



Списание ЕПОХИ  
Издание на Историческия факултет на  
ВТУ „Св. св. Кирил и Методий“  
Journal EPOCHI [EPOCHS]  
Edition of the Department of History of  
“St. Cyril and St. Methodius” University of Veliko Tarnovo



Том / Volume XXVIII (2020).  
Книжка / Issue 2

## THE “DECLINE” OF BRONZE AGE WANAX: THE PHRYGIAN VANAK-, THE PRIEST-KING, THE ‘WANAX TO BASILEUS MODEL’ AND THE POWER RELATIONS IN PHRYGIAN SOCIETY

Stefan YORDANOV

**Abstract:** *The article discusses the nature of the Phrygian ruler’s institution in order to elucidate its place in the potestary-political system of the Phrygian society. On the basis of the assumption that the inscription on the Midas Monument’s rock-cut façade was consecrated not to the king Midas, but to the goddess Mida, an attempt has been made to stress the necessity of further analysis of the questions concerning the meaning of the titles lavagt-, vanak- and others, the origins of the supreme titles in Phrygian titulature, the presence of the priest-king in the Phrygian potestary-political system, the validity of the so-called ‘Wanax to Basileus Model’ in view of the Phrygian example, etc.*

**Keywords:** *Phrygian ruler’s institution, priest-king, wanax/vanagt-, lavagetas/lavagt-, akenanogavos, King Midas, goddess Mida.*

1. For ancient Anatolia, the first half of the 1st millennium BC was marked by new socio-political realities, with the Phrygian State taking an important place among them.

1.1. The main potestarian Old Phrygian (7th century BC) institutions, recorded in the Phrygian inscriptions evidence<sup>1</sup>, are as follows: **vanak** (*anax/wanax, ruler*), **lavagetas** (*lawagetas, military leader*), **proitavos** (*leader; head*), **arkiaevais** (*governor; leader*), **memevais** (*councillor*) and **akenanogavos** (*keeper of the monuments*). Among these titles, *vanak* and *lavagetas* usually are frequently presented as Greek borrowings. A borrowing, but in this case an Anatolian borrowing, notwithstanding its Greek parallel – the title *koiranos*, is the title **kuryaneyon**<sup>2</sup>.

1.2. The Old Phrygian title *proitawos* is cognate to the Etruscan *purth* (*purthne*), the Greek *prytanis* and the Latin *praetor*. It is most probably a designation of the abstract ‘*leader; master*’, as well as for a particular rank title. If we judge by the Etruscan example, it has been delegated control and executive functions, sacred and civil; but if we judge by the examples of the Roman *praetor* and the Bithynian name title *\*Prousius*, it has been delegated supreme executive functions and even executive power, evolved into a monarchic one<sup>3</sup>.

1.3. There is another term by which the Phrygian ruler’s institution was probably named – the term βαλήν or βαλλήν<sup>4</sup>. The lexeme was evidenced by Aeschylus as a Phrygian word for *king* [Aesch.,

\*Stefan Yordanov – PhD, Associate Professor, Faculty of History, St. Cyril and St. Methodius University of Veliko Tarnovo, Bulgaria; @st\_iordanov@yahoo.com

<sup>1</sup> As enumerated by Bayun, L. S., and Orel, V. E. 1988, p. 166.

<sup>2</sup> See about it in general, with lit.: Lubotsky, A. 1988, p. 23.

<sup>3</sup> See more, with lit.: Nemirovskiy, A. I. 1983, p. 102, pp. 121–122.

<sup>4</sup> See on this lexeme the detailed analysis of Kaczyńska, E. 2011, pp. 59–62, containing an enumeration of all the sources that evidence it.

Pers. 657]; Sophocles tells us that the shepherds exclaimed: ἴω βαλῆν [Sext. Empir. 672, 26], and, according to the *Etymologicum Magnum*, Βάλιν in Thrace designated Dionysus<sup>5</sup>. The lexeme, which has received controversial interpretations, belongs to the relatively numerous lexical family in the Thracian language – the family of the names ending in *-en-*.

The Phrygian **bal(l)ēn** (*king*) is explained by V. P. Neroznak through the Thracian gloss Βάλιν.<sup>6</sup> It is necessary to ask how reasonable his proposition is that these data present the lexeme as a Thracian or a Phrygian derivative of the same Indo-European root from which the Slavic lexeme *bolij* (*great*) originates. This proposition explains the word βαλ(λ)ην as meaning *great*, which in principle can be an epithet categorizing a god. In that case, Βαλ(λ)ην would be a substantivized adjective, and in the sources the categorization of both God and ruler's institution is recorded as *great*<sup>7</sup>. Consequently, the homophony of that word with the name of Baal, which Wojciech Sowa points out as explanatory for the origin of the lexeme *bal(l)ēn* [Sowa, W. 2007, pp. 163–164], is nevertheless accidental. As for the naming of a supreme office by means of its categorisation, the case is similar to that of, for example, the Philistine lexeme *serēn* – a lexeme from the same suffix family<sup>8</sup>.

What matters in that case is that the lexeme designates namely Dionysus, and along with this it was translated by ancient authors as *king*. According to the data of the ancient mytho-epic tradition in Phrygia, Dionysos is present in 'regal' plots. Dionysos is the god who, in the narration of Pseudo-Plutarch (X, 'Marsyas'), turned the Midas' 'golden well' into a high-water spring<sup>9</sup>. The information of Pseudo-Plutarch on the River Marsyas, this 'Aztec' plot in ancient mythology – Apollo flayed the skin of the vanquished *Marsyas* just like war prisoners were killed in an Aztec gladiatorial sacrifice during the Festival of Xipe Totec, with their skin flayed and worn for twenty days by Aztec priests or chosen youngmen<sup>10</sup> – also contains an *aition*, explaining the name of the Berekinthos Mountain and that it was called after the man who became the Mother of Gods' first priest<sup>11</sup>. It is again a narration of Pseudo-Plutarch about the River Sagaris where the mythical hero Ballenaeus was one of the main characters to whose honor a feast of the same name was established. This information was confirmed in a comment by Eustathius and in some scholia to Aeschylus' work *Persae*<sup>12</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> See on this title as well: Vassileva, M. 1990: pp. 98–99. The title isn't mentioned in the Old Phrygian inscriptions, but Maya Vassileva associates it with the name Baki = Dionysus from these inscriptions, juxtaposing the invocations to Sabas and Βάλιν.

<sup>6</sup> The lexeme **bal(l)ēn** (*king*) isn't determined in the records as a Phrygian one only, but in one case as a gloss from Thuri. See the references in Neroznak, V. P. 1978, pp. 138–139, s.v. For that reason, V. P. Neroznak doubts if the word was Phrygian or Sicilian, but, however, he considers it as sharing the same root with the Thracian gloss Βάλιν (τὸν Διόνυσον Θραῖκες; *Etym. Magnum*). Therefore, the Thracians regarded Dionysus as "king"? Cf. the use of ἄναξ as a categorisation of the gods.

<sup>7</sup> Elwira Kaczyńska offers another etymology. She presents the lexeme as a derivative of the Indo-European root \*wal- / wald(h), thus belonging to the same family together with the Gothic **valdan** (*to rule*), the Old Slavic **vlad**, **vlasti** (*rule*), etc. See Kaczyńska, E. 2011, pp. 59–62.

<sup>8</sup> Gonzalo Rubio put the Phrygian **ballēn** in the suffix family of the Philistine title *serēn* and the Lydian words *essēn* (*king*) and *palēn* (*chief*). See Rubio, G. 2004, p. 7102. Cf. also: Yordanov, S. 2016, pp. 32–33. As early as in antiquity, ancient lexicographers paid attention to this suffix family, particularly Herodianus. See his information quoted in Kaczyńska, E. 2011, p. 61 (8, 8a).

<sup>9</sup> Plut., Peri potamon..., X, 1 (Müller, K. 1861: p. 649); Torshilov, D. O. 1999, pp. 338–339 (the original text in Ancient Greek), p. 340 (the translation of D. O. Torshilov).

<sup>10</sup> See in brief on Aztec practice: Neumann, F. J. 1976, pp. 254–255. Here we can make another extremely distant cross-temporal and cross-cultural comparison between the Balkans in antiquity and the Aztec world – similar to Hristo Danov's comparison between the Thracian custom to lament over a new born child, because of the hardships he/she was about to face during his/her lifespan, according to Herodotus' evidence (V, 4) – and the analogous custom among the Aztecs [see Danov, H. 1969, p. 207].

<sup>11</sup> Plut., Peri potamon..., X, 4 [Müller, K. 1861, S. pp. 649–650]; Torshilov, D. O. 1999, p. 339 (the original text in Ancient Greek), p. 340 (the translation of D. O. Torshilov).

<sup>12</sup> Plut., Peri potamon..., XII, 3, 4 (Müller, K. 1861: p. 651); Torshilov, D. O. 1999, p. 344 (the original text in Ancient Greek), pp. 345–346 (the translation of D. O. Torshilov). See also: Eust. ad Od. II, p. 188; Schol. ad Aesch.

If this lexeme was really used in Phrygia – there are no valid reasons to reject its use by the Phrygians – it would be unfounded to view it ‘in competition’ with the lexeme *vanak* for the role of monocratic ruler’s designation. The state of our knowledge on the Phrygian potestary-political system is rather a different one – we don’t know which was the exact term to designate the Phrygian ruler’s institution on the basis of its typology, unknown to us as well.

1.4. With so many names designating offices (at least two), three of which respectively are convenient to denote the ruler’s institution, we should pose the question of whether there were enough data to evidence those names categorising the Phrygian ruler.

The known historical rulers of Phrygia are few. Possibly one or two of them bore the name Midas. The presence of such a name among the historical rulers’ names was taken out from the data of the ancient mytho-epic tradition. However, in this tradition, Midas was presented as a ruler through the terms for designation of the ruler’s institution belonging to the Classical and Hellenistic epochs, and to Roman times respectively, mostly through the term *basileus*. We don’t know the precise term that was used by the historical Midas to express his regal status. Mita was evidenced in some texts of Sargon II during the period between 717 and 707 BC as ruler of the people of *Mushki*. These data depict him as a local ruler in Southeastern Anatolia and a nominal vassal of Assyria, while the Greek tradition knows him as governor of the Central Anatolian Phrygians. Chronologically, his appearance in the Assyrian documents coincides with the dates of his reign indicated by Eusebius – 738–696 BC, with variants: 676 BC for his death according to Julius Africanus, and 741 BC for the starting year of his reign according to the Armenian version of Eusebius<sup>13</sup>. But this Midas from Southeastern Anatolia was not presented as a ruler through the proper Phrygian title, which again remains unknown to us. That’s why the appearance in a Phrygian written monument of a Phrygian ruler’s name along with a Phrygian title, one of the few similar monuments, is of great importance.

