



## The Golden Bowl: Thoughts on the New Sappho and its Asianic Background

The paper explores the relation between a set of poetic formulas in early Greek and Anatolian languages of the second and early first millennia having to do with the cosmography of the rising sun in macrocosm, and going up into bed in microcosm, with an eye to defending the reading and restoration ἔρωι δέπας εἰσομβάμεν(αι) in the editio princeps of the new Sappho. The Luvian word for “sky, heaven,” represented as a *bowl* in Hieroglyphic, is the likeliest source of the Greek word *depas*, Mycenaean *dipas*, in the second millennium, together with the associative semantics of *depas* and “heaven” evidenced in Hittite and Luvian texts in the second millennium, and in early Greek poetry in the first.

### 1. SUMMARY INTRODUCTION

Against a background of known Asianic-Greek contact in the Western Anatolian-Aegean interface I consider first the Homeric formulaic cosmography of Dawn, the bed of Tithonus, Okeanos and the rising Sun, and the seemingly innocuous verb GO with double preverbs UP INTO, εἰς-αννα-βαίνειν. Anatolian Hittite and Luvian religion and cosmology in the second millennium lack a Dawn figure but know two Suns, the Sun-god of Heaven who comes up from the sea (in a famous passage from Muwatalli's prayer) and the Sun-goddess of the Nether-

Delivered as the first Joshua and Verona Whatmough Lecture, Department of Linguistics, Harvard University, on April 19, 2006. An earlier version was presented at the University of California, Berkeley, on February 15, 2006. For unstinting support, encouragement, and suggestions as well as critical feedback and searching/scorching criticism on this paper I am deeply indebted to Albio Cassio, Anna Morpurgo Davies, Ana Galjanić, Mark Griffith, Michael Haslam, Joshua Katz, Stephanie Jamison, Craig Melchert, Sarah Morris, Hayden Pelliccia, Itamar Singer, and two anonymous readers. I cherish partisans and opponents alike. The title is Stephanie's; the rest is my responsibility.

world, the domain through which the Sun travels at night, administering justice and punishing false oath, to return to the east. These ideas recur in Homer, in “Orphic-Pythagorean” passages in Pindar *Ol.* 2 as well as in the famous invocation beginning Ζεῦ πάτερ . . . Ἡέλιός θ’ in *Il.* 3.276–280, which have particularly striking affinities with Luvian texts relating to the Sun-god <sup>d</sup>*Tiwaz* and the Sun-goddess of the Netherworld *tiyammassis* <sup>d</sup>*Tiwaz*. I then proceed to examine the formulaic behavior of a set of passages in seventh-, sixth-, and early fifth-century Greek poetry figuring the trajectories of Dawn or the Sun, and sharing remarkably similar diction. They include the deployment of the verb εἰς-ανα-βαίνειν GO UP INTO, and the sexual overtones of its Iliadic and Hesiodic objects λέχος “bed” and ὑπερώιον “women’s bedchamber.” These poetic fragments of Mimnermus, Stesichorus and Aeschylus are nearly all preserved uniquely in a single passage in Athenaeus (469c-470d) concerned with what will turn out to be the key word δέπας “cup, bowl”. These passages are formulaically, thematically, and mythographically in a very real sense the same: they all tell of the rising of the sun at dawn in the east, and his nightly journey back to the east in a vessel termed a δέπας.

The new Sappho papyrus,<sup>1</sup> a poem on aging, contains a four-line exemplum on the myth of Dawn and Tithonus, which furnishes a new and artistically innovative combination of all the formulaic elements we have surveyed. In the editio princeps the editors read ἔρωι δέπας εἰσομβάμεν(αι) “go up into the bowl for love/lust” in the critical spot, thus infusing the key word δέπας as object of GO UP INTO with the sexual overtones of the verb’s other objects λέχος and ὑπερώιον. The δέπας has become a love nest into which Dawn carries Tithonus. I argue that the editors’ reading of the controversial δέπας should be correct, and the objections raised to it by Martin West (2005) and others are not cogent. If this reading is correct, we may then wish to turn once again to Luvian Anatolia for illumination: the origin of the key word δέπας.

## 2. DAWN AND THE SUN, IN EAST AND WEST

Martin West in his monumental *East Face of Helicon* (1997) has amassed a great deal of evidence for what we may think of as the ideational diffusion from the “East” of much of Greek cosmography about the Sun. By the “East” West has in mind and primarily draws from the Sumero-Akkadian cultural sphere of Mesopotamia and its spread to Hurrian and the West Semitic cultures of the Levant. The channels for this diffusion, its geographic basis and its nature are largely left unspecified.

Can we be more specific? In particular can we point to any “singular details,” the touchstone of the comparative method? Areal diffusion, whether linguistic or cultural, is part of the purview of the comparative method, as I have argued

1. Gronevald and Daniel 2004b. I print the complete text below.

elsewhere. Areal, that is geographical diffusion presupposes contact, and it is appropriate to look first at areas where we know independently that cultural contacts took place from an early period: Hellas and Anatolia in the second millennium — which were contiguous over the long western coast of Asia Minor. Scholars have argued since the last decade of the last century for Western Anatolia as a *Sprachbund* or linguistic area on the basis of shared grammatical features between Anatolian and Greek like the East Ionic *-εσχε/ο-* imperfect, and the direction of diffusion is clearly from East to West.<sup>2</sup> The Anatolian dialects of the western coastal area are mostly “Luvoid,” that is varieties of Luvian or similar Anatolian dialects, as appears from the onomastic stock of historical figures of the region like Madduwattas and Piyamaradus, the Luvian affinity of Lycian, and other evidence. For these reasons I will look first to Luvian or Luvoid Anatolia for comparanda, supplementing that with central Anatolian Hittite where necessary.

In an important article Spencer 1995 calls attention to the archeological record of Bronze Age and Iron Age Lesbos, showing that the island “was very much an extension of the Anatolian cultural tradition both before, and even after, the arrival of the Aeolian Greeks” (272):

In the Early Iron Age the cultures of the hinterland to the east were just as accessible as they had been in the Bronze Age when Lesbos formed an outlying part of the Anatolian cultural lake. Various bodies of material from Early Iron Age Anatolia have shown that the flow of information, technology, material goods (and even groups of people) westwards to the Aegean from as far east as the Anatolian plateau and as far south as Northern Syria and Iran . . . did not end with the collapse of the Hittite empire in the Late Bronze Age. Furthermore, the route used for this communication was not simply the . . . sea route from southern Anatolia and the Levant, because archeological evidence indicates that corridors existed overland through Anatolia which remained open through the Late Bronze Age–Early Iron Age transition. . . .

289–90

West 1997: 174 discusses Homeric dawn formulae like “But when the early-born one appeared, rose-tinged Dawn,” comparing the recurring formula in *Gilgamesh* “At the first light of dawn (lit. upon something of dawn gleaming forth).”<sup>3</sup> But more detailed is the formula in *Il.* 19.1–2:

Ἡὼς μὲν κροκόπεπλος ἀπ’ Ὠκεανοῖο ῥόαν  
ὠρνυθ’, ἔν’ ἀθανάτοισι φάος φέροι ἥδ’ ἐβροτοῖσιν

Sa-ron-robed Dawn arose from the streams of Okeanos

2. Puhvel 1991 [morphology, ideology], Watkins 1998a [phonology, syntax], 1998b [ideology], and 2001 [morphology]

3. This recurrent formula is apparently unique to *Gilgamesh*: Tigay 1982: 9, 231. On dawn in Mesopotamian culture see Horowitz 1998.

to bring light to gods and mortals.

