

# Aithiopes

By R. S. P. BEEKES, Leiden

Quis enim Aethiopus ante quam  
cerneret credidit?

Plinius *Nat. Hist.* 7.1.6

1. The name Αἰθίοπες was explained in antiquity as '(with) burnt faces' and this interpretation is still found in all handbooks.<sup>1</sup> I have found doubts only in Mehler 1965 s.v. (who states *missch(ien)* 'perhaps'), and by Stephanie West 1985 ad α 22, who states that there is no reason to doubt this interpretation. I think there is every reason to doubt it, and I shall try to prove that it is wrong. I have always wondered why the traditional interpretation has never been questioned or refuted (cf. Beekes 1969, 194).

All elements are problematic: αἶθ-, the -ι- and -οπ-, which I shall discuss in succession.

2. One question must be considered beforehand. *Myc. aitijoqo/e* /*Aithiok<sup>w</sup>os*, -ei/ shows that the form had a labiovelar. This would exactly fit the old etymology. However, it does not prove that it is correct, or that the form must be Indo-European, for Kuiper 1968 pointed out that the substratum language of Greek had labiovelars as well. Quite clear is *Myc. qasireu* /*g<sup>w</sup>asileus*/, Gr. βασιλεύς, and *Myc. qeto* πίθος. Yet another example is *atoroqo* ἄνθρωπος; in this case the substratum origin is not generally accepted; I shall make some comments on it in the next section. And, as far as Mycenaean is concerned,

---

<sup>1</sup>) Another name which is still given a Greek etymology is Atlas. It is interpreted as \*sm̥- 'one' and τλᾶ 'carry'. The only objection I have seen is in LFGRE s.v., where it is remarked that the verb means 'to endure' etc. in Greek; but as the original meaning was 'to carry' the objection may not be decisive. What meaning the etymology would give is usually not stated. Solmsen (1909, 24) thought: "der allein, aus eigener Kraft trägt". I find this meaning bizarre. (The Oxford Classical Dictionary interprets 'very enduring'.) In classical Greek ἅ- < \*sm̥- means 'one (together)', used in bahuvrihi's, as in ἅλοχος. For the development of this element see Frisk and Chantraine s.v. ἅ-; it never means 'one alone'. The etymology would be nearly impossible, if Atlas was originally a mountain, as is mostly stated; but Lesky (1950) rejects this. Atlas is the name of a very ancient, no doubt pre-Greek figure (Lesky compares the Kumarbi-myth) and a Greek or Indo-European name is not to be expected.

*qisipee*, dual of ξίφος, must be mentioned. Mycenaean also has *Moqoso*, Μόφος (note that here the labio-velar is represented by *p* in Greek as opposed to the *k* in ξίφος), and *teqade* if this is /Thēg<sup>w</sup>ans-de/, Θῆβαι. Further *asoq-ijo*, *-ikija*, if these are forms derived from Ἄσωπος (Ruijgh 1967, 168). I will argue that *aitijoqo/e* must be added to the list. Kuiper further pointed to instances where a velar interchanges with a labial, as θαλυκρός, θαλυσσόμενος : ἐθάλυσα, θάλπω; πάρνωψ : κόρνωψ, Πύδνα : Κύδνα etc. One may add ἵκα : ἴπα '(wood-) worm' ("obscur", connection with ἵασθαι is improbable, as it means "accabler", plûtôt que 'nuir à", Chantraine Dict. s.v. ἴζ). Further I refer to Furnée 1972, 388 for more material. I think that Θεσσαλοί/Θετταλοί - (Boeot.) Φετταλοί - (Thess.) Πετθαλοί should be added.

There can be no doubt, then, that the pre-Greek substratum language had labiovelars. It should be noted that their development is not identical to that of the Indo-European labiovelars in Greek. Note πίθος, ξίφος and the variation between velars and labials. The explanation of both facts is a matter which I will not go into.

2.1. ἄνθρωπος. Kuiper argued (1956) that this word is non-IE. The first reason, of course, is that there is no good etymology. I will briefly note the more recent explanations which have been proposed.

Otrębski (1967) connects the word with θεράπων. He is unclear and unconvincing about ἄν-. This could be solved along Kuiper's lines (below) if one takes θεράπων as non-IE (but see Chantraine against Frisk). But then Kuiper's proposal is preferable.

Hamp (1968) assumed (I simplify his reconstructed forms) that in *\*h<sub>2</sub>n(d)r-h<sub>3</sub>k<sup>w</sup>-*, of which the first part is the stem of ἀνῆρ, the laryngeal aspirated the dental (which is itself epenthetic). But in Greek laryngeals did not aspirate (the positive evidence is too meagre and there is decisive negative evidence, as in πλατύς), and even in Sanskrit an intervening *-r-* prohibited aspiration.

Ruijgh's suggestion (1970, 312) that the first element is cognate with ἄνθραξ 'charcoal' and that it means 'aux yeux noires comme le charbon' does not convince. It is hard to imagine how such a word could have come to mean 'man' in general. His comparison with French *poilu* 'hairy' > 'soldier' is inadequate as it precisely designates a *limited* group of people which is indeed - roughly - characterized by the adjective as distinguished from most other people.

Szemerényi (1971, 655 f.) suggests an analysis "1) *\*andr-hōk<sup>w</sup>o-* or even 2) *\*ant-hrōk<sup>w</sup>o-*" but he does not identify any of these elements.

Thus far, then, no convincing etymology has been found. It is improbable that it contains  $-\omega\pi-$  ‘face’, for ‘x-faced’ would rather indicate a certain group of men than ‘man’ in general; cf. Αἰθίοπες if it meant ‘Burnt-Faces’; and compare ‘Pale-Faces’. PIE had no suffix  $-op-$  or  $-ok^w-$ . Therefore, the structure of the word, if it is not a compound or a derived noun, is quite un-IE:  $*h_2nd^hrōk^w-$  is the only possibility I see.