It naturally comes to the so-called Midas’ Tomb, thus named during its discovery, but later most neutrally and maybe most precisely renamed as the Midas Monument. There, on the one hand, the name Midas is mentioned in one of the inscriptions. On the other hand, the ancient written tradition also considers, even before the discovery of its inscriptions, it as a monument of the mytho-epic Midas namely<sup>14</sup>. Judging by the chronology of the monument, it is perhaps Midas of the 8th century BC, respectively some of the rulers bearing that name, taking into account the scholars’ supposition that this name was used as a dynastic one more than once. In this proper Phrygian monument, the titles *vanakt-* and *lavaget-* are probably used as designations of the Phrygian ruler’s office. Therefore, in regard to our topic, this monument is of essential meaning.

The so-called Midas inscription narrates: “*Ates arkievais akenanogavos Midai lavagtaei vanaktei edaes*” [Brixhe, C., and Lejeune, M. 1984, pp. 5–8, cat. M-01a].

Neroznak’s translation: “*Attes Arkievid, the inscribing man (?) has put to Midas, lavagtas and vanax*” [Neroznak, V. P. 1978, pp. 71–72].

Pers., p. 659 (quoted in Torshilov, D. O. 1999, pp. 344–345, notes). Cf. Kaczyńska, E. 2011, pp. 59–60 (1–4a).

<sup>13</sup> Roller, L. E. 1983, p. 300, with references; more on the chronology of the 8th century’s historical Midas: Berndt-Ersöz, S. 2008, pp. 1–37.

<sup>14</sup> On this matter, Wojciech Sowa states: „*Despite such a background, the contacts between Phrygian and Greek are still obscure. Greek authors note the close relationship of both languages, cf. e.g. Plato, who states in his Kratylos that some words sound in Phrygian almost the same as in Greek, esp. the word for ‘dog’ and ‘fire’, and who also seems to have had some information about the epigraphical traditions of the Phrygian language (describing the monument which is known today as the ‘Midas’ Tomb’ – M-01 in CIPP). Plato says that there was a statue of a “bronze virgin” standing upon the grave of the Phrygian king as well as an inscription in hexameters stating that “until water flows and big trees blossom, she [the bronzevirgin] will stand on that much lamented grave announcing to travellers that Midas was buried there”. In fact, the attested Phrygian inscription (M-01a; façade of the tomb, end of the 8th – beg. of the 7th century BC) reads as follows →ates : arkievais : akenanogavos : midai : lavagtaei : vanaktei : edaes ‘Atesarkievais the akenanogavos has given (dedicated) to Midas, the wanaks (king) and the lawagetas (leader)’. Despite the fictitious text, Plato’s statement seems to be a confirmation of some knowledge about Phrygia in Athens in 5th cent. BC, though as part of the Persian Empire it did not play any important role in that period*” [Sowa, W. 2007, pp. 153–154].

Woudhuizen's translation: "*Ates, the son of Arkias, <honorific title>, has dedicated during the Kingship and military leadership of Midas*" [Woudhuizen, F. C. 1993, p. 3; quoted in Blažek, V. 2005, p. 18].

Brixhe's translation: "*Ates...has dedicated [this monument] to Midas, lavagtas and vanax*" [Brixhe, C. 2004, p. 786, as cited in Ruppenstein, F. 2015, p. 92].

Orel's translation: "*Ates, the senior official and the keeper of monuments, dedicated (this) to Midas, the (military) chief and the lord*" [Orel, V. 1997, pp. 9–12; cited after Blažek, V. 2005, p. 18].

As we can see, the differences in the translations lie in the following two aspects: first, in the interpretations of the form and nature of the word *akenanogavos* – *akenanolawos*, according to V. P. Neroznak<sup>15</sup>, and second, in the reconstruction of the exact form of the name Ates or Attes. Each translator views Midas to whom the monument has been dedicated, as the holder of both the titles of *lavagtas* and *vanax*. There are no difficulties in the inscription's reading, but nevertheless its text poses some problems.

1.5. The main resulting problem is what the real place of those titles in the Phrygian potestary-political system is. Why do the two ruler titles – probably borrowings – bring to the forefront of the ruler's titles system of this ancient country? If ancient texts explicitly indicate it as designating the regal institution, then why isn't the title **bal(I)ēn** used in the inscription? Does the simultaneous categorisation of one of the historical rulers named Midas through the two titles – of *lavagtas* and *vanax* – constitute it in an example of a priest-king<sup>16</sup>? What relates it to 'older Phrygian rites, particularly the rites of mourning for a dead priest-king', and how? [Roller, L. E. 1999, p. 258, quoted in Vassileva, M. 2001, p. 55]. How does the supposed priest-king from the inscription on the Midas' Monument correlate to the sacred realities of Attis (*king, priest and god*) on the one hand, and of Midas as Great King in the Attic painting on the other hand<sup>17</sup>? All these questions are very sophisticated and in the framework of such a brief text as the current one, only a partial attempt to answer them is possible.

As for the potestarian phenomenon of the so-called priest-king, in B. C. Dietrich's publication we can find enough indicative representation of how the functioning of this institution in societies in the Balkan-Anatolian area was seen in part of literature, as well as on what kind of data the scheme of its historical development has been based. B. C. Dietrich depicts the historiographical situation as follows:

*'Our evidence, mostly of an archaeological nature for Greece and Crete, is just good enough to make our point in broad outline. Sir A. Evans already correctly described the Cretan ruler as a priest-king, working from the most telling evidence: the architecture and central function of the palace. In recent years the weight of evidence has increased, although its precise interpretation yet remains open to doubt. Philologists like Meillet, Wakkernagel, and Kretschmer, for example, have established a very early linguistic substratum – called Aegean by Schachermeyr – common to Crete, Mycenaean Greece, and the Asian countries where the practice of priest-kings was obtained. Here we find words like Minos, Knossos, and above all a common word for king – basileus. Both Minoses at Knossos – for there were two between 1600 and 1400 B.C. – were priest-kings – basileis, so was Agamemnon at Mycenae. The title faded away into a memory at Athens, where the archon basileus exercised his old priestly functions at the Eleusinian Mysteries, or presided over the Council which met in the King's Porch'* [Dietrich, B. C. 1965, p. 24; my underlinings, St.Y.)

Regardless of how it is analysed, this scheme of the historical development, which has an early starting date, outlines a genetic continuity between the Cretan priest-kings, through Minos, Knossos

<sup>15</sup> Neroznak, V. P. 1978, pp. 71, 72, 75, 77. Akenanogavos – interpreted as a priestly title, meaning something like the 'priest of fire': Woudhuizen, F. C. 2008–2009, pp. 194–195. Another very interesting interpretation, also as a priestly title, is the interpretation of Archibald H. Sayce as 'High-Priest'. See Sayce, A. H. 1922, p. 550. The same function of *akenanogavos* as High Priest is also defined by some modern authors: Lubotsky, A. 1988, p. 12 f.; Janda, M. 1997, pp. 271–277; Lancelotti, M. 2002, p. 37, fn. 117 (Here I use the references of paragraph § 5, "Καύης, κοίης, *akenanogavos* and the Thracian *kae* (to pp. 183–187)" on pages 87–89 in: Oreshko, R. N. 2015, p. 88, fn. 44). In accordance with Fred C. Woudhuizen's view is the statement of Rostislav Oreshko: "For καύης we can thus postulate the same original meaning as κοίης: 'sacrificer' < 'maker of (burnt) offerings'" [Oreshko, R. N. 2015, p. 89].

<sup>16</sup> Thus categorized by see Vassileva, M. 2005, p. 16.

<sup>17</sup> See in details on these questions: Lancelotti, M. 2002; Miller, M. C. 1988, pp. 79–89.

and Agamemnon to the archonte basileus in Athens. This representation of the origin of the ruler title basileus has its reflections in contemporary literature<sup>18</sup> and is qualified by Jan P. Crielaard as the ‘Wanax to Basileus model’ – a model with which he expresses reasonable disagreement [Crielaard, J. P. 2011, pp. 83–111]. In this regard, except for the attempt of establishing the exact place of both possible borrowings from the Creto-Mycenaean potestary-political system in the Phrygian governmental system – *wanax* and *lavagetas*, I will try to answer the question of whether the data about the Phrygian *vanak*- cast some additional light on the problems of the ‘Wanax to Basileus model’.

2. The two titles mentioned in the Midas’ Monument inscription were well known in the potestary-political system of Creto-Mycenaean Greece<sup>19</sup>. They are encountered sporadically in Iron Age records. In the Homeric epics, they are used with a meaning which reflects different new potestary-political patterns<sup>20</sup>. Of the two titles – *anax* and *lavagetas* the former has been used mostly in the ritual sphere<sup>21</sup>, while the latter has been used sporadically. But yet during the Iron Age, the *anax* appears as an office’s designation as well: in Cyprus<sup>22</sup>, in Miletus<sup>23</sup>, and in Phrygia – in the Midas’ Monument inscription<sup>24</sup>.

3. The etymology of the two titles is of some importance for resolving the main problems formulated above. The title *lavagetas* has a clear etymology, but even it poses some problems in regard

<sup>18</sup> Two examples where this representation is maintained: ‘Soon after the destruction or decline of these centralised administrative centres of the Late Bronze Age, the system collapsed and Greece was apparently segmented into what we would call today petty states. The wanax disappeared, but the local rulers, the basileis, managed to consolidate their power after the upheavals of the end of the Late Bronze Age and therefore from being local governors they assumed the leadership of self-sustained communities’ [Ainian, A. M. 2006, p. 182]. And the second one: ‘With the destruction of the Mycenaean palatial system, local community chieftains, each a basileus, would have continued to exercise their authority, but no longer alongside, or occasionally slotted into, the palatial system of regional hierarchical authority. The essential features of wanaks ideology (concerns with ‘birth’ and ‘lineage’ and ‘fertility’), as we have here explained them, were then transferred to the basileis, who on the local level might have legitimised their authority, even in the Mycenaean period, with a similar ideology. But the essential meaning of the term basileus remains opaque’ [Palaima, T. G. 2006, p. 69]. The idea of the historical development after the end of the Mycenaean period, reflected in these standpoints, really ‘presupposes the preservation of certain social structures’, which Jan P. Crielaard contradicts at the very beginning of his article.

<sup>19</sup> An overview on *wanax* in Mycenaean Greece, with rich historiography: Vlachos, G. C. 1974, p. 129 f., note 2; p. 130, note 3. Among the recent literature: Palaima, T. G. 2006, pp. 53–71.

<sup>20</sup> See, for example, with literature: Carlier, P. 1984, pp. 215–221; Carlier, P. 2006, pp. 101–109. On the title *lavagetas*, Florian Ruppenstein wrote: ‘The word “*lāwāgetās*” is an even more problematic case. It does not appear at all in the Homeric epics and only a few times in other Greek writings in the form of *λαγέτας*, notably in the Pindaric Odes (O. 1,89; P. 3,85; P. 4,107). *Λαγέτας* is normally translated as “leader of the people”. Still, this is not a certain office-holder but a rather an unspecific title.’ [Ruppenstein, F. 2015, p. 98].

