name, as many other names from this region attested in Late Bronze Age sources belong to the same type, cf., e.g., Piyam-araduš, Walmuš, Alakšanduš or Tarḫundanus (TONITRUS+ra/i-tà-nu) on the HLuw. seal from Troy. As both Hittite and Luwian did not display a (regular) phonological contrast between u and o,¹⁰ these u-stems reflect in all probability original o-stems (cf. esp. Alakšanduš < Ἀλέξανδρος). Ḥartapus’ name is thus probably ended in -os and belonged to the same type as Sizidos or Mukos attested in the Old-Phrygian corpus, which continue the old IE type of the o-stems. If the auslaut of the name presents little difficulties, its anlaut turns out to be quite ambiguous. One may think of two options which would lead to different reconstructions: a voiced tectal g or some sort of laryngeal. At first glance, the former option seems to be an obvious solution, as a number of good examples show that phonetically the Anatolian ḥ was close to a voiced tectal in other languages. On the one hand, a number of geographical names attested in Hittite and/or Luwian with a voiced (lenited) ḥ are rendered by γ in Greek which, as the closest relative of Phrygian, is the most relevant case, cf., for instance, Naḫitiya = Νάγιδος, Parḫa = Πέργη or Šāḫiriya (Şēḫiriya) = Σα(γ)γάριος.¹¹ One the other hand, although there are no certain examples of rendering of either Greek or Phrygian names in Luwian (or Hittite),¹² there is some evidence concerning renderings of Greek and Persian names in Lycian, whose phonetic system was probably close to that of Luwian, at least in the part concerning laryngeals. The renderings of the voiced tectal generally oscillate between g, which stood probably for a voiced (lenited) laryngeal, and x, which stood for its voiceless (non-lenited) variant,¹³ cf.

¹⁰ Phonetically, the sound o probably existed at least in Hittite, where it was, however, merely an allophone of u, only marginally, if ever, achieving the status of a separate phoneme. For the problem of o in Hittite cf. Kloekhorst 2008: 35–60 with further references.
¹¹ For further examples and other reflections of Anatolian laryngeals elsewhere see Simon 2014.
¹² Two other possible instances of Phrygian names found in HLuw. inscription of PORSUK, Parḫuiaras and Masa-Urhisas reflecting respectively as *Barguidas and Masa Urgitos (directly attested in the Phrygian inscription from Kerkenes Dağ), are discussed in Oreshko forthcoming a.
¹³ This interpretation is suggested first of all by oscillation between x and g in some Lycian names, cf. Xeriga = Xariga = Xerixe; Xeziga = Xezixa, Pixesere = Pixesere, Zagaba = Zaxaba or Lyc. Humrxxa = Lycian B Umrgga-.
Humrxxa = Greek Ἀμόργης < Pers. *Hu-marga; Mexitst(e) < Μεγίστης or Μέγιστος (alternatively Mexitstêne < Μαγασθήνης); Tënegure (Tënağure) < Άθηναγόρας.\textsuperscript{14}

Conversely, both voiced and voiceless Lycian laryngeals were usually rendered by χ in Greek in the non-initial position, cf. Pix̑̃̃ma > Πιγομος; Pixrẽi (Lyc. B Pixrê)> Πίγρης, Iđâxre > Ἰδαγρος (Ἰδαγρῆς), Maxa > Μαγας, Xeriga > Γεργις or Zagaba/ Zaxaba > Λαγβος. In all probability, a very similar situation was the case with Carian, cf. Quq = Γύγος, Dquq = Ἰδαγύγος (cf. Lyc. B Ddxuga), Yrqsoś = Ὑργοσως, -yriq = -υριγος.\textsuperscript{15}

The problem is, however, that in the initial position all Luwian consonants, including the laryngeals, were voiceless (fortis). Inter alia, this is demonstrated by the common rendering of the Anatolian initial laryngeal as κ- in Greek, cf., e.g., Ḫubu/išna > Κυβίστρα or Ḫilakku > Κιλικία. Lycian evidence also confirms this, cf. Xesñtedi > Κεσινδηλις, Xñtabura > Κενδαβορα (Κινδαβυρις) or Xñtanube > Κινδανυβας.\textsuperscript{16} However, there are exceptions, cf. Xeriga > Γεργις or Carian Quq = Γύγος. Furthermore, recently Zsolt Simon (2017) convincingly argued that the Luwian name Kurti(ya)s reflects the name Γόρδιος borrowed from Phrygian into Luwian (and not vice versa), which seems to demonstrate that the Phrygian initial g shows up as k in Luwian.

Should one then conclude that the initial Ḫ- represents a sort of laryngeal in the Phrygian prototype of Ḫartapus? This interpretation turns out to be, however, even more problematic. As far as one can judge, Phrygian did not have any sort of laryngeal in its phonetic system whatsoever. All three PIE laryngeals have been lost in Phrygian, producing different vocalic reflexes, and there is no evidence suggesting that a secondary phonemic laryngeal could develop from any old sounds. It is possible that the old initial *s – which seems to demonstrate in general a development analogous to Greek and Armenian (> h > ☞)\textsuperscript{17} – might have produced in Phrygian a sort of hard breathing (spiritus asper), for which the name of the river Ἅλυς, if it would prove Phrygian, would be practically the only piece

\textsuperscript{14} It is noteworthy that Greek κ was also usually rendered by Lycian x, cf. �истемlida = Δημοκλείδης, Alaxssaîtra (Alixssaîtra) < Ἀλέξανδρος or Exeteijà < Ἑκαταῖος. Greek χ seems to be rendered by geminate x in Lycian, cf. Musxxa < Μόσχος (Μοσχᾶς). For identifications and attestations of these and further names adduced below see Melchert 2004: s. vv. and Neumann 2007: s. vv.

\textsuperscript{15} Cf. Adiego 2007: 244–245. The usual spelling of the name of the Storm-God with q (Trq(u))δ in C.Hy 1, C.Ia 3 and possibly C.Ki 1) strongly implies that this letter conceals a laryngeal, possibly both voiced and voiceless.

\textsuperscript{16} This rendering is sporadically found also in the non-initial position, cf. Ixtta > Ἰκτας.

\textsuperscript{17} Thus, pace Ligorio – Lubotsky 2018: 1823–1824 (who connect demonstrative pronoun s- with PIE *ki-) and contra Sowa 2017 [2018]: 107–108.
of positive evidence.¹⁸ However, it seems quite improbable that this sound would be rendered by ḫ in Anatolian, as the latter represents a sound with a strong fricative component, as, *inter alia*, the examples of rendering of Anatolian ḫ through γ or κ in Greek and elsewhere show. In all probability, a hard breathing would be simply ignored when transcribing a Phrygian or Greek word into Luwian, and a name beginning with har- would be rendered by HΛuw. <ara/i> or the like.

Thus, the interpretation of the initial ḫ in Ḥartapus as a voiced tectal g is in fact the only feasible alternative, despite the difficulties pointed out above. In fact, at a closer look, there is no real contradiction between this interpretation and the cases Γόρδιος > Kurti(ya)s or Ἡλίακκο < Κύπρια and comparable cases. The latter are of little relevance, as they reflect only the perception of the initial Anatolian laryngeals by the Greeks, which is not quite the same as rendering the Phrygian g in Luwian. As for Kurti(ya)s, all persons bearing this name in Luwian

¹⁸ The connection of the river name Ἅλυς with the Germanic word for ‘ale, beer’ (*alū-þ-*) recently proposed by Sowa 2017 [2018] is quite incredible, as both points on which it is based – that *sizeto* is an imperative form of a verb and the associated word *alus* is its direct object and then possibly ‘beer’ – lack any firm foundation. In fact, the forms *Alus Sizeto* (W-08), *Sizeto* ... *Alus (W-09)* and *Alus Sizetodas* (W-10) represent nothing other than a personal name with a patronymic, referring apparently to the same person. The personal name Ἅλυς is well attested in Greek inscriptions from Anatolia (and beyond), being found primarily in the north-western parts (6 tags in LGPN V.A for Mysia, Lydia and the Troad), but also sporadically found elsewhere (once in Ephesos, in Caria, in south-west Phrygia/Pisidia and in Pontos, cf. LGPN V.B and V.C). Furthermore, *Alus* is well attested in the Lydian corpus (LW 4a: 1 and 4b: 2; LW 49: 2; LW 32 (for the reading see Oreshko 2019: 223) and in a graffito published by Innocente 1990). The name may also be attested in a graffito G-204 from Gordion, although there is some doubt that it is written in Phrygian (Greek or Lydian is not excluded). The name is very probably based on the name of the river Ἡλύς, making thus an exact parallel to the case Σα(γ)γάριος = Lyd. Sakarjas (for which see Oreshko 2019: 223–224, cf. Thonemann 2006 for further relevant evidence). As for the second name, its close phonetic variant, *Sizidos*, is attested in the Old Phrygian corpus: it is found on a bowl (G-105), on a beam from Tumulus MM (see Liebhardt – Brixhe 2009) and on a bowl from Tumulus D near Bayındır (HP-110). Parallelism with other names attested in both tumuli strongly suggests that *Sizidos* represents a nominative form of the name (and not a genitive). Consequently, *Sizeto* should be a genitive form of *Sizetos* (possibly a contracted form of a gen. in -ovo), in which one may see a dialectal form of the same name with a voiceless dental (for the phenomenon cf. below). This interpretation is confirmed by the evidence found in W:10: while separation of das (as in Brixhe – Lejeune 1984: 55) makes no sense, *Sizetodas* may be naturally interpreted as a suffixal patronymic, finding a parallel in *Yungidas* (B-07) and in Greek patronyms in -δῆς/-άδης. As for the etymology of the potamonym Ἁλυς, its connection with the PIE root for ‘salt’ (*seh₂-l-, cf. Tischler 1977: s. v. Halys with further references) is unlikely, as the river is not known to be especially salty. Rather, given the later name of the river – ‘Red River’ – one may consider a connection of the name with the PIE color term *selH-u- ‘yellowish brown’, attested as an o-grade adjective in Germanic (E sallow, MDu. salu(we) etc.) and Slavic (Russ. solóvyj ‘yellowish-gray’), for the root cf. Kroonen 2013: s. v. *salwa-.*
inscriptions appear to be, from a synchronic sociolinguistic point of view, not Phrygians, but rather Luwians. Accordingly, the form Kurti(ya)s reflects phonetically not the Phrygian name Γόρδιος, but the form which the name assumed in the Luwian-speaking milieu of southern Cappadocia. The case of Ḥartapus is clearly different. As his inscriptions in general can be interpreted as an attempt to emulate the ‘Empire practice’ of writing in Luwian hieroglyphs undertaken essentially outside the Luwian-speaking milieu (cf. Oreshko 2017: 60-63), the spelling of his name – which is in this case genuinely non-Luwian – should reflect a more or less ad hoc attempt of the scribe(s) to correlate the ‘Phrygian’ phonetic system with the Luwian one. As the initial tectals are voiceless in Luwian, the choice of a š-sign does not seem aberrant. Moreover, it is possible that the choice was influenced by the rendering of ‘Phrygian’ g via Luwian h in other positions, i.e. reflected a general rule ‘Phrygian g = Luwian h’. As a result, the original ‘Phrygian’ form of Ḥartapus’ name can be reconstructed as *GarTaPos, where T = t/d and P = p/b; alternative e-vocalization of either or both first two syllables is not excluded.

§ 5. The name of a comparable structure is not attested directly in later epigraphic record from Anatolia. However, there is a piece of toponymic evidence which confirms and further specifies the proposed reconstruction. It comes from the corpus of inscriptions of the so-called Xenoi Tekmoreioi dated to the 3rd century AD and connected with the sanctuary of Mēn Askaenos to the north of Antiocheia, an important city located in the northernmost part of the territory variously called in Greek sources Phrygia Paroreia or Pisidia.¹⁹ One of the numerous ethnic names attested in the inscriptions is Γαρδηβιανός (Tekm. 2:25) or Γαρδυβιανός (Tekm. 9:4).²⁰ Separation of the ethnic suffix -ᾱνό- suggests a geographical name *Γαρδιβιον/*Γαρδυβιον (or *Γαρδυβα/*Γαρδιβα).²¹ In this name one may readily recognize a common type of Phrygian toponym derived from a personal name with the adjectival suffix -eyo- (which obviously reflects PIE *-ii̯o-). To take the most transparent cases, one may point out: Μιδάειον (Μαδάϊον/Μιδήϊον) < Μίδας; Γορδίειον (Γορδείον/Γόρδιον) < Γόρδις (for which cf. below); Δορυλάειον (Δορύλαιον) < Δορυλά(ϝ)ος; Δασκύλειον (Δασκύλιον) < Δάσκυλος; Ἀκμονία <

¹⁹ For a general overview of the historical problematics of the Xenoi Tekmoreioi see Ruge 1934, cf. further Wallner 2016 for a new fragment and an updated perspective. For the sanctuary of Mēn see Labarre 2010 and for a more general study of the region in the epigraphical and socio-political perspective Bru 2017.

²⁰ See Ramsay 1906: 321 and 333.