Kuiper’s comparison (1956) with δρώψ which is glossed as ἄνθρωπος remains the best approach. However, the reliability of the gloss has been doubted, and Kuiper himself admitted that the definition given by Clemens Alexandrinus (Strom. 5.8.47 f.) “is certainly no strong support for any etymology to be based on this word.” (Kuiper nevertheless considers the word non-IE “since it is unlikely that any acceptable Indo-European etymology can be given . . . , and since words for ‘man’ are not seldom of foreign origin”.) I think that the case for δρώψ is not that bad. There are two more sources for the word, given in the Thesaurus, which have not been mentioned in this context.

First there is a comment by Porphyrius on the word. It is found in a manuscript in Oxford cited by Bentley in his *Epistula ad Millium* (Ryce 1836, 303). Both Clemens and Porphyrius comment upon a series of probable nonce-forms containing all the letters of the Greek alphabet: κναζζβι χθυπτης φλεγμω δρωψ. Clemens has φλεγμο(ς) δρωψ, but the comment by Porphyrius makes it clear that the ‘text’ had δρωψ and that this was explained with δρώψ, which therefore entered the text (wrongly). Porphyrius says: ὁ δὲ δρωψ ὄψον . . . Ἐχει δὲ καὶ ἕτερον ἑρμηνείαν οὕτως . . . δρωψ δὲ ἄνθρωπος· δρωῖνες γὰρ οἱ ἄνθρωποι λέγονται. This shows that the original version had δρωψ, but that one also tried to explain this word by adducing δρώψ, which means that δρώψ really existed. Also the fact that the plural is given, which is understandable for a word meaning ‘man’, suggests that this was the more often occurring form, and therefore a real word.

Secondly, there is a treatise on Greek dialects, called the *Grammaticus Meermannianus*, so called after its Dutch owner Meerman (Schaefer 1881, 2, 662).<sup>2</sup> Here we find the following note: [The Aeolians] περισπῶσιν ὡς ἐπίπαν τὰ μονοσύλλαβα ὀνόματα· ῥῶζ, τρῶζ, δρῶψ, χρουῖς, ῥουῖς, θρουῖς, βοῖς, χνουῖς, νοῖς, χῆν, Ζεῦς [read Zeῦς]. The phenomenon, of course, is well known: the Aeolic barytonesis.

<sup>2</sup>) The manuscript is now in Berlin (Phillips 1595), as Professor J.P. Gumbert informs me. The manuscript is dated to the XVth or XVIth century; nothing is known about its author.

This implies that the Aeolians knew a word δρωψ. As the other words are all unproblematic, there is no reason to doubt the reality of our word.

Thus both passages testify to the existence of a word δρωψ, so that we need not be too sceptical.

Kuiper assumed that ἄνθρωπος is a form with a prothetic vowel and prenasalization. For the combination he pointed to ἀνθηδών, ἀνθηγήνη beside τενθηδών, τενθηγήνη and θρωναξ (words for 'wasp'). A similar complex is κύνωψ, ἀκύνωψ, ἀγχύνωψ, plants of the family *Plantago*. Further we find ἄγγουρος beside γουρος, a kind of cake. And ἄγγουρα· ῥάξ, σταφύλη H. beside NGr. ἀγουρίδα 'unripe grape'; Frisk s.v. And again βρύττος/βρύσσοσ 'Art Meerigel' beside ἄμβρυτοι· εἶδος ἐχίων θαλασσίων (Furnée 1972, 287 A1). Though some of these forms could be explained away as assimilation or dissimilations, or as due to the general instability of the words for insects etc., the principles involved are well-established (Kuiper 1956, Furnée 1972, 267–291, 368–377). Thus ἄνθρωπος must be connected with δρωψ and is a pre-Greek word.

3. *The root αἶθ-*. There are many words with this root, and we will have to study their meaning. Some do not, in my view, belong with the verb αἶθω.

3.1. αἶθυια (Od.) is a bird. Boisacq already qualified the etymology ('brown, fire-colour') as "non convaincant". One can only fully agree with Szemerényi (1964, 207): "the usual derivation from αἶθω 'burn' can only be regarded as an unjustifiable attempt to explain with the help of the next best Greek word the name of a bird whose very identity is unknown; need one point out that it is much more likely to be a borrowing from a substratum language?" (Note that αἶθων is an epic epithet of big animals. It is improbable that such a term was used as the name of a bird. We shall conclude below that there is no certain evidence for a meaning '(red-)brown' for words with αἶθ-.)

3.2. αἶθουσα 'portico' is interpreted by Frisk as 'die glühende', 'wo die Sonne glüht'. Chantraine is apparently not convinced by this explanation: the word designates "un portique extérieur, où l'on pouvait originellement faire du feu, ce qui semblerait rendre mieux compte du terme que la notion qu'il était exposé au soleil." In LFGRE it is simply called 'Feuerstätte'. The word would mean, then, 'the burning one', which does not seem a very probable designation for a portico. However, in Homer the verb always has middle forms; only the participle occurs, viz. αἰθόμενος (αἶθων is not a participle). The interpretation

(as a participle) ‘the burning one’ is therefore doubtful. Furnée 1972, 197 points out that Herodian (2, 919) gives the form with double -σσ-, which makes a participle impossible. (LSJ suggest \*αἰθοῦσσα, but it is not clear from what noun it would be derived.) Furnée also points out that the suffix -ουσα occurs in pre-Greek nouns: ἄγχουσα/ἔ-, κάδουσα, νήθουσα, all plants. The gloss αἰδῶσσα H. would confirm non-IE origin for the word (Latte considers the word as corrupt, but one can always say that of a gloss when one does not like it). Like Szemerényi above I would say: need one point out that it is much more likely that this is a technical building term borrowed from a substratum language, like so many others as μέγαρον, θάλαμος etc.