<sup>21</sup> In the Eleusinian mysteries, the last dromena were accomplished in a building called *anaktoron*. According to C. Trümpy the relation of *potnia* with Demeter on the one hand and with *wanax* on the other hand explains the designation of the Eleusinian temple as *anaktoron* (*anaktoron* < \*(w)anakt-ktoron, i.e. ‘anax’s sanctuary’ [See Trümpy, C. 2004, pp. 34–37, quoted in: Maran, J., and Stavrianopoulou, E. 2007, pp. 291–292, n. 63]. The title *anax* is presented as the second component in composite personal names, in connection with which the interesting juxtaposition between the names Iphianassa and Iphigeneia deserves to be notified. They are analysed as isosemanthemes by Palaima, T. G. 2006, pp. 58–63.

<sup>22</sup> In Cyprus, members of Cyprian royal families were called *ἄνακτες* and *ἄνασσαι* according to Aristotle (Harpocration v. ἄνακτες καὶ ἄνασσαι.οὶ μὲν υἱοὶ τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ καλοῦνται ἄνακτες, αἱ δὲ ἀδελφαὶ καὶ γυναῖκες ἄνασσαι. Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῇ Κυπρίων πολιτείᾳ. Harpocration et Moeris, ed. Bekker [Berlin, 1833], p. 18). See on the office *wanax* in Cyprus as possible survivance from the Bronze Age: Poldrugo, F. 2001, pp. 21–51.

<sup>23</sup> The ‘renaissance’ of the term *wanax* at Miletus during the period from the 10<sup>th</sup> to the 8<sup>th</sup> century BC by the dynasty of Neleids does not misguide Georges C. Vlachos; he expressly distinguishes the Homeric supreme rulership and Mycenaean sacral kingship [Vlachos, G. C. 1974, p. 130, n. 2].

<sup>24</sup> Almost complete consultation on the problem of how *wanax* and *basileus* have been used in Greek records during the Homeric epoch and in peripheral cases like Cyprus: Palaima, T. G. 1995, p. 123.

to the inquiry of whether this title is a Greek borrowing or, conversely, a native Phrygian lexeme. The situation in the etymology of the title *wanax* is more sophisticated, because its presence in Creto-Mycenaean Greece before its appearance in an inscription in Phrygia can formally present it as a borrowing moving from the Greek world to Phrygia, and even – as a heritage from the Bronze Age; both the possibilities are supposed. But the lexeme is a loanword in the Greek language of the Creto-Mycenaean period as well. The origin of the title *wanax* remains unclear and if Wojciech Sowa is right, it cannot be explained as Paleo-Balkan because of the absence of Paleo-Balkan titles sharing this typology and linguistic aspect [Sowa, W. 2007, p. 161]. However, the situation with its non-Greek etymology remains unresolved. Searching for distant parallels is probably not precise. I am inclined to think about the suffix *-x* in the lexeme *wanax* to be the same as in *titax* (*king*)<sup>25</sup> and probably in other lexemes, but this problem will not be discussed here. According to some scholars' opinion, the word *wanax* is a compositum<sup>26</sup>, but in view of this etymological decision, also distant Indian and Toharian parallels are actually partial or pseudo-parallels.

If the question of the typology of the Phrygian titles *vanakt-* and *lavagt-* was in brief illustrated and if two titles are borrowed or native, we have the following possibilities:

### 3.1.1. The title *lavagt-* has been borrowed:

Bayun and Orel take the view that the Phrygian *lavageta-* < *lavagetas* is a Greek borrowing (see paragraph 3.3.1.).

3.1.2. The title *lavagt-* has not been borrowed, but it has developed independently in Phrygian language in its capacity of a term which is etymologically congeneric to the Mycenaean title. This possibility was formulated by Émil Benveniste, albeit without any detailed argumentation [see Benveniste, É. 1969, p. 24].

### 3.2.1. The title *vanakt-* has been borrowed:

Bayun and Orel take the view that the Phrygian *vanakt-* < *wanax* is a Greek borrowing (see here below, paragraph 3.3.1.).

3.2.2. The title *vanakt-* has not been borrowed, but it has developed independently – this possibility is also accepted by Émil Benveniste, but also without proper detailed argumentation [see Benveniste, É. 1969, p. 24].

Vyac. Ivanov notices in brief the presence of the Mycenaean (and Indo-European?) term *vanak-* in Phrygia, only mentioning the possibility for it to be an independent phenomenon by basing it on É. Benveniste's admission [Ivanov, Vyac. Vs. 1977, pp. 170–171, with literature].

Having accepted the independent appearance of the Greek term *wanax/anax* and its Phrygian equivalent, Vl. Georgiev wrote literally the following in this regard:

*‘Das Wort Favактеι Dat. Sing. = myk. Favάκτε(ι) erscheint in den altphrygischen Inschriften, die aus dem VIII–III Jahrhundert v. u. Z. stammen. Nach der allgemeinen Auffassung soll das phrygische Wort eine Entlehnung aus dem Griechischen sein (Frisk s. v., Chantraine s. v.). Diese Meinung ist aber unbewiesen und unwahrscheinlich. Das phrygische Wort ist mit dem griechischen urverwandt, vom Indoeuropäischen ererbt. Es gibt viele phrygische Wörter, die im Griechischen Entsprechungen haben, da Phrygisch und Griechisch nahe verwandt sind’* [Georgiev, V. I. 1981, p. 360, quoted in: Georgiev, V. I. 1984, p. 126].

### 3.3.1. Both terms *vanakt-* and *lavagt-* are borrowed:

According to L. S. Bayun and V. E. Orel, both terms are Greek borrowings – a view which they substantiate through the rather general explanation that it was a result of the long-term mutual contacts with the ancient Greeks.<sup>27</sup>

<sup>25</sup> See on this pre-Greek lexeme: Bremmer, J. N. 2004, p. 47; Bremmer, J. N. 2008, p. 86, with references.

<sup>26</sup> See, for instance: Willms, L. 2010, pp. 232–271. This etymology starts from Szemerényi's segmentation of the word as \*wen-ag-t- or \*wṇ-ag-t-, i.e. IE \*wen- (*kin, tribe*) + \*ag- (*to lead*) + agent-suffix -t, and, accepting the first component as *battle; victory*, clarifies the original meaning of *wanax* as *leader in battle* or *somebody who leads to victory*.

<sup>27</sup> „Длительные контакты с греками привели к проникновению в фригийский определенное число греческих заимствований, часть которых может быть датирована весьма ранним (возможно, второй

Entering into a discussion with Florian Ruppenstein, Vassilis Petrakis considers that ‘*there is a very plausible context for the adoption and adaptation or appropriation of these Greek titles*’ – the information of Herodotus (I, 14) about the Midas’ dedication to his ‘ἀξιοθέητον’ throne at Delphi and the tradition of his marriage to a Greek princess from Aeolian Kyme (Hermodikē in Aristotle, fr. 611.37 or Demodikē in Pollux Onomastikon X, 37), but, above all, ‘the very fact of the adoption of the Greek alphabet by the Phrygians (probably in the late 8th century BCE), and archaeological evidence for wide-ranging contacts between Phrygia and the Greek world during the 8th–7th centuries’ [Petrakis, V. P. 2016, p. 409].

Frank de Graaf poses the question of when and where the Phrygians borrowed the pair of titles *wanax* and *lawagetās*, considering Michel Lejeune’s opinion that it happened during the pre-Homeric times, as by Homer ἀνάξ had changed to the general term *master*. In the 1st millennium BC, we can find *la(wa)getās* only as a gloss. Frank de Graaf relates the emergence of the two titles in Phrygia with the migration movement in which, from his perspective, the Troad/Troas is an initial point, corroborated in his view by the archeological data: similar ceramics from Troy and Gordium<sup>28</sup>.

According to F. Cassola, the terms *wanax* and *lāwāgetās* were adopted by Midas or another Phrygian king in the 8th century. Such a hypothesis contradicts the fact that the terms have in all likelihood lost the exact political meaning which they had during the Mycenaean palatial period. That’s why Michel Lejeune dated the borrowing of the terms in pre-Homeric times [Cassola, F. 1997, p. 145 f.; Lejeune, M. 1972, pp. 341, 344, quoted in Ruppenstein, F. 2015, p. 98].

According to George L. Huxley, Phrygian and Ancient Greek borrowed both terms from some other language, may be even not Indo-European, such as the language of the Linear A [Huxley, G. L. 1959, pp. 91–92].

### 3.3.2. Both the terms *vanakt-* and *lavagt-* are not borrowed, but they have developed independently:

A staunch supporter of such an interpretation is Claude Brixhe. Part of his arguments in this respect are as follows<sup>29</sup>:

“*Je crois que lavagta- et vanakt- ont toutes chances d’être autochtones en Phrygie et que leur présence en grec et en phrygien peut procéder d’un héritage commun. Cela est particulièrement clair pour le second thème, qui, comme le remarque d’ailleurs M. Lejeune, non seulement fournit au paléo-phrygien un composé indigène, modrowanak (M-04), mais est toujours vivant, à l’époque greco-romaine, dans l’antroponymie du pays phrygien, sous les formes Ουαναξος, Ουαναξον, Ουαναξιον.*” [Brixhe, C. 1990, p. 75, with lit.].

3.4. Here I will not add my opinion on whether the two titles were borrowed or not. However, the state of the research itself poses a series of new questions. If these titles were borrowed from the Creto-Mycenaean title system, then how they have been borrowed – in a literal form with the same institutional status which they designated in the Creto-Mycenaean world? Why did the title *vanak* undergo a ‘decline’ and remained of secondary importance, if this situation namely is reflected in its postposition in the Midas’ Monument inscription? If we find the composite title *Modrowanak* in the Phrygian inscriptions, then what is its relation to the title *vanak*? Some questions close to the ones above would arise if the titles were not Greek borrowings in the Phrygian title system, but native titles. Undoubtedly, the probability for the titles to have been native Phrygian poses the problem of what the reason has been for their use both among the Creto-Mycenaean societies and among the Phrygians.

половиной II тыс. до н.э.) временем, ср. ст.-фрив. *lavageta-* < *лавагет*, *вождь*’ микен. *rawa-ke-ta*“ [Bayun, L. S., and Orel, V. E. 1988, p. 165].

<sup>28</sup> De Graaf, F. 1989, pp. 153–155. A general consideration in this regard: A Phrygian presence in or near the Troad is in either case attested, and if the Phrygians were subjected to the Trojan influence of acculturation, such a situation could affect their titulature, including the ruler’s titulature, with a borrowing of Luwian or possibly Thraco-Pelasgian terms, which we do not observe. The problem requires further analysis.

<sup>29</sup> Brixhe, C. 1990, pp. 74, 75. Short presentation of his opinion with references to his proof in his other publications: Ruppenstein, F. 2015, pp. 92–93.

