Old Phrygian *bevdos* ‘statue, image’, Greek 
\(\beta\varepsilon\upsilon\delta\oslash\) ‘woman’s dress’
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The rare Greek word \(\beta\varepsilon\upsilon\delta\oslash\) ‘sumptuous woman’s dress’ is a borrowing from Old Phrygian *bevdos* ‘statue, image (of a goddess)’, which goes back to PIE *bheudh-os-* ‘perception’.

The Old Phrygian Germanos inscription (B-01) is written on a rock immediately beneath a niche which most probably served for a statue of Kybele. Brixhe and Lejeune (1984: 64) give the first two lines as follows:

1. s[-]bev[-]osadi[---]
2. k\(\acute{a}\)v\(\acute{a}\)rmoyo[-]imroyedaesetovesniyo[---]

About the second letter of the first line Brixhe and Lejeune say: "un trou rond suivi d’une haste verticale: lequel de ces deux éléments (\(\acute{o}\) ? \(\acute{i}\)?) est accidentel?" Considering the position of the letters, \(i\) seems certain (\(o\) would be too close to the preceding \(s\); a ligature \(oi\), proposed by Orel 1997: 138, is less likely). About the sixth letter they write: "barre transversale non évidente ni sur l’estampage ni sur les photographies: a ou d?" Since the combination \(ao\) is unknown in Old Phrygian inscriptions, we must decide for \(d\) (cf. Lubotsky 1993: 96, fn. 4, Bajun and Orel 1988: 186, Orel 1997: 138). The end of line 1 is unreadable.

As to the second line, I have argued (Lubotsky 1993: 93) that the "traces d’une lettre non identifiable" between k\(\acute{a}\)v\(\acute{a}\)rmoyo and imroy are accidental. The same is true for the final letter of the line ("absence de traces certaines"). Further, the empty spaces between k\(\acute{a}\)v\(\acute{a}\)rmoyo and imroy, on the one hand, and on both sides of edaes, on the other, must be taken seriously (ibidem, p. 94). This means that the distances indicated word boundaries. We thus arrive at the following divisions: s\(\varepsilon\)bevdosadi[---] k\(\acute{a}\)v\(\acute{a}\)rmoyo imroy edaes etovesniyo.

The beginning of the inscription is reminiscent of M-01b.
which is usually analysed as ‘Baba (+ epithets) has made this keneman’, *si* being acc.sg. neuter of the demonstrative pronoun. Old Phrygian inscriptions often start with an object in the accusative, e.g. M-04 akinanogavan : tiyes / modrovanak : avara, Vezirhan sint imenan kaliya titedat ---, W-01 materan : areyastin / bonok : akenanogavos / vrekun : tedatoy (cf. for the reading order of this inscription Lubotsky 1988), so that it is likely that *sibedos* must be analysed *si + bevos*, *bevos* thus being acc.sg.n. of an s-stem.

Orel (1997: 139f.) takes *bevos* to be a proper name in the nominative. He refers to Zgusta (1984: 121), who mentions Phrygian place names like Παλαιὸν Βεῦδος, Βεῦδον Οἶκος. Zgusta further connects the gloss found at EM 195.52, viz. *βεῦδος* ... *ἀγαλμα* (at Hermione) ‘statue of a god’ and writes: “es kann sich um eine phrygische Glosse handeln, und das *ἀγαλμα* konnte das Bild einer Gottheit sein”. I would add that Gr. *βεῦδος* n. ‘sumptuous woman’s dress’ (Sappho, Call., etc.) might be the same word. Greek may have borrowed this word from Phrygian in the meaning ‘statue of a goddess’, but since these statues presumably were lavishly adorned and dressed, *βεῦδος* was used in the narrower meaning of a specific woman’s dress. Pfeiffer (1965: 14) writes in his comment to a Callimachos’ passage είν τὸ Πάρω κάλλη τε καὶ αἴόλα βεῦδε ἔχουσαι (Aetia I, Fr. 7 11): "vestes purpura tinctae grammaticis et κάλλη et βεῦδα erant; in Call. prob. β. significant χεῖνα longum et κ. ἱμάτιον, quibus Gratiae in anaglypho Thassico vestitae sunt" ("according to the grammarians, both κάλλη and βεῦδα were purple clothes; in Callimachos, βεῦδα probably refer to a long tunic and κάλλη to an outer garment which the Graces on a Thassos relief were wearing"). He also mentions Hesychius’ gloss *βεῦδος*’ στέμμα τι καὶ ἱμάτιον γυναικείον (βεῦδος = garland and a woman’s outer garment). The meaning στέμμα ‘wreath, garland’ may also point to the adornment of a statue.

In view of syntactic considerations, mentioned above, it is much more probable that OPhr. *bevos* is not a name, but the word for the statue (of a goddess). As already surmised by Orel (1997: 140), this word is derived from IE *bʰeu-ūdʰ-‘to perceive’. I take it as a regular s-stem *bʰeu-ūdʰ-os* (cf. Gr. ἀ-πεῦθ-ής
'ignorant', Av. baoðah- n. ‘perception’). The original meaning of this formation must have been ‘perception, idea’, which seems to be a suitable term for the image of a god or a goddess.
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