3.3. αἶθων is used of metals and animals (λέων, ἵπποι, αἰετός, βόες); Αἶθων is the name of a horse (and the name Odysseus uses before he makes himself known). If one considers this, it is evident that one meaning fits all occurrences: ‘radiant, shining’. That this fits the metals is evident, but I do not agree with LSJ who say that it is for animals “prob. of colour, ‘red-brown, tawny’ since ‘sleek, shining’ or ‘fiery, fierce’ do not suit all cases.” It suits animals well, if their pelt is meant. It is well known that a well-kept horse, or a cow, has a shining pelt. Everyone who has a dog knows that a shining pelt is a sign of good health. There is no reason to resort to colour: it misses the point of the epithet, which stresses the visible health and strength of the animal.

The meaning also fits κεραυνός, for which LSJ make a separate category, and also for men: what is meant is the radiant strength of a man.

3.4. αἶθωψ is used with χαλκῶ and οἶνον (and καπνόν in κ 152). Here the same meaning fits as was assumed for αἶθων. (For καπνός the shining sparks of fire carried in the smoke must be meant.) It is generally admitted that αἶθων and αἶθωψ had the same meaning.

3.5. αἰθός, rare and first found in the Vth century, is the only word for which a meaning ‘black’ seems attested. In Ar. Th. 247 a slave says, after his back has been singed, αἰθός γεγένημαι. One might think of a meaning ‘glowing, burning’, however. Pindar uses the word of a shield, where it must be ‘shining’. Hom. πάναιθος does not imply the existence of single αἰθός; and it means ‘shining’ (of helmets, Ξ 372).

3.6. αἰθάλη, αἶθαλος ‘soot’ (Hom. αἰθαλόεις ‘sooty’) is the only word which with certainty means something like ‘sooty, black’, but this meaning is restricted to the forms with -αλ-.

3.7. Other forms with αἶθ- have a suffix *-r-*. All forms have the basic meaning 'bright'. (ἰθαρός 'cheerful, glad' and 'pure' fits in without problem; I see no reason for Chantraine's doubt. That a word which is formally deviant develops a specific meaning, is what one would expect. See also section 4. on the word.). I make a few remarks.

3.8. αἰθήρ. I agree with Szemerényi (1971, 656) that, because of the many *r*-derivatives, αἰθήρ is not a late artificial creation after ἄήρ, as Meillet suggested. (On ἄήρ see Kiparsky 1967, 625 f. and Peters 1980, 33 f.) The word means 'clear, bright sky'. The same meaning is found in αἰθρηγενής, epithet of Boreas, 'born in the clear sky (over Thrace)'.

3.9. αἶθρος is interpreted by Deroy (1948, 334) as 'warmth'. However, this suggestion is a mere guess. The only support adduced is the connection with αἶθω. The meaning 'cold' is given by ancient commentators. Hoekstra (1984, 219 ad ξ 318) adduces decisive arguments for 'cold(ness)'.

3.10. We have seen that there is no evidence in the older derivatives of a meaning 'fire-coloured, red-brown' or 'black, burnt', with the possible exception of αἰθός, which is late and rare. There are only two meanings found: 'burn, burning, fire, firewood, soot' etc. and 'bright, clear, shining'.

One might consider the possibility that we have to assume two different roots for the two meanings. Note that Frisk makes a separate entry for the *r*-forms s.v. αἰθήρ beside αἶθω. Of course, fire may be bright, but it is not the same thing. The related languages all point to an original meaning 'to kindle, to burn', so that 'be bright' is not the original meaning. (Pokorny's, p. 11, NSW. *id* "eine helle Karpfenart" and NHG dial. *aitel* are too uncertain; OE *īdel*, *ītal* 'idle' do not belong here.) A development from 'burn' to 'shining, bright, clear', with the association of 'cold', seems difficult. (The ancient gloss on αἰθήρ: ἀπὸ τοῦ αἶθεσθαι· ἐστὶ γὰρ πυρώδης is mere phantasy.) I see no etymology for a root *\*h<sub>2</sub>eid<sup>h</sup>-* 'bright'.

4. *The -i-*. About the difficulty of the *-i-* Chantraine notes: "avec un ι diversement expliquée." In fact there is not much diversity. Schwyzler 448 thought of a "wirkliches Kompositions-*i*", but the forms which he adduces are unreliable. The only explanation that remains is that of a Caland-*i*. Thus Risch (1974, 218), who also seems to have some doubt: "vermutlich auch Αἰθί-οπες." Mrs Bader (1975, 22) lists a whole series of alleged Caland forms from our root: αἰθήρ, αἶθρα; αἶθων; αἰθάλ-η; αἶθω-σσω; αἶθος, -αιθής. However, this evidence is not reliable. Caland's system comprises in the first place *u-*, *ro-*, and *lo-*

adjectives, and Greek has none of them; “αἰθήρ, αἴθρα ... beweisen kein \*αἰθρός”, as Schwyzer (448) remarked; an adjective with -αλο- is not the same as a *lo*-adjective; the verb has the suffix -ύσσω (Chantraine, Dict.). An *s*-stem neuter seems to belong to the Caland system, but here this form is first found in Apollonius Rhodius, so that it cannot be used as evidence for a PIE system; and an adjective in -αιθής is unknown to me. Thus, in fact there is no evidence at all in Greek for (forms of) a Caland system. And *if* there were a Caland form in -*i* beside an adjective in -*ro*-, this adjective would probably have meant ‘bright’ like all *r*-forms in Greek (see above 3.7–3.9).

Peters (1980, 79) thinks the *ro*-form is found in ἰθαρός ‘cheerful, glad; pure’, and refers to Skt. *vīdhra-* ‘clean, clear’, supposed to be \**vi-idhra-*, and Ossetic *ird id.* which may continue Iranian \**vidra-* or \**idra-*. None of the Indo-Iranian forms is very certain, and it is far from evident that they have the root with a meaning ‘bright’ etc. As to the Greek word, again I think that it is not certain that an adjective in -αρο- belongs to the Caland system, as did the *ro*-adjectives. But even if the whole group would be correctly interpreted, it would at best prove a PIE form \*(*H*)*id<sup>h</sup>ro-* ‘clean, clear’, which is irrelevant to the supposed αἴθι- ‘burnt, black’. (Note that Chantraine (Dict.) separated ἰθαρός from αἴθω because of its deviant meaning.)