4.1. The elucidation of the potestary-political situation among the Phrygians was not elucidated enough by the information about Midas, available in ancient written tradition, but nevertheless it is important. There, Midas (Μίδας) is a highly mythologized figure<sup>30</sup>. I will only enumerate some of the well-known aspects of that mythologization<sup>31</sup>:

4.1.1. The mytho-epic tradition [see **Moyseeva, T. A.** 1984, pp. 25–26] presents the Phrygian king Midas as a fighter against the drought and a provider of the moisture, i.e. as a mytho-ritual figure of a social functionary who guarantees social prosperity, according to the specifics of the mythological thinking.

4.1.2. Midas was a ploughman called to power – a mytho-epic plot motif which was widespread from the Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages<sup>32</sup>.

4.1.3. The motif of Midas' donkey ears is also a widespread mytho-epic plot motif (the tale plot Aarne–Thompson, 782) which goes beyond the frameworks of ancient religions and enters *Tristan and Iseult* as well through Celtic folklore<sup>33</sup>.

4.1.4. Midas' rise to power was preceded by omens and interpreted by the prophetess of Telmessos. The marriage with the prophetess has been interpreted in the literature as an aloform of a marriage with the Great Mother Goddess (see paragraph 5.3.4.).

4.2. No additional details are needed to see that the mytho-epic Midas is presented by means of those mythological themes and motifs that possess a socio-normative character and are used very often to sacralize the ruler's institution both in the antiquity and the so-called traditional societies. Their use in the depiction of Midas' image can imply only partially that in Midas' titlature his power status was not presented by chance in the inscription of the Midas Monument through the title *vanakt-* – a title which, according to most researchers, has had the typology of a sacred ruler in the Creto-Mycenaean societies.

5.1. The analysis of the data coming from the inscription on the Monument of Midas<sup>34</sup> provides additional important information. It is accepted that the practice of the ruler to bear a theophoric name was evidenced there, in that case – stemming from the divine name of the Great Mother-Goddess. It is also accepted that in the inscription on the rock-cut façade of that rock monument, there is a devotion to Midas, categorized as *lavagt-* and *vanak-* by his senior official – a bearer of one or two titles: *akenanogavos* or *arkievais* and *akenanogavos*. In this regard, I would like to draw the attention to the following specifics of this inscription:

5.1.1. According to the statement of Susanne Berndt-Ersöz, the Midas' Monument dates back to the first half of the 6th century, and such a monument should be considered as a royal monument according to its grand scale, or as a Lydian royal dedication to a local deity by the son of Croesus, Ates, if one judges by its decoration style<sup>35</sup>.

5.1.2. On the other hand, the categorization of that type of monuments – rock sanctuaries devoted to the Great Mother Goddess – as temple-like centres in literature is well-founded.

<sup>30</sup> The mythological connotations still contain his name, which could be probably explained through the Hittite word *mit(t)a-/miti-* which 'often means red wool, twisted threads, or cords', and which 'appears in several Hittite texts and always in a ritual context' [**Burke, B.** 2001, p. 255]. Therefore, Midas was a name with, so to say, a sacral aspect or even a name-title? The name is far from its final explanatory decision. Fred C. Woudhuizen points out the Greek (?) correspondences of the name the Lin. A *mi-da* (MN) and the theonym Μιδέα [**Woudhuizen, F. C.** 2008–2009, p. 188]. Cf. also the Lycian name *mida* (Μίδας ?): T. L. 141, quoted in: **Houwink ten Cate, Ph. H. J.** 1961, p. 103.

<sup>31</sup> In ancient tradition, the images and the motifs related to this mythologization were narrated sometimes for Midas, sometimes for Gordios.

<sup>32</sup> See more in **Krappe, A. N.** 1919–1922; **Krappe, A. N.** 1923; **Alekseev, M. P.** 1983, pp. 298–299; **Banaszkiewicz, J.** 2010, pp. 88–90; **Klaniczay, G.** 2012, pp. 25–27, 29, 144.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. for example: **Ciczewski, S.** 1889, pp. 221–246; **Lehmann-Nitsche, R.** 1936, pp. 281–303; **Mandach, A.de,** 1987, pp. 104–116. See also: **Milin, G.** 1991, p. 316, to whom I owe these brief references. On the spread of the plot motif to East: **Scobie, A.** 1977, pp. 88–90.

<sup>34</sup> A good description, summing up the previous literature: **Vassileva, M.** 2005, pp. 62–67.

<sup>35</sup> This statement of Susanne Berndt-Ersöz was accepted in: **Özkaya, V.** 1997, p. 98; **Munn, M.** 2008, p. 119. Other views on this matter exist too, including the opinions seeing in Ates a title, as it is attested for Atthis in Pesinous by later authors.



5.1.3. The typology of the so-called Midas' Monument as a rock sanctuary devoted to the Great Mother Goddess, poses the question of why an inscription in honour of a ruler, particularly a Phrygian ruler, has been put on the rock-cut façade of such a religious monument. If the monument was actually erected by a Lydian 'sponsorship', the admission that the inscription has been put in honour of the Phrygian ruler, is an apparent contradiction.

The contradiction drops off if we acknowledge that the inscription contains a devotion not to the ruler, but to the goddess Mida – the Great Mother Goddess.

5.2. The acknowledgement that there is namely a devoting inscription to the goddess Mida on the Midas' Monument, has already been formulated in literature. I have not made a detailed reference, but perhaps one of the earliest ascertainments there of belongs to Albert Gabriel<sup>36</sup>. I think that this acknowledgement should be updated and subjected to further analysis. There are some considerations that further justify it:

5.2.1. The possibility to see in *modrovanak* a lexeme meaning 'моцновладька' (*a mighty authority holder*) [Neroznak, V. P. 1978, pp. 75–76] is an interpretation based on the fact that the title is evidenced in the text of the inscription on Cybele's throne<sup>37</sup>. Therefore, it has to do with the goddess and perhaps it refers to her. There is a different interpretation provided by the researchers who think that the title means 'master of the town of Modra'<sup>38</sup>.

5.2.2. The admission that the name of the goddess Mida was presented in the Midas' Monument, means that the inscription's entitling was an entitling not to the king Midas, but to the goddess Mida. Thus, we know in practice how one Great Mother Goddess was seen as a reality from the potestary-political sphere. If we judge by the information in the inscription, she is the centre of the supreme potestarian offices in the society, their *pleroma*, their divine bearer and source. **However, we don't know how the historical Midas was entitled.**

5.2.3. In principle, it is almost generally accepted that the titles from the inscription on the Midas' Monument rock-cut façade are those possessed by the Phrygian ruler. For example, it is clearly stated in the heading of Huxley's article 'The Titles of Midas'. But if the acknowledgement that the inscription, devoted to the goddess Mida, is precise, then it is obvious that it was she namely and not the earthly ruler Midas who was the bearer of both titles.

5.2.4. The so obtained difference with the hitherto prevailing interpretations of the question of who is the bearer of the titles *lavagt-* and *vanak-*, is partial to some extent. Despite of the fact that we understand from the inscription how the Great Mother Goddess was called by title as a potestary figure, yet, it still informs which earthly potestary realia present her as an exceptionally sovereign, all-powerfull figure, as a *sui generis* *pleroma* of world power. Therefore, the inscription contains important data about the potestary realia of high order in the Phrygian society after all.

<sup>36</sup> He wrote: "Au sommet du monument de Midas, dans une inscription dont on ne peut donner encore le sens exact apparaissent les mots : *ates et midai*. Ces Vocables se rattachent à la primitive religion phrygienne : Mida la Phrygienne, mère mythique de Midas est la protectrice des moissons. C'est à elle qu'est attribuée la découverte du fer dont l'emploi devait modifier les méthodes de l'agriculture. *Ates (Attis)* est associé à Mida (Cybèle). Mais même si dans l'inscription il ne s'agit que d'un nom sacré, théophore, appliqué à un personnage historique, peut admettre la persistance des cultes et des mystères auxquels pouvaient donner lieu certaines pratiques des métallurges. Au reste, la royauté, même à l'époque historique, gardait son caractère sacerdotal." [Gabriel, A. 1950, p. 206]. See the previous points of view on the monument's function presented in a brief exposé: *Ibid.*, p. 208.

<sup>37</sup> The title is evidenced in an inscription, engraved on the throne of Cybele, which contains the text: *akinanogavan: tiyes / modrovanak: [?] avara [?]* (M-04, as quoted in Lubotsky, A. 1988, p. 12). Alexander Lubotsky states that the first word is probably a title related to the goddess herself. The word *akinanogavan* is conjugated in the accusative case, and if *modrovanak*, which is in the nominative case, is related to the goddess as well, then it probably has to be in the same case? Or *modrovanak* is a categorization of the goddess ('mighty mistress') and something has been performed on her by the *akinanogavos*?

<sup>38</sup> '...where [in M-04] the form *modrovanak* is attested as "Lord of the city of Modra" (for the type of the compound cf. Gk. ΠΝ Λεσβωνάξ, Κυπροαναξ' [Sowa, W. 2007, pp. 160–161, and quoted there Neumann, G. 1994, p. 370]. See also: Ligorio, O., and Lubotsky, A. 2013, p. 188.

5.3. If the goddess bears the two titles, – which we know as superior ones from another society, from the political formations of Mycenaean Greece, where they are titles of two different potestary functionaries – then this poses the question of whether the Phrygian ruler is, like the goddess, a bearer of both high official titles and their respective functions, or, as it was in the political formations of Mycenaean Greece, both titles were possessed by different functionaries. The inscription on the Midas' Monument rock-cut façade does not answer that question.

5.3.1. George L. Huxley seeks to overcome this difficulty of the analysis through the supposition that at the time when the titles were borrowed by the Phrygians, both offices/titles were executed/borne by the same functionary in the Mycenaean world, since Agamemnon occupied/possessed both offices/titles during the growth of his Empire. '[...] *But the king of Mycenae about 1250 B.C. may well have been both wa-na-ka and ra-wa-ke-ta, since the Hittite emperors with whom he corresponded were both kings and war-leaders. When Midas took both titles, he was perhaps recalling the great overlords of the Achaean commonwealth.* [...]' [Huxley, G. L. 1959, p. 92]. George L. Huxley adduces reasons for this supposition through an Anatolian parallel too. He indicates that a similar combination of the functions of king and war-leader, comparable to the title concentration in the Midas' Monument inscription, has been the practice of the Hittites. Normally, both offices were held by one man in the Hittite State [Huxley, G. L. 1959, p. 91, with a reference to Gurney, O. R. 1958, pp. 105–121]. But at the same time he states an interesting and probably indicative exception of this Hittite potestary model: in his autobiography, Hattusilis III stated that while his brother Muwatallis was occupying the throne of their father, he himself became chief of the armed forces. His conclusion does not suffer from definiteness: '*In Mycenaean Greece the duties of king and war leader need not have always been held by different people; and when Homer made his heroes both kings and war leaders during the Trojan War, his account of them came as close to the facts as is possible in heroic poetry.* [...]' [Huxley, G. L. 1959, p. 91]. In this regard, it is worth drawing the attention back to the viewpoint that the Pan-Hellenic supreme ruler's power of Agamemnon was rather a poetical creation [Jachmann, G. 1953, p. 241 ff., especially p. 245]. Bearing in mind these considerations, the search of a combination of the two offices in one and the same hands – a situation which could be developed in the mighty Phrygian Empire – is a possible interpretation which, however, is not founded by any direct records<sup>39</sup>.