We find the crucial cosmographic detail that Dawn comes up from the waters of Ocean. The notion is not Mesopotamian, where the Sun comes up in the mountains. The persistence of this image as a set topos in Greek is seen half a millennium later in Theocritus 2.147–48, “Today, when the mares began to run toward heaven, bearing rosy-tinged Dawn from Ocean,” σάμερον, ἀνίκα πέρ τε ποτ’ ὠρανὸν ἔτραχον ἵπποι, Ἄω τὰν ῥοδόπαχυν ἀπ’ Ὠκεανοῖο φέροισαι.

This goddess Dawn in Homer shares her bed with her immortal but aging lover Tithonus, one of a series of Dawn’s abductees, as appears from the functional and formulaic interchangeability of *Il.* 19.1–2 with *Il.* 11.1–2 = *Od.* 5.1–2:

Ἦώς δ’ ἐκ λεχέων παρ’ ἀγαυοῦ Τιθωνοῖο  
ὤρνυθ’, ἵν’ ἀθανάτοισι φάως φέροι ἡδὲ βροτοῖσιν

Dawn arose from her bed from beside noble Tithonus  
to bring light to gods and mortals.

The formulaic equivalence shows that the myth of Tithonus was already a standard topos in the eighth century, and one integrated into the formulaic cosmography of Dawn and the rising Sun.

The Sun himself, not surprisingly, both rises out of Okeanos and sets into Okeanos:

Ἥελιος ...  
ἐξ ... βαθυρρόου Ὠκεανοῖο (-ρροο’ Ὠκ.)  
οὐρανὸν εἰσανιών

*Il.* 7.421–23

the Sun ...  
from deep-owing Okeanos  
going up into heaven,

and:

ἔν δ’ ἔπεσ’ Ὠκεανῶι λαμπρὸν φάος Ἥελιοιο

*Il.* 8.485

The bright light of the Sun fell into Okeanos.

Hesiod puts both in a single line:

Ἥελιος ...  
οὐρανὸν εἰσανιών οὐδ’ οὐρανόθεν καταβαίνων  
*Theog.* 760–61

The Sun ...  
going up into heaven, nor coming down from heaven.

In *Il.* 11.184 οὐρανόθεν καταβάς occupies the same hemistich as οὐρανὸν εἰσανιών. The same double preverb εἰς-ανα UP INTO with the verb GO appears

in both *Iliad* and *Theogony*, and we will find many recurrences in the Greek poetic texts to be discussed below. They will explicate the very specific overtones of this seemingly “innocent” verb of motion.

Now Anatolian religion and myth knows no goddess Dawn, the *\*h<sub>2</sub>ausos-* of Greek Ἥως, Latin *Aurora*, Indic *Uṣas*, and Avestan *Ušah-*, and the various derivatives in the Northern languages.<sup>4</sup> Hittite *kariwariwar*, “at dawn, early,” is just a temporal adverb, and no personification is found.

But Anatolian religion and cosmology knows several Suns, both male and female: Haas 1994: 377–81, and especially Singer 1996: 179–81 and 2002 *passim*. Originally in central Anatolia, the single autochthonous Hattic solar deity was the goddess Eštan, the Sun-goddess of Arinna, <sup>d</sup>UTU<sup>URU</sup> *Arinna*, later joined in Hittite by the Sun-god of Heaven, *nepisas* <sup>d</sup>UTU-*us*, the male *Istanus*, and the Sun-goddess of the Netherworld (“Earth,” with Singer) *taknās* <sup>d</sup>UTU-*us*, the female *Istanus*. The Netherworld is the domain through which the Sun passes at night to return to the east.

Now one “unique and enigmatic” passage (Singer) in an invocation to the Hittite Sun-god in Muwatalli’s Prayer captured the attention of Hittitologists already in the early days of the field: “You come up (*sarā uwasi*), Sun-god of Heaven (*nepisas* <sup>d</sup>UTU-*us*), from the sea (*arunaz*), and you take your stand (= *ssan . . . tiyasi*) in heaven (*nepisi*),” *sarā=kan uwasi nepisas* <sup>d</sup>UTU-*us arunaz nu=ssan nepisi tiyasi* (iii 13–15).<sup>5</sup> The cosmography is identical with that of the Homeric passages cited. Note the unusual syntax of the first Hittite clause, with the ablative *arunaz* “from the sea” right-dislocated around the vocative phrase colon for emphatic focus,<sup>6</sup> and the semantic and grammatical similarity of the compound verb *sarā uwa-*, COME UP, to εἰσαναβαίνειν.

An Old Hittite hymn to the Sun-goddess of the Netherworld preserved in a Middle Hittite tablet<sup>7</sup> speaks of “Ye servants of the Sun-goddess of the Netherworld, who regularly put her to sleep and invigorate her,” *taknās* <sup>d</sup>UTU-*uwās* ἸR.MEŠ-ŠU *sasnuskittaniy=an*<sup>8</sup> *tasnuskittaniy=an kuiēs*. The curious—and surely intentionally—rhyming imperfective verb forms are a metaphor for sunset and sunrise respectively.<sup>9</sup>

West 1997: 541–42 cites Pindar fr. 129, “for them the strength of the sun shines down there while it is night here,” τοῖσι λάμπει μὲν μένος ἀελίου τὰν

4. The alluring figure of *\*h<sub>2</sub>ausos-*, who “uncovers her breast as a dawn-cow her udder” (RV 1.92.4, of the goddess *Uṣas*), appears to be a later creation of already dialectal Indo-European, posterior to the separation of Anatolian and perhaps Tocharian. I return to this topic in a forthcoming paper entitled “The Milk of the Dawn Cows Revisited.”

5. See the discussion in Singer 1996: 179–81, who also notes the “Sun-god in the water” at KBo 5.2 ii 13, <sup>d</sup>UTU *uitēni*.

6. Compare the right-dislocation of the negations *oṽ* and *UL* (= *natta*) for emphatic focus in Pindar *Ol.* 7.48 and Hittite (*CTH* 404; 1B: KUB 12.34 +) cited in Watkins 2006: 329–30.

7. *CTH* 371: KBo 7.28 + KBo 8.92, Singer 2002: 21–24.

8. Read doubtless *sasnuskittaniy=an* for tab. <sup>o</sup>*skatteniy=an*.

9. Singer 2002: 27 n. 4.

ἐνθάδε νύκτα κάτω, together with Sumero-Akkadian parallels which “seem to presuppose the idea that the sun, after leaving the sky at sunset, passes through the underworld and performs the same functions of giving light and administering justice as in the upper world.” As we will see presently, the Anatolian and particularly Luvian parallels are much closer to hand.