Thus, I conclude that there is no evidence in favour of a Caland form αἴθι-, and that the Greek evidence tells against it, as it would rather mean ‘bright’ etc. than ‘burn’.

It should finally be noted that it is not very likely that αἴθ(ι-) from the root ‘to burn’ would mean ‘burnt’ rather than ‘burning’. This is clearly also Ruijgh’s view, who translates Αἰθίωση as ‘aux yeux brûlants’ (1967, 316).

## 5. The question of -οπ-.

5.1. *The words with -ωπ- and -οπ-.* There always have been some doubts about the use and meaning of -οπ-, suffix or second element of a compound. The question must be seen in connection with -ωπ-. Recently, Risch 1974, 171 (§ 63b) stated that many of the words with -ο/ωπ(ο)- are certainly, and others probably compounds of ὠπ-/ὀπ- ‘eye’. Thus, he makes no distinction between -ωπ- and -οπ-. I think we should keep the two forms distinct, as it is *a priori* probable that the two forms have different functions, i. e. meanings, and origins. The two forms are distinguished by Chantraine 1933, 257–260, who also gives non-Homeric forms. Partly, these are simply later and therefore perhaps irrelevant, but some forms or types may accidentally not occur

in Homer. The material may be grouped as follows.<sup>3)</sup> (These are the forms in -ωψ, οψ. In -οπος there is only χάροπος B 12, and ἔλλοπος beside ἔλλοψ, an adjective of fish. The forms in -ωπο- have been studied by Sommer 1948; they are post-Homeric.):

A -ωπ-

B -οπ-

Words from the root 'to see'

- |                           |                     |
|---------------------------|---------------------|
| 1. 'eye', 'sight'         | adj. (οἶνωψ, ῥῶροψ) |
| 2. 'face, aspect'         |                     |
| 3. more vague (from 1, 2) |                     |
| 4. illnesses              |                     |

Words of uncertain, probably non-Greek origin

- |   |                                |
|---|--------------------------------|
| 5. illnesses                                    |                                |
| 6. plants                                       |                                |
| 7. isolated (θυμάλωψ)                           |                                |
| 8. animals (κέρκωψ)                             | animals (πάρονοψ, δρύοψ)       |
| 9. ethnonyms (Κέρκωπες<br>(also towns, rivers)) | ethnonyms (Δόλοπες, Δρύοπες)   |
| 10. persons (Κύκλωψ <sup>4)</sup> )             | persons (Κέκροψ, Μέροψ, Πέλοψ) |

<sup>3)</sup> I have made use of a paper written in 1979 by Th.P.J. van den Hout, who collected the complete material regarding -ωπ- and -οπ-. I am grateful for his permission to use his work.

<sup>4)</sup> Neither Thieme's \**pku-klōp-* 'cattle-thief' nor Rüdiger Schmitt's (1967, 168, on both) \**κυκλο-κλωψ* 'thief of the wheel (of the sun)' nor Mme Bader's 'with brilliant eye' (1984, from \**kuklo-*, Skt. *śukrá-*) has anything to recommend it. As has been pointed out, if the word contains -ωπ- 'face', the word would not mean 'with one (round) eye' but 'rundäugig'. Chantraine's statement that it would mean 'qui n'a qu'un gros oeil rond' (I would not know where 'gros' comes from) is wrong as it would mean 'having round eyes', with plural 'eyes'. And this notion 'round-eyed' is nonsensical: it could only be meaningful in opposition to e.g. 'squint-eyed', which is not the case. It would also lose its self-evidence: 'one-eyed' would be confirmed by the Polyphemus story, but 'round-eyed' refers to nothing. I agree with Heubeck (1983 ad ι 106) that the word was only interpreted as 'one-eyed' later. He is also right when he says that it would originally have meant 'Visi rotondi' (Round-Faces). As we shall see in 5.2, ὄπ- means 'face', and hence 'eyes', but not 'eye'. The meaning 'Round Faces' makes no sense at all. An IE etymology, then, seems impossible and I agree with Marzullo (1952, 206 n.1) that the word is rather of pre-Greek origin. He proposed that it was originally \**Kiklōpes*, with the reduplication seen in Γίγας etc. This is possible but not necessary. It might contain the non-Greek element -ωπ- in names. I disagree with Schmitt when he says (1967, 168): "Jedenfalls verdient dieser Versuch einer neuen Lösung [his proposal mentioned above] vielleicht mehr Vertrauen als etwa die von



- |              |   |
|--------------|---|
| 11.          | instr. (καλαῦροψ, κόλλοψ <sup>5</sup> ) |
| 12. ἄνθρωπος | χάροπος                                 |
| 13.          | ἄστερόπη/ἄστράπη                        |
| 14.          | ἥπεροπ-εύω, κλοτοπ-εύω                  |
| 15.          | εὐρύοπα?                                |