5.3.2. On the other hand, one more divine ruler in Phrygia has been a holder of the title *vanak-* – the 'heavenly king' Dionysos namely<sup>40</sup>. In contrast to the goddess, this male deity has not been *lavagt-* and *vanak-* simultaneously, but only *vanak-*, which is may be significant.

5.3.3. Actually, the invocation to the goddess Mida in the Midas' Monument through the use of the ruler's titles is not an unexpected phenomenon. There are many cases in the Antiquity in which the goddess was categorized as mistress, including through the use of titles from the circle that interests us. Some unsystematic examples only to illustrate this phenomenon:

**Artemis in Pamphylia** was categorized as *Φανασσα*<sup>41</sup>. The epiclesis > Ἥγεμόνη is attested as **Artemis in Lycosoura** too [see Paus., VIII, 37, 1]. Aphrodite in the role of the deity *kourotrophos* in

<sup>39</sup> A similar explanation is formulated by Florian Ruppenstein as well. He wrote the following on that matter: '*Furthermore, the Phrygian kingdom under the reign of Midas was much more powerful than the small Greek poleis on the west coast of Asia Minor. It seems therefore hardly possible to find convincing reasons why the Phrygians should have been so impressed by the Greeks that they decided to call their king both ἄναξ and λαγέτας.*' [Ruppenstein, F. 2015, p. 98, with a reference to Brixhe, C. 2002, p. 70].

<sup>40</sup> A statement in the New Phrygian inscription No. 88: 'τιγ γεγαριτμενο<ς> ειτου πουρ ουανακταν κε ουρανιον ισγεικετ διονσιν'. Translations: 'let him become cursed/devoted and he will have to do with [or 'for'] the heavenly king Dionysos' (Lubotsky); 'let him become cursed/devoted by [the God of] Fire and the Heavenly King' (Witzak). According to the linguistic analysis and the translation of Alexander Lubotsky, the formula "πουρ κε ουανακταν ουρανιον διουσιν" (*for the heavenly king Dionysos*) is presented in the inscription [Lubotsky, A. 2017, p. 430; see also: Lubotsky, A. 1989, p. 153, and Witzak, K. 1991–1992, pp. 157–162, quoted in: Blažek, V. 2005, p. 19].

<sup>41</sup> See Huxley, G. L. 1959, pp. 90–91, with a reference to Anderson, J. G. C. 1899, S. 300 (a supposition that the personal name Οὐάναξος is a theophoric one, descended from the goddess' epithet Φανασσα), and

Athens was called 'Ἡγεμόνη τοῦ δήμου [CIA IV, 2, 1161 b]<sup>42</sup>. This typology was shared by Artemis-Queen among the Paeones and the Thracians [see **Popov, D.** 1981, pp. 30, 32].

Apart from the categorization through a title, there are god names identical to the titles. Such is the case with the names of Greek goddess **Aphrodite** and of Etruscan goddess **Turan**, whose names actually represent name-titles<sup>43</sup>. The cult of the Great Mother Goddess in its Phrygian variant (Mida in the Midas' Monument) elucidate why the Goddess of Love namely was 'mistress', all the more that the theonym Aphrodite shares similar semantics. The relation of Aphrodite the Mistress with ancient Anatolia can be testified by the probability for the cult of Cybele to have been borrowed by the Greeks in the Troad, where she was named Aphrodite according to the statement of the Homeric hymn to Aphrodite<sup>44</sup>.

The same was the case with West Anatolian Cybele, as long as it is correct to use that name for the goddess whose theonym is restored by Rostislav Oreshko as **Kubanta** and who he categorises as the '**Great Mistress**' of Western Anatolia [**Oreshko, R. N.** 2012, pp. 668–669]. Along with this, he shared the view that onomastic evidence, such as the male names Sauska-K(u)runtiya and Kubanta-K(u)runtiya, reflects the common concept of protection on the part of the 'Goddess of War and Love', specifically of male warriors. This goddess's function to protect them and to be their imaginary mistress in the divine world can be explained on the basis of her role as guide and leader in the initiations of the age-set male societies – the ruler's main support in numerous early states in the ancient world<sup>45</sup>.

5.3.4. The high significance of the Great Mother Goddess cult in the Antiquity was determined by her role as a divine figure ensuring the legitimacy of the earthly ruler's power. The ruler was her son or consort, or both in some mythical versions.

The ancient mytho-epic tradition on the Midas' marriage with the prophetess from Telmissos is among the examples sharing this typology in the Balkan-Anatolian area, attested by Walter Burkert; he also indicates the image of Cyniras in historic Cyprus and that of Candaules from the Gyges legend in Lydia<sup>46</sup>.

The mytho-epic ruler Midas is also presented as the son of the Mother of Gods, or Kybele in some cases<sup>47</sup>. What matters in that case is the circumstance that the Midas' Monument inscription relates him to the deity Mida, whose son or consort aims to present himself through the acceptance of her name<sup>48</sup>. The high significance of this coincidence between the name of the mytho-epic Midas and of the deity Mida was noted in scientific literature, yet [see, for example: **Vassileva, M.** 1997, p. 17].

5.3.5. The image of Mida/Mise, a deity venerated in the Orphic hymns<sup>49</sup>, is of great interest in our case. Mida was presented as a hermaphroditic deity, similar in this aspect to Agdistis as well as to the pair Baubo (Baubon in the Eleusinian mysteries).

6. What is important is that if the Phrygians were a migratory people from the Balkans to Asia Minor, then the dynasty of mytho-epic Midas was 'autochtonized' through the veneration of the Anatolian

**Calder, W. M.** 1928, p. 217, non vidi; cf. **Bermejo Barrera, J.C., y Fernández Canosa, X. A.** 1997, pp. 136–137.

<sup>42</sup> I owe these two examples to **La Genière, J. de**, 1985, p. 713.

<sup>43</sup> See on that matter in more details: **Yordanov, S.** 2008: pp. 93–104; **Yordanov, S.** 2016, pp. 15–39.

<sup>44</sup> See **Burkert, W.** 1979, p. 103. Cf. as well **ibid.**, p. 189, note 8, p. 189 to the text on page 103, where Walter Burkert reminds of the information of Charon, that Kybéle had been the 'Phrygian and Lydian' name of Aphrodite [**Charon**, FGr.Hist., 262 F 5].

<sup>45</sup> Only to note: this function of the Thracian goddess Bendis is clearly attested. Some features in the cults of the two goddess mistresses, Aphrodite and Turan, present them as sharing this functional aspect too.

<sup>46</sup> **Burkert, W.** 1979, p. 196, note 7, with references to the records' in formation and literature.

<sup>47</sup> **Plut.** Caes., 9, 3; **Hygin.** Fab. 191; 274; **Arnob.** Adv. Nat. 2, 73; **Ps.-Hes.** fr. 251 (47) Rzach, and others. See for example: **Vassileva, M.** 1997, p. 17; **Vassileva, M.** 2005, p. 82 f.; **Munn, M.** 2008, p. 118 f. (the paragraph under the title 'Midas as a Great King and Son of the Great Mother'), and others.

<sup>48</sup> For example, Midas is presented as the son of Mida/Mise in the Hesychios gloss Mida Theos. See **Hesychius**, s. v. Mida Theos.

<sup>49</sup> See more on this deity: **Dieterich, A.** 1893, pp. 1–12; cf. **Roller, L. E.** 1983, p. 310. An inscription MIDAE DEAE was present on the coins of Cremna in Pisidia. See **Drexler, W.** 1894, p. 587.

cult of the Great Mother Goddess. In a process of acculturation, typical for the Era of Antiquity, the Phrygians and the Phrygian ruler adopted a local deity, as a result of which society and dynasty became 'local' or at least sanctified by the previous local deities. In this respect, Karl Strobel states:

'[...] *The fact that the names of both Midas/Mita and Gordios/Kurtis are Luwian is not without relevance and probably shows that the royal family of the city of Gordion tried to connect itself with the royal dynasties of the LBA period.*' [Strobel, K. 2008, p. 142, quoted in: Kopanias, K. 2015, p. 220].

6.1. In the Phrygian case there are some difficulties in such an interpretation, which outline a slightly different explanation. If the etymology of the name of the king Midas shows its Hittite-Luwian linguistic appurtenance, as Strobel thinks, then how can we explain the linguistic peculiarities of the name of the goddess Mida / Mise, attesting a very well documented Thracian phonetic characteristic – the variation d / z. Indeed, the two variants of the goddess' name, Mida and Mise, substantiate this variation clearly enough. The name of the god Sabadhios vs Sabazios and the mythical toponym Gadeira vs the toponym Gazoros are also indicative examples thereof. The analysis of these examples would provide the answer to the questions posed hitherto, but it is rather a subject for another research study<sup>50</sup>. However, the naming of a local goddess (most probably the West Anatolian Cybele) after a hermaphroditic deity, embodying love, reminds us of the aspect of his/her similar hypostasis, as this aspect was outlined in Rostislav Oreshko's above-cited study. I would categorize this case as an instance of naming a local goddess through the native Phrygian theonym, possibly of Thracian origin<sup>51</sup>. So, if one of the principal Phrygian sanctuaries was consecrated to the Great Mother Goddess in her Thracio-Phrygian hypostasis, then such a situation undoubtedly adduces evidence of the vitality of the native Phrygian religious beliefs, which migrated together with the Phrygians from the Balkans. Later, the Phrygians were gradually 'autochthonized' through a syncretisation to the local Anatolian Great Mother Goddess. The presence of a relatively large number of parallels between Thrace and Phrygia is a long-standing and increasingly developed observation of the scholars. Birgitte Bøgh generalizes the observations in this respect on the basis of the conviction that '*the knowledge that we possess of the cult and religion in the Thracian region could illuminate the nature of Matar in Phrygia*', and that '*the king in the Thracian area may have engaged in a relationship with a goddess, including a hieros gamos and serving as a reinforcement of his power, a situation similar to that in Phrygia, and perhaps surviving there*' [Bøgh, B. 2007, pp. 309–310, with the references to: Roller, L. E. 2002, pp. 683–694, and Roller, L. E. 2003, pp. 161–167].