Ἄκμων (cf. Steph. Byz. s. v. Ἀκμονία); Νακόλεια (Νακολία) < Νάκολος or Νακόλη (cf. Steph. Byz. s. v. Νακολία) and Κοτιάειον (Κοτυαίον) < *Κοτυφας (cf. Lyd. Katowas).²² Given the late date of the attestation, when the Greek diphthong ει already merged with ι, it is in no way surprising that the suffix appears as -ι-. The examples Δορύλα(ϝ)-ος > Δορυλά(ϝ)-ειον, Δάσκυλος > Δασκύλειον and Νάκολος > Νακόλεια show that the suffix -ευو- replaces the thematic o-vowel, as contrasted with its retention in Μιδά-ειον (a-stem) and Γορδί-ειον (i-stem). Accordingly, the place name *Γαρδαβιον/*Γαρδιβιον presupposes a personal name *Γαρδαβος or *Γαρδιβος, which practically exactly corresponds to the reconstructed *GarTaPos. The difference in vocalization of the second syllable presents no serious problem, as the phenomenon of raising a > e/i is well attested in other Anatolian toponyms, cf. cun. Ḫilakku > Κιλικία, Adriya > Ἰδριάς, cun. Yalanda > Ἀλινδα, cun. Ἄρσα > Ἐρσος = Lyd. Ipsi-, cun. Puranda = Πύρινδος etc.²³ Alternatively, the second a in HLuw. Ἡρταπος may be an approximation of a more raised vowel. As a result, the original ‘Phrygian’ form of the name Ἡρταπος can be with high probability reconstructed as *Gardabos (or *Gardebos).

Besides clarifying the phonetics of the king’s name, the Tekmorean evidence unexpectedly sheds some light on *Gardabos as a historical figure. The attestation of the place name *Γαρδαβιον in the northern part of Phrygia Paroreia fits amazingly well into the picture of Ἡρταπος’ kingdom, however sketchy it may be at present. Although it is impossible to say where exactly *Γαρδαβιον was situated, one can make some inferences from the general geographical range of the inscriptions of the Xenoi Tekmoreioi. The identifiable locations mentioned in the corpus allow the ‘Tekmorean area’ to be defined in approximately the following way: Pisidian Adada marked the southern limit; the western limit was defined, from south to north, by the cities Apollonia, Metropolis and Synnada; the northern part of the area included the entire Regio Ipsiana et Moeteana up to Aizanoi; the eastern border was marked by Philomelion on the eastern side of Sultan Dağı.²⁴ This area immediately borders from the west on the Konya Plain, which probably constituted the core part of Ἡρταπος’ kingdom. It seems possible that some parts of the future ‘Tekmorean area’ situated to the east and north of Sultan Dağı were under the control of the king: the Eber Gölü and the lower Kaystros lie from the region of Türkmen-Karahöyük approximately as far as BURUNKAYA which defines the approximate north-eastern border of the kingdom. Such an extent

²² The Lydian name is attested in the Greek inscriptions as Κάδαος, Κάδοας, Κάδαως and may be based on the divine name *Κατος which likely corresponds to the name of the goddess known variously as Κότυς, Κότυφω or Κόττω, see in detail Oreshko forthcoming b.
²⁴ Cf., e.g., Labarre 2010: 127–128 with further references.
of Ḥartapus’ kingdom in the north-western direction appears to be all the more likely, as Phrygia Paroreia lies closer to the Late Bronze Age homeland of Masa (Mysia) than western Cappadocia does. Thus, nothing speaks against an assumption that *Γαρδαβιον is a foundation of the king Ḥartapus-*Gardabos attested in HLuw. inscriptions, just as Μιδάειον and Γορδίειον are the foundations by the respective Phrygian kings.

§ 6. The establishment of a nearly exact phonetic shape which the name had in the early Phrygian vernacular allows one to address the question of its etymology. Approaching it from an Indo-European perspective, the first thought would be to recognize in its initial part PIE root *gʰerdbʰ- ‘encircle, enclose’, which was also supposed to be present in the name of several later Phrygian kings, Γόρδιος/Γορδίης (cf. Obrador-Cursach 2019a with further references). Although phonetically good, this connection is not especially appropriate semantically: the root has produced in different IE languages different terms for ‘enclosed’ spaces, as, for instance, Greek χόρτος ‘pasturage’, Lat. hortus ‘garden’, Skr. grhá- ‘house’, Lith. gaŗdas ‘pen’, OCS gradъ ‘town, garden’ etc., but no terms which would be obviously appropriate in a personal name. Obrador-Cursach (2019) argued for a secondary connection of Γόρδιος/Γορδίης with this root (i.e. a derivation of the name from the toponym), which is, however, refuted by the evidence of Phrygian graffiti discussed below, and would be in any case hardly applicable for *Gar-

An alternative possibility is suggested by Sanskrit evidence. The name *Gar-
dabos finds a virtually exact correspondence in gardabhá-, one of the Sanskrit terms for ‘donkey, ass’ traced back to something like *gorde-bho- (cf. Mayrhofer 1986–2001: s. v. gardabhá-). Given the length of the name, the phonetic similarity is striking indeed, and the reflection of PIE *g as g – and not as k, as one would expect in Phrygian (cf. Ligorio – Lubotsky 2018: 1823) – does not present a serious problem, given both the early date of the attestation and the evidence for variation between voiced and voiceless stops seen in the dental series (cf. above fn. 18 and below on Γόρδις). However, from a semantic point of view, such an etymology of the royal name might seem on the first glance fantastic or funny. In fact, already Sanskrit evidence shows that such a meaning is not impossible: Gardabhá- is attested in Purāṇas as a name of a dynasty which reigned for some time in northern India (cf. below). Also in Tocharian B, where kercapo ‘donkey’ likely represents an early borrowing from Sanskrit, Kercäpay is attested as a per-
sonal name of apparently a more humble personage (see Adams 2013: s. vv.).

However, even stronger supportive evidence comes from Anatolia and Greece.

§ 7. The first strand of evidence is supplied by parallels in Anatolian onomastics. Among the Bronze Age Anatolian names, there is a well attested set of names based on the Anatolian term tarkaš(ša)na/i- which is commonly interpreted as ‘donkey, ass’, while a closely connected term tarkaš(ša)niya- is taken to refer to ‘mule’ (cf. Hawkins – Morpurgo-Davies 1998 or Tischler 1991–1994: s. v. targasnalli-i%). This interpretation has been very recently put into doubt by Simon (2019), who argued instead for an interpretation of tarkaš(ša)na/i- as ‘horse’ and tarkaš(ša)niya- as ‘donkey’. As the issue has immediate bearing on the problem of the ‘identity’ of *Gardabos, it is appropriate first to briefly revisit the evidence.

Simon argued that the meaning of ASinus2A-ni ‘mule’ does not fit well neither into the context of Aleppo 7, § 7, which he took as referring to the export of horses from Egypt, nor into that of Yalburt (blocks 13 and 3) which may refer to some sort of military activities involving ASinus2A-ni-i(a)-. Additionally, he pointed out that, judging from the context of KUB 31.71 II 14, É targaššana- mentioned there should refer to an ordinary horse stable and not specifically to ‘donkey stable’; and that the sign ASinus2A which does not demonstrate long ears typical for ASinus may represent ‘horse’. Neither of these points appear to be convincing enough to turn ‘donkey’ into a ‘horse’. First, the context of Aleppo 7, § 7 is in no way suggestive for any sort of export: the clause *a[-wa/i-m]u MI.REGIO ASinus2A-ni (PES)u-sa-tá means simply ‘He drove ASinus2A-ni for me to Egypt’, with ‘to’ being the straightforward interpretation of MI.REGIO without any
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Further morphemes: for ‘from’ one would expect -ti (abl.-instr. sg.), but even if it is ‘from’, the sense would not change drastically. The passage probably presupposes nothing more than a trade connection by pack animals between Syria and Egypt. Second, the context of YALBURT is not clear enough to be sure that ASINUS₂ᵃ·ni-(i(a))- are directly involved in battle activities.²⁷ In fact, CENTUM’ ROTA mentioned in YALBURT block 9, § 1 in conjunction with an ‘army’ (EXERCITUS) likely means ‘charioteers’, which implies that under ASINUS₂ᵃ·ni-(i(a))- could well be meant draught or pack animals, if not booty, as horse-back riding is unlikely at such an early period. As a matter of fact, both donkeys and mules were usual animals employed in military campaigns for transportation of goods (cf., e.g. Mitchel 2018: 118–121). However, even if it would turn out that ASINUS₂ᵃ·ni-(i(a))- took part in the battle, it would not necessarily mean that they are ‘horses’: there is ample Near Eastern evidence of using donkeys as draught animals for chariots (see, e.g., Nagel – Bollweg 1992, cf. Mitchel 2018: 86–95), and there is nothing impossible in the animals still being in use in a similar function in some parts of Late Bronze Age Anatolia. On the other hand, although Simon is right that È tar-gaššana- is probably a general word for ‘stable’, this still does not make targaššana- a ‘horse’: the same ‘stable’ could be used for all sorts of equids. The observation that the sign ASINUS₂ᵃ may represent a horse seems to be correct as well, and in fact can be further supported by the evidence of ANDAVAL § 4 in which the shape of the sign for ‘horse’ (à-zú-wa/i-) very closely resembles ASINUS₂ᵃ and not EQUUS (*99). However, this means nothing more than that ASINUS/ASINUS₂ᵃ could serve as a generic sign for ‘equid’, in the same way as was the case with cuneiform ANŠE which had a generic meaning ‘equid’ which could be specified by following signs (cf. ANŠE.KUR.RA ‘horse’). For Hieroglyphic Luwian such a specification is a phonetic reading, as again the evidence of ANDAVAL clearly shows. However, precisely from a phonetic – i.e. linguistic – point of view Simon’s reconstruction looks unconvincing. It appears absolutely incredible that the name for ‘donkey’, for which central Anatolia was in the 3rd–1st millennium BC one of the primary natural habitats (cf. below), and which was used as a pack animal already in the 3rd millennium BC, would be derived from the name of ‘horse’ which was fully domesticated in the steppes of Kazakhstan and Ukraine only shortly before 2000

²⁷ It is noteworthy that the reading ASINUS₂ᵃ·ni-(a)-pa-wa/i suggested by Poetto (1993: 62) and adopted in the subsequent discussions (cf. Simon 2019: 319–320 with further references) is false. A collation of the inscription which I was able to undertake in June 2010 showed that ‘pa-wa/i’ is in fact a somewhat weathered <sa₅>. The consequences of this reading will be addressed in detail elsewhere.
BC and which appeared in Anatolia probably not earlier than ca. 1750 BC. In sum, there are no good reasons to abandon the traditional interpretation of tarkaš(ša)-na/i- as ‘donkey’. It is not excluded that at some point the term could also have been used in the broader sense of ‘equid’ and thus include ‘horses’ as well; the exact meaning of tarkaš(ša)niya- ‘one of tarkaš(ša)na/i-’ remains not quite clear, but ‘mule’ remains a reasonable possibility.

§ 8. One may now proceed with donkey-names. The most famous are two names of the kings of the lands located in western parts of Anatolia: Tarkasnawas and Tarkašnalliš. The former, belonging to a king of Mirā is attested by the famous KARABEL relief (ASINUS²₃-wa/i), the so-called ‘Tarkondemos seal’ (HLuw. ASINUS²₃-wà/i = cun. Tarkašananawa) and by several seal impressions found in Hattusa (ASINUS²₃-wa/i). In the later 14th and 13th century BC, when Western Anatolia was under the power of the Hittite Empire, the land of Mirā covered vast territories in the central parts of Western Anatolia, but its original core was probably located in the region of Meipoç in the upper courses of the river Tembris just to the south of the Phrygian Highlands.²⁸ Tarkašnalliš is known from cuneiform sources (see Laroche 1966: s. v.) as a king of Ḥaballa. The precise location of this land is not quite clear, but the extant evidence suggests that it should be sought in the border areas between Western and Central Anatolia. A location in the valley of the inland Kaystros (Akar Çay), i.e. just to the south of the probable heartland of Mirā, appears to be the likeliest option.²⁹ Thus, the two Luwian royal ‘donkey-names’ are associated with a geographical region immediately adjacent to both the Bronze Age Masa and the later kingdom of *Gardabos-Ḫartapus.

The name was, however, popular also in other parts of Anatolia. Names based on tarkaš(ša)na/i- are found on numerous sealings from the Nişantepe archive (14th–13th century BC). The name Tarkas(sa)nallis is found in a spelling ASINUS-li on cat. no. 423 in Herbordt 2005. Further names were read by Hawkins (in Herbordt 2005: 274) as: ASINUS-tà-li (nos. 428–439), ASINUS-tà-la-a (no. 425), ASINUS-tà-la-na (nos. 426-427) and ASINUS-tà-ka-la-na (no. 424). Besides the Nişantepe archive, ASINUS-tà-li is found on a sealing from Temple 26 in Hattusa (no. 320 in Dinçol – Dinçol 2008a) and ASINUS-tà-la-a – with ASINUS repre-

²⁸ For the location of Mirā see Hawkins 1998 (with a map on p. 31), Gander 2017: especially 270–271 (with map on pp. 279–280), cf. Oreshko 2019: 153–155. I discussed the location of the original territory of Mirā in a talk ‘Heartland and Fortresses of the Land of Mirā’ given at the conference ‘Anatolian Landscapes. Inhabiting Western Anatolia in Antiquity’ (Rencontres de l’IFÉA, Istanbul, April 5–6, 2018), which will be elaborated in print elsewhere.
²⁹ For the location of Ḥaballa cf. Garstang – Gurney 1959: 100 (~ the Phrygian Highlands), Hawkins 1998: 14, fn. 39 and a map on p. 31 (~ Phrygia Paroreia) and Gander 2017: 271–272.
sent by the whole animal executed with amazing detail – on a seal from the Hatay museum (no. 8 in Dinçöl et al. 2012).