These ideas, notably that of the nocturnal judgments of the Sun, also find their expression in the “Orphic-Pythagorean” description of the afterlife in Pindar *Ol.* 2.56 : the spirits of the dead pay the penalty, ποινὰς ἔτεισαν, for sins committed above in Zeus’ realm (Διός, \**diw-*) and a judge beneath the earth pronounces sentence, κατὰ γᾶς δικάζει τις. But the good enjoy the sun in equal nights and equal days (?). The Anatolian analogies of certain “Orphic” notions are well known.<sup>10</sup>

A famous passage in the *Iliad* provides further evidence for the vengeance of Sky-god and Sun-god on the dead who have sworn false oaths. It is the prayer of Agamemnon in *Il.* 3.276 ff., beginning Ζεῦ πάτερ . . . Ἡέλιός θ’ . . . and continuing with the invocation of “you rivers and you earth, and you who in the world below take vengeance (τίνοισθον) on the dead, whoever has sworn a false oath, be you witnesses and watch over the solemn oaths (ὄρκια πιστά).” The invocation recalls the litanies of deities in Mursili’s Plague Prayers and Muwatalli’s Prayer, like “male gods and female gods of the sky and the dark netherworld, sky (and) earth, clouds (and) winds, thunder (and) lightning . . .” (Muwatalli iii 9–11).

We have considered so far just Hittite evidence in North-Central Anatolia. Among the Luvians of south and west Anatolia the pair of solar deities was simply Sun-god, <sup>d</sup>*Tiwaz* (stem *Tiwad-*) = <sup>d</sup>UTU-*az/za*, with the epithet “father,” *tadis*, and the Sun-goddess of the Netherworld (“Earth”), *tiyammassis* <sup>d</sup>UTU-*za*.<sup>11</sup> Some scholars indeed have suggested that the Sun-goddess of the Netherworld originated in the Luvian-speaking area of Southern Anatolia and that the Old Hittite Sun-god of Heaven is to be equated with Luvian <sup>d</sup>*Tiwaz*, but this remains controversial.<sup>12</sup> Neu argued over thirty years ago (1974) that Old Hittite <sup>d</sup>*Sius-(s)ummi* “our *Sius*” is <sup>d</sup>UTU the Sun-god, and the exact cognate of Greek *Zeús* (*patér*) and Vedic *Dyáuṣ* (*pitár-*), etymologically the god of the bright sky. While <sup>d</sup>*Sius-(s)ummi* as <sup>d</sup>UTU is uncertain, the Luvian Sun-god <sup>d</sup>*Tiwaz* (\**diw-*) has the epithet *tadis* “father” just like the Greek Ζεὺς πατήρ and Vedic *dyauṣ pitá* (\**dyew-/diw-*).

The avenging Sun-god who punishes those who swear false oaths, which we saw in *Iliad* 3, has an exact match in Cuneiform Luvian *hirutallis* <sup>d</sup>UTU-*waz* (<sup>d</sup>*Tiwaza*), the “Sun-god of the oath” (*hīrūt-*), the “Sun-god by which one swears” (Melchert), like Ζεὺς ὄρκιος.<sup>13</sup> And the dual domains of the solar couple are

10. Bernabé and Jiménez San Cristóbal 2001, Watkins 1995: ch. 26, and Galjanić forthcoming.

11. See Hutter in Melchert 2003: 224–27.

12. Taracha 2000: 179<sup>62</sup> *apud* Melchert 2003: 21<sup>23</sup>.

13. Watkins 1993: 469. Luvian *hīrūt-allis* qua “of or pertaining to the oath” contains the same adjectival suffix as the substantivized <sup>LÚ</sup>*lapan-allis* “saltlick warden,” from “of or pertaining to a saltlick,” Watkins 1997. Compare the same relational suffixes in Ζεὺς ὄρκιος and Τελαμώνιος Αἴας.

clearly stated in the third Luvian ritual of the hierodule Kuwatalla, KUB 35.48 iii 19–23 (as restored from duplicates): “If he is living, the Sun-god will deliver him above; if he is dead, the Sun-goddess of the Netherworld will deliver him, the man of the spell, of the binding, of the evil \_\_\_\_\_, of the curse, of the perjury,” *mān=as hūitwalis sarriy=an* <sup>d</sup>UTU=*waza darauiddu mān=as ulantis a=an tiyammassis* <sup>d</sup>UTU=*waza darauiddu utnassin hishisassin taparuwassin tatariyammassin hirutassin EN-an*. These Anatolian and particularly Luvian divinities, their nature and attributes are thematically very close indeed to the Greek conceptions in the passages cited, as are the moieties of male-female, sky-earth, day-night, above-below, up-down to Greek ideology and the formulas which are their vehicle.

Since Anatolian knows no Dawn goddess, and late Indo-European *\*h<sub>2</sub>ausos-* does not regularly rise from the sea, it would seem reasonable to suggest that Greek Ἥως represents a syncretism of the relex of the late Indo-European female figure *\*h<sub>2</sub>ausos-* and certain aspects of the Western Anatolian solar couple, the Sun-god (of heaven) and the Sun-goddess of the Netherworld, notably the voyage of the female nocturnal Sun through the Netherworld back to the East.

There is a vast literature on the figure of Dawn, whether as Indo-European *\*h<sub>2</sub>ausos-* or Greek Ἥως and her various putative hypostases, which time and space prohibit pursuing further here.<sup>14</sup>

### 3. THE GODDESS GOES UP TO BED: GREEK εἰσαναβαίνειν

In the next section of this paper I wish to examine more closely the overtones of the verb εἰσαναβαίνειν GO UP INTO in its deployment. If the cosmological goal of this verb in Greek epic is heaven, οὐρανός, its more mundane goal is bed, λέχος, and speci cally the women’s bedchamber, ὑπερώϊον, accessed by a ladder, κλίμαξ. The subject of the verb, more frequently than not, is a woman, and the purpose of the action is almost always sex.

Mimnermus in the seventh century provides as simple and straightforward a formulation of the rising from sea to sky as that in the Hittite King Muwatalli’s Prayer:

ἐπὴν ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἥως  
Ὠκεανὸν προλιποῦσ’ οὐρανὸν εἰσαναβῆι  
12W. 3–4

When rosy- ngered Dawn  
has left Okeanos and gone up into the sky,

14. I am as usual indebted to Joshua Katz for providing me with most of this literature, and much critical discussion. See for example Nagy 1990, Janda 2000, and Katz 2000 for a variety of approaches. Particularly fruitful, I believe, would be Katz’s suggestions for exploring things like the Dawn-Dusk relation, Germanic *East-West*, IE *\*nok<sup>u</sup>t-* as “evening” rather than “night” (cf. Hittite *nanakkuszi* “gets dark”), and the Vedic dual dvandva *\*uśāsānāktā*, and *doṣā-(nākta-)* *uśās-* in the *Āprī* hymns.

where we have Dawn + epithet,<sup>15</sup> leaving Ocean, and the doubly preverbed verb εἰσαναβῆι + heaven. It is the same verb whose participle εἰσανιῶν we saw in *Il.* 7.421–23 and Hesiod *Theog.* 761 of the Sun going up from Okeanos into heaven. Yet in Homer and Hesiod the commonest object of the same verb εἰσαναβαίνειν “go up into” is λέχος “bed,” as well as high places like Ilios; Dawn (personified as a female) going up into the sky is entirely consistent with the verb. But there is more. With a single example of εἰσαναβαίνειν in the *Iliad* and none in the *Odyssey* we have no less than eleven in Hesiod, of which seven, perhaps eight, feature a female subject.<sup>16</sup> So also does the single Iliadic example, Agamemnon enumerating the prizes he will give Teucer: “either a tripod, or two horses with their chariot,”

ἥῃ γυναιχί ἢ κέν τοι ὁμόν λέχος εἰσαναβαίνοι  
*Il.* 8.291

or a woman who will go up into your bed.