*Ad A. Words in -ωπ-*

1) There is no doubt about the existence of the words with -ωπ-, e. g. ἐλίκωψ. Feminines have -ωπις: βοῶπις. The words mean 'having the eyes, the face of ...'. (On ἄνθρωπος see 12. below.) – 2) E. g. κυνώπα (which presupposes κυνώπη). A noun is πρόσωπον 'face' (see below). – The distinction between 1. and 2. is often uncertain. – 3) E. g. εὐώψ 'agreeable'. These forms are later, and the distinction from 1. and 2. is often difficult. So 1.-2.-3. are clearly one group. – 4) Names for illnesses were perhaps derived from type 1-3: αἰμάλωψ, νυκτάλωψ etc. Yet, the structure of several of these words is quite unclear and they may therefore be of non-Greek origin: ἀγγίλωψ, αἰγίλωψ, μώλωψ. – 5) See the preceding. – 6) Plants. E. g. ἀ(γ)χύνωψ, κνύζωψ. – 7) There is a small number of isolated words. θυμάλωψ 'piece of burning wood, charcoal'; Hesych gives νέρωπα· λαμπρόν. – 8-10) In these categories the suffixes seem to overlap. As to B 8 Chantraine remarked that these words "se dérobent à toute étymologie" and are probably of non-Indo-European origin. The ethnic names also have no etymology. Some of them are identical with animals' names: Κέρκωπες 'Apes', Δρύοπες 'Woodpeckers'. For the words

---

vornherein auf eine etymologische Deutung verzichtende Auffassung durch Benedetto Marzullo ..." The overwhelming majority of names in Greek myth and religion are non-IE, and the Cyclopes have nothing Indo-European about them.

<sup>5</sup>) Eva Tichy (Pöhlmann-Tichy 1982, 300-304) explains κόλλοψ from \*kolio-, cognate with *kolb* 'pole, stake' and the suffix -ωπ-, as 'der das Aussehen eines Pflocken oder Dübells hat'. There are several objections to this interpretation. The meaning is improbable; an instrument is not called 'having the appearance of ...'. There are more 'instruments' with this suffix (σκόλοψ, μέσοπα). The words with this suffix are probably all non-Indo-European. There is a variant κόλλαβος. Chantraine (Dict.) says that this word, which means 'fine pastry', was used for κόλλοψ "par confusion". Eva Tichy thinks that it was used for reasons of decency, because there was a word κόλλοψ (or a use of the word) with an obscene meaning, as it was "anklingend". This is quite improbable: you don't use a word for 'pastry', either by mistake or out of decency, if you want to say 'pin'. We have to take this variant seriously. The interchange is confirmed by μέσ(σ)αβον, a kind of strap for oxen under the yoke, beside which there is μέσοπα (acc.). This kind of variation is typical of loanwords from the substratum; cf. Furnée 1972, 107.

in -ωπ- see Aly 1914. For towns cf. Ὠρωπός, Εὔρωπος etc., for rivers Ἄσωπός, Εὔρωπος; see Aly 1914, 72f. I found only one name of a town (no river) with -ωπ-, Κασσιόπη on Corcyra. A mountain is Ῥοδόπη, but note that this is far to the north from the other names. See on these names also 5.2. On Κύκλωψ see note 4. – 12) On ἄνθρωπος see 2.1.

*Ad B. Words in -ωπ-*

1) On the type οἶνωψ see section 5.2 below. – 6) Plants. I only know χέδροψ. – 8–10) See under A above. – 11) Some names of ‘instruments’ have -ωπ-. I note further βειέλοπες, μέσ(σ)οπα, σκόλοψ. On κόλλοψ see note 5. Cf. Furnée 1972, 107. – 12) The meaning of χάροπος is unknown. Connection with χαίρω was denied by Sommer 1948, 120–2. I agree that this connection is quite uncertain. – 13) ἀστεροπή is non-IE, as I argued in 1987. – 14) On these two words see Kuiper 1933, 283, and 1951, 25: they may be derived from a noun/adjective in -ωπ- ‘connected with’. (For such a noun one could compare the gloss δόλοπα· κατάσκοπον, μαστροπόν Hsch.) – 15) εὐρύοπα. The meaning of this form is much discussed. Leaf e.g. (ad A 498) observed that one would expect -ωπ- if it meant ‘wide seeing’. Schmitt (1967, 159f.) mentions Leaf but adds: “Hiergegen cf. jedoch mit zwingender Argumentation Sommer 1948, 119.” However, Sommer there mentions his view that -ωπ- in (e.g.) αἴθοπ- is a verbal noun ‘Anblick’ (not ‘Gesicht’ or ‘Auge’) and that this word means ‘Funkelanblick bietend’. There is no real argument, however, let alone a decisive one. (On Sommer’s idea see further 5.2 below.) It should be noted that, if one accepts Sommer’s interpretation, εὐρύοπα would mean ‘breiten Anblick bietend’, which makes no sense. Schmitt rejects the argument of Pindar’s βαρύοπα: “Wegen Pindar, Pyth. 6, 24?, ... ist aber noch lange nicht das homerische εὐρύοπα, ..., als ursprüngliches ‘mit weit(reichend)er Stimme’ gesichert. So bleibt εὐρύοπα am besten bei idg. \*h<sub>3</sub>ekʷ- ‘sehen’.” However, there is in fact no argument for ‘to see’, and there are two or three arguments in favour of ‘voice’. Thus, Chantraine (Dict. s.v.) says that the connection with ‘voice’ “trouve appui d’une part dans certains emplois avec κῆρυξ ου κέλαδος, dans βαρυόπᾶς dit de Zeus tonnant (Pi.), dans le vocalisme bref. La seconde hypothèse s’appuierait sur un seul emploi tardif avec ἥλιος et rencontre en une certaine mesure un obstacle dans le vocalisme o bref. Il est très probable que le sens originel est ‘à la vaste voix’, dit de Zeus tonnant, et que le composé a été secondairement rattaché à ὄψομαι, ὄπωπα ‘voir’.” This is also the view of Kirk 1985 ad A 498: “He [Zeus] is εὐρύοπα,

‘long-sounding’ (...) not ‘far-seeing’ (...), as is appropriate to the god of thunder.” Thus also Stephanie West 1981, 258 (‘dalla voce che s’ode per ampio tratto’). The exact meaning must be ‘having a broad (= far-reaching) voice’. I repeat that, if -οπ- had the meaning ‘face’, the word would mean ‘having a broad face’, which is incomprehensible.