6.2. The nature of the name Midas as a theophoric name, which coincides with the divine name of the Great Mother, finds a very close parallel in ancient Thrace. Many Odrysian rulers, who belonged to an Early Iron Age dynasty and under went an acculturation process with a Paleo-Balkan background from as early as the Bronze Age, bore the theophoric name Cotys. It coincides with that of the Paleo-Balkan goddess Cotyto. This close parallel in the practice of the ruler's sacralization is already indicated [see, for example: Vassileva, M. 1997, p. 17, n. 55]. I am not going to consider the question of whether the typologies of the deity Mida and the goddess Cotyto are similar to a certain extent. The important thing is that in the cases of Cotyto – Cotys and Mida – Midas, the parallel between the Thracian and Phrygian religious practices lies in the field of social normativity. Very crucial for conducting further analysis is the dual nature of the deity Mida and her possible close relation to the god Dionysos on the one hand, and to the goddesses of love on the other hand, which approximates his/her typology to

<sup>50</sup> In this respect, Albert Dieterich wrote: '*Kann den aber sprachlich Μίση und Μίδα gleich gesetzt werden? Im griechischen ware ein solcher Wechsel von δ und σ wohlkaumdenkbar. Es gibt aber Schreibungen wie Μητρι Ζιζιμηνη – Μ. Δινδιμηνη (Laodicea. Athen. Mitt. XIII, 287 n. 9; vgl. Ναδιανδός und Ναζιανζός Philostorg. *histor. eccl. VIII 11*), wo ζ gewiß nur der tönnen den s-Laut bezeichnen soll. Jedenfalls sind Μίδα und Μιση die verschiedenen griechischen Auffassungen eines fremden Wortes.'* [Dieterich, A. 1893 [1911], p. 130].

<sup>51</sup> The borrowing of this Thracian theonym by the Phrygians is not an unexpected phenomenon, since a similar example of borrowing is evidenced by many other instances more; I would cite only the example of the inclusion of two Bithynian deities in the Phrygian pantheon. See in details: Witzak, K. T. 1992–1993, pp. 265–271.

that of the goddess mistresses, patronizing male warriors. In that way, the sanctuary with the Midas Monument can be viewed as a centre of the cultic life of warrior societies. This is a very important basis for the rulers of the early states in the Antiquity. But these questions need further analysis – a topic for another study.

\* \* \*

If we turn back to the inscription on the Midas' Monument after everything said above, we will face another potestary-political system in comparison with the others seen in the literature up to now. Midas bears the name of the goddess Mida and is considered to be her son, but in the sanctuary near the Town of Midas he made a dedication to the goddess – mistress (*lavagt-*) and patron (*vanagt-*). As for the goddess Mida, the Phrygian ruler in the inscription probably plays the role of her first priest – lord (*arkievais*) and high priest (*akinanogavos*). Bearing the titles *lavagt-* and *vanagt-*, the goddess Mida does not affect the Phrygian ruler's political power. His earthly power is a projection of her almighty heavenly power. But the manifestations of the earthly power coming from the godly power does not cast enough light on the potestary-political system of the Phrygian society. Hence, further research is required. In my opinion, the power relationships in the Old Phrygian period were presented very profoundly by Lynn E. Roller in her statement that '*... the prominent display of visual images of the Phrygian Mother in the Iron Age can be explained by the desire of the ruling Phrygian elite to use the Mother Goddess to reinforce their position of political dominant by stressing their special relationship with the goddess. The goddess's role as the mother and protector of the Phrygian State both strengthened the nascent Phrygian polity and cemented the position of its ruler.*' [Roller, L. E. 2003, p. 165]

## REFERENCES

### Abbreviations

T. L. - Tituli Lyciae lingua Lycia conscripti (TAM I).

### Works cited

**Ainian, A. M.** 2006 – Alexander M. Ainian. The Archaeology of Basileis. – In: Deger-Jalkotzy, Sigrid, and Lemos, Irene S. (eds.). Ancient Greece: From the Mycenaean Palaces to the Age of Homer [Edinburgh Leventis Studies, 3]. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006, 181–211.

**Alekseev, M. P.** 1983 – М. П. Алексеев. Сравнительное литературоведение. [Comparative theory of literature (In Russian)]. Ленинград: Наука, Ленинградское отделение, 1983, 450 с.

**Anderson, J. G. C.** 1899 – J. G. C. Anderson. Exploration in Galatiacis Halym. Part II. Topography, epigraphy, Galatian civilisation. – Journal of Hellenic Studies, Vol. 19, 1899, 52–134, 280–318.

**Banaszkiewicz, J.** 2010 – Jacek Banaszkiewicz. Podanie o Piascie i Popielu. Studium porównawcze nad wczesnośredniowiecznymi tradycjami dynastycznymi. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 2010.

**Bayun, L. S., and Orel, V. E.** 1988 – Л. С. Баюн, В. Э. Орел. Язык фригийских надписей как исторический источник. II. – Вестник древней истории, 1988, № 4 [The language of the Phrygian Inscriptions as a historical record. II. – Journal of Ancient History, № 4 (In Russian)], 132–168.

**Benveniste, É.** 1969 – Émil Benveniste. Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes. 2. Pouvoir, droit, religion. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit, 1969, 340 p.

**Bermejo Barrera, J. C., y Fernández Canosa, X. A.** 1997 – Jose C. Bermejo Barrera, y X. A. Fernández Canosa. Mito y método histórico: El Ejemplo de Artemis. – Gallaecia, No. 16, 1997, 125–143.

**Berndt-Ersöz, S.** 2008 – Susanne Berndt-Ersöz. The Chronology and Historical Context of Midas. – Historia, Band 57/1 (2008), 1–37.

**Blažek, V.** 2005 – Václav Blažek. Paleo-Balkan Languages I: Hellenic Languages. – Sborník prací Filozofické Fakulty Brněnské Univerzity / Stidia Minora Facultatis Philosophicae Universitatis Brunensis, N 10, 2005, 15–33.

**Blomberg, M., and Henriksson, G.** 1996 – Mary Blomberg, and Göran Henriksson. *Minos Enneoros*: Archaeoastronomical light on the priestly role of the king in Crete. – In: Religion and power in the ancient Greek

world. Edited by Pontus Hellström and Brita Alroth. Uppsala : Univ., 1996 (= Boreas (Uppsala), 24, 1996), 27–39.

**Bøgh, B.** 2007 – Birgitte Bøgh. The Phrygian Background of Kybele. – *Numen*, 54 (2007), 304–339.

**Bremmer, J. N.** 2004 – Jan N. Bremmer. Remember the Titans! – In: *The Fall of the Angels*. Edited by Christoph Auffarth and Loren T. Stuckenbruck. [Themes in Biblical Narrative, Vol. 6]. Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2004, 35–61.

**Bremmer, J. N.** 2008 – Jan N. Bremmer. Greek Fallen Angels: Kronos and Titans. Chapter Five. In: Bremmer, Jan N. *Greek Religion and Culture, the Bible and the Ancient Near East* [Jerusalem studies in religion and culture; v. 8]. Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2008, 73–99.

**Brixhe, C.** 1990 – Claude Brixhe. Comparaison et langues faiblement documentées : L'exemple du phrygien et de ses voyelles longues. – In: *La reconstruction des laryngales* (= Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, fasc. CCLIII). Paris : Les belles lettres, 1990, 59–99.

**Brixhe, C.** 2002 – Claude Brixhe. Achéens et Phrygiens en Asie Mineure: approche comparative de quelques données lexicales. – In: Matthias Fritz and Susanne Zeilfelder (eds.). *Novalis Indogermanica. Festschrift für Günter Neumann zum 80. Geburtstag*. [Grazer Vergleichende Arbeiten 17]. Graz, 2002, 49–73.

**Brixhe, C.** 2004 [2008] – Claude Brixhe. Phrygian. – In: R. D. Woodard (ed.). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages*. Cambridge, 2004, 777–788 = Claude Brixhe. Phrygian. – In: R. D. Woodard (ed.). *The Ancient Languages of Asia Minor*. Cambridge, 2008, 69–80.

**Brixhe, C., et Lejeune, M.** 1984 – C. Brixhe et M. Lejeune. *Corpus des inscriptions paléo-phrygiennes*. Paris, 1984.

**Burke, B.** 2001 – Brendan Burke. Anatolian Origins of the Gordian Knot Legend. – *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, 42 (2001), 255–261.

**Burkert, W.** 1979 – Walter Burkert. *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual*. [Sather Classical Lectures. Volume forty-seven]. Berkeley – Los Angeles, 1979, xix + 226 p.

**Calder, W. M.** 1928 – *Monumenta Asiae Minoris antiqua*. Vol. I. Edited by W. M. Calder. London: Longmans, Green & Co. Ltd., 1928.

**Carlier, P.** 1984 – Pierre Carlier. *La royauté en Grèce avant Alexandre*. [Etudes et travaux (Université des sciences humaines de Strasbourg. Groupe de recherche d'histoire romaine), 6]. Strasbourg : AECR, 1984.

**Carlier, P.** 2006 – Pierre Carlier. Ἄναξ and βασιλεύς in the Homeric poems. – In: Deger-Jalkotzy, Sigrid, and Lemos, Irene S. (eds.). *Ancient Greece: From the Mycenaean Palaces to the Age of Homer* [Edinburgh Leventis Studies, 3]. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006, 101–109.

**Cassola, F.** 1997 – F. Cassola. Rapporti tra Greci e Frigi al tempo di Mida. – In: *Frigi e Frigio*. Atti del 1° simposio internazionale, Roma, 16–17 ottobre 1995. A cura di R. Gusmani, M. Salvini, P. Vannicelli (eds.). Roma: Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, 1997, 131–152.

**Ciczewski, S.** 1889 – Stanislas Ciczewski. Bajka o Midasowych uszach. – *Rosprawy Akademii umiejtnosci. Wydział historycznofilozoficzny* (Kraków), XXVIII, 1889, 221–246.

**Crielaard, J. P.** 2011 – Jan Paul Crielaard. The 'Wanax to Basileus Model' Reconsidered: Authority and Ideology after the Collapse of the Mycenaean Palaces. – In: *The 'Dark Ages' Revisited*. Acts of an International Symposium in Memory of William D. E. Coulson. University of Thessaly, Volos, 14–17 June 2007. Vol. I. Edited by A. Mazarakis Ainian. Volos: University of Thessaly Press, 2011, 83–111.

**Danov, H.** 1969 – Христо Милошев Данов. Древна Тракия. Изследвания върху историята на българските земи, Северна Добруджа, Източна и Егейска Тракия от края на IX до края на III в. пр.н.е. [Ancient Thrace. Researches on the History of the Bulgarian lands, Northern Dobrudzha, East and Aegean Thrace from the end of the 9th to the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC (In Bulgarian)]. София, 1969.

**De Graaf, F.** 1989 – Frank de Graaf. Midas wanax lawagetas. In: *Thracians and Mycenaean*. Proceedings of the Fourth International Congress of Thracology, Rotterdam, 24–26 September 1984. Edited by Jan G. P. Best and Nanny M. W. De Vries. Leiden – Sofia: Joint edition of E. J. Brill and Terra Antiqua Balcanica, 1989, 153–155.

**Dieterich, A.** 1893 [1911] – Albert Dieterich. Die Göttin Misa. – In: Dieterich, Albert. *Kleine Schriften*. Leipzig und Berlin: Teubner, 1911, 125–135. Originally published in *Philologus*, 52 (1893), 1–12.