Hawkins (in Herbordt 2005: 274) interpreted the names as further derivatives based on tarkaš(ša)na/i-. However, it is possible that we are dealing simply with the same name Tarkas(sa)nallas spelled in different ways. Linguistically, a name Tarkas(sa)natakalana obviously makes little sense, as it is too long and -takalana cannot be sensibly identified with any Luwian root. One may notice, however, that with the exception of <la>, all three phonetic signs following ASINUS are found in the word tarkaš(ša)na/i-. This suggests that they may be phonetic indicators clarifying the reading of ASINUS, a similar practice being well attested for the Empire Period tradition, cf., e.g., MONS.TU = Tudḫaliyas or VIR.ZA/I = zída/i- ‘man’. In other words, the name can be rather interpreted as ASINUS.TÀ.KA.NA-la = Tarkas(sa)nallas. The same probably applies for other names, which can now be re-read as ASINUS.TÀ-li, ASINUS.TÀ-la and ASINUS.TÀ.NA-la.³⁰

It is noteworthy that the sign ASINUS₂ₐ featuring a strange ‘knot’ under the jaw of the donkey, in which it is rather difficult to recognize any sort of ‘harness’, may in fact represent a ligature ASINUS+ta(wa)+ra/i, the ligated element being an alternative way to hint at the reading tarkaš(ša)na/i- (cf. Oreshko 2016b: 269–274). The latter variant of the sign is found on a further Nişantepe sealing (no. 441). It is difficult to follow Hawkins (in Herbordt 2005: 274) who interpreted the sign to the left of it as LEO (lion’s head), since the sign, in contrast with LEO, has a vertical orientation and a clearly angular shape. In all probability, the sign in question is <wà/i> and we have the same name as the one borne by the king of Mirā: ASINUS₂ₐ,wà/i = Tarkasnawas. Yet another Nişantepe sealing (no. 345 in Herbordt 2005) probably features a further variant of this name, [AS]INUS.TÀ(WA)-i(a), i.e. Tarkas(sa)nayas or Tarkas(sa)niyas (cf. Oreshko 2016b: 272).

On the other hand, a name Tarkašan or Tarakšan is attested already in the Old-Assyrian documents from Kaneš (cf. Soysal 2011: 332), and it is not excluded that the same name is found on several sealings of the Old-Hittite period which feature sign(s) ASINUS and ASINUS.TÀ (nos. 126 and 127 respectively in Boehmer

³⁰ On a closer glance, a name *Tarkas(sa)natalla/i does not make much sense from a morphological point of view either, despite the existence of a suffix -(a)t(t)alla/i- and the seeming parallel which it finds for instance in Muwatallis. The suffix -(a)t(t)alla/i- is a Hittite suffix originating, as far as one can see, from the re-analysis of the Luwian conglomerate of two suffixes: the suffix -d/-t- forming abstract nouns plus the adjectival suffix -(a)lla/i- (cf. Hoffner – Melchert 2008: 57 and 62). Muwatallis is an original Luwian example of such a formation, being a (substantivized) adjective based on muwat- ‘power’ which is derived from the verbal root muwa-. It is doubtful that *tarkaš(sa)nat- ‘donkey-ness’ ever existed in Luwian.
Moreover, a further ‘donkey-name’ is probably found in the graffito on a Karum period vessel which is one of the earliest examples of HLuw. writing ever found (see Poetto 2018 [2019] with further references). The first sign of the name is ASINUS, but the reading of the further sign, which seems to represent in fact a ligature of two signs, is not at all obvious. Poetto suggested a reading ASINUS-sa/si-li, identifying the core of the second sign as *174 (<si>, but no evidence for the value sa). If the identification of the ligated element as <li> appears possible, the identification of the core as <si> is, from an epigraphical point of view, is not very convincing, although it is difficult to propose an alternative. In view of the later evidence, one may tentatively suggest that we are dealing again with the name Tarkas(s)a(nalis), and the unusual sign serves to give a phonetic clue to one or several syllables of the name.³²

§ 9. As for semantics of the names Tarkas(s)a(nalis) and Tarkas(s)a nawas, Hawkins – Morpurgo-Davies (1998: 248–249), who were the first to recognize the ‘donkey trail’ in the west-Anatolian royal onomastics, tried to ‘humanize’ the names. In interpreting the former name, they followed the common interpretation of the

---

³¹ The identification of DARE in the lower part of no. 127 suggested by Poetto (2018 [2019]: 19–20) is problematic, as a name ASINUS.DARE = Tarkas(s)a-na-piya ‘Given by Donkey’ does not make much sense. Rather, the sign is <tà>, as in other cases. Several other attestations of ‘donkey-names’ in HLuw. sealings claimed elsewhere are probably non-existent. First, the reading of the name on a sealing found in Çine-Tepecik (Günel – Herbordt 2010) as [ASI]NUS2A-ia-pi-su+ra/i-li, is incorrect. The first sign cannot be ASINUS₂ₐ both because there is clearly no space for such a high sign and because the visible part of the sign is too pointed to be a donkey’s muzzle. The traces rather suggest its identification as <łu>, although <ḥā> is not completely excluded. The name is [L]u-pi-i(a) (or [Ḫ]a-pi-i(a)), and the ligature below it, su+ra/i or rather BONUS+ra/i, apparently does not belong to the name, but is a ‘beneficial sign’ comparable with VITA(+ra/i) in Nişantepe sealings (cf. also the same ligature found in no. 567 in Herbordt 2005); the last ‘sign’ is undoubtedly BONUS.VIR₂ (and not li₂). The identification of ASINUS on a seal published in Dinçöl – Dinçöl 2005 is likewise false. The head of the animal has two divergent and pointed ears, a large eye and an open mouth (contra the inexact drawing given there which features a sort of goatee beard), nothing of which is found with ASINUS. The animal can be identified rather as a dog or a wolf and the name is either Zu(wa)na/is or *Walipna/is/*Ulipna/is. No more certain is the identification of signs on a sealing from Soli (see Dinçöl – Dinçöl 2008b). Even the tiny photo given there shows that the ‘animal head’ has neither the long ears typical for ASINUS nor the ‘crest’ typical for ASINUS₂ₐ. The sign is probably not an animal head at all. The reading of the upper signs as URBS.DOMINUS is no more credible.

³² It is not excluded that the sign represents an early form of what later became the ligature +ta(wa) which represents a semicircular element with several further semicircles inscribed in it. If right, then the ligated element may still be <+ra/i>, as suggested by Archi (cf. Poetto 2018 [2019]: 18), i.e. we are dealing with an early form of the entire complex ligature +ta(wa)+ra/i. The name can then be simply Tarkasnas = Ass. Tarkašan.
substantive *tarkaššanalli*- found once in the CLuw. corpus (see below) as ‘muleteer, donkey driver’, and suggested that *Tarkas(sa)nawas* could mean something like ‘provided with or in some way connected with donkeys’, referring to the interpretation of the suffix -wa- by Laroche (1960: 125–126) and Starke (1990: 183). At the same time, they pointed out that one finds in the Ancient Near East names which literally mean ‘donkey’ or ‘mule’, as, for instance, Akk. *Imaru/M Emarum* or *Kudanum*. The connection of the kings with ‘donkeys’ might seem to be odd enough, so an attempt to give a more rational explanation of the names as expressing possession of or a mastery over the animals is quite understandable. However, the examples of *Gardabos* and *Tarkašan*, which completely correspond to the respective animal names, suggest that the actual meaning of *Tarkas(sa)-nallis* and *Tarkas(sa)nawas* may in fact be, in a modern perspective, even more radical, implying virtual identity of the name-bearer with the animal. It is noteworthy that from a typological point of view, there is nothing surprising in such names, since in Late Bronze Age Anatolia (as elsewhere) one finds quite a few examples of personal names completely corresponding to animal terms, cf., for instance, *Walwa/is ‘Mr. Lion’* (LEO-wa/i, nos. 511–514 in Herbordt 2005); *APER-ni/ni ‘Mr. Boar’* (ibid., nos. 590–591); *K(u)runt(iy)as (CERVUS-ti)* ‘Mr. Stag’ (< ‘the horned one’) or *Uwā* (both feminine and masculine) ‘Ms. Cow’ and ‘Mr. Bull’.

As for the suffix -(a)lla/i- seen in *Tarkas(sa)nallis*, it is simply a common adjectival suffix (cf., e.g., Melchert 2003: 195 or Hoffner – Melchert 2008: 55), and *per se targaš(ša)nalla/i-* is not necessarily an agent noun. The context of the only attestation of the word in the CLuw. corpus is far from being clear, but it speaks rather against the meaning ‘donkey driver’. The word appears in KUB 35.111 rev. III 1 (*targaššanalli[š ...]*) followed by *waliyamma* at the beginning of the next line, and this scheme seems to be mirrored by the paragraph in ll. 5–6 which features ‘wa’liyammati ... *MEŠ-in-za* ‘(of) the eagle(s)’. The probable mirror parallelism of the paragraphs suggests that *targaššanalli[š]* refers to the animal (and not a profession); it is quite possible that both *targaššanalli[š]* and *MEŠ-in-za* are adjectives meaning ‘of the donkey’ (sg.) and ‘of the eagle’ (pl.) respectively.

---

33 This interpretation is found for instance in Tischler 1991–1994: s. v. targasnalli- and Melchert 1993: s. v. targaš(ša)nalla/i-, cf. Simon 2019: 326, fn. 49 who correctly points out that the context is not conclusive for this interpretation.

34 The adjective *targaš(ša)nalli(ya)-* registered in Melchert 1993: s. v. is non-existent: for the restoration in KUB 31.71 III 14 of *É targaššan[az ḫ]u’yanza* see Mouton 2007: 274 with fn. 357 with further references.

35 For a regular contraction of -iya- > -i- in the nom. acc. pl. forms of Luwian ya-adjjectives cf. Melchert 2003: 197 with fn. 27. Tentatively, one may connect *waliyamma* with Luw. *wa*lalli- / Hitt. *walla- ‘thigh’ and Hitt. *walliwalli- ‘mighty, powerful’. The passage then probably refers to the ‘power’ of a donkey’s legs and an eagle’s talons/wings.
A more specific semantic function of the suffix -alla/i- in Tarkas(sa)nallis is suggested by onomastic parallels. The most relevant one, also in a geographical sense, is found in the name of the father of Tarkasnawas which is attested in cuneiform as Alandallĩš/Alaldallĩš and is found in KARABEL A spelled with a sign depicting a bird of prey: AVISₚ+li (cf. Hawkins 1998: 4–8 and 18). This spelling implies that the name is derived from the name of a bird *alanta/*alalda-. The case proves to be immediately reminiscent of the dynastic name of the Lydian kings, Μερμνάδαι, which the joint evidence of the Oxyrhynchus Glossary and the Lexicon of Hesychius allows to be derived from μέρμνης = τρίορχος ‘buzzard’.³⁶ It is clear that the name Alandallĩš, as Μερμνας, does not imply any ‘driving’ or ‘possession’ of birds – rather, both names directly identify their owners with the respective winged creatures, symbolically imbuing them with their qualities. In all probability, the suffix -alla/i- has here a function close to equative. The same may be supposed for another Anatolian name of a comparable structure attested in Old-Assyrian tablets: Wawala (fem.) or Wawali, which is clearly based on wawa- ‘cow, bull’. The name may be interpreted as ‘Cowy’ and ‘Bully’, and represents thus a somewhat ‘softer’ variant of Uwā cited above.³⁷ One may further point out the name Uwayas, in which one can recognize a derivative from Uwa with the adjectival suffix -(i)ya-. Note that the pair Wawa-la/i : Uwa-ya closely matches Tarkas(sa)na-li- : Tarkas(sa)na/i-ya-. Furthermore, the Roman names adduced in the discussion by Hawkins – Morpurgo-Davies (1998: 257), such as Porcius, Ovinius, Caprilius, Equitius, Taurius, Asinius (cited by Varro RR 2.1.10), now prove to be more than relevant. Derived with the usual adjectival suffix -i-, which ety-
mologically corresponds to the Anatolian -(i)ya-, they show that the derivation of ‘animal personal names’ with adjectival suffixes may well have PIE roots.

§ 10. The element -wa- in Tarkas(sa)nawas presents a more difficult case. As a matter of fact, the suffix -wa- is in no way a common means of derivation in Anatolian, and is found only in a handful of words whose analysis is in the most cases ambiguous. The clearest case is arāwa- ‘free’, attested both in Hittite and Lycian, which is usually connected with arā- ‘friend’ and āra ‘properly’ (cf., e.g., Kloekhorst 2008: s. v.). The interpretation of the meaning of this suffix as ‘provided with’ by Laroche and Starke is basically an ad hoc assumption based on this single case. No more convincing is the recent attempt by Rieken – Sasseville (2014) to claim that the suffix -wa- originally denoted ‘rank and status’. The analysis of evidence proposed by the authors is rather idiosyncratic even on the level of morphology, let alone the semantic side, since the very identification of suffix -wa- is far from obvious in the majority of cases discussed (annawanni-, aliwani-, ayawala-, annawali-, āš(š)iwan-). In contrast, a number of clearer cases, as Luw. parnawa- ‘to serve’, Lyc. priñawa- ‘to construct, make, work at, labour’, Lyc. xñtawa- ‘to rule’, or Hitt./Luw. išhaššarwae- ‘to treat/regard as a lady’ can be naturally explained by an assumption of a denominal suffix -wa- building verbs, as argued elsewhere.³⁸ Lastly, Oettinger (2017) proposed to identify a denominal suffix -wa- in some Luwian terms connected with directions, as išarwila/i- ‘right (hand)’ (along with išarway(a)- ‘favorable (vel sim.)’) or iparwašša- ‘western’, assuming an original contrastive function of the suffix. This is not impossible, but clearly not applicable to the case of Tarkas(sa)nawas.

