NEW PHRYGIAN υψοδαν

ALEXANDER LUBOTSKY

1. New Phrygian (NPhr.) inscription No. 15 from Nacoleia was discovered and published for the first time by Ramsay (1887: 394). His text was based on two copies made by himself and a copy made by J.R.S. Sterrett. Almost twenty years later (1905: 114f.), Ramsay discussed this inscription again and presented some different readings, although he did not consult the stone in the meantime. Here are both versions of the text:

Ramsay 1887:  
ΞΕΥΝΗΤΑΝΕΙΣΑΥΨΟ  
ΔΑΝΙΠΟΤΥΣΣΣ[-]ΣΤΑΜ  
ΕΝΑΝΜΑΝΚΑΝΑΜΙ  
ΑΣΙΑΝΙΟΙΑΝΑΡΔΟΡΥΚΑ

Ramsay 1905:  
ΞΕΥΝΗ ΤΑΝΕΙΣ[Λ]Υ[Κ]Ο-  
ΔΑΝ ΠΙΡΟΥΣ ΣΣ[-]ΣΤΑΜ-  
ΕΝΑΝ ΜΑΝΚΑΝ ΑΜΙ-  
ΑΣΙΑΝΙΟΙ ΑΝΑΡ ΔΟΡΥΚ[Λ]

As to the readings, Ramsay remarked in the first article: “One of my copies has Μ for Ψ in l. 1. Only one letter or part of one is lost at the end of l. 3.” In the second publication, Ramsay had more doubts about the first line: “In l. 1 the second last symbol may possibly be Μ in ligature with Ο, or Ψ or imperfect Κ. Professor Sterrett and my copy of 1881 read Ψ; but my copy of 1884, which was made with extremest care, rejected Ψ and read <Μ in ligature with Ο>.” Why Ramsay opted for Κ in 1905 is unclear, but this reading was taken over by Calder (1911: 172f) and included in all later collections of NPhr. inscriptions. No drawings or photographs of this inscription have been published.

From Ramsay’s remarks we may conclude that the disputed second last letter of the first line looks like Ψ, but its vertical stroke stands not in the middle of the letter, but a little bit to the left. Perhaps Ramsay was reluctant to assume Ψ because it was the only occurrence of this letter in NPhr. texts. The reading Ψ is now confirmed by NPhr. inscription No. 116 published by Brixhe and Neumann in 1985. The first part of this inscription reads as follows (as given by the editors on p. 163; I have only corrected a printing error in the first line, where we must read ΟΣΟΣ instead of ΟΣ):
On the third letter of the second line the editors give the following comment (p. 164): “Une lettre triangulaire dont on aperçoit le sommet et le bas de la haste droite (doublée par un trait accidentel): Λ ou Δ.” If we read this letter as Δ and assume that the missing letter at the end of the preceding line is [υ], we get [υ]ψοδαν, the same word as in inscription 15.²

The initial υ- of this ψοδαν is surprising. In NPhr., /υ/ is generally represented by ου, so that we expect /upsodan/ to be written in NPhr. as *ουψοδαν. This spelling is theoretically possible in 116, where we have only /ψοδαν and one or two letters are missing at the end of the preceding line. In inscription 15, however, we must assume a graphic variant with υ- (cf. for this kind of variation μουρον vs. μυρα, σεμουν vs. σεμυν, etc.). Note that the digraph ου is not attested in this inscription, and υ is used instead (προτος, δορυκα[ ]).

2. In order to determine the function and meaning of (ο)ψοδαν, let us analyze both contexts in more detail. We first look at inscription No. 116, which has been treated in two publications. The editors of the inscription, Brixhe and Neumann (1985), discuss various possibilities of word division and interpretation with great caution, often without expressing their preference. Bajun and Orel (1988: 154ff), on the contrary, just present their analysis and translation of the inscription, without any discussion. One can find in the article many ingenious suggestions, but, in general, Bajun and Orel treat the material not without violence. The fragility of their analysis already follows from the rather incomprehensible translation they give on p. 157: “For Xeune he (sc. the husband) (has placed) the ... grave and this ... tomb and on the top of the monument fixes (her) reduced image. To this (image he gives) her name, of which wife Hecatea the husband Hermolaos”, etc. (translation from Russian mine).