**Dietrich, B. C.** 1965 – B. C. Dietrich. Some eastern traditions in Greek thought. – *Acta Classica*, 8 (1965), 11–30.

**Drexler, W.** 1894 – W. Drexler. Nachträgliches über Mismos und Mida. – *Philologus*, Vol. 52, Issue 1–4, 1894, 587–587.

**Gabriel, A.** 1950 – Albert Gabriel. Au sujet du « Monument de Midas ». – In: *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, 94e année, N. 2, 1950, 202–208.

**Georgiev, V. I.** 1981 – Vladimir I. Georgiev. Introduction to the History of Indo-European Languages.

Sofia: Publishing House of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, 1981.

**Georgiev, V. I.** 1984 – Vladimir I. Georgiev. Griech. Dvái ‘Herrscher, Herr, Fürst’ und βασιλεύς ‘König’. – Indogermanische Forschungen, Band 89, 1984, 125–128.

**Gurney, O. R.** 1958 – O. R. Gurney. Hittite Kingship. In: Myth, Ritual and Kingship. Edited by S. H. Hooke. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958, 105–121.

**Hesychius** – Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon recensuit et emendavit Kurt Latte. Vol. I–. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1953–.

**Hajnal, I.** 1998 – Ivo Hajnal. Mykenisches und homerisches Lexikon. Übereinstimmungen, Divergenzen und der Versuch einer Typologie [Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft: Vorträge und kleinere Schriften 69]. Innsbruck, 1998.

**Houwink ten Cate, H. J. Ph.** 1961 – Philo Hendrick Jan Houwink Ten Cate. The Luwian Population groups of Lycia and Cilicia Aspera during the Hellenistic period. [Documenta et Monumenta Orientis Antiqui. Volumen decimum]. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965.

**Huxley, G. L.** 1959 – G. L. Huxley. Titles of Midas. – Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies, 2 (1959), 85–99.

**Ivanov, Vyac. Vs.** 1977 – Вяч. Вс. Иванов. Микенское греческое wa-na-ka и его индоевропейские соответствия. – В: Балканский лингвистический сборник. Москва: Наука, 1977, 165–171.

**Jachmann, G.** 1953 – G. Jachmann. Das homerische Königtum. – Maia, VI, 1953, 241–256.

**Janda, M.** 1997 – M. Janda. Zur altphrygischen Areyastis-Inschrift. – In: Frigi e Frigio. Atti del 1° simposio internazionale, Roma, 16–17 ottobre 1995. A cura di R. Gusmani, M. Salvini, P. Vannicelli (eds.). Roma: Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, 1997, 271–277.

**Kaczyńska, E.** 2011 – Elwira Kaczyńska. Phrygian Glosses in Pseudo-Plutarch’s Work De Fluviiis. – Lingua Posnaniensis, Vol. LIII (1), 2011, 57–63.

**Kelder, J. M.** 2010 – Jorrit M. Kelder. The Kingdom of Mycenae. A Great Kingdom in the Late Bronze Age Aegean. Bethesda, Maryland: CDL Press, 2010, xii + 172 p.

**Kelder, J.M.** 2012 – Jorrit M. Kelder. Ahhiyawa and the world of the Great Kings: A re-evaluation of Mycenaean political structures. – Talanta, XLIV, 2012, 41–52.

**Kelder, J. M., and Poelwijk, M.** 2016 – Jorrit M. Kelder, and Marco Poelwijk. The Wanassa and the Damokoro. A New Interpretation of a Linear B Text from Pylos. – Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies, 56, 2016, 572–584.

**Klaniczay, G.** 2012 – Gábor Klaniczay. Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses: Dynastic Cults in Medieval Central Europe. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

**Kopaniás, K.** 2015 – Konstantinos Kopaniás. The Mushki/Phrygian Problem from the Near Eastern Point of View. – Chapter 8. Part 2. In: Nostoi. Indigenous culture, migration and integration in the Aegean islands and Western Anatolia during the Late Bronze and Early Iron ages. Edited by Nicholas Chr. Stampolidis – Cigdem Maner – Konstantinos Kopaniás. Istanbul: Koç University Press, 2015, 211–225.

**Krappe, A. N.** 1919–1922 – A. N. Krappe. The Ploughman King. Revue Hispanique, t. 46, 1919, 516–546; t. 56, 1922, 265–286.

**Krappe, A. N.** 1923 – A. N. Krappe. La légende de Libuše et de Premysl. – Revue des Études Slaves, 1923, t. 3, fasc. 1–2, 86–89.

**La Genière, J. de,** 1985 – Juliette de La Genière. Dela Phrygie à Locres épizéphyrienne: les chemins de Cybèle. – Mélanges de l’école de Rome, 97–2, 1985, 693–718.

**Lancelotti, M. G.** 2002 – Maria Grazia Lancellotti. Attis: between myth and history: king, priest and God [Religions in the Graeco-Roman World. Vol. 149]. Leiden: Brill, 2002, xii + 207 p.

**Lehmann-Nitsche, R.** 1936 – Robert Lehmann-Nitsche. König Midas hat Eselohren. – Zeitschrift für Ethnologie, 68 Jahrg., H. 4/6, 281–303.

**Lejeune, M.** 1972 – Michel Lejeune. À propos de la titulature de Midas. In: M. Lejeune. Mémoires de Philologie Mycénienne. Troisième série (1964–1968), Incunabula Graeca 43 (Rome 1972) 331–344 (= Athenaeum 47, 1969, 179–192).

**Ligorio, O., and Lubotsky, A.** 2013 – О. Лигорио, А. Лубоцкий. Фригийский язык. – В: Языки мира: Реликтовые индоевропейские языки Передней и Центральной Азии. Москва: Academia, 2013 [The Phrygian language. In: Russian Academy of Sciences. Institute of Linguistics. Red. coll.: Y. B. Koryakov, A. A. Kibrik. The World Languages: The relic Indo-European Languages of Near and Central Asia (In Russian).], 180–195.

**Lubotsky, A.** 1988 – Alexander Lubotsky. The Old Phrygian Areyastis-inscription. – Kadmos 27, 1 (1988), 9–26.

**Lubotsky, A.** 1989 – Alexander Lubotsky. The syntax of the New Phrygian inscription No. 88. – *Kadmos*, 28, 1–2 (1989), 146–155.

**Lubotsky, A.** 2017 – Alexander Lubotsky. The Phrygian inscription from Dokimeion and its meter. In: *Miscellanea Indogermanica. Festschrift für José Luis García Ramón zum 65. Geburtstag*, herausgegeben von Ivo Hajnal, Daniel Kölligan, Katharina Zipser. [Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft]. Innsbruck, 2017, 427–431.

**Mandach, A. de,** 1987 – André de Mandach. Midas et Marc: le mythe de deux souverains aux oreilles inavouables. – In: «Actes du colloque Tristanet Yseut: mythe européen et mondial». 10–12 février 1986. Centre d'Études Médiévales, Université de Picardie, Amiens. Göppingen, Kummerle Verlag, 1987, 104–116.

**Maran, J., and Stavrianopoulou, E.** 2007 – Joseph Maran, and Eftychia Stavrianopoulou. Πόρτιος Ἀνήρ. Reflections on the Ideology of Mycenaean Kingship. – In: *Keimelion. Elitenbildung und elitärer Konsum von der mykenischen Palastzeit bis zur homerischen Epoche The Formation of Elites and Elitist Lifestyles from Mycenaean Palatial Times to the Homeric Period*. Herausgegeben von Eva Alram-Stern und Georg Nightingale. [Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse. Denkschriften, 350. Band Veröffentlichungen der Mykenischen Kommission. Band 27. Herausgegeben von Sigrid Deger-Jalkotzy]. Wien : Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2007, 285–298.

**Milin, G.** 1991 – Gaël Milin. Le roi Marc aux oreilles de cheval. [Publications romanes et Françaises, fondées par Mario Roques, dirigées par Jean Frappier, puis par Alexandre Micha, CXCVII]. Genève: Librairie Droz S. SA. 11, rue Massot, 1991.

**Miller, M. C.** 1988 – Margaret C. Miller. Midas as the Great King in Attic Fifth-Century Vase-Painting. – *Antike Kunst*, XXXI (1988), 78–89.

**Moyseeva, T. A.** 1984 – Т. А. Мойсеева. Мидас как символ богатства в античной традиции. – *Вестник древней истории*, 1984, № 4 [Midas as a symbol of richness in the antique tradition. – *Vestnik drevnej istorii* [Journal of Ancient History], № 4 (In Russian)], 12–30.

**Müller, K.** 1861 [1965] – Plutarchi Libellus de fluviorum et montium nominibus et de iis, quae in illis reperuntur. – In: *Geographi Graeci minores*. Edidit K. Müller. Vol. 2. Paris: Didot, 1861 [a new edition: Hildesheim: Olms, 1965], 637–665.

**Munn, M.** 2006 – Mark Munn. *The Mother of the Gods, Athens, and the Tyranny of Asia. A Study of Sovereignty in Ancient Religion*. Berkeley – Los Angeles – London: University of California Press, 2006, xxi + 452 pp.

**Munn, M.** 2008 – Mark Munn. Alexander, the Gordian Knot, and the Kingship of Midas.– Ch. 6. In: Howe, Timothy, and Reames, Jeanne (eds.). *Macedonian Legacies. Studies in Ancient Macedonian History and Culture in Honor of Eugene N. Borza*. Claremont, California: Regina Books, 2008, 107–143.

**Nemirovskiy, A. I.** 1983 – А. И. Немировский. Этруски. От мифа к истории. Москва, 1983. [The Etruscans. From the Myth to the History (In Russian)]. [A. I. Nemirovskij. Etruski. Otmifakistorii. Moskva, 1983.]

**Neroznak, V. P.** 1978 – В. П. Нерознак. Палеобалканские языки. [Paleo-Balkan Languages (In Russian)]. Москва: Наука, 1978. [V. P. Neroznak. Paleobalkanskijeazyki. Moskva: Nauka, 1978.]

**Neumann, F. J.** 1976 – Franke J. Neumann. The Flayed God and His Rattle-Stick: A Shamanic Element in Pre-Hispanic Mesoamerican Religion. – *History of Religion*, Vol. 15, 1976, No. 3, 251–263.

**Neumann, G.** 1994 – Günter Neumann. *Ausgewählte kleine Schriften*. Hrsg. von E. Badali, H. Nowicki und S. Zeilfelder. (= Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, Band 77). Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität, 1994.

**Orel, V.** 1997 – Vladimir Orel. *The Language of Phrygians. Description and Analysis*. Delmar, N. Y.: Caravan Books, 1997.