On the other hand, comparative IE evidence (cf. Oettinger 2017 and Rieken – Sasseville 2014: 302–303 with further references) clearly shows that the original semantics of PIE suffix *

³⁸ See Oreshko 2020b: 93–94, fn. 26. To the evidence discussed there, one can add two further cases in which separation of the verbal suffix -wa- would be possible, even if not compelling: 1) the name of a pastry mallitiwalla-, which is clearly based on mallit- ‘honey’ and thus possibly means ‘coated with honey’, may be based on a verb *mallitiwa- ‘to coat with honey’; 2) a morphologically close formation zunaulli-/zunawalli-, which may be the Luwian word for ‘hunter’ standing behind CANIS.ZU(WA) (see Oreshko 2013: 415–416), and so may naturally be explained as nomen actoris in -alla/i- (in origin a substantivized adjective) based on the verbal stem *zu(wa)nawa- derived from the word for ‘dog’ (zu(wa)na/i-) which literally means ‘to dog’, i.e. ‘to chase with dogs’.

See Oreshko 2020b: 93–94, fn. 26. To the evidence discussed there, one can add two further cases in which separation of the verbal suffix -wa- would be possible, even if not compelling: 1) the name of a pastry mallitiwalla-, which is clearly based on mallit- ‘honey’ and thus possibly means ‘coated with honey’, may be based on a verb *mallitiwa- ‘to coat with honey’; 2) a morphologically close formation zunaulli-/zunawalli-, which may be the Luwian word for ‘hunter’ standing behind CANIS.ZU(WA) (see Oreshko 2013: 415–416), and so may naturally be explained as nomen actoris in -alla/i- (in origin a substantivized adjective) based on the verbal stem *zu(wa)nawa- derived from the word for ‘dog’ (zu(wa)na/i-) which literally means ‘to dog’, i.e. ‘to chase with dogs’.
PIE *ser-*) or denominative adjectival formations (e.g. Skt. arṇavā- ‘watery’ < ārṇā- ‘flood’ or Lat. Minerva < *menes-y-eh₂ ‘the intelligent one’). The suffix *-yó- was thus in PIE probably an unspecific **adjectival** suffix denoting some association with the underlying root, being similar in this respect to other PIE adjectival suffixes *-no-, *-jo-, *-to-, *-ro- etc. (cf. Oettinger 2017: 259).

It is then probably unnecessary to assume a specific function of -wa- in Anatolian: a few attested formations with the suffix -wa- may well be (fossilized) reflexes of this original situation. Then arāwa- ‘free’ is simply ‘that of arā- (or āra) > ‘arā-like’ or ‘belonging to the arā-class’, and Tarkas(sa)nawas is ‘that of tarkas(sa)na-’ and means basically the same as Tarkas(sa)nallis and Tarkas(sa)-nayas – ‘Donkey-like’ – being just a formal variation of the same theme. The interpretation of the meaning of suffix as being close to equative – or should one rather term it **equotive**? – also finds support in the only other linguistically transparent case of the suffix found in onomastic material (see Hawkins – Morpurgo-Davies 1998: 249): the name Warpalawas which is clearly based on warpal-la/i- ‘powerful’ (cf. Melchert 1993: s. v.). As piling together two adjectival suffixes (-a)lla/i- and -wa-) does not make much sense, one may see in warpalla/i- rather a substantivized epithet of the Storm-God (cf. warpalliš in KUB 4.4 rev. 13), and accordingly interpret Warpalawas as ‘one of the Powerful’: ‘Storm-God-like’, for which Tarḫuni(y)a attested in cuneiform (cf. Laroche 1966: s. v.) represents a semantically close counterpart.

§ 11. Another strand of evidence supporting the connection of *Gardabos** with Skr. gardabhā- comes from the Greek legendary tradition. It is striking that the most famous of the Phrygian kings, Midas, was represented by the Greeks as having specifically donkey’s ears. This representation is a paradox which despite numerous efforts – ranging from Ovid’s (Met. 11.146–193) representation of it as Apollo’s punishment for Midas’ ‘bad’ musical taste to ascribing the king a special genetic condition (Prag – Neave 1997: 85–104) to proclaiming him a (misidentified) ‘Ear’ of the Persian King (Berndt 2018)³⁹ – did not find an entirely satisfactory explanation. Even the interpretation of Midas’ donkey ears by Vassilyeva (2008) as a reflection of ‘an old Anatolian royal symbol’, which was triggered by just the evidence on Tarkas(sa)nawas discussed in Hawkins – Morpurgo-Davies 1998, does not satisfactorily explain why it was precisely donkey – and not, for instance, an **eagle** or a **lion** – which got associated with the Phrygian king in such an indecorous way. In fact, the evidence discussed above clearly shows that the association of donkey with kings was not in any way exclusive (cf. also below). The interpre-

³⁹ For earlier suggestions and further literature see Vassilyeva 2008 and Berndt 2018.
tation of the name of an early Phrygian king as ‘Donkey’ now presents a plausible possibility to explain the paradox: in the animal ears of Midas one may see a peculiar refraction of the tradition regarding one of the Phrygian kings as a ‘Donkey’, even if only by name. The details of the transformation process from the donkey name of a king to the donkey ears of his descendant will probably never be fully retrieved, but in view of the close cultural and linguistic links between the Greeks and the Phrygians, there is nothing impossible in the assumption that the archaic Greeks of Ionia or Aeolis could have had some knowledge of the naming tradition of the Phrygian kings. In fact, as will be argued below, this tradition need not necessarily go as far back as to the king *Gardabos, since the name borne by several later kings of Phrygia was also connected with the same equid.

§ 12. In sum, there is every reason to think that behind the phonetic similarity of *Gardabos and Skr. gardabhá- stands a real etymological connection of the words. The discovery of Phrygian ‘donkey’ has a number of interesting implications both on a linguistic and a cultural level. To begin with, Skr. gardabhá- is a suffixal derivative, and the suffix -bha- < PIE *-bho- has quite a peculiar distribution in the IE languages. The suffix is relatively well attested only in two branches, Greek and Indo-Aryan, in both being strongly associated with animals. In Sanskrit, the suffix can be still perceived as a living albeit already moribund morphological category (cf. Burrow 2001: 198–199). Besides garda-bhá-, the suffix is attested in another term for ‘donkey’, rásā-bha-, which may be connected with the verbal root ras- ‘cry, roar, yell; make a noise; to praise (Ved.)’ and thus literally interpreted as ‘yeller’ (cf. Mayrhofer 1986–2001: s. v.). The suffix is further present in two close terms for ‘bull’: vṛṣa-bhá-, which is based on vṛśa-/vṛṣan- ‘powerful, manly, heroic (adj.); bull, male animal’, and ṛṣa-bhá-, which appears to be the same word with an irregular loss of n- (of either PIE or a later date); both terms can be connected with PIE *(u̯)ers-n- ‘male’, which gave also Greek ἄρσην, Arm. aṟn ‘ram’, Lith. veřšis ‘bull calf’ etc. (cf. Beekes 2010: s. v. ἄρσην). The suffix further appears in adjective sthūla-bhá- ‘big’ clearly an extension of sthūla- ‘large, big, thick, powerful etc.’, which suggests that the suffix has here an intensifying function, and in śala-bhá- ‘locust, grass-hopper’, which is possibly based on śala- ‘staff, dart, spear’ and the name denotes thus a ‘staff-like insect’ (cf. śalā-kā- ‘small stick’ and śala-ka- ‘a sort of spider’).

In Classical Greek the suffix was already not perceived as a distinct morphological category. The clearest case of the suffix is found in ἔλαφος ‘deer’, whose root is connected within Greek with a word for ‘young deer’, ἐλλός (ἑλλός), and has a number of good correspondences in other IE languages (e.g., Arm. ełn ‘deer’, OCS jelenn ‘deer’, Toch. B yal ‘gazelle’ etc.) which can be traced back to PIE *h₁el-en-. Two further terms for mammals include ἔριφος ‘kid’, for which no underlying
root is known, and κίραφος ‘fox’ which is a suffixal extension of κίρα (a Laconian word with the same meaning), of which κίδαφος (with numerous variants) ‘fox’ is probably simply a phonetic variant. The suffix was also probably present in several names for birds, κόσσυφος ‘blackbird’ (attested also as κόσσυκος) and not quite clear ἀσκάλαφος (also ἀσκάλαβος) and κόραφος (poss. connected with κορώνη ‘crow’ and κόραξ ‘raven’). It is also attested in the names of two insects: σέρφος ‘gnat or winged ant’ (cf. also σέρυφος/σερίφη ‘sort of insect’) and θήραφος ‘spider’ (with diminutive θηράφιον) probably a derivative from θήρ ‘beast’ (cf. Beekes 2010: s. v. θήρ). Besides many dubious cases (cf. Schwyzer 1953: 495–496), the suffix is attested in an adjective στέριφος, which is synonymical both with στερεός ‘firm, solid’ and στεῖρος ‘barren’; the second seemingly comparable case, ἀργύφεος or ἀργύφεος ‘silver-white’, usually regarded as derived from ἀργύρος ‘silver’, is dubious, as there are good grounds to regard it as a compound ἀργυρός (ἀργ-ύφεος) containing in the first part ἀργός/ἀργής ‘bright, shining’ (< PIE *h2erg- ‘shining white’) and in second part the root of the verb ὑφαίνω/ὑφάω ‘weave’ (< PIE *μεθ-).⁴⁰

Outside Greek and Indo-Aryan, the suffix seems not to be attested with names for any big animals at all.⁴¹ At best, the suffix was present in the names of some birds (cf., e.g. OCS golǫбь ‘dove/pigeon’, Lat. columba ‘id., palumbēs ‘wood pigeon’), but the disparate evidence does not suggest that the suffix represented in any way a systematic or recognizable morphological category in any other known IE language. Thus, if Phrygian *garda-bo- is not a borrowing from

---

⁴⁰ This interpretation is suggested by the contexts of two of the three early attestations of ἀργύφεος: in Hom. Od. 5.230 it is applied to φᾶρος ‘cloak, mantle’ and in Hes. Th. 574 to ἔσθη ‘dress, clothing’. This interpretation would also agree with attestations of ἄργυφος with ‘sheep’ (δισ or μίλιον) in Hom. Il. 24.621 and Hom. Od. 10.85, as it can be interpreted as an elliptical epithet ‘whose wool will be woven into white garments’. The use of ἀργύφεος with νάματα ‘streams’ in Anthologia Palatina 9.633 (Damocharis) and with ὠεόν ‘egg’ in an Orphic fragment (Orph. Fr. 70) probably reflects late understanding of the term as a synonym of ἄργος, ἄργης or ἀργύρεος. Only the context of Hom. Il. 18.50, where ἀργύφεος is found with σπέός ‘grotto’, seems to contradict this interpretation. However, one may assume that ἀργύφεος is used here in a metaphorical or poetic sense referring to the pattern of bright reflection made by the water on the walls of the grotto, which is indeed reminiscent of weaving.

⁴¹ As both Gaulish personal onomastics and Celtic comparative evidence show that the word for ‘deer’ in Celtic languages had no labial suffix (cf. Delamarre 2003: s. v. elembi(os) and Matasović 2009: s. v. *elani(t)i-), the Celtic month-name elembiuos should be probably analyzed as a compound elem-biuos (< *elem-biuos) in which one can see a correspondence to the Greek month-name Ἐλαφη-βολιών (‘Deer-shooting’) rather than Ἐλάφιος. The element -biu- can be connected with the root seen in OIr. benaid ‘strikes’ (pres.), bi ‘stroke’ (pret.) etc., which goes back to PIE *bʰiH- ‘strike’ (for further cognates see Matasović 2009: s. v. *bi-na-, cf. Delamarre 2003: s. v. boilos).
Indo-Aryan (as is the case with Tocharian kercapo), the discovery of a reflex of the PIE suffix *-bʰo- in (early) Phrygian produces a striking exclusive morphological isogloss between Phrygian, Greek and Indo-Aryan.⁴²

The interpretation of *garda-bo- as a genuine Phrygian formation is supported by some evidence concerning the root. Mayrhofer (1986–2001: s. v. gard-dabhá-), pointing out the derivation of rāśa-bha- from ras- ‘shout, yell’ (cf. above), tentatively connected the word with the root gard- ‘to shout (in joy), to emit a sound’, a very rare verb attested only a couple of times in Indian texts.⁴³ Semantically the derivation looks plausible, and the slim evidence can now be further underpinned by Armenian and Baltic material. The Sanskrit verb finds a virtually precise semantic and formal correspondence in Armenian verb kardam ‘to shout, call, recite loudly’ (dialectal also ‘to sing’). Given the phenomenon of voicing of stops after r and n in Armenian (cf., e.g. mard ‘man’ < PIE *mṛto- or ard ‘(just) now’ < PIE *h₂(e)rti), which can be reformulated as preservation of PIE voiced stops in this position, the Armenian root kard- represents an exact etymological counterpart of Skr. gard-. This connection is decidedly more preferable than the derivation of the Armenian root from *gvrH-dhh₁- ‘to offer a song of praise’ proposed by Martirosyan (2009: s. v.), which, given a very basic meaning of the Armenian verb, looks rather artificial. Moreover, the connection of Skr. gard- and Arm. kard- finds further support in the Baltic material which is usually discussed together with kardam: the meaning of the verbs perfectly agrees with the oldest Baltic evidence, OLith. gerdas ‘rumor, prank, messenger’ and OPr. gerdant ‘they say’; the meaning of the verb ‘to hear’ attested in the modern Baltic languages (Lith. girdė́ti etc.) can be naturally explained by the usual semantic ambivalence

42 It is noteworthy that a final labial element is found in two female personal names which Greek tradition in a way associates with Phrygia: that of Ἑκάβη (Lat. Hecuba), a Phrygian princess and the wife of Priamos of Troy, and Νιόβη, a daughter of Tantalus, who is sometimes called ‘Phrygian’ although his seat was at Mount Sipylos in Lydia. It is not clear if the names are relevant here. The name Νιόβη has no obvious parallels elsewhere. In contrast, Ἑκάβη looks suspiciously Greek-like, as it can be analyzed as an abbreviated form based on ἐκηβόλος/ ἐκαβόλος < *ϝεκαβόλος ‘Far-Shooting’, an epithet of Apollo (cf. von Kampzt 1982: 140 with further references). The connection with Apollo does not look unreasonable, given that the deity was the main god of the Trojans. In any case, the separation of the ‘suffix’ -β- in Ἑκάβη does not produce a sensible root. It is noteworthy that the names featuring a labial suffix are attested in the Iliad also on the ‘Greek side’: Τήλεφος and Ἄντιφος. Again, both can be interpreted as abbreviated names (coming from *Τηλέφονος and Ἀντί-φονος/-φάτης (or the like) respectively, cf. von Kampzt 1982: 142), rather than formations with the suffix -φο- (which does not make much sense semantically).