In my opinion, some progress in elucidating the syntactic structure of the inscription can be made if we take the following considerations into account:

²Bajun and Orel (1988: 154) have already pointed to the possible identity of these words in 15 and 116, although they read in 15 ιτιξ λυσαδαν.
A. Inscription 116 is clearly an epitaph, where different parts of the grave are enumerated. We do not have many NPhr. epitaphs at our disposal, but at least one starts with a name in the dative, 15 ΞΕΥΝΗ, for which see below. It is probable that ΞΕΥΝΕ or ΞΕΥΝΕΙ is also a dative of this female name, for whom the grave has been made. An additional argument in favour of this interpretation can be found in φοιμανιας(ς) in line 5, which may mean 'the above-mentioned one' in the dat. or gen.sg. feminine. Brixhe and Neumann (1985: 169) take ΞΕΥΝΕ as nom.sg. and analyze the first words as ΞΕΥΝΕ ΙΟΣΟΣ ΚΕ 'Χευνε and Iosos', which seems less plausible because the only candidate for a verb is ρικτι in line 4, which stands in the 3sg., and there are hardly any possible datives for the name of the dedicatee. Moreover, it is by no means certain that ΞΕΥΝΕ can be a nominative. In 31, line 3 reads ΞΕΥΝΕΙΟΙΔΙΚΕΙΣΕΙΑΝ, and the interpretation ΞΕΥΝΕ ΟΙ ΑΔΙΚΕΙΣΕΙ ΑΝ, assumed by Brixhe and Neumann (ibid.), does not provide an easy analysis (note that Neumann 1986 reads ΞΕΥΝΕΙΟΙ (ε)ΔΙΚΕΣ Ε(Σ)ΑΝ 'für Xeuneos [hat er] diesen Stein / diese Stele gestellt'). Also 69 ΞΕΥΝΕ ΠΕΙΡ is unclear.

B. δετον is likely to be identical with 31 δετον (Brixhe – Neumann 1985: 170). The context of 31 (πουκρος μανισου ενεπαρκες δετον) suggests the translation 'Pukros, son of Manisos, inscribed d.' (on ενεπαρκες 'inscripsit' cf. Lejeune 1970: 68). Accordingly, δετον can mean either 'inscription' or 'monument'. If we assume with Brixhe and Neumann that this word is verbal adj. of the root *dʰeH₁- (*dʰet-), only the meaning 'monument' seems appropriate (cf. edaes 'placed, erected'). We know a few other neuters, which are substantivized adjectives in Phrygian, cf. κακουν 'something bad', μυρουν 'something foolish'. It is by no means surprising that Phrygians have two names for a monument, μανκα (probably 'a stele') and δετον (a generic name for a monument?). Considering the variety of different types of monuments, we can expect that there also were many names for them.

C. κνομιαν is a term for the grave proper. I disagree with Brixhe and Neumann (171) that "κνομιαν semble désigner le tombeau dans son ensemble (emplacement + monument)" because expressions ιος ιο σεμουν κνομιαι κακουν αδικετ αινι μανκα 'whoever brings harm to κνομιαν or to the stele' or κνομιαι ... αινι κορου 'to κνομιαν or to the place (= Gr. χώρος, cf. Brixhe 1983: 129)' would then be incomprehensible. The other argument of Brixhe and Neumann, viz. that "κνομιαν ..., quand il est associé à un autre terme, il figure toujours en première position" (ibid.) is also by no means compelling. The malediction formulae generally concern the grave and the monument on it, so that it is quite natural that κνομιαν is mentioned first. This point is important because these two authors further conclude that κνομιαν cannot be preceded by other names for parts of the grave (cf. for instance on p. 170: "Le second sens [= "monument" of δετον, AL] serait naturellement difficile à admettre ici, puisque le nom ou le groupe de noms désignant le tombeau apparaît plus loin").