In all the Homeric and Hesiodic examples the primarily sexual purpose of going up into bed is overt or implied. The same is implied in *Il.* 11.1–2 cited above, with the action in the reverse direction, Dawn rising from her bed from beside her lover Tithonus. And the same naturally is implied in the unique Iliadic example of the phrase ὑπερώιον εἰσαναβᾶσα (*Il.* 2.514) “having gone up to her bedchamber,” of the παρθένος αἰδοιή who bore Askalaphos and Ialmenos to Ares, who lay with her in secret. (The overtness of ὑπερώιον in the *Odyssey* is entirely different.) This is wholly consistent with the erotic glorification of the female divinity \**h<sub>2</sub>ausos*-everywhere in the late Indo-European world.

We find unexpected corroboration of the sexual overtones of the simple action GO UP INTO or ONTO in Greek art, in depictions of aspects of the wedding ritual in vase painting and sculpture. Edwards 1984, with its suggestive title “Aphrodite on a ladder,”<sup>17</sup> studies, documents, and illustrates a number of representations in painting and sculpture of a ladder, with a girl or Aphrodite ascending or descending, as symbol of the ascent of the bride on her wedding night to the thalamos, or bridal chamber, in the woman’s quarters on the second floor, and of her descent on the following morning for the Epaulia, or day-after-the-wedding gift-giving ceremony. The ladder is often discreetly in the background but its symbolic function is clear enough. As Edwards states (1984: 63), “The simplest meaning of the ladder is as a means of ascent or descent. . . . [I]n the *lebes gamikos* in the Athens National Museum . . . the presence of the ladder with its attendants,

15. I continue to translate these compounds as “rosy-” rather than “rose-,” following Schindler 1986: in old possessive compounds of this type, derived adjectives were blocked in Indo-European from being first members and their underlying noun functioned semantically as the adjective; similar “golden-” rather than “gold-” (χρυσό-).

16. Respectively male subject *Th.* 57, 508, *Fr.* 211.10; female subject *Th.* 939, *Fr.* 23(a).7, 25.35, 26.8, 129.21, 180.11, 193.12; uncertain *Fr.* 129.7.

17. I am indebted to Sarah Morris for the reference.



like the uncovered *lebes gamikos*, recalls the events of the previous night, when the then maiden ascended the ladder and her state in life was forever changed.”

He had noted earlier that ladders are the means of access to a beached ship (and, I might add, perhaps even to another “vessel” like a δέπας), and they are part of the siege scene in Greek as they were in Hittite art.<sup>18</sup> We learn from Aeschylus, *Septem* 466f. that the ladder’s rungs were called the “means-of-ascent,” ἀνὴρ δ’ ὀπίτης κλίμακος προσαμβάσεις/στείχει: a sort of kenning GOING-UP-ONTO with double preverb (so also Euripides, *Phoen.* 1173). And the act of descending a ladder (from the women’s quarters on the second story) is, not surprisingly, κατὰ τῆς κλίμακος καταβαίνουσα GOING DOWN the ladder (Lysias 1.9).

Pindar attests the word for “ladder” only twice in our attested corpus, both times in fragments, but both times in highly charged and significant contexts. Fr. 162 describes the overweening mountain-piling exploit of Otus and Ephialtes:

πιτνάντες θοὰν κλίμακ’ οὐρανὸν ἐς αἰπύν

Fr. 162

stretching a swift ladder to high heaven.

It may be thought of as a siege scene, but the goal of the ladder, as in Mimnermus and the other solar cosmologies to be surveyed, is οὐρανός.

Fr. 30, most of a strophe from his opening Hymn 1 to Zeus, describes the marriage of Themis and Zeus Savior in allusive and traditional language.

πρῶτον μὲν εὖβουλον Θέμιν οὐρανίαν  
χρυσέαισιν ἵπποις Ὀκεανοῦ παρὰ παγᾶν  
Μοῖραι ποτὶ κλίμακα σεμνὰν  
ἄγον Οὐλύμπου λιπαρὰν καθ’ ὁδόν  
σωτῆρος ἀρχαίαν ἄλοχον Διὸς ἔμμεν·  
ἃ δὲ τὰς χρυσάμπυκας ἀγλαοκάρ-  
πους τίκτεν ἀλαθέας Ὠρας

Fr. 30

First did the Fates lead wise-counseling, heavenly Themis  
on golden horses from the springs of Okeanos along a shining road  
to the holy ladder of Olympus  
to be the primordial wife of Zeus Savior;  
and she bore the golden-lleted  
bearers of splendid fruit, the ever-true Horai.

I have modified William Race’s translation in the light of the role of the “ladder” just discussed, and the “Indo-European touch” of active ἄγειν as the verb to “lead” the bride to the husband’s house, as it is the verb to “lead” water in irrigation (ὕδωρ

18. Compare the jacket illustration to Bryce 2002. Richard Thomas calls my attention to Menander, *Perikeiromene* 483–84, with its *double entendre* involving both siege and sex, together with the verb ἀναβαίνειν. Mark Griffith notes that Nagler 1974: passim in his discussion of *kredemnon* “has a similar point to make about the analogy of woman/city, veil/battlements, etc.”

ἄγειν) in most early Indo-European languages (cf. Watkins 2006). “First” is an Indo-European theme,<sup>19</sup> and the phrase “from the springs of Okeanos” is bound to recall the solar trajectory, the rising of Dawn from the sea. Synchronically these splendid verses press Pindar’s art to its limits: the homoeoteleuta οὐρανίαν, παγαῖν, σεμνὸν, the almost rhyming παγαῖν : ἄγον modulating to ὀδόν, ἔμμεν are the strokes of a master. And the whole is framed by the double epithets of Themis in the first line, and the triple epithets of the Horai in the last, in their ascending abstractness. When Pindar does that he is being indexical, calling attention to his message.

Greek customary domestic architecture already before Homer thus provided for women’s quarters on an upper floor or loft, termed ὑπερώϊον, and accessed by ascending or descending a ladder, the κλίμαξ. The cultural associations of both Greek terms with sex are natural enough, and documentable both in literature and in art.


It seems to have gone unnoticed that this cultural feature of Greek domestic architecture is shared with Anatolia, where it is documented at a comparable period, the reign of Katuwas in Carchemish, tenth or early ninth century BCE. Craig Melchert calls my attention to the Hieroglyphic Luvian royal inscription:

za-zi-pa-wa/i (DOMUS)ha-ra/i-sà-tá-ni-zi  
 1á-na-ya BONUS-sa-mi-i FEMINA-ti-i  
 DOMUS+SCALA(-)tá-wa/i-ni-zi i-zi-i-ha  
 KARKAMIŠ A 11a § 19

and these upper floors  
 for Anas my beloved wife  
 as TAWANI-apartments I made (tr. Hawkins).