43 There are three attestations of the verb (and not one as per Mayrhofer): one in Tāndyabrahmanda (XIV, 3, 19) and twice in Dhātupāṭha (a lexical list of verbal roots) (cf. Böhtlingk – Roth 1855–75: s. v. and Monier-Williams 1899: s. v.).
‘make a sound’ ~ ‘hear’ found in many IE languages (cf. Kümmel – Rix 2001: s. v. *g(u̯ )erdh- and Derksen 2015: s. v. girdėti).

The presence of a reflex of the root *gerd- ‘shout, call’ in Armenian makes it very likely that it was preserved in Phrygian as well. This means that *garda-bo-probably was, from a synchronic Phrygian point of view, as transparent a formation as ráśa-bha- was for the Indians. This introduces an important nuance into the interpretation of the name. It is clear that ‘shouting/calling’ has a close semantic associations both with the idea of ‘praising’ and ‘making famous’, cf., *inter alia, the Vedic meaning of ras- ‘to praise’, the bidirectional relationship between Greek κλέος ‘fame’ vs. κλείω/κλέω ‘to celebrate, proclaim, praise, (later) call’ (< PIE *kley- ‘hear’ : ‘say’) or the derivation of Lat. fāma < for ‘to speak, say’. In this sense, the literal meaning of *Gardabos ‘Shouter’ may well contain fine semantic allusions to the idea of ‘fame’, which played notoriously an important role in the PIE society still traceable in many historical IE traditions (κλέος ἄφθιτον etc.). These allusions might add to the positive semantic associations of the donkey.⁴⁴

§ 13. The striking morphological isogloss between Greek, Phrygian and Indo-Aryan and even more exact root correspondence between the latter two naturally raises the question about the circumstances of the prehistorical contact between these branches which could have given rise to it. In itself, the existence of such an isogloss is not surprising, as there are ample other indications that proto-Greek, proto-Phrygian, Proto-Armenian and proto-Indo-Iranian constituted a separate group within the PIE at some chronological stage.⁴⁵ Given the geographical distribution of the respective branches, the most probable region for this prehistoric unity – or, at least, intensive contact – is the vast zone of the Pontic steppes.

It is curious that the probable cultural background of the donkey-name of *Gardabos points in quite the same direction. The semantic associations of the donkey-name was briefly touched upon already by Hawkins – Morpurgo-Davies (1998: 256–257), who emphasized that all equids were of great importance in the economies of the Ancient Near East, and there was no semantic opposition ‘noble

⁴⁴ In this context one may also mention the adjective puntarriyal/i- attested in a Hittite text (KUB 24.7 II 18) as an epithet of the goddess Ištar, which can be connected with ANŠE-aš puntariya[war] ‘p. of the donkey’ attested in a lexical text (KUB 3.99 II 12’). Recently, Simon 2020 convincingly argued that this epithet likely means not ‘stubborn’, but ‘shouting loudly’ – or ‘shouting like a donkey’. This curious testimony once again confirms that the ancient notions about (wild) donkeys were very different from what one would think about them now.

⁴⁵ See Martirosyan 2013 and Lamberterie 2013 with further references. Cf. also recent discussions by Kim 2018 and Obrador-Cursach 2019b.
steed’ vs. ‘stubborn mule/donkey’ largely entrenched in the modern perception of the domestic equids. This is true, but it seems that for understanding the cultural associations of the name *Gardabos and other donkey-names of Anatolia a passage from the Gilgamesh epic adduced by the authors themselves is much more pertinent. In the passage (VIII: 50) Gilgamesh, mourning over Enkidu, refers to him as ‘a swift mule, a wild donkey of the uplands’ (kudani ṭarid akannu ša šadî), which echoes Enkidu’s ‘genealogy’ given earlier (VIII: 3–4) as ‘your mother, a gazelle, your father, a wild donkey’ (umma-ka šabiti akannu abu-ka, cf. George 2003: 654–655 and 650–651). One may suppose that the name *Gardabos reflects similar associations, referring to a wild donkey, the untamed inhabitant of the steppes. Indeed, despite all their useful qualities, the common donkey (Equus asinus f. asinus) and the mule are still domestic animals used, as already mentioned above, first of all as draught and pack animals, which is not quite a right association for kings. In contrast, wild donkey or onager (Equus hemionus) as a free, strong and a swift animal – no less swift than a horse – seems to be an entirely appropriate name for the king of a people strongly associated with horse-breeding, as in fact the early Phrygian were (cf. below). Furthermore, the immediate connection of the wild donkey with the steppe is no less significant. It is striking that several ancient authors, such as Strabo (12.6.1), Varro (RR 2.1 and 2.6) and Plinius (HN 8.69 and 8.83), mention among a few natural habitats of the wild donkeys knowns to them just the steppe-like landscapes of Central Anatolia, Phrygia and Lykaonia (cf. Nagel et al. 1999: 180, 184–85). Moreover, it is not excluded that Homer’s (II. 2.852) curious association of ‘the race of wild asses’ (ἡμιόνων γένος ἀγροτεράων) with Paphlagonia may in a way reflect this situation. The wild ass was thus an autochthonous inhabitant of the central-Anatolian ‘uplands’ in Bronze and Iron Age, which agrees well with the unique character of the Anatolian term for ‘donkey’ (tarkas(sa)nallis and presents a ready explanation for the wide popularity of the donkey names in Anatolia.

However, it would be probably too hasty to conclude that *Gardabos represents simply a calque of the Anatolian Tarkas(sa)nallis or Tarkas(sa)nawas which came into being only after the proto-Phrygians had appeared in Anatolia. It is worth remembering at this point that there are scattered but distinctive indications that the Phrygians retained in their culture until at least 500 BC some traits which connect them with the nomadic traditions of the Pontic steppes. Among the most striking features one may point out 1) the association of the Phrygians with horses, perceptible both in their characterization by Homer as ‘having quick-moving steeds’ (Φρύγας ... αἰολοπώλους in II. 3.185 and HH 5.137) and ‘fighting on horse-back’ (Φρύγες ἱππόμαχοι in II. 10.431) and also in the horse-burial in the early Tumulus KY (ca. 800–750 BC) at Gordion; 2) the very tradition of burial in tumuli, whose form associates their origin with open steppe-like landscapes,
finding correspondences both in the Balkan area and in the Scythian kurgans; 3) the similarities in the visual representation of the Phrygians and the Scythians by the Greeks, and especially the correspondence in the ‘Phrygian cap’, in essence a bashlyk-like headgear widely spread in the later periods among the nomadic peoples of the steppe regions from the Black Sea to Central Asia and Siberia.⁴⁶ In the latter area wild donkeys were no less a common sight than in Anatolia, although they belonged here to slightly different species. In the Pontic steppes one finds the kulan (Equus hemionus kulan), which is more resistant to the harsh winters of the region, and in the more southern areas – from southern Russia and Kazakhstan to the Iranian Plateau – the Persian onager (Equus hemionus onager).⁴⁷ *Gardabo-/gardabhá- might refer to either, as they are similar in appearance and behavior. However it may be, nothing speaks against the assumption that the proto-Phrygians saw in the wild donkey a noble animal – the ‘mighty swift shouter of the steppe’ – already before their arrival in Anatolia, and the correspondence with Tarkas(sa)nallis and Tarkas(sa)nawas reflects the typologically comparable background of the central-Anatolian and north-Pontic cultures.

§ 14. One can also find elsewhere scattered evidence indicating that other horse-breeding nomadic tribes of the Pontic-Central-Asian steppe region, predominantly Iranian after ca. 1000 BC, had a comparable ideology connected with wild donkeys. For instance, one finds in the Avestan Yasna 42.4 a reference to a mythical (wild) donkey (xara-) standing in the middle of the primordial ocean Vourukaša; or a Delphic oracle reported by Herodotus (1.55.2) gives a reference to Cyrus as a ‘mule’ (ἡμίονος), which not only indicates the mixed half-Mede half-Persian origin of the king, but also implies the symbolic identity of one of these ethnic groups with (wild) donkeys. Furthermore, it is curious that the name Gardabhas (or Gardbhins) found, as mentioned above, in the Purāṇas as the name of a ‘dynasty’ may well have similar associations. The name appears in the standard list of rulers of Northern India which is comprised of Ābhīras, Gardabhas/Gardbhins, Śakas, Yavanas, Turuṣkas/Tuṣāras and Maruṇḍas.⁴⁸ As the Śakas can be identified as the Iranian Saka, the Yavanas with the Bactrian Greeks and the Turuṣkas/Tuṣāras likely represent the Kušāṇa, it is probable that the

⁴⁶ One may also mention the elongated skull of the person buried in the great Tumulus MM resulting from the artificial cranial deformation (see Prag – Neave 1997: 99), which is reminiscent of a similar practice abundantly attested with the later nomadic tribes of the north-Pontic and Siberian region, such as Sarmatians, Alans and Huns.
name of *Gardabhas/Gardabhins refers to a further tribe coming from the northwest which, in view of the etymology of their name, might well have a nomadic background, quite similar to the following Saka. An Iranian origin of the tribe seems likely, although cannot be proven.

Lastly, it is appropriate to mention that the Armenian word for ‘donkey’, ēš, comes from PIE *h₁eḱuo- which gave the word for ‘horse’ in all other IE languages (Luw. azuwa-, Skr. áśva-, Lat. equus, ἵππος etc.). The semantic shift from ‘horse’ > ‘donkey’ is a non-trivial one and can be only in part explained by an assumption of a semantic hierarchy between different words for ‘horse’ in the PIE ordinary ‘language of men’ vs. poetic ‘language of gods’, as suggested by Calvert Watkins (see Martirosyan 2009: s. v. ēš with further references). On a deeper level, the underlying reason of such a shift might be that the proto-Prygians did not strongly differentiate ‘horses’ and ‘(wild) donkeys’ keeping both within the same semantic category of ‘swift hoofed animal (of the steppe)’.

§ 15. The linguistic observations put forward above have some further important implications bearing on the early history of the Phrygians. The phonetic similarity of the names *Gardabos and Γόρδιος (Γορδίης), a dynastic name of several kings of Gordion, has already been briefly pointed out above. Now, when one can plausibly recognize in the final part of *Gardabos a suffix *-bo-, the similarity becomes even more perceptible, and it would be natural to assume an etymological link between them. However, first one needs to adduce some Phrygian epigraphic evidence which sheds some light on the issue.

There are three graffiti from Gordion which bear on the issue. The first is a fragmentary graffito G-201, the four letters of which can be read as goṛḍ[l]. Given that the majority of the graffiti from Gordion feature personal names, one may recognize in it the beginning of Γόρδις or Γόρδιος. The second graffito, G-198, also preserves only four letters, which can be read gard[l]. The sequence exactly corresponds to the initial part of *Gardabos, but also has an identical consonantal structure to goṛḍ[l], which implies a phonetic variation a/o. The final and crucial piece of evidence is supplied by the third graffito, G-224c, found on a large vessel dated to ca. 4th century BC (see fig. 1).
The first letter is slightly damaged, but all letters of the name are preserved. Brixhe – Lejeune 1984: 180 read the graffito as garies or paries. However, a careful observation of the photo shows that the fourth letter is in all probability not <i>, but <t>, a short horizontal stroke being vaguely discernible in the upper part of the letter, at the transition between the body and the neck of the vessel. As there is other evidence suggesting an alternation of voiced and voiceless dentals in Phrygian (cf. fn. 18 on Sizidos/*Sizetos), there is good reason to recognize in G-224c a name based on the same root *gard- and to read it as Gartes. Read in this way, the name turns out to be a fairly exact counterpart of Γόρδις well attested in Greek epigraphic sources.