**Oreshko, R. N.** 2012 – Р. Н. Орешко. Кубанта: «Великая владычица» Западной Анатолии? – В: *Индоевропейское языкознание и классическая филология – XVI. Материалы чтений, посвященных памяти профессора Иосифа Моисеевича Тронского 18–20 июня 2012 г.* Санкт-Петербург: Наука, 2012, 660–670 [Rostislav N. Oreshko. Kubanta: «The Great Mistress» of Western Anatolia? In: *Indo-European linguistics and Classical Philology – XVI. Texts of the readings in memory of Professor Iosif Moiseevich Tronskiy 18–20 June 2012*, 660–670 (In Russian)]. [R. N. Oreshko. Kubanta: “Velikaja vladūchitza” Zapadnoj Anatolii? – V: *Indoevropskoe jazykoznanie i klassicheskaja filologija – XVI. Materialy chtenij, posvjashtennyh pamjati professora Iosifa Moiseevicha Tronskogo 18-20 ijunja 2012 g.* Sankt-Peterburg: Nauka, 2012, 660–670.]

**Oreshko, R. N.** 2015 – Rostislav Oreshko. Hipponax and linguistic, ethnic and religious milieu of western Anatolia. Some further notes on: Shane Hawkins *The language of Hipponax*, 2013. – *HEPHAISTOS. Kritische*



Zeitschrift zu Theorie und Praxis der Archäologie und angrenzender Gebiete / New Approaches to Classical Archaeology and Related Fields, 30–2013. Editors/Herausgeber Burkhard Fehr–Lambert Schneider–Christoph Höcker – Inge Nielsen – Martina Seifert. Publikation des Archäologischen Instituts der Universität Hamburg, Abteilung Archäologie und Kulturgeschichte des antiken Mittelmeerraumes. Berlin: LIT–Verlag, 2015, 79–104.

**Özkaya, V.** 1997 – Vecihi Özkaya. The ShaftMonuments and the *Taurobolium* among the Phrygians. – Anatolian Studies. Journal of the British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara, Vol. XLVII, 1997, 89–103.

**Palaima, T. G.** 1995 – Thomas G. Palaima. The Nature of the Mycenaean Wanax: Non-Indo-European Origins and Priestly Functions. In: Rehak, P. (ed.). The Role of the Ruler in the Prehistoric Aegean. Proceedings of a Panel Discussion presented at the Annual Meeting of the Archaeological Institute of America, New Orleans, Louisiana, 28 December 1992 (Aegaeum 11). Liège: University of Liège, 1995, 119–139.

**Palaima, T. G.** 2006 – Thomas G. Palaima. *Wanax* and related power terms in Mycenaean and later Greek. – In: Deger-Jalkotzy, Sigrid, and Lemos, Irene S. (eds.). Ancient Greece: From the Mycenaean Palaces to the Age of Homer [Edinburgh Leventis Studies, 3], Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006, 53–71.

**Payne, A.** 2012 – Annick Payne. Iron Age Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions. Edited by H. Craig Melchert. [Society of Biblical Literature. Writings from the Ancient World. Theodore J. Lewis, General Editor. Associate Editors Billie Jean Collins, Daniel Fleming, Martti Nissinen, William Schniedewind, Mark S. Smith, Emily Teeter, Terry Wilfong. No. 29]. Atlanta, Georgia: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012.

**Petrakis, V. P.** 2016 – Vassilis P. Petrakis. Addenda to ‘Writing the *wanax*: Spelling peculiarities of Linear B *wa-na-ka* and their possible implications’. – *Minos. Revista di filologia egea*, No. 39, 2016, 407–410.

**Poldrugo, F.** 2001 – Floriana Poldrugo. La persistenza della figura del *wanax* miceneo a Cipro in età storica. – *Studi Classici e Orientali*, Vol. 47, No. 1 (Ottobre 2001), 21–51.

**Popov, D.** 1981 – Димитър Попов. Тракийската богиня Бендида. [The Thracian Goddess Bendis (In Bulgarian)]. София: Наука и изкуство, 1981. [Dimitar Popov. Trakiyskata boginya Bendida. Sofia: Naukaizkustvo, 1981.]

**Roller, L. E.** 1983 – Lynn E. Roller. The Legend of Midas. – *Classical Antiquity*, Vol. 2, No. 2 (Oct., 1983), 299–313.

**Roller, L. E.** 1999 – Lynn E. Roller. In Search of God the Mother: the Cult of Anatolian Cybele. Berkeley – Los Angeles – London: University of California Press, 1999.

**Roller, L. E.** 2002 – Lynn E. Roller. The Phrygian Mother Goddess and her Thracian Connections. In: Thrace and the Aegean: Proceedings of the Eight International Congress of Thracology. Sofia – Yambol, 25–29 September 2000. Edited by Alexander N. Fol. Vol. II. Sofia: 2002, 683–694.

**Roller, L. E.** 2003 – Lynn E. Roller. The Mother Goddess Between Thrace and Phrygia. – In: Thracia. Vol. 15. In Honour of Alexander Fol’s 70<sup>th</sup> Anniversary. Sofia: Institute of Thracology – TANGRA TanNakRa Publishing House, 2003, 161–167.

**Rubio, G.** 2004 – Gonzalo Rubio. Philistine religion. – In: Jones, Lindsay (ed.). *Encyclopedia of religion*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., 7101–7105 < <http://www.academicroom.com/topics/philistin.html> >

**Ruppenstein, F.** 2015 – Ruppenstein, Florian. Did the terms ‘wanax’ and ‘lāwāgetās’ already exist before the emergence of the Mycenaean palatial polities? – *Göttinger Forum für Altertumswissenschaft*, 18 (2015), 91–107 < <http://gfa.gbv.de/dr.gfa.018.2015.a.05.pdf> >

**Sayce, A. H.** 1922 – Archibald H. Sayce. The decipherment of the Hittite hieroglyphic texts. – *Journal of The Royal Asiatic Society*, 54 (4), 1922, 537–572.

**Scobie, A.** 1977 – Alex Scobie. A Korean Midas Tale. – *Folklore*, Vol. 88, 1977, No. 1, 88–90.

**Shear, I. M.** 2004 – Ione Mylonas Shear. *Kingship in the Mycenaean World and Its Reflections in the Oral Tradition*. [Prehistory Monographs 13]. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: INSTAP Academic Press, 2004, xii + 233 p., 11 figs.

**Sowa, W.** 2007 – Wojciech Sowa. A Note to ‘Phrygian’ Words in Greek. – *Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia*, Vol. 12. Kraków, 2007, 153–170.

**Strobel, K.** 2008 – Karl Strobel. Die kulturelle und religiöse Entwicklung Altphrygiens I: Kontinuitäten – Brüche – Einflüsse. – In: *Neue Funde und Forschungen in Phrygien*. Hrsg. von Elmar Schwertheim und Engelbert Winter. [Asia Minor Studien 61]. Bonn, 2008, 123–142.

**Torshilov, D. O.** 1999 – Д. О. Торшилов. Античная мифография: Мифы и единство действия. С приложением аргументов Аристофана Византийского и “О реках” Лжеплутарха. Санкт-Петербург: Издательство “АЛТЕЙЯ”, 1999 [The antique mythography: The Myths and the oneness of action. With appendices of the Arguments of Aristophanes of Byzantium and of the “On the rivers” of Pseudo-Plutarch (In Russian)]. Санкт-Петербург: Издательство “АЛТЕЙЯ”, 1999.

**Trümpy, C.** 2004 – C. Trümpy. Die Thesmophoria, Brimo, Deo und das Anakoron: Beobachtungen zur Vorgeschichte des Demeterkults. – *Kernos*, 17, 2004, 13–42.

**Vassileva, M.** 1990 – М. Василева. Гора, бог и имя: о некоторых фрако-фригийских параллелях. – *Вестник древней истории*, 1990, № 3, 94–101 [The Mountain, the God and the Name: on some Thraco-Phrygian parallels. In: *Journal of Ancient History*, No. 3, 94–101 (In Russian)]. [M. Vasileva. Gora, bogiimja: o nekotoryh frako-frigijskih paralleljah. – *Vestnik drevnej istorii*, 1990, N 3, 94–101.]

**Vassileva, M.** 1997 – Maya Vassileva. King Midas: between the Balkans and Asia Minor. – *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne*, Vol. 23, 1997, No. 2, 9–20.

**Vassileva, M.** 2001 – Maya Vassileva. Further considerations on the cult of Kybele. – *Anatolica*, Vol. 51, December 2001, 51–64.

**Vassileva, M.** 2005 – Майя Василева. Цар Мидас между Европа и Азия. [The King Midas between Europe and Asia (In Bulgarian)]. София: Академично издателство „Марин Дринов“, 2005.

**Vlachos, G. C.** 1974 – Georges C. Vlachos. Les sociétés politiques homériques. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1974.

**Walcot, P.** 1967 – Peter Walcot. The divinity of the mycenaean king. – *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolia*, 1967, 2, 53–62.

**Willms, L.** 2010 – Lothar Willms. On the IE Etymology of Greek (w)anax. – *Glotta*, 86, 2011, 232–271.

**Witczak, K. T.** 1991–1992 – Krzysztof T. Witczak. Some remarks on the new Phrygian inscription No. 88. – *Lingua Posnaniensis*, 34, 1991–92, 157–162.

**Witczak, K. T.** 1992–1993 – Krzysztof T. Witczak. Two Bithynian Deities in the Old and New Phrygian Inscriptional Texts. – *Folia Orientalia*. Vol. 29, 1992–1993, 265–271.

**Woudhuizen, F. C.** 1993 – Fred C. Woudhuizen. Old Phrygian: Some Texts and Relations. – *Journal of Indo-European Studies*, 21, 1–25.

**Woudhuizen, F. C.** 2008–2009 – Fred C. Woudhuizen. Phrygian & Greek (Supplementum Epigraphicum Mediterraneum 33). – *Talanta*, XL–XLI (2008–2009), 181–217.

**Yordanov, S.** 2008 – Стефан Йорданов. Богинята на любовта в мегарона на властта: Наблюдения върху потестарно-политическата система на палеобалканските народи. – В: България, българите и Европа – мит, история, съвремие. Т. II. Научна конференция, 31 октомври 2007. Велико Търново: Унив. изд. „Св. св. Кирил и Методий“, 2008, 93–104. [The Goddess of Love in the Megaron of Power: Observations on the potestary-political system of the Paleo-Balkan Peoples. In: *Bulgaria, the Bulgarians and Europe – myth, history, modern times*. Vol. II. A Scientific Conference, 31 of October 2007, 93–104 (In Bulgarian) <[http://www.kroraina.com/st\\_iordanov/purthne.html](http://www.kroraina.com/st_iordanov/purthne.html)>]. [Stefan Jordanov. Boginyata na lyubovta v megarona na vlastta: Nablyudeniya varhu potestarno-politicheskata sistema na paleobalkanskite narodi. – V: Balgaria, balgarite i Evropa – mit, istoriya, savremie. T. II. Nauchna konferentsiya, 31 oktombri 2007. Veliko Tarnovo: Univ. izd. “Sv. sv. Kiril i Metodiy”, 2008, 93–104.]

**Yordanov, S.** 2016 – Stefan Yordanov. Potestary political cultures in change in times of change: Interactions in the Aegean region and the Eastern Mediterranean at the end of the Bronze Age and the beginning of the Iron Age. – *Palamedes. A Journal of Ancient History*, 11, 15–39.