D. In ακροδιαν Brixhe and Neumann recognized "accusatif d'un composé ΑΚΡΟ-ΔΜΑ, comparable au grec μεσό-δμη et désignant une partie du tombeau: "partie supérieure de...""
According to Neumann (1988: 22), "akrodma meint also "Oben – an der Spitze – Gebautes"." Since μεσόδημη indicates a part of the building, viz. "tie-beam", from where “a box amidships”, in inscriptions also “a shelf built between the floor of the gallery and the roof” (LSJ 1106), it seems conceivable that ακροδίμα is a term for the “roof” of the grave.3

E. The word-conjunction κε appears either after each member (Χ κε Υ κε: δεως κε ζεμελως κε), or after the second word only (ΧΥ κε: δεως ζεμελως κε) (Brixhe 1978: 1ff.). When more than two members are connected by κε, the only unambiguous way to indicate the relationship between the words is to put κε after each member. In the first four lines of 116 we find κε or κ' four times. Moreover, at the end of line 2 we read ταν σαυναμαν [..], followed by κνοιμαν in the next line. Due to its ending, σαυναμαν cannot be an adjective in acc.sg.n. belonging to κνοιμαν (pace Bajun – Orel 1988: 154). Rather, σαυναμαν is a term for one of the parts of the grave. This means that σαυναμαν must have been followed by [κε]. Brixhe and Neumann remark that “à la fin de la ligne II, on ne dispose apparemment pas des 2,5 cm nécessaires pour un ΚΕ” (p. 170), but as we do not really know the original measures of the stone, this is not a compelling argument.

These considerations lead us to the following analysis: ξένος(ι) is the name of the woman, to whom the grave is dedicated, followed by five parts of the grave or monument:

(ι)σος(ι) κε
δετον [(ο)υ]ψοδαν κε
ταν σαυναμαν [κε]
κνοιμαν κε
ακροδίμα κε

As (ο)υψοδαν cannot be acc.sg.n. of an adjective, it is not congruous with δετον (acc.sg.n.). Therefore, (ο)υψοδαν is likely to be an adverb, characterizing the monument. A probable meaning is 'above, on the top (scil. of the grave)' . ταν must be a demonstrative pronoun 'that' in acc.sg.f., which means that σαυναμα is feminine.

Theoretically, there is another possible analysis of these five parts. If we assume that κε stands after the first word of each syntactic member (cf. 33. αυτος κε ουα κ' εροκα = 36. αυτος κε ουα κ' εροκα 'and he himself and his progeny (?)'), the division would be different, viz.

(ι)σος(ι) κε δετον // [(ο)υ]ψοδαν κε ταν // σαυναμαν [κε], etc. This analysis is less probable, however. Firstly, (ι)σος(ι) can only be acc.sg.n. of the s-stems, which would indicate that δετον is an adjective and not a term for (a part of) the monument. Secondly, (ο)υψοδαν is then a part of

---

3 ακροδίμα (κε) is followed by λο/δημον, which may be an adjective belonging to it (acc.sg.n.). At the end of the third line there is enough place for an ι, so that the Phrygian word may also be read λο[ι]δημον. Etymologizing words with an unknown meaning is a hazardous business, but if λο[ι]δημον contains the suffix -imo-, connection with Gr. λοίςθος 'beam' seems possible (for Phr. -d- < *-sdh- cf. the Phr. ending of 3sg. middle imperative -do, -δου (lakedo, γεδου) < *-sdhδ, Gr. --σθω).
the grave or monument, which seems difficult to reconcile with the context of inscription 15 (see below).

What are these five parts? Three of them are more or less clear: δετον is probably the monument, κνουμαι is the grave proper, and ακροδιμαι is its upper part, the “roof”. Since σαυναμαι stands between δετον 'monument' and κνουμαι 'grave', it is likely that σαυναμαι is the term for the foundation, the pedestal of the monument. The Phrygian word is reminiscent of Hitt. šam(a)na- c. 'foundation, foundation-stone', šam(a)natar- n. 'foundation, supporting wall' and is probably a borrowing from an Antolian language. We are left with (ι)σσος, which can be analysed as acc.sg. of the neuter s-stems (cf. acc.sg. βεκος in 111 βας ιοι βεκος μεμερετ 'Bas will take his bread away'). The meaning and etymology of this word remain unclear to me.

The analysis of the rest of the inscription goes beyond the scope of this article.