This evidence seems to imply that the variation a/o was a synchronic process in Phrygian. This can be corroborated by several further pieces of evidence. First, there every reason to think that the Old Phrygian dakor (verb, 3. sg.) found in the Kerkenes inscription is the same as dakar (3. sg.) attested in the New-Phrygian inscription no. 18, cf. also dakaren in no. 98 (3. pl.). Second, there is a form pator-attested in line 4 of the Vezirhan inscription. Neither the reading of the final part of the word nor its syntactical context is clear, but the word is reminiscent of the IE word for ‘father’ (cf. Brixhe 2004: 57 and 65). Its expected form is, however, *patar, cf. Phr. mātar (nom. sg.), materē (dat. sg.) and the Neo-Phrygian forms πατερης (no. 48) ‘parents’ and πατρες (no. 130). The o-vocalism is, however, perplexing. In fact, the form finds a close parallel in an unpublished graffito from Gordion – which I use the opportunity to publish here (see fig. 2). The graffito features four letters which can be read as mạ to after which one can see the lower part of a vertical hasta. Probably the most straightforward possibility would be to read the sequence as mạ toṛ and recognize in it a phonetic variant of Matar (‘Mother’), the name of the main deity of the Phrygian pantheon (Cybele). Both mạ toṛ and pator- can be interpreted as regional or dialectal variants of mātar and *patar respectively.

Lastly, some Neo-Phrygian inscriptions attest a form δοκετ (nos. 44 and 54) or αδοκετ (no. 106) which clearly represent a phonetic variant of δοκετ and αδδοκετ respectively, both meaning ‘make, cause’. It is easy to notice that all but the latter forms feature the alternation a/o in the position before r, which is the case also with *Gardabos vs. Gordi(o)s. A change of the vocal before r – either raising or a certain neutralization – is cross-linguistically a common phenomenon, which once again confirms that the variation a/o in Phrygian is a synchronic process.

The genuinely Phrygian attestation of the name Gartes corroborates the argument of Simon (2017: 114–115) that the form Γόρδις is the original form of the Phrygian name. Indeed, this inference perfectly agrees with all the available strands of epigraphical evidence: while there are abundant early attestations of HLuw.
Fig. 2. Phrygian graffito from Gordion, Inv. no. 1-19 (with a drawing by Ardeth Anderson). Courtesy of the Penn Museum Gordion Archive⁴⁹

Kurtî and Assyrian Gurdî (Qurdî)⁵⁰ and several early (4th century BC) attestations of Γόρδιος in Herakleia in Pontos – where it is probably a local name – and at Pantikapaion on the northern shore of the Black Sea (cf. LGPN VA: s. v.), there are no epigraphical attestations of the name Γόρδιος or Γορδίης in Phrygia whatsoever and only one relatively early attestation of Γόρδιος in Temnos in Aeolis (3rd century BC).⁵¹ Thus, the names transmitted by Herodotus (Γορδίης) and by later Greek authors (Γόρδιος), as well as HLuw. Kurtiyan, may indeed be interpreted as

⁴⁹ According to the object card, the three fragments with the graffito were found on July 7th, 1950, at the City Mound, NC Trench, Level II.

⁵⁰ To the attestations of the name Gurdî collected in Aro 1999 and discussed by Simon 2017 one may now add two attestations found in the Assyrian tablets from Marâş, Marqasi 1, rev. 33 (Jiménez – Adali – Radner 2015: 155–159) and Marqasi 5, rev. 19 (Jiménez – Fıstıkçı – Adali 2015: 174–178). These two attestations from outside Assyria once again confirm the Anatolian (in a geographical sense) character of the name (thus contra Zadok 2010: 413–414).

⁵¹ The name Γόρδιος is well attested only in Cappadocia (10 tags in LGPN VC, including one attested in literary sources), but all attestations, except one associated with Ariarathes VI (1st c. BC), are very late (2nd c. AD and later). Similarly, there are only scattered late attestations of the name elsewhere: one in Ephesos (6th c. AD), one in Paphlagonia (2nd/3rd c. AD), one in Sebasteia in Pontos (320 AD) and, outside Anatolia, one at Chersonesos in the Tauris (1st c. AD); there is also one attestation of Γορδιανός in Cappadocia (6th c. AD). In addition, there are 6 tags for a name Γορδιανός for the central parts of Anatolia (Cappadocia, Lycaonia, Paphlagonia and Pisidia) and one in Cilicia Pedias (all not earlier than the 2nd c. AD), and one attestation of its female counterpart Γορδιανή at Hadrianoi in Mysia (2nd/3rd c. AD). The latter names clearly represent ethnic names based on the name of the city Gordion, suggesting that Γόρδιος may in fact be not
secondary formations resulting from thematization of the original e/i-stem by the non-Phrygian speakers, as suggested by Simon.

These considerations have obvious implications for the question of the relationship between the personal name and the name of the Phrygian capital. The linguistic evidence perfectly agrees both with the testimony by Stephan of Byzantium (s. v. Πόρδις εν Αλκαίων), who derives the name of the city from the personal name (ἀπὸ Πόρδιου τοῦ πατρὸς Μίδου), and with the common Phrygian pattern of deriving city names with the suffix *-eyo- (cf. above). This decidedly disproves the idea that the personal name is a secondary derivative from the city name based on the PIE root *g*erdh- ‘encircle, enclose’, sporadically expressed earlier and recently elaborated by Obrador-Cursach (2019). In contrast, Γόρδις and G̣artes can now be naturally explained as reflexes of *gordi/e-, and thus simpler (suffix-less) variants of *Gardabos/Gordebos. This means that the founder of Gordion and his descendants were no less enthusiastic devotees of the ‘swift shouters of the steppe’ than the king Hartapus himself, which, as already noted, well explains the donkey ears of Gordios’ son Midas.

§ 16. There remains one last point to be discussed in the domain of personal onomastics: it seems to be possible to identify yet another Anatolian ‘donkey-name’ with possible Balkan connections. The name Mugallu (Mugalli) is known from Assyrian sources from the reigns of Esarhaddon (681–669 BC) and Ashurbanipal (668–631 BC) and is associated with a king of Melid and a king of Tabal, which may or may not be identical (cf. Hawkins 1993–1997). Recently, the same name (in the spelling Mugalli) showed up in an Assyrian sale contract from Maraş as a name of an ordinary witness (Marqasi 2: 34, see Jiménez – Adalı – Radner 2015: 159–163). It seems very probable that the name ‘Mu-ka-|FRATER-la-sa attested in an old Phrygian name, but a shorter version of the ethnic name coinciding with the city name, which was a common practice in Anatolia.

52 The attractiveness of the idea is certainly understandable, but it plainly runs contrary to all available evidence: while there are no attestations of the name *Gordos for the Phrygian capital, the names Γορδίου τεῖχος or Γορδίου κώμη speak for themselves. Obrador-Cursach’s claim that Πουντας found in the NPhr. inscription no. 48 is a Phrygian ethnic appellation based on the name of a village *Pontanos or *Pontana is not very convincing either. It is not clear how the final syllable of the name could be lost in the process of the ‘derivation’, and the existence of a suffix-less means of derivation also looks more than odd, especially in view of Τέμβρος/Τέμβρις attested in the same inscription, which is clearly an eyo-adjective based on the river name Τέμβρος/Τέμβρις. In fact, it is not excluded that Πουντας represents not an epithet at all, as it is usually taken, but a noun and refers to an independent divine entity, ‘Sea’ (~ Greek πόντος), building a pair with Bas (which might be ‘Earth’).
KARATEPE 3 represents the same name. Lastly, it is not impossible that Μυγαλός attested in a 3rd century BC inscription from Iasos in Caria (IIasos 82: 3) represents the same name rather than a Greek name connected with μυγαλή ‘shrewmouse’ (cf. Robert 1963: 176 and Zgusta 1964: 341 with fn. 347).

No comparable names are attested in Hittite sources of the Empire Period, and the peculiar distribution of the name in roughly the same region where HLuw. Kurtis and Gurdî are found suggests that the name may be connected with the appearance in Tabal of Phrygian settlers. This supported by the fact that Mugallu of Tabal pays his tribute to Ashurbanipal in horses, which is immediately reminiscent of the Phrygian horse-breeding tradition (cf. above). The attestation of Μύγαλλος in Iasos does not contradict it: it comes from a busy port city and dates to the Hellenistic period when brought about an increase in ethnic mobility within and between the Aegean and Anatolia. From a linguistic point of view, one may try to connect the name with the Hittite root mūgai- ‘invoke, evoke, entreat’, but the connection does not appear to be especially illuminating semantically, and, as far as one can see, the root does not appear in Hittite or Luwian onomastics whatsoever.

On the other hand, the name finds a nearly exact phonetic correspondence in the rare Greek term μύκλος known first of all from two attestations in Alexandria (II.771 and 816), a learned epic poem by the Alexandrian scholar Lycophron. Alonso Déniz (2020) has recently in detail discussed the word, significantly clarifying its history and attestations. He convincingly demonstrated that the word has the meaning ‘donkey’ in both passages where it is attested, and that the meaning ‘lewd, lustful’ in line 771, where it is applied to the suitors of Penelope, is based on misunderstanding on the part of late scholiasts (and modern scholars), rooted in part in the usual association of donkeys in Classical antiquity with lustfulness. Alonso Déniz further suggested that the word is in its origin an adjective derived with the suffix *-lo- from the root *muk- seen in μυκάομαι ‘low, bellow; ring, sound’, which is finally of onomatopoeic origin. Given that not only the meaning, but also the underlying semantics of μύκλος finds a striking parallel in gordis and *gardabos, it appears very likely that the name Mugallu is indeed immediately connected with μύκλος. This is further supported by the fact that

---

53 For the name cf. Oreshko 2014: 626–627.
54 The word μυγαλός is attested several times in a magical papyrus from Egypt (PMag.Lond. 121.2445, 2460, 2592), and, given the context (cf. esp. 2459–60: ταῦτα πάντα βάλε εἰς ὅλμον σὺν τῷ μυγαλῷ ...), it refers to a small animal, and thus probably indeed to μυγαλέη/μυγαλή. However, ‘Mr. Shrewmouse’ is a strange name by any standards, and is not found elsewhere in the Greek world.

This realization sheds a new light on the Greek word – which turns out to be probably not Greek at all. First of all, it is striking that the word βασσάρα ‘vixen’, which Lycophron used in parallel with μύκλος in the next line of the poem (772), applying it now to Penelope, is in all probability not Greek, but a Thracian word. The word βασσάρα is attested by Greek sources, mainly lexicographical works, with two main meanings: ‘fox’ and ‘a long garment of bacchantes’, apparently one made of fox skins.⁵⁵ In the latter sense, βασσάρα is inextricably associated with the cult of Dionysos, as are all its further derivatives (βασσαρίς, ἀναβασσαρέω, Βασσαρεύς etc.), and some sources even directly associate it with Thrace, cf., e.g., Hesychius 305 βασσάραι’ χιτῶνες, οὗς ἐφόρουν αἱ Θρᾴκιαι Βάκχαι. The Thracian habit of wearing garments made of fox skins is, inter alia, corroborated by Xenophon (Anab. 7.4.4), and the Thracian associations are even further confirmed by an epigraphic attestation of ἄρχιβασσάρα ‘leader of the bassarids (bacchantes)’ in an inscription from Apollonia Pontica (IGBulg 401.16).⁵⁶ The attestation of βασσάρα (pl.) ‘small foxes’ in the description of the Libyan fauna by Herodotus (4.192.2) in no way implies Libyan origin of the word; rather, it suggests that the word was present in the Cyrenaic dialect of Greek, as is inferred also by some sources known to Hesychius (305 βασσάρος ἀλώπηξ ... παρὰ Κυρηναίοις) and Eymologicum Magnum (191, 1:βασσάρα ... βάσαρος ἡ ἀλώπης κατὰ Ἦρωδοτον ὑπὸ Κυρηναίων).⁵⁷

The fact that βασσάρα is a Thracian word, of course, does not necessarily mean that μύκλος should have a similar linguistic background. However, in combination with the fact that μύκλος is probably not found in any other Greek text,⁵⁸ this makes it very likely that the word is not Greek. The probable attestation of the word in the personal names in south-eastern Anatolia suggests that it may be a Phrygian word. The gloss of Hesychius which defines μυχλός as a specifically Phocean word for a breeder-ass (Φωκεῖς δὲ καὶ ὄνους τοὺς ἐπὶ ὀχείαν πεμπομένους) generally corroborates this conclusion, implying that the word

---

⁵⁵ For the evidence see Chantraine 1968–1980: s. v. βασσάρα.
⁵⁶ Slavova 2016: 489–490 with further references.
⁵⁷ Connection of the word both with Hitt. waššuwar- ‘dress’ and Coptic bašor (cf. Beekes 2010: s. v. βασσάρα with further references) is quite unfounded. There are also two curious mentions of βασσάρα in connection with Lydia, one in a fragment of Edonians by Aeschylus (fr. 59 Nauck) and one in the Onomasticon by Pollux (6.59), cf. Gusmani 1964: 272. The evidence can be associated with the spread of orgiastic cults in Lydia, which links it with Thrace; for discussion of the evidence cf. Oreshko forthcoming b (sections on Pakiš (Bacchus), *Pētos (cf. Bendis) and *Katus (cf. Kότυς, Κοτυτώ or Κοττώ)).
⁵⁸ For discussion of other alleged attestations of the word see Alonzo Déniz 2020: 112–113.
might have been known also in Mysia. It remains unclear if μύκλος is a late phonetic variant of *mugallos, featuring a contraction and devoicing of the tectal, or simply a parallel formation found in a different dialect of Phrygian (e.g., that of Mysia).⁵⁹ In any case, *mugal(l)os can be regarded as a derivative based on the onomatopoeic root *mug-, a close phonetic variant of *muk-, reflected in Greek μύζω 'moo, moan, growl', Lat. mūgiō 'moo, bellow' and in Hitt. mùgai- mentioned above.