Below (5.2) we shall argue for verbal government-compounds in the Homeric adjectives like οἶνοψ. Such a form could be supposed for εὐρύοπα, but the Greek evidence is not in favour of this solution.

5.2. οἶνοψ- etc., Αἰθίοψ. While the element -οπ- (A 1-2-3.) is perfectly clear, also in its later developments, this is not the case with -οπ-. Beside the non-Greek forms we only have a very small number of archaic adjectives in poetry (B 1). The words may be shortly discussed.

Οἶνοψ and μῆλοψ seem clear. So is αἶθοψ, which has been considered a recent variant, for metrical reasons, for αἴθων. The problem of μέροψ has definitely been solved by Koller in a fine article in this journal (1968). It is a formulaic use of the name of the tribe called Μέροπες.<sup>6)</sup> Νῶροψ has no etymology.)<sup>7)</sup> Peter Schrijver suggest to me that it may be compared with Hitt. *nahsariya-* ‘to fear’ (which has been compared with OIr. *nár* ‘modest, noble, magnanimous’). If the Hittite word is based on a verbal noun *nah-sar-*, we would have a root *\*neh<sub>2</sub>-*, and we could posit an adjective *\*noh<sub>2</sub>-ro-* ‘fearsome’. Ἔνοψ has no etymology (see below).

<sup>6)</sup> The old formula is πόλις μερόπων ἀνθρώπων, and after πόλις we don’t expect a general qualification of men, but a specific indication. The oldest verse is probably found in an archaic section of the hymn to Apollo, vs. 42: Μίλητός τε Κόως τε πόλις μερόπων ἀνθρώπων. We have independent evidence that the Meropes lived on Kos, so the word was originally the name of this tribe, which was later misunderstood. Their eponymous hero Μέροψ is found in B 831 and Λ 329. – Barbara Pastor de Arozena’s view (1993) can therefore be dismissed. She mentions Koller’s article but does not discuss it. Her proposal (‘glitter-ish’, from *\*mer-* ‘shine’, Pok. 733) is semantically improbable, even if the word were a general epithet of men.

<sup>7)</sup> Connection with Lith. *nóras* is dubious, as the -ο- is analogical (Fraenkel 1950-1, 192 f.); it cannot be *\*nōr-*, as *ō* would have given Lith. *uo*. Derivation of *\*νωρος*, *νωροπ-* from *\*h<sub>2</sub>ner-* (Kuiper 1951) is difficult because of the lengthened grade *ō*, which is unexpected in an *o*-stem adjective. – If *νωρέμνος* Hsch. is cognate (as Fraenkel suggests), it would point to non-IE origin. (The position in the alphabet suggests that it was *\*νωρούμνος*.) However, the meanings given, μέγας, πολύς, κατώτατος, ἔσχατος, ἀσθενής (which some want to change in εὐσθενής), πλατύς, give the impression that its meaning was unknown, and in any case is not strong support for a connection with *νώροπι*.

The general assumption is that -οπ- belongs to the root  $*h_3ek^w$ - 'to see'. If so, we should explain why we find -οπ- here, instead of -ωπ-. The question is usually not put, let alone answered.

I considered the following explanation. We could assume that -ωπ-/-οπ- are ablaut forms of one paradigm, with nom. sg. -ωψ, gen. -οπ-ος. Strangely enough I did not find this explanation in the literature. In fact we expect ablaut in a root noun. It is probably found in  $*\tilde{\omega}\psi$ , ὀπός 'voice' (the nominative can be reconstructed with certainty on the basis of Lat. *vōx*, Skt. *vák*). That the short vowel was generalized is possible, cf. πός 'foot' (Dor.; πώς is only given by Hesychius; πούς is a recent form), τρίπος Hom. However, it is hard to believe that both the long vowel and the short vowel were generalized, the more so as the connection with the root 'to see' will always have been clear to the speakers. I can think of the following solution. The adjectives οἴνοπ- etc. occur only in the dative and accusative. As the old nominative is not known, we may suppose that it was  $*\text{oĩ}\omega\psi$ , and that the oblique cases with -οπ- were retained in old formulae. I don't think that this is the correct explanation, as forms like πρόσωπον, ἔλικωψ, γλαυκῶπις are also very old and have generalized the long vowel. Thus, it is improbable that -οπ- is an old ablaut form of  $\tilde{\omega}\psi$ . As regards Αἰθίωψ, note that it does not have the development  $t_i > s$  seen in πρόσωπον, which one expects in the case of a very old formation.<sup>8)</sup>

It has therefore been suggested that the forms with -οπ- are derived from another word. Thus Sommer 1948, 119: "Es wäre ja auch nicht zu verstehen, warum αἶθοπ ... stets mit kurzem -ο- erscheinen." (As far as I know, Sommer is the only one to posit the question and to try and solve it.) Sommer suggests that -οπ- is a verbal noun, with the same meaning as ὄψις, 'Anblick, Aussehen'. However, in this case, too, I would expect lengthened grade, at least in the nominative, both in the root noun itself and in compounds, cf. Skt. *vrtra-hā* 'killer of Vrtra' <  $*-g^{wh}\tilde{e}n$ .<sup>9)</sup> Even more serious is that  $\tilde{\omega}\psi$  'face, eyes' is the verbal noun of this root. There is, of course, only one root noun of

<sup>8)</sup> Peters (1988, 377) thinks that πρόσωπον beside *prātīkam* shows that the old nominative had lengthened grade. I don't think that this is correct because I would not know why the lengthened grade, which is quite normal in Sanskrit, would not have been preserved (in *pratyān*). – Frisk, and Hamp 1973, 84 f., suggest that in Greek a form  $*\text{prosik}^w\text{om}$  was changed after  $\tilde{\omega}\psi$ . I don't think that this is what happened; cf. ὀπιεύω, where the  $\tilde{i}$  was not replaced.