Since the world’s cutest writing system is the world’s least reader-friendly in transliteration I give a phonetic version:

zanzi=pa=wa (DOMUS)haristaninzi  
 Anaya wasami wanati  
 DOMUS+SCALA(-)tawaninzi iziha

Here (DOMUS.SUPER)haristaninzi (as in parallel passages) denoted the upper floor or loft (also used for storage of grain in a Hittite text) and DOMUS+SCALA (-)tawaninzi the women’s quarters located there, reached by a ladder which is overt in the sign .

19. See Watkins 1995: 375, 508 for examples from several traditions, and recall the story of Protesilaos.

See Hawkins' commentary *CHLI* 99; he specifically compares Homeric ὑπερώϊον.<sup>20</sup> If the sexual innuendoes of ὑπερώϊον and κλίμαξ are not surprisingly absent in Anatolia, the association of DOMUS+SCALA(-)*tawani*- with (conventional) conjugal happiness worthy of monumental commemoration is certainly there.

#### 4. GREEK DAWN AND THE NEW SAPPHO.

In the fourth part of my paper I wish to examine more closely the formulaic behavior of a set of passages in seventh, sixth, and early fifth-century Greek poetry regarding the cosmographic trajectories of Dawn or the Sun, and sharing remarkably similar diction. These will then culminate in the new Sappho.

Dawn (Eos) as the rising sun “goes up into the sky,” as we have seen, (Mimnermus 12W) but once there she seems to be simply the male sun Helios, like the Hittite Sun-god of heaven who “comes up from the sea.” Athenaeus<sup>21</sup> cites the Mimnermus passage as “hinting at (αἰνισσόμενος) the hollow of the drinking cup (ποτήριον), when he calls the δέπας an εὐνή ‘bed.’” The passage reads in full:

Ἡέλιος μὲν γὰρ ἔλαχεν πόνον ἥματα πάντα,  
οὐδέ ποτ' ἀμπαυσίς γίνεται οὐδεμία  
ἵπποισιν τε καὶ αὐτῷ, ἐπὴν ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἥως  
Ὀκεανὸν προλιποῦσ' οὐρανὸν εἰσαναβῆι.  
τὸν μὲν γὰρ διὰ κύμα φέρει πολυήρατος εὐνή,  
κοίλῃ, Ἡφαίστου χερσὶν ἐληλαμένη,  
χρυσοῦ τιμήεντος, ὑπόπτερος, ἄκρον ἐφ' ὕδωρ  
εὐδονθ' ἀρπαλέως χώρου ἄφ' Ἑσπερίδων  
γαῖαν ἐς Αἰθιοπῶν, ἵνα δὴ θοὸν ἄρμα καὶ ἵπποι  
ἑστᾶσ', ὄφρ' Ἥως ἡριγένεια μόλῃ·  
ἐνθ' ἐπέβη ἑτέρων ὀχέων Ὑπερίονος υἱός.

12W

For the Sun's lot is toil every day and there is never any respite for him and his horses, when rosy-tinged Dawn has left Okeanos and gone up into the sky. A lovely bed, hollow,<sup>22</sup> forged by the hands of Hephaistos, of precious gold and winged, carries him sleeping pleasurably, over the wave on the water's surface from the place of the Hesperides to the land of the Ethiopians, where his swift chariot and horses stand until early-born Dawn comes. There the son of Hyperion mounts his other vehicle.

20. If Hier.Luv. *tawani*- is complete it could conceivably contain the same element as Hitt. *tawan-annas*, the title of the Hittite queen, if the second element of the latter is “mother.” But this is speculative.

21. 470a, where the topic is words for drinking vessels, especially δέπας.

22. I have preferred Meineke's correction κοίλῃ (κοίλῃ *codd.*) to Kaibel and West's ποικίλῃ.

In the same passage<sup>23</sup> Athenaeus cites for δέπας a fragment of Stesichorus' *Garuoneis* with a variant of the same two-preverb compound we have discussed above. I give the first four lines as emended (principally Barrett and West):

τᾶμος δ' Ὑπεριωνίδα ἴς  
 δέπας ἐσκατέβα <παγ>χρύσεον ὄ-  
 φρα δι' Ὀκεανοῖο περάσαις  
 ἀφίκοιθ' ἱερᾶς ποτὶ βένθεα νυ-  
 κτὸς ἐρεμνᾶς

S17 = I85 *PMGF*

And then the strength of Hyperion's son went down into the cup of solid gold, to cross over Okeanos and reach the depths of holy dark night . . .

Here we find the first overt mention of the δέπας as conveyance of the sun across Okeanos, though it was implicit in Mimnermus a generation earlier. The passage in the *Garuoneis* continued with the actions of Heracles who had borrowed the δέπας for his own transportation.

Not surprisingly εἰσκαταβαίνω and εἰσαναβαίνω are treated as metrically identical in the epic hexameter corpus, occupying the adonic clausula, just as are οὐρανὸν εἰσανιών and οὐρανόθεν καταβάς at line initial, as noted above. The choice of either is contextually determined, and belongs to the plane of "parole" rather than "langue." We may retain that formulaically δέπας εἰς-ανα/καταβαίνειν, λέχος εἰς-ανα-βαίνειν, ὑπερώιον εἰς-ανα-βαίνειν, and οὐρανὸν εἰς-ανα-βαίνειν are all commutational variants; each noun can be substituted for the other.

The Stesichorus passage has many verbal echoes in a fragment of Aeschylus' *Daughters of the Sun (Heliades)* also cited by Athenaeus for the word δέπας:

ἐνθ' ἐπὶ δυσμαῖς  
 ἴσου† πατρὸς Ἥφαιστοτυχῆς  
 δέπας, ἐν τῷ διαβάλλει  
 πολὺν οἷδατόεντα  
 †φέρει δρόμου πόρον ουθεις†  
 μελανίππου προφυγῶν  
 ἱερᾶς νυκτὸς ἀμολγόν.

F69 *TrGF*, Radt.

Where, in the west, is the bowl wrought by Hephaestus, the bowl of your father, speeding wherein he crosses the passageway of many swellings . . . seeing the milky gloom of black-horsed holy night.

Though not quoted by Athenaeus, Aeschylus mentions the same δέπας as used by Herakles in his tenth labor of stealing the cattle of Geryon in a fragment of

23. 469c-470d, styled "ein ganzes Nest direkter Zitate," Dräger 1995: 70.

the *Children of Herakles* (*Heracleidae*), of which I cite the first four lines. These two are the only instances of the word δέπας in our attested corpus of Aeschylus:

ἐκείθεν ὄρμενος  
ὀρθόκερως βοῦς ἤλασεν  
ἀπ' ἐσχάτων γαίης, Ὀκεανὸν περάσας  
ἐν δέπαϊ χρυσηλάτῳ

F74 *TrGF*, Radt.

starting thence he drove the straight-horned cattle  
from the ends of the earth, having crossed Okeanos  
in a bowl of beaten gold. . . .

This episode contains echoes of the *Garuoneis* passage of Stesichorus (δέπας . . . <παγ>χρύσειον, δι' Ὀκεανοῖο περάσαις) as it does of the new Sappho (δέπας [?], εἰς ἐσχατὰ γᾶς), to which we now turn. PKöln Inv. Nr. 21351 + 21376 has been ably edited by Gronevald and Daniel (2004a, 2004b), with the important critical discussion by West (2005).