§ 17. It seems appropriate to conclude the discussion of the onager strand in the early Phrygian culture with observations on the structure and semantics of the different ethnic names of this people, Masa, Muška and Φρύγοι. It is possible that these names themselves are further exponents of the same early 'strong-hoofed ideology'.

As argued earlier (Oreshko 2017: 58-59), the fact that the location of the Late Bronze Age country Masa corresponds, at least in part, to that of the Classical Mysia implies that the two names reflect the same ethnic name. A third reflex is found in the form Moøoi. Combining this evidence, one might reconstruct the original form of the root as *mos- or *mœs-. However, it is not impossible that the original form of the root was simply *mos-: the form may have developed in 2nd millennium Anatolia to a form with an open-mid vowel (*mɔs-), on the one hand, which is sufficiently close to *mos- to be perceived as such by the Hittites; in a different Anatolian dialect, the vowel of *mos- might have assumed a more closed realization (*mɔs-) and give *mus- and then müs- in Greek.

Although Greek evidence on the ethnolinguistic or cultural identity of the Mysians is far from being coherent or clear, there are still enough indications of the Balkan origin of the people and its close links with the Phrygians.⁶⁰ Besides the well-known testimonies of Strabo (Str. 7.3.2 and 10, 12.3.3, 12.4.4, 12.4.8 and 12.8.1-2), one may cite here a piece of evidence found in the Ethnika of Stephan of Byzantium (s. v. Φρυγία) according to which the inhabitants of both parts of Phrygia – ‘Greater Phrygia’ (i.e. Phrygia proper) and Phrygia Epiktetos – could be called ‘Phrygians and Mysians’ (οἱ ἐξ ἑκατέρας λέγονται Φρύγες καὶ Μυσοί). Now,

⁵⁹ Given the probable foreign status of μύκλος in Greek, one may suspect that the source from which Lycophron picked up the word was the iambic poetry of Hipponax, who is well known for his usage of foreign words, including Phrygian ones (cf. Hawkins 2013: 141–211, esp. 194–201 on Phrygian), rather than Archilochus, as was proposed by Alonso Déniz 2020: 122. The allusion to the unbridled or lewd character of the μύκλος γυναικοκλῶ ψ 'the women-stealing donkey' in l. 771 of Alexandra is entirely compatible with the general mocking and invective tone of Hipponax’s poetry.

⁶⁰ For a fuller discussion cf. Oreshko in preparation.
the appearance of the form *Muška* instead of *Masa* in TKH confirms both the ethnocultural links between the Mysians and the Phrygians and the correctness of the linguistic connection between *Masa* and *Μυσοί*. The question is now what is the precise relationship between the forms *Masa*/*Μυσοί* and *Muška*.\(^{61}\)

Diakonoff (1984: 119 and 195, note 87) has already connected earlier the name *Muška/i* with *Μυσοί* and suggested that the former represents a ‘Proto-Armenian plural of *mus-*’, connecting the element -k- with the Classical Armenian plural ending -k‘. Although the ethnolinguistic connection of the Phrygians and Armenians is a viable hypothesis (cf. above), this explanation is unlikely. The attestation of TKH clearly demonstrates that the final part of *Muška/i* is not an Assyrian misinterpretation of the plural form – a suggestion rather dubious in itself – but a part of the stem. Second, even if the origin of the Armenian plural ending -k‘ is not quite clear, it is unlikely that this morphological element could be present in ‘proto-Phrygian’ at the end of the 2nd millennium BC. The morpheme -k‘ can be either a sort of agglutinative morpheme adopted into Armenian from a sub-stratum language of the Armenian Highlands – although no source of it can be at present identified – or a peculiar continuation of the PIE nom. pl. ending *-s*, as usually assumed (cf., e.g., Schmitt 2007: 111–112 or Olsen 2017: 1081–82). In either case, it is a very specific Armenian phenomenon found neither in any other Indo-European language nor in Phrygian.

Instead, one may suggest recognizing in *Muška* a suffixal derivative from the root found in *Μυσοί* and *Masa*. Parallels for such a suffixal formation are attested in other Indo-European languages,\(^{62}\) including those of the Balkan region with which both the Phrygians and Mysians are genetically connected. First, according to Strabo (7.3.12), the older form of the tribal name of the Daci (Greek Δακοί/Δακαί), who lived to the north of the lower Danube and were the neighbours of Moesii, is Δᾶοι\(^{63}\). Similarly, the usual Latin form Graeci, attested also in other languages of Italy (Etruscan creice, Paelignan graex, Venetic graikoi) and as Γραικοί by Greek authors, represent a suffixal extension of Grāī (Grāii), which is likely connected

---

\(^{61}\) For the late *Muška/i* see especially recent discussions by Grace 2015 and Kopanias 2015, cf. also by Fiedler 2005. The ambitious study by Wittke 2004, which aims to combine historical and archaeological evidence, practically lacks a linguistic component and is in many details unconvincing (first of all in terms of ethnolinguistic attribution), although it does contain many interesting observations. The nihilistic view denying any connection of the *Muška/i* even with the central-Anatolian Phrygians, represented, for instance, by Röllig 1994–1997 is quite obsolete. As mentioned above (fn. 3), a detailed discussion of the question of the eastern *Muška/i* will be given elsewhere.

\(^{62}\) E.g. Albici, Careci, Marici, Bibroci, Cadurci, Cheruscii, for these and further examples of ethnic names containing suffix -k- see Fruyt 1988: 116 with further references.


Semantics of the suffix -k- in Muška/i may be suggested on the basis of comparative evidence of first of all Greek and Latin. In Greek, the closest comparandum appears to be the adjectival suffix -iko-, which had in the Classical language a rather wide array of meanings associated with the idea of appurtenance; in Homer, however, the suffix appears almost exclusively in possessive adjectives derived from ethnica, e.g., Ἀχαιικός or Τρωικός. A similar situation is found in Latin. The suffix -ico- is connected here first of all with the ‘socio-political sphere’ (cf. cīvicus or pūblicus) and derives adjectives of appurtenance from toponyms (cf. Gallicus or Italicus), although sporadically it is found also in other semantic fields. Similarly, one of the main functions of a somewhat rarer suffix -co- was to derive ethnic names, cf., e.g., O(p)scus or Faliscus (cf. Weiss 2009: 294–296). The suffix -k- has numerous further reflexes both in Greek and Latin and in many other IE languages.

The adjectival semantics of the suffix presents a ready explanation for the existence of (quasi-)doublets of the type Δᾶοι/Δακοί. The simpler variant may be interpreted as a simple stem used either as toponym or as an ethnicon, while the extended variant represents an adjective of appurtenance derived from it, which, when substantivized, produces practically the same meaning as the original stem. A similar phenomenon of variation between ethnic names based on a pure stem and adjectives derived from it has abundant parallels elsewhere. As examples in Greek one may point out an io-suffix derivative Θρᾴκιος/Θρῇξ which has no clear semantic distinction from the suffix-less Θρᾶξ/Θρῆξ (both meaning simply ‘Thracian’ = ‘inhabitant of Thrace’) or two forms with the suffix -iko-, Σκυθικοί and Μοσχικοί attested as variants of Σκύθαι and Μόσχοι in the Ethnika by Stephan of Byzantium (s. v. Σκύθαι and Μόσχοι respectively).

Applying these considerations to the case of Muška/i on a formal level, one may analyze it as an adjective of appurtenance based on the root *Mus- and

---

64 See Fruyt 1988 with further references, cf. Hadas-Lebel 2012 [2014]. To these two well-known Balkan examples one may tentatively add the ethnic name of Δόλογκοι, a group of tribes of Thracian origin settled on the Chersonesus. One may suggest that the older unextended form of the ethnicon is attested in Dolon, a name which Homer gives to one of the Trojans. On the other hand, one may suspect that the same k-suffix contains the ethnic name of the Thracians (Θρᾶξ/Θρῆξ), although no form like *Θρᾶοι/Θρᾶιοι is attested.

65 See Schwyzer 1953: 497 with fn. 7.

66 All three pairs represent examples of more or less synchronic variation. As an example of a similar diachronic variation one may point out Rus-sk-ij ‘Russian’ derived from Rus which was used both as ethnicon and the country name.
meaning thus literally ‘belonging to Muš-, Muš-ean’. As in the Greek forms cited above, one may suppose that the semantic distinction between the original root and the suffixal derivative is insignificant, which agrees with the use of Muška and Masa as synonyms by Ḥartapus. However, the distribution of the forms shows that there still might have existed a subtle semantic distinction between the forms. The ethnic names based on the pure root are found in Europe (Μοισόι/ Moesi) and in Mysia (Μυσόι); in Central Anatolia both pure root (Masa) and the derived form (Muška) were already used, the former being apparently older; in the eastern part of the early Phrygian area (northern Mesopotamia) only the derived form of the ethnic name seems to be known (Muški). The picture may suggest that the original semantics of the derivative Muška was a ‘one coming from Musa/ Masa’ with a subtle allusion to separation and migration to a different region.⁶⁷

§ 18. This interpretation can, however, be specified – if not modified – by considerations on the possible original semantics of the ethnic name. A clue for it is found in the modern languages of the Balkans. The Albanian word for ‘mule’ is mushk or mushkë (also mutshkë), and similar words are found in Romanian languages of the region, Rumanian mușcoiu and Aromanian musca, as well as in practically all Slavic languages, cf. OCS мъскъ or мъскъ, Serbo-Croatian mazak or maz(a)g, Old Czech mesh, mža, mezek, mezek ‘hinny’, Old Russian москъ, мъскъ or мъскъ etc. (see in detail Trubachov 1994: s. v. *мъскъ). Usually, the word is considered to have originated in the Balkan region, and to have radiated from there into the Slavic area.⁶⁸ A connection between the ethnic name of Μυσόι and Albanian mushk has been suggested by Meyer already in the nineteenth century (1892: 322–323), who perceived the latter as a suffixal formation *mus-k-o-. Besides the phonetic similarity between the words, Meyer adduced the evidence

---

⁶⁷ It is noteworthy that similar considerations underlie Kretschmer’s (1896: 214) explanation of the form Δαϊκόι (‘Daïsche’) as a more general term than Δᾶοι, referring to an entire group of tribes associated with the latter.

⁶⁸ This lexical set has been also connected with Latin mūlus. For it, a reconstruction*muχₐ-s⁽l⁾-o- was suggested, which aimed to integrate also Greek μύκλος and μυχλός, while the Balkan term was conceived to go back to *muχₐ-sk-o (Walde – Hofmann 1938–1954: s. v. mūlus). A tigger for this reconstruction has been the term muscella ‘young she-mule’ attested in one Latin inscription (CIL IV 2016) and a late derivative muscellarium ‘stable for mules’. However, the probable connection of μύκλος/μυχλός with *mugallos and with Lat. mūgiō, disproves the idea that the root contained *χ which could simply disappear in Latin. In contrast, a simpler reconstruction of Latin mūlus as *mus-l-os suggested by Meyer (1892: 322–323) appears very probable, with a proviso that it in its turn goes back to older *mos-l-os. The form is structurally parallel to *mos-k-os, and it is not excluded that North Italian words for ‘donkey’, as Venetian muso (see below), preserve the pure root.
of a fragment of Anacreon (fr. 35 Bergk = fr. 377 PMG = 117 Gentile) which refers to the Mysians as ‘inventors’ of the interbreeding between mares and jack-asses (ἵπποθόρων δὲ Μυσοὶ εὕρον μεῖξιν ὄνων); Meyer also assumed that the northern parts of Anatolia might have been the homeland of the mules, having in mind apparently Hom. Il. 2.852 (cf. above). Meyer thought that *mus-k-o- is in its origin an adjective, ‘Mysian (animal)’, which was then adopted as a general term for ‘mule’. The latter point is dubious, but the new evidence confirms the connection. Not only Albanian mushk(ë) is virtually identical to Muška/i, and the variation in the root vowel of the word for ‘mule’ seen in different languages closely corresponds to that seen in Masa-Mušoi-Mošoi, but, crucially, also the entire body of evidence discussed above implies that this correspondence is based not on a fortuitous phonetic similarity, but on actual ethnolinguistic realities. It appears fairly logical that kings called ‘(Wild) Donkey’ would have ruled over the people called the ‘Mules’, whether the latter name was understood literally or was an elliptical term for ‘Mule-Breeders’.

It is appropriate to note that the connection of Mysians with mules suggested by Anacreon is in fact present already in Homer. The fragment of Anacreon comes from a scholion concerning Hom. Il. 24.278 (Scholia Vetera). This line makes part of the passage describing preparations for Priam’s embassy to Achilles to ransom Hector’s body (Il. 24.265–280, cf. earlier 24.159 and 24.189), in which mules figure prominently as draught-animals for the cart (ἄμαξα) on which the precious gifts are to be transported. In 24.277–78 ‘strong-hoofed mules toiling in harness’ are referred to specifically as ‘a splendid gift of the Mysians’ (ζεῦξαν δ᾽ ἡμιόνους κρατερώνυχας ἐντεσιεργούς, τούς ρά ποτε Πριάμῳ Μυσοὶ δόσαν ἀγλαὰ δῶρα). The common use of mules for drawing chariots or carts in north-western Anatolia is further confirmed by a fragment of Sappho (fr. 44 L.–P. = fr. 55 Diehl), which mentions them in the scene of meeting Hector coming back with Andromache from his wooing trip to the Mysian Thebes (Ἰλίαδαι σατίναι[ς] ὑπ’ ἐὕτροχοις ἀμφόνα Μυσοὶ δόσᾳ ἄγον αἱμόνας).