<sup>9)</sup> Skt. nom. sg. *an-āk* contains  $*ak_s$ - 'eye', cf. *anakṣá-*, which will have short vowel because of the two consonants following.

a given root possible. Germ. *Gesicht* can illustrate the semantics: it meant 'das Sehen' and 'der Anblick' and (from the latter) 'face' (Kluge-Seebold s.v.; Dutch *gezicht* still has all these variants of meaning). Thus, this does not offer a solution. Finally, in the case of Αἰθίοπ-, which is the form that interests us, a meaning 'einen verbrannten Anblick bietend' would hardly seem acceptable.

I think that a solution can be found in the following way. The form that most resembles our type of adjectives is Skt. *śvityañc-*, *-īc-* 'whitish' < \**kṛiti-h<sub>3</sub>(e)k<sup>w</sup>-*. The meaning exactly fits that of the Greek adjectives. In Avestan we have *zairyanc-*, *zairic-* 'yellowish'. The same root is found in Skt. *pratyāñc-*, *-īc-* < \**proti-h<sub>3</sub>(e)k<sup>w</sup>-*, 'directed towards'. What interests us is the nominative, *pratyāñ* (acc. *pratyāñcam*); Av. *zairyāš*. For these forms a root *añc-* has been assumed, but Rüdiger Schmitt (1968) convincingly posited \**proti-h<sub>3</sub>ek<sup>w</sup>(-s)*, with secondary nasal after the participles. The remarkable thing is that the vowel in the nominative is short. That an original long vowel would have been retained, is shown by *ápāñ* 'turned backward', which has its long vowel from contraction: \**apa-Ha(n)k*. This word type is found in verbal government-compounds like Skt. *hāvīr-ād-* 'eating the oblation', nom. *dru-śád* 'sitting in the tree'. I assume that the type is old. (Note that if it is not old, and if the nominative had lengthened grade, we would also expect \**αιθίωψ*) Words of this type mean 'looking'. This fits in very well with *svityañc-* and the Homeric adjectives: 'white-looking' can easily become 'whitish'; 'looking (like) wine' is the meaning of *οἶνωψ*.<sup>10</sup>)

This means that a form Αἰθί-οψ could have existed, with the root of 'to see' and with short -ο-. However, a form of this type would have had the meaning 'looking burnt, burnt-ish', which is not an acceptable meaning. Such qualifications are stronger, not so cautious: you call people 'Redskins' but not 'looking red, a little red, reddish'.

<sup>10</sup>) Note that a first element in -ο-, whatever the form of the second element, would give *ō*: *-o-h<sub>3</sub>(e/o)k<sup>w</sup>-* > *-ōk<sup>w</sup>-*. Thus we would expect \**οἶνωψ*. The forms must therefore be analogical after forms of which the first element ended in a consonant. Cf. beside Skt. *hāvīr-ād-*, *madhv-ād-*: *āmād-* < *āma-ad-*. We have the old contraction in Greek in *χηρωσταί* < *ḡ<sup>h</sup>eh<sub>1</sub>ro-h<sub>1</sub>ed-* (for *oh<sub>1</sub>e*, *eh<sub>1</sub>o* > *ω* cf. *ἄν-ωγα* < \**h<sub>1</sub>e-h<sub>1</sub>og-*, parallel to *eh<sub>1</sub>e* > *η* as in *ἦ* 'he said' < \**h<sub>1</sub>e-h<sub>1</sub>eḡ-t*, Rix 1976, 204, and *ἦα* 'I was' < \**h<sub>1</sub>e-h<sub>1</sub>es-m*); in *ὠμηστῆς* the *e*-vocalism of the root was restored, as in Lat. *hērēs* (dissimilation with the previous *ō* seems improbable to me; cf. *ἰππημολγός*, *φιλήρετμος*). *χηρωσταί* is important in showing the regular form. On these forms see Dunkel 1987 (with a different explanation of the vocalism).

Thus you can call Dutchmen *Kaaskoppen* ('Cheese-heads'), but not 'cheese-like'. And, again, αἶθ(ι)- does not mean 'burnt'.

Further note that Greek has no words with -οπ- meaning 'face'.

As to the Homeric adjectives, I would not exclude the possibility that there existed non-Greek adjectives in -οπ-. Thus, ἦνοπ- has no etymology, and it is hard to imagine an Indo-European pre-form: if it had a *f*, as is assumed, \**μēn-*, with lengthened grade, seems to be excluded; so it should be \**μeh<sub>1</sub>n(o)-* (which is not impossible, cf. χῆρος < \**g<sup>h</sup>eh<sub>1</sub>-ro-*, Lat. *vērūs* < \**μeh<sub>1</sub>-ro-*). One could further think of \**masno-* < \**uh<sub>2</sub>sno-*. If it had no wau, it does not become easier: \**h<sub>1</sub>eh<sub>1</sub>no-*. Νῶροψ has no etymology either; a suggestion was made above. It seems quite possible to me that Greek adopted a few adjectives in -οπ- from a non-IE language; -οπ- in these forms was then considered a form of ὀπ- 'to see'; after which new adjectives were formed with the suffix in its 'new' meaning. Note that Chantraine (Dict. s.v.) thinks that εὐρύοπα contained ὀπ- 'voice', but that this was later interpreted as having the root 'to see'. We know that Αἰθίοπες was so interpreted, and probably quite early (see below).

In the case of Αἰθίοπες it seems evident to compare the tribal names (above nr 9, in section 5.1.), and these are of non-IE origin. We now know that these names, or at least a number of them, had a labiovelar: Myc. *doroq-* Δόλοπες, *Ero<sub>2</sub>q-* \**Ἐλλοπες* (cf. Ἐλλοπία). (I don't think that one could accept the interpretation of Δόλοπ- as 'Trugauge', Landau 1958, 168). This means that *Aitijoq-* fits into this group.

#### 6. Conclusion for the linguistic analysis of Aithiopes; the Aithikes.

As far as the linguistic interpretation is concerned we can now draw the following conclusions.