I give below the complete 12-line text of Sappho's poem, previously known in part as 58 Voigt, with West's conjectures for the missing four to six syllables in the first four lines. It is the mythological exemplum of the last four lines that interests us here. I give the controversial line 10 (third from end) as printed by the original editors, including the emendation of εἰσανβάμεν(αι) to εἰσομβάμεν(αι) for dialect reasons (the Lesbian preverb is ὀν-, not ἄν(α)) The translation is my modification of West's.

Ἵμμες πεδὰ Μοῖσαν ἰοκ[ό]λῳν κάλα δῶρα, παῖδες,  
σπουδάσδετε καὶ τὰ μὲν φιλάοιδαν λιγύραν χελύνην·  
ἔμοι δ' ἄπαλον πρὶν ποτ' ἐόντα χροὰ γῆρας ἦδη  
ἐπέλλαβε, λεῦκαι δ' ἐγείνοντο τρίχες ἐκ μελαίναν·  
5 βάρυς δέ μ' ὁ [θ]ῦμος πεπότηται, γόνα δ' οὐ φέροισι  
τὰ δὴ ποτα λαΐψῃρ' ἔον ὄρχησθ' ἴσα νεβρίοισι.  
τὰ μὲν στεναχίσδω θαμέως· ἀλλὰ τί κεμ ποείην·  
ἀγῆραον ἄνθρωπον ἔοντ' οὐ δύνατον γένεσθαι.  
καὶ γάρ ποτα Τίθωνον ἔφραντο βροδόπαχυν Αὔων  
10 ἔρωι δέπας εἰς(ομ)βάμεν' εἰς ἐσχατὰ γᾶς φέροισα[ν]  
ἔοντα [κ]ἄλον καὶ νέον, ἀλλ' αὐτὸν ὕμῳς ἔμαρψε  
χρόνῳ πόλιος γῆρας, ἔχοντ' ἀθανάταν ἄχοιτιν.

Hasten you after the fair gifts of the violet-bosomed Muses, girls,  
and the clear-voiced lyre that loves song;  
but my once tender flesh old age now  
has seized, my hair grown white from black;  
my heart weighs heavy, my knees do not support me,  
that once were nimble for the dance as little fawns.  
These things I often lament; but what can I do?  
To be ageless, and human, is not a possibility.

For once, they said, rosy-armed Dawn for love  
 went up into the bowl, carrying Tithonus to the ends  
 of the earth, and he fair and young, but nonetheless  
 in time grey old age caught him, having an immortal wife withal.

Now West finds ἔρωι δέπας εἰσομβάμεν' of line 10 "quite unsatisfactory," for alleged thematic, mythographic, lexical, and poetic reasons. Yet it is hard to resist this new mythology in the Tithonus tale and its verbal expression just like Stesichorus' δέπας ἐσκατέβα and Mimnermus' οὐρανὸν εἰσαναβῆ, εἰσαναβαίνω and εἰσκαταβαίνω are formulaically identical, as we have seen. And for Dawn to "go up into the bowl for love/lust,"<sup>24</sup> ἔρωι δέπας εἰσομβάμεν(αι)—as would seem quite appropriate after an abduction—is *pace* West immediately comparable to the sexually directed epic λέχος εἰσαναβαίνειν, ὑπερώιον εἰσαναβαίνειν, and might well have appealed to Sappho: the δέπας has become a love nest into which Dawn carries off Tithonus, bearing him to the ends of the earth.

West argues for reading ἔρωι φ..αθειςαν βάμεν', with a participle—he translates "love-smitten"—which obviates the need to emend the preverb to Lesbian εἰσομβάμεν'. A further argument for West's solution is the absence of assimilation sandhi in the papyrus (-ανβ-) which might speak against the close constituency we would expect from preverb + verb, and have in e.g. τὰ]μ φιλάουδαν, πόλιος γῆρας (but not in λιγύραν χελύνην), or with enclitic in τί κεμ ποεῖην. One might also argue from the absence of citation of the Sappho in Athenaeus on δέπας that no mention of δέπας existed there; but this argument from silence is invalidated by the fact that Athenaeus does not cite the δέπας in Aeschylus' *Children of Heracles* either. Yet the main problem with the participle solution is that neither West nor anyone else—I discussed this with Michael Haslam—can come up with the right Greek verb. Are we sure that it exists?<sup>25</sup>

At this point, perhaps, given the authority of Martin West, Michael Haslam, and Richard Janko, "prudence" might advise retaining the role of Tithonus but discarding δέπας εἰσομβάμεν' of the new Sappho from the set of thematically and verbal-formulaically interrelated passages, of which it seems the very capstone. But I don't think so. And I still maintain that δέπας εἰς-ανα/κατα-βαίνειν, λέχος εἰς-ανα-βαίνειν, ὑπερώιον εἰς-ανα-βαίνειν and οὐρανὸν εἰς-ανα-βαίνειν are formulaically commutational variants, and they cannot be discarded.



It is clear that all the Greek passages we have cited are thematically and mythographically in a very real sense the same: with a variety of confusing inconsistencies and uncertainties (how do the Sun's chariot and horses get back to

24. On ἔρωι see Gronevald and Daniel 2004b: 2f.

25. Most recently Richard Janko (2005, in the last issue of the TLS for that year) suggested another restoration of the damaged wording in line 10: ἔρωι λαλάγεισαν βάμεν' "literally, 'murmuring (with love).'" While I am not competent to judge the papyrology I find "murmuring (with love)" an unlikely equivalent of a verb glossed in LSJ and the translators and lexica of Pindar (*O.* 2.95–97, 9.40) as "chirp, prattle, babble," and an unattering and inept description of Dawn, despite the putative references to Tithonus' ultimate fate.

the east, and the δέπας back to the west?) they tell of the rising of the sun at dawn in the east and the nightly journey of the sun back from west to east in a vessel termed a δέπας. Dawn is a principal and Tithonus an optional actant. Whether Sappho really figured the mounting of the love-nest bowl (δέπας) or not—I believe she did—other passages make clear the central image of going up into or down into a δέπας, an action which is formulaically equivalent to going up into the Sky, or up into bed or bedroom for love-making. If in an uncertain but possible reading in a newly discovered papyrus of a great poet, we find indications of a new artistic combination of all these formulas, motifs, and overtones, “prudence” might indicate that we accept it.

##### 5. CONCLUSION: THE ANATOLIAN CONTEXTS OF EARLY GREEK POETRY

Let us now look once more across the water to Anatolia for the remainder of this paper. The Hieroglyphic Luvian sign for “sky,” CAELUM, is  with variant  notably at Yazılıkaya. Its phonetic reading is *tipas-* [di:bas?], beside the Cuneiform Luvian form *tappas-* [dapas?]. The two go back to IE *\*nébhes-/nebhes-* respectively. The first shows *\*ē* > Luvian *i*, while the second shows *\*éb* > *abb/app* by Čop’s law, with the initial nasal irregularly developing into an oral stop, probably voiced originally on general phonetic grounds, a preservation of the feature of voicing of the *\*n*. Craig Melchert (p.c.) informs me that Norbert Oettinger (e-mail of 10/15/05) has suggested that in view of the *-p-* of alphabetic Greek δέπας the Cuneiform Luvian *tappas* is as likely a source of either Greek form (Myc. *di-pa* or Alphabetic δέπας) as the Hieroglyphic *tipas*, since Luvian lacks a vowel *e*. Note also that Luvian *a* is rendered as Greek <ε> in first millennium onomastics in Western and Southern Anatolia: cf. *Apasas* = Ἐφεσσός.