This semantic interpretation of Muška invites one to take another glance at the morphological structure of the word. The question is now, what is the meaning of the suffix-less variant reflected in Masa, Mušoi and Mošoi. There are three possibilities: 1) the underlying word refers to the same animal, and the suffix -k builds either an adjective ‘of the mule’, and then the name Muška refers to the ‘(People) of the Mule’, or a diminutive, and the name would mean ‘Young (or Small) Mules’; 2) the underlying word means ‘donkey’ or 3) it means ‘horse’, in either case, suffix -k playing a more essential role to build the name of a new type of equid. The evidence is ambiguous. On the one hand, the Old Czech evidence – mesh, mzha, mezek, mezk, all meaning ‘hinny’ – shows that both the root and suffixal derivative could mean the same; also Armenian išak ‘donkey’, a derivative
from ėš with the same meaning, shows that the suffix could indeed have simply a diminutive function. On the other hand, there are North Italian dialectal words for ‘donkey’, cf. muso (Veneto), mussa (Treviso), mus (Friuli), müsa (Lombardia) (cf. Meyer-Lübke 1911: s. v. mūscēlla). Their linguistic history is, however, unclear: in theory they might continue an old word for ‘donkey’ brought to Italy from the Balkans by, for example, the ancient Venetians; however, it also may be a new formation based on the onomatopoeic mu-, just as *mugallos and μύκλος. Neither of these two interpretations is excluded, but there is some scarce and tantalizing evidence which might support the idea that the pure root means ‘horse’.

There are two pieces of relevant Paleo-Balkan evidence: a passage of Sextus Pompeius Festus mentioning Iuppiter Menzanas in association with a horse sacrifice among the Messapians, the people of a Balkan origin inhabiting the south-eastern parts of Italy, and an attestation of a form MEZHNAI in the Thracian inscription on the golden ring from Duvanli which features the image of a horseman (cf. Ködderitzsch 2010 with further references). In combination, these two pieces of evidence might suggest that *me(n)zana- means ‘horseman’ and the underlying *me(n)za-, accordingly, ‘horse’. The word has been further compared with Alb. mëz or mâz ‘foal’, which also finds a correspondence in Rumanian mînz. The Albanian word is usually reconstructed as *mandja- (or the like) and connected with Alb. verb mänd ‘to suckle (cf. Orel 1998: s. v. mëz), which within Albanian looks plausible. However, if one approaches the lexical set from a Paleo-Balkan perspective, this looks unlikely, as a name for ‘horse’ (*me(n)-za-) would hardly be derived from such a verb; rather, the meaning ‘foal’ can be explained by a later semantic shift ‘horse’ > ‘foal’, triggered by the borrowing of Lat. caballus into Albanian (> kalë), which is at present its main word for ‘horse’ (cf. Ködderitzsch 2010).

The Balkan material may be further supplemented by two pieces of Anatolian evidence. First, there is a gloss of Hesychius: Μαζέυς· ὁ Ζεὺς παρὰ Φρυξ. The word seems to correspond to the Greek derivatives in -ευς and looks like an epithet rather than a name, and as such it could mean virtually anything. However, the similarity of Ζεὺς Μαζέυς and Iuppiter Menzanas is rather striking, and one may tentatively suggest that Μαζέυς is an alternative formation based on the same Balkan root for ‘horse’, structurally comparable with Greek ἱππεύς.

Second, there is Μάζακα, the old name of the Cappadocian capital city Caesarea (mod. Kayseri), for which also variants Μάζακος, Μάζαξ and Mazacum are known (for references see Zgusta 1984: 356–357). In Armenian sources this name
is known as Mažak’, Mažak, Mašak or Mižak.⁶⁹ Flavius Josephus in Antiquitates Iudaicae 1.125 (late 1st century AD) connected the name Μάζακα with the name of Μέσχος, the leader of the Μεσχῆνοι, whom he identifies as the older name of the Cappadocians. This evidence is echoed in a passage of a later ecclesiastical historian Philostorgius (ca. 365–after 425 AD) who derives the city name from the name of the ancestor of the Cappadocians, Μοσόχ (Μάζακα ... ἀπὸ Μοσόχ τοῦ Καππαδοκῶν γενάρχου ἔλκυσμενή τὸ ὄνομα, Hist. Eccles. IX.12, see Bidez 1981: 120). A similar version is related later also by Constantine Porphyrogenitus, who renders the name of the Cappadocian progenitor as Μουώχις or Μοούχις (cf. Zgusta 1984: 257).⁷⁰ Both the ethnic name Μεσχῆνοι and the name of the Cappadocian leader are immediately reminiscent of Muška and, given the geographical context, one can hardly doubt that they are specific Cappadocian reflexes of this very ethnic name; it is noteworthy that the variation o/a finds a close parallel in Phrygian (cf. above). The evidence further suggests that ζ in Μάζακα reflects a relatively late voicing of the sibilant in an intervocalic position, which also agrees with the Armenian evidence. Both this phenomenon and the epenthetic vowel between the sibilant and the tectal find a direct parallel in some Slavic forms of the word for ‘mule’, cf. Serbo-Croatian mazak or Old Czech mezek. This evidence suggests thus that both Μάζακα and Μαζεύς go back to the root *mos-. The same can be assumed also for the Messapic Menzanas and the Thracian *mezena-. In sum, although the available evidence is too fragmentary to fully prove the point, there is reason to think that the ethnic name of the Masa-Mysoi-Moisoi is based on the old Balkan word for ‘horse’,⁷¹ and the Muška – the ‘Mules’ – are the descendants of Masa ‘the Horses’ in both a symbolic and a geographical sense.

§ 19. Lastly, there is a possibility that also the other ethnic name of the Muška under which the Greeks knew them, Φρύγες, has a similar semantics, although

---

⁶⁹ For the forms see Mxit’ar Sebastac’i, Barigir Haykazean lezui. Ba’aran yatuk anuanc’ [Dictionary of the Armenian Language. Dictionary of Proper Names], Vol. II, Venice: s.v. ՈւՇբԱՈՅ [Mažak’].

⁷⁰ The disparaging attitude of Zgusta to this evidence (‘wertlos’) is absolutely unjustified. In contrast, the Iranian etymologies of the name cited by him (from Avestan maz- ‘big’, or from Ṧaḏak‘i ‘a Parthian spear’ or from (Ahura) Mazda) are quite irrelevant, since there is no evidence implying any Persian involvement in the city foundation or significant presence of an Iranian ethnolinguistic element in the region beyond the ruling class associated with the Achaemenid administration. The connection of the name Mašika found in an old Assyrian tablet with Mažaka suggested by Forlanini (1992: 174) is not supported by any evidence either.

⁷¹ The precise reconstruction of the root remains not quite clear. There is no certainty that the word has an Indo-European origin and that the sibilant s/z should necessarily be traced back to an old palatal cluster -Gj-, although this is not excluded.
the evidence is arguably somewhat slimmer. Hitherto, two possible etymological connections have been suggested for Φρύγες. Kliger (1950) and, apparently independently, Gusmani (1958: 860 and 1964: 273) suggested that Φρύγες represent a name equivalent to Germanic Franks (Franco), probably ‘the free ones’. The idea is based first of all on the gloss of Hesychius: βρίγες- οἱ μὲν Φρύγες, οἱ δὲ βάρβαροι, οἱ δὲ σολοκισταί. Ἰόβας δὲ ὑπὸ Λυδῶν ἀποφαίνεται βρίγα λέγεσθαι τὸν ἑλευθέρον. ‘βρίγες- some (say it means) ‘Φρύγες’, some (say it means) ‘barbarians’, some (say it means) ‘those who pronounce words incorrectly’. Juba claims that ‘(a) free(man)’ is called βρῖξ among the Lydians’. On the other hand, Obrador-Cursach (2020), discussing the word vrekun, which earlier was regarded (unfoundedly) as a Phrygian form of the ethnic name, entertained a possibility of a connection of Φρύγες with PIE *bhṛgh- ‘high’, without, however, going into details about its more specific meaning. In theory, either interpretation represents a fair option, but at present neither can be really supported by any further evidence.⁷²

An alternative possibility is suggested by another gloss of Hesychius: βρικόν· Κυρηναίοι. βρικόν (Κύπριοι) βρικόν· ‘donkey’, Cyrenaens. ‘Barbarian’ (Cypriots). Already the appearance of the same definition ‘barbarian’ both with βρικός and βρίγες suggests that the two words were regarded by some as phonetic variants of the same name. The possibility of the variation γ/ύ in the ethnic name is corroborated by three further glosses of Hesychius: 1) 1087 βρέκυν· τὸν Βρέκυντα, τὸν Βρίγα. Βρίγες γάρ οἱ Φρύγες, Βερεκύνδαι δαίμονες, οἱ Φρύγες; 2) 522 Βερεκύνται· Φρυγῶν τι γένος. καὶ πρότερον Βερεκυντία ἡ Φρυγία. καὶ αὐλὸς Βερεκύντιος; 3) 523 Βερέκυντα βρόμον· Φρύγιον αὐλόν. Σοφοκλῆς Ποιμέσιν. Stephan of Byzantium presents further evidence for this: Βρύκες καὶ Βρύκαι, ἔθνος Θρᾴκης. λέγονται καὶ Βρυκεῖς καὶ Βρυκήιοι.⁷³ The latter name clearly represents a phonetic variant of the name of Βρύγες, also known as Βρύγαι, Βρύγοι, Βρίγες, Bṛγae (for a collection of evidence see Detschew 1957: s. v. Βρύγες), who appear to be, judging from their name, the part of Phrygians who remained in the Balkans instead of crossing to Anatolia. Needless to say, the lexicographical evidence is shaky ground, as one can be sure of neither the correctness of the transmitted form, nor its origin, nor its ethnolinguistic attribution. However it is, the evidence does suggest that the ethnic name of the Phrygians can be based on the word βρικός ‘donkey’, and it agrees well, at least, with a very similar meaning of the (quasi) synonymic name Muška. The fact that the word is defined as Cyrenaic

⁷² For two other, less convincing etymologies (to Lat. fruor and got. brükjan < PIE *bʰreu̯g- ‘use, enjoy’, and to Greek φρύγω ‘roast, parch’), cf. Detschew 1957: s. v. Βρύγες.
⁷³ Cf. also the further gloss of Hesychius: βρίκελοι· ... οἱ δὲ βαρβάρους ...
The onager kings of Anatolia

βρικός can be interpreted as an old Balkan term retained in an archaic peripheral Greek dialect, and the presence in it of the Thracian word βασσάρα 'fox' (cf. above) once again supports the possibility.

The correctness of Hesychius’ definition of βρικός as ‘donkey’ may be additionally supported by etymological observations. It appears very probable that the root *briK-/*bruK- is onomatopoeic in origin and, like *gard- and *mug-/*muk-, refers to the loud cry of the donkey. Greek has a common verb βρυχάομαι (rarely also βρῡχανάομαι) ‘roar, bellow’, which is used first of all to refer to the sound produced by a lion, a bull, an elephant or a wild beast in general; Homer employs it to render the death-cry of a wounded warrior, as well as in the description of the sound of the sea. As has been noted earlier (cf. Chantraine 1968–1980: s. v. βρυχάομαι; cf. Beekes 2010: s. v.), the verb may be connected with several words found in Hesychius’ Lexicon, such as βρυχέτος which he defines as synonymous with βρυγμός, and βρύκος (also βρυχός) for which he gives definitions κῆρυξ ‘herald’ or ‘barbarian’ (also ‘locust’); also βρούχετος· ... βάτραχον δὲ Κύπριοι may belong here and with it, βρεκεκεκέξ which imitates the croaking of frogs in Ar. Ra. 209. The word βρυχάομαι has different meanings connected with ‘mouth’ and ‘teeth’ (‘biting, gobbling, gnashing’), but it also has the meaning ‘roaring’, cf. βασιλέως ἀπειλὴ ὁμοία βρυγμῷ λέοντος (LXX Pr. 19. 12) ‘threats of a king are like roaring of a lion’. The definition of βρύκος as ‘barbarian’ immediately refers us back to Βρύκες, Βρύκαι etc. (cf. above), which once again corroborates the etymological connection. All this evidence implies that the root *briK-/*bruK- is a different expression of the same idea as Greek βρυχάομαι, and the onomatopoeic character of the word agrees well with the variation in the vocalization of the root (u/i) and with oscillation in the tectal, which is reminiscent of the variation seen in *muk-/*mug-. Both βρυχάομαι and *briK-/*bruK- may be further etymologically connected with βρέμω ‘to roar, grumble’, which implies that the tectal and the nasal are simply alternative root extensions based on the ‘root’ *bru-/*bri-/*bre- imitating a loud sound produced by animals. Lastly, the form Β(ε)ρεκύ νται, which looks like a participle based on the root *β(ε)ρεκ- (with raising *o > ü before the nasal), also supports the etymological interpretation of βρικός as ‘roarer’. This evidence seems to shed light on another curious gloss of Hesychius, βρικίσματα· ὀρχήσις Φρυγιακή. The form βρικίσματα looks like a derivative based on *βρικίζω ‘to be(have) like βρικός’, and there seems to be good reason to interpret it as ‘Donkey Dance’ – a fair thing to practice for a people variously called ‘Mules’ or ‘Donkeys’ (and possibly ‘Horses’) and once ruled by the ‘Onager Kings’.
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