3. The general syntactic structure of inscription 15 is rather transparent. Here, too, the first word is the female name ξευνη. The ending -η sometimes occurs instead of the usual dat.sg. ending of the consonant stems -ε(ι), cf. κνουμαι (114) vs. κνουμαι(ι) (passim), ατ τη (6, 39, 62, 65, 86, 114) vs. ατ τι(ε) (passim), so that it is probable that ξευνη is a dative of the dedicatee. The name is followed by a group, indicating the object in acc.sg. ταν ειξα υψοδαν προτος σι[.]σταμε(ν)αν μανκαν, and then (after unclear αμι/εσιαν) the subject, the name of the dedicator τοι αναφ δορυκα[νος ---] 'her husband Dorykanos'. As in inscription 116, υψοδαν belongs to the description of the monument (in this case μανκα 'stèle'), so that the function of an adverb 'above, high' seems appropriate. Notwithstanding the fact that ειξα, the reading of which is uncertain (see above, §1), and προτος remain obscure, the interpretation of υψοδαν as a part of the grave or monument, although possible in inscription 116, seems improbable here. For σι[.]σταμε(ν)αν we may assume σιεσταμε(ν)αν, middle perf. part. of the root στα- 'to erect'. The combination of μανκα with the root στα- is attested two more times in NPhr.: in inscription

---

4 For this name see Haas 1966: 106, who compares Δορυκανοι in MAMA I: 308. For τοι cf. 86, 111 βας τοι βεκος μεμερετ 'Bas will take his bread away'.

5 For προτος two explanations have been proposed. One explanation takes προτος as the predicate of the sentence with the meaning 'made, erected', cf. Meister 1909: 319, fn. 4 (3sg. sigm. aorist 'er gab hin, er weihte'), Haas 1966: 106 ('erbaute'). The obvious flaw of this analysis is the absence of the augment and the ending -ες, which are characteristic of the Phrygian aorist forms. According to the others, προτος is an adverb or a preverb. Ramsay (1905: 115) assumed an adverb 'in front', probably having Gr. προ in mind, Diakonoff and Neroznak (1985: 131) saw in προτος a preverb 'against', derived from *proti, whereas Bajun and Orel (1988: 140) considered it identical to Gr. Hom. προτι, Skt. prati. Connection with proti is improbable because in the Greek inscriptions of Phrygia we find πος/πος instead of προς/προς, which is to be explained by the fact that in Phrygian this adverb had the form πος (cf. Brixhe – Neumann 1985: 176, who point at πος-εκαςες in inscription 116). Moreover, the proposed meaning of this adverb does not suit this context: a monument does not stand in front or against something.

As a theoretical possibility, we can mention that if υψοδαν has the function of a preposition, προτος may be acc.pl. of the o-stems (*-ons > *-uns > -us), depending on υψοδαν.
31 ... μανκαν ιαν εσταες βρατερε ... 'the stele, which he erected for (his) brother' and probably in 9 μ<α>νκαν οπεσταμεναν (for the reading see Calder 1926: 26).

4. The analysis of the context of inscriptions 15 and 116 shows that (o)ψοδαν most probably is an adverb with the meaning 'above, on the top (scil. of the grave)'. As fas as its etymology is concerned, (o)ψοδαν can be connected with the Greek adverb υψόθε(ν) 'from' above' or rather *υψόθα. To be sure, Gr. *υψόθα is not attested, but this may be a matter of chance, since adverbs in -θα (like πρόσθα, ὀπισθα, etc.) are found in Arcadian, Thessalian, Asiatic Aeolian and the western dialects and often known only from inscriptions and grammatical treatises (cf. Lejeune 1939: 357). On the other hand, the opposition between ενθεν 'thence' and ενθα 'there, thither' shows that the Greek adverbs in -θεν had an ablative meaning, whereas those in -θα have a general locative meaning (ibid.: 386), a meaning which better suits the proposed function of Phr. ψοδαν. The etymology of the Greek suffix -θα is unclear, but if Lejeune is right that -θα reflects *-dʰη, -θα would regularly match NPhr. -δαν. Another possible explanation is to assume that Phr. -δαν is -δα (= Gr. -θα) + an additional -ν, an explanation which is generally applied to the Greek adverbs in -θεν, viz. -θε (PIE *-dᵉ) + -ν.

As fas as I know, no other forms in -δαν are attested in Phrygian. For the sake of completeness, we mention that δεδαν in NPhr. inscription 114 (Brixhe – Drew-Bear 1978) may represent an adverb in -δαν, but the context is too unclear for any conclusions. Here is the text of this inscription (for the segmentation of which cf. also Lubotsky 1989a: 82):

[10 letters]εδεν κακον αββε
[pet + 11 letters]ον μρος σας, ιος
[ca. 14 letters]εδαν τη τι τ[ε]
[τικμενο]ς ετυν.
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