The phonetic similarity to Greek δέπας (already Myc. *di-pa*, du. *di-pa-e*) together with the iconicity of the pictorial representation did not escape the attention of Hittitologists and Hellenists alike; Chantraine *DELG* s.v. (1968) says simply “perhaps borrowed from Luvian” with a reference to Laroche 1960: 96.<sup>26</sup>

Melchert 2002: 299–300 (a reference I owe to Joshua Katz) cites Hawkins 1993 for “a new Hieroglyphic Luvian inscription on a silver bowl, where the inscribed object is referred to as *zi/a CAELUM-pi* ‘this *\*tapi*.’” Hawkins properly compares the formal relationship of *\*tapi-* and (DUG)*tapi-sana*, the name of a vessel, probably a bowl, attested in Hittite ritual contexts.” Melchert concludes that “it seems more likely that ... a kind of bowl *\*tapi*, probably of non-Indo-European origin, was spelled with a ‘rebus-spelling’ CAELUM-*pi*, based on the

26. It is clear that whatever the phonetic realization of the initial <t> in Cuneiform Luvian in the second millennium or Hieroglyphic Luvian in the first millennium, the Mycenaean Greeks of the second millennium perceived it as [d-], which persisted unchanged into Classical Greek.

associations between the notion of ‘bowl’ and the hieroglyphic sign for ‘heaven, sky,’ as claimed by Bossert, which seem real enough.”

If CAELUM-*pi* is to be read *\*tapi-* (or *\*dapi*) and clearly meant “bowl,” whatever the origin of the word, the associations between a *\*dapi-* “bowl” and *dibas* or *dapas* “heaven, sky” could also rest on phonetic and iconic similarity.

I am grateful to Itamar Singer for reminding me of Relief 28/29 of the Hauptkammer (Chamber A) of the rock sanctuary of Yazılıkaya. The rock sanctuary of Yazılıkaya is a holy place: the Alamo of the Hittites. Relief 28/29 depicts two upright bulls or bull-men standing on the earth (hieroglyph TERRA, Laroche 201, q.v.) and supporting on their upraised human arms the sky (hieroglyph CAELUM, Laroche 182, variant), as a great starry bowl.<sup>27</sup>

The bull-men standing on earth and holding up heaven are focally central, and the group attests a “momentous artistic change” (Alexander 1986: 58–60) from the group of figures 34–40, which “floats in space . . . with their feet dangling above the lower frame.” In frgs. 25–33, “the sculptor [Alexander identifies him as ‘the Yazılıkaya master’] has labeled the frames ‘heaven’ and ‘earth,’ cutting into the lower one to make very specific the idea conveyed by the hieroglyph.” The feet of gods and bull-men alike press on the surface of “earth,” the ground level; what is cut out below for the sign is the chthonic netherworld. Note that the same sign (Laroche 201) itself is a component of Laroche 202 (DEUS) VIA + TERRA the “divine earth-road” whose constituent signs correspond one-for-one with cuneiform (DINGIR)KASKAL.KUR, the underground watercourse, natural or artificial, which is a cultic entrance to the netherworld, as in the SÜDBURG monument itself.<sup>28</sup>

In 1996 (reprinted 2005) Hawkins published another inscribed silver bowl, (ANKARA, seen by Laroche), likewise beginning *zi/a-wa/i-ti* CAELUM-*pi* “this bowl” and continuing “*dedicated* for himself . . .” and adding the remarkable dating phrase “when Tudhaliya Labarna *smote* (*hu-la-i(a)-ta*, from Hittite? [JDH]) the land of Tarwiza—it in that year he made” (trans. Hawkins). The toponym is probably to be identified with Hittite KUR URU*ta-ra-(ú)-i-ša*, attested only in the Middle Hittite Annals of Tudhaliya I/II (great-grandfather of Suppiluliumas I) in a list of places destroyed on his Assuwa campaign; identification of the toponym with the city name Troy was suggested long ago, but remains *sub iudice*. It was suggested finally by Hawkins (cf. also Bryce 1998: 136), that the bowl and its appellation *\*dapi-* belong to the time of Tudhaliyas I/II (ruled ca. 1400), the time of the Hittite defeat of the Assuwa (Aswa) coalition in Western Anatolia, and the doubtless concomitant arrival both of the word *dipa* and the names *Aswiyo*s (*A-si-wi-jo*) and *Potnia Aswiya* into Ahhiyawa, the Mycenaean world. This dating

27. See the illustration from Humann’s 1882 drawing in Bittel-Naumann-Otto 1941 (repr. 1967) p. 61 (the site has weathered a good deal).

28. See Hawkins 1995: 44–45, with n. 143 on the “chthonic sense” of Hier. TERRA.



must likewise remain *sub iudice*, since the epigraphic form of the signs appears—as discussed by Hawkins—at variance with so early a date (Middle Hittite), de Anna Morpurgo (p.c.).

King Tudhaliyas I/II also dedicated to the Storm God on this occasion, as booty from the Assuwa campaign, the bronze longsword discovered in 1991, of likely Western Anatolian/Aegean production. It bears a cuneiform inscription in Akkadian, beginning with the dating formula “When Tudhaliya the Great King destroyed the land of Assuwa” (*i-nu-ma Tu-ut-ḫa-li-ya LUGAL GAL KUR<sup>URU</sup> A-aš-šu-wa ú-ḫal-liq*). The dating phrase on the sword is stylistically virtually identical to that of the hieroglyphs on the bowl “When Tudhaliya Labarna smote the land of Tarwiza.” Inscribed objects are very rare in ancient Anatolia, as Hawkins stated, and Tudhaliyas clearly wished to commemorate his important achievement, the first “manly deed” of his reign; the identical dating phrase to that of the sword appears in Hittite in his later *Annals*. As Hawkins rightly insisted, “The selection of the defeat of Tarwiza for use as a dating formula gives it a similar prominence . . . and it implies greater importance for Cuneiform Taru(w)isa than might otherwise be inferred from the latter’s sole attestation as merely one of a number of defeated Assuwa countries.” Perhaps we do have a glimpse of a fifteenth-century Trojan War.

That one of the two inscribed objects is a sword said to be of western Anatolian/Aegean provenance (cf. Mycenaean *pa-ka-na* “longswords,” \*σφάγαννα, σφάγαννα to σφάζω [Chantraine]) and the other is a bowl called \**dapi-* (cf. Mycenaean *dipa*, Hier. Luwian *dipas*, Cun. *dappas*) is surely striking. This bowl may be compared with the hieroglyph CAELUM, and for that matter with the δέπας transporting Herakles on the Douros vase in the Vatican. They are very similar.

The conjunction of word and picture remains—the notion of the sky as “great inverted bowl” is widespread, whether inverted or not—and a Luvoid \**dapas-* or \**dibas-* remains the likeliest source of the Greek name for the artifact in the second millennium.<sup>29</sup> One may be permitted to wonder whether there might have been some further Anatolian influence on Greek poetic culture involving this word and its associations either in the Bronze Age at the time of its initial borrowing into Mycenaean Greek, or in later, sub-Mycenaean or “Dark Age” times.

Consider the following. We have seen the Greek verb phrase οὐρανὸν εἰσανιῶν in Homer, οὐρανὸν εἰσαναβῆι in Mimnermus. We may note what amounts semantically to the same verb phrase in Hieroglyphic Luvian in an inscription from Karkamiš on the upper Euphrates, ca. 800 :

á-ma-za á-ta<sub>5</sub>-ma-za . . .



(DEUS) TONITRUS-hu-za-sa (DEUS) SOL-wa/i-za-sa-ha

29. So explicitly Katz 2001: 219–20 and Melchert 2002: 299 n. 9. I have no explanation for the discrepancy in shape between the Hieroglyphic Luvian sign CAELUM and the Mycenaean Greek ideogram for *di-pa*.

(“CAELUM”)ti-pa-si “PES<sub>2</sub>”(-)hi-nu-wa/i-ta  
(KARKAMIŠ A6 § 3)

my name . . .  
the Storm God Tarhunzas and the Sun God Tiwazas  
caused to *pass* to heaven (translation Hawkins.)

aman-za adiman-za . . .  
Tarhunzas Tiwazas=ha  
tipasi PES<sub>2</sub>(-)hinuwanta

The 3pl. verb is probably incomplete; the full reading is not known, but it is a causative in *-nu-* from a verb of motion. The word “heaven” in the dative *tipasi* is preceded by the determiner  CAELUM. It thus has the semantics of οὐρανός but the graphic form of δέπας. Surely it is no coincidence that the Western Anatolian borrowing Myc. *dipa* /δέπας has the phonetic form of Anatolian *tipas-/tappas-* but the semantics of its icon .



The topos in KARKAMIŠ A6 recalls *Od.* 9.20, καὶ μευ κλέος οὐρανὸν ἵκει, and for name-fame Greek ὀνομάκλυτος and Tocharian A *ñom-klyu* “fame.” It is in itself a topos readily intelligible in either culture, Anatolian or Greek: the Sun-god Tiwaz made my name reach up to heaven (*tipasi*) /my (Odysseus’) fame reaches up to heaven (οὐρανόν). The striking coincidence of syntax, semantics, and visual image in the Greek and Hieroglyphic Luvian passages, I believe, point clearly and unequivocally to Greco-Western Anatolian Luvian contact, and cultural transmission from east to west.

The cultural transmission of a lexeme, that is, a borrowing, can and does explain how a word for “bowl” or “cup” (δέπας) can come from a word for “sky” or “heaven” in Western Anatolian. But it is the cultural transmission of the associative semantics of that lexeme, via the shared formulas which are its vehicle, which alone can explain the curious fact that lexeme δέπας is found precisely in a single locus of solar mythology and cosmography in Greek poetry of the eighth, seventh, sixth, and early fifth centuries. As I suggested over twenty years ago,<sup>30</sup> it is the cultural transmission of shared formulas from one of the same two cultures to the other, Luvian to Greek, which can explain the formula φίλιος αἰπεινή from Cuneiform Luvian *alati* . . . *Wilusati*, “from steep Wilusa.”

Schematically and thematically, then, my demonstration rests on the shared formulas as displayed below:

{	Ἡὼς		ἄπ' Ὠκεανοῖο ῥοάων ὥρνυθ'
	Ἡὼς	οὐρανὸν εἰσαναβῆι	Ὠκεανὸν προλιποῦσ'
{	Ἡέλιος	οὐρανὸν εἰσανιών	ἔξ Ὠκεανοῖο
	Ἡέλιος	οὐρανὸθεν καταβαίνων	
	(Ζεὺς)	οὐρανὸθεν καταβάς	

30. Watkins 1986.

{	Ἡέλιος	δέπας εἰσκατέβα	
	Aṽων	(ἔρωι) δεπὰς εἰσοιβάμεν'	
{	(γυνή)	(for sex) λέχος εἰσαναβαῖνοι	
	(παρθένος)	(for sex) ὑπερώιον εἰσαναβάσσα	
	FEMINA-ti-i	DOMUS<SUPER>	DOMUS+SCALA
{	(παρθένος)	(for sex) (κλίμαξ) (ἄνω)	
	ἀνὴρ δ' ὀπίλτης	κλίμακος προσαμβάσεις	στείχει
	πιτνάντες	κλίμακ' οὐρανὸν ἔς αἰπύν	
{	Ἡὼς	ἐκ λεχέων (from sex, παρὰ Τιθωνοῖο) ὥρνυθ'	
	(γυνή)	(from sex) (κλίμαξ) καταβαίνουσα	
	Θέμιν οὐρανίαν Ὀκεανοῦ	παρὰ παγᾶν ποτὶ κλίμακα σεμνὰν ἄγον	
{	sarā=kan uwasi nepisas	<sup>d</sup> UTUarunaz nu=ssan	nepisi tiyasi
		(DEUS) SOL	(CAELUM)tipasi PES <sub>2</sub> -hinuwata
	. . . . .		
	. . . . .		CAELUM-pi (*dapi-)
	. . . . .		

University of California, Los Angeles  
 cwatkins@humnet.ucla.edu

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexander, R. L. 1986. *The Sculpture and Sculptors of Yazılıkaya*. Newark.
- Allen, A. 1993. *The Fragments of Mimnermus. Texts and Commentary*. Stuttgart.
- Bernabé, A., and A. I. Jiménez San Cristóbal. 2001. *Instrucciones para el Más Allá*. Madrid.
- Bittel, K., R. Naumann, and H. Otto. 1941. Repr. 1967. *Yazılıkaya*. WDOG 61.
- Bryce, T. 1998. *The Kingdom of the Hittites*. Oxford.
- . 2002. *Life and Society in the Hittite World*. Oxford.
- Dräger, P. 1995. *Stylistische Untersuchungen zu Pherekydes von Athen*. Stuttgart.
- Edwards, C. M. 1984. "Aphrodite on a Ladder." *Hesperia* 53: 59–72.
- Galjanić, A. Forthcoming. "Three and Then Some. Typology of Invocation and Enumeration in the Orphic Hymns and their Near Eastern Predecessors." Proceedings of the Conference "Orpheus and Orphism. New Perspectives," Palma de Mallorca, Feb. 2005.
- Gronevald, M., and R. Daniel. 2004a. "Ein neuer Sappho-Papyrus." *ZPE* 147: 1–8.
- . 2004b. "Nachtrag zum neuen Sappho-Papyrus." *ZPE* 149: 1–4.
- Haas, V. 1994. *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*. Leiden.
- Hawkins, J. D. 1993. "A Bowl Epigraph of the Official Taprammi." In M. Mellink, E. Parada, and T. Özgüç, eds., *Aspects of Art and Iconography: Anatolia and its Neighbors. Studies in Honor of Nimet Özgüç*, 715–17. Ankara.
- . 1995. *The Hieroglyphic Inscription of the Sacred Pool Complex at Hattusa (SÜDBURG)*. *StBoT*, Beiheft 3. Wiesbaden.
- . 1996. "A Hieroglyphic Luvian Inscription on a Silver Bowl in the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations, Ankara." *Anadolu Medeniyetleri Müzesi*, 1996 Yılı. Ankara.



West, M. L. 1997. *The East Face of Helicon. Western Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth*. Oxford.

———. 2005. “The New Sappho.” *ZPE* 151: 1–9.