The element αἶθ- means 'bright, shining' or 'burning'; there is no certain evidence for 'burnt'. The element -ι- is simply unexplained in our form; there is no support for the interpretation as Caland-*i*. The element -οπ- does not mean 'face', for in that case we expect -ωπ-. There were probably compounds in -οπ-, but their meaning, 'looking', does not fit Αἰθίοπες.

Clearest is the comparison with αἶθοψ. This form contains the same elements, except the -ι-, and means 'bright, shining'. It is absolutely unclear how the -ι- in Αἰθίοψ could change the meaning into 'with burnt face'. The only reason to assume this meaning is that the form was interpreted in this way in antiquity. We now know, of course, that such interpretations, whether they be folk etymologies or learned

theories, are often wrong. In this case it seems evident that we are dealing with a folk etymology.

On the other hand, it is evident to compare this name of a people with other names of peoples in *-οπ-*. And these are of non-IE origin. The form should not be considered out of its context (the names of unknown peoples) because of its superficial resemblance with Greek words.

It is generally stated that Αἰθίοπης is an Augenblicksbildung for the sake of the metre. We must now consider that it is an ancient form, because of *Myc. Metoqeu /Metok<sup>w</sup>eus/* and *Wonoqewe /Woinok<sup>w</sup>ēwei/*, which have *-ēu-* after *-ok<sup>w</sup>-*. Note further Πανοπεύς (*Iliad*), and perhaps Ἐπωπεύς. At least there existed forms in *-eus* from stems ending in *-ok<sup>w</sup>-*.

One is tempted to compare the form with the tribal name Αἰθῆκες, a people situated in the north-east of Thessaly (B 774).<sup>11)</sup> Here again, though this time we know nothing at all about its meaning, the word has been derived from αἶθω. Strangely enough, this is repeated in Chantraine's dictionary s. v. 1. φοῖνιξ, where the form is analysed as *\*aidhi-* + *-h<sub>3</sub>k<sup>w</sup>-* 'visage'. This is, of course, impossible as the labiovelar could not have given *-k* in this position in a Greek word.<sup>12)</sup> (See also section 2. above.) It is clear that this word must also be considered in the context of other names of peoples in *-ῖκ-*, the Τέμμῖκες (of which we know nothing), and perhaps the Γραῖκες. Here, too, we are dealing with non-Greek, probably non-IE names.

Now since *both* names are non-Indo-European, the question whether they are cognate receives a new perspective. We have seen in section 2. that in these loanwords a labiovelar may develop into *k* where this does not happen in Indo-European forms. So *κ* vs. *π* is not a problem. For *ī* vs. *io* one might think of *iHo* vs. *iH*; the substratum language may have had laryngeals or pharyngeals, which are a widespread group of sounds, not specific for Indo-European. Another solution

<sup>11)</sup> They are further mentioned by Strabo VII 7, 8–9, IX 5.1, 12 and 19; Plutarch *Quaest. Gr.* 13, 26; Steph. Byz. s. v. Αἰθικία. Strabo IX 5.12 says that they have now disappeared (ἐκλελοιπέναι), and explains that this means that "the people vanished and their country has become utterly deserted, or else merely their ethnic name no longer exists and their political organisation no longer remains what it was." Apparently nothing was known about their disappearance.

<sup>12)</sup> A development to *k* before certain consonants (beside *ǰ*) has been considered. Lejeune 1972, 45 and 52 n.2 calls this possible, but there is no evidence from inherited words except the gloss ἀνιγρόν, if from *\*nig<sup>w</sup>-* 'wash', but before *r* such a development is most improbable (cf. πρίατο, *Myc. qirijato*).

may be that *io* was weakend to  $\bar{i}$ , as for example Proto-Germanic *\*-iaz* became *\*-īs* in Gothic (e.g. *hairdeis*). But I have not found alternations of this kind in Greek substratum words.

Another possibility is that we have two different suffixes, *-op-* vs. *-ōk-* added to the same root (or stem) *Αἰθ(ι)*-. One might argue that the agreement between the two names is too large to be a coincidence. In the following I shall therefore consider the possibility that the names referred to the same people, though this cannot be regarded as certain. It is remarkable that, as far as I have seen, the assumed (near-)identity of the names was not used for further conclusions about the origin of the Aithiopes.

Bonfante (1941) thinks that the Aithikes had an Illyrian name, but in Wilkes' study of the Illyrians (1992) I noted about a hundred names of peoples, none of which has a suffix *-īk-*.

### 7. *In search of the real Aithiopes*

7.1. Since the common etymology has been proven wrong, *Αἰθίοπες* is no longer just a word for 'black' or 'negro', but in all probability the pre-Greek name of a real people. It seems clear that the name was later interpreted as meaning 'burnt-face' and only after that had the historical development which we can, with some difficulty, follow. The situation up to now is as follows.

Lesky (1959; thus West in his edition of Hesiod's *Theogony*, ad 985) has demonstrated that the Aithiopes were first a mythical people, living on the Okeanos, and only later came to be located to the south of Egypt. This mythical people probably lived in the east, it is maintained, because Poseidon coming home from the Aithiopes comes from the east (ε 283 f.), and because the king of the Aithiopes, Memnon (see below), was the son of Eos. Later Memnon is said to come from Susa, which was founded by his father Tithonos (who is mentioned Λ 1, ε 1). For references I refer, beside Lesky, to Pietschman in Pauly-Wissowa's *Realenzyklopädie*.

Already in the *Odyssey* do we find attempts to locate the Aithiopes on the map as a real people. I call this the post-mythical stage. In *Od.* δ 83 ff. we find Menelaos recounting his visit to Cyprus, Phoenicia, the Egyptians, the Aithiopes, the Sidonians and the Eremboi, and Libya. This is a strange order of countries and peoples, but it is given as a kind of reality.

A further, much debated statement about the Aithiopes is α 23 f., where it says: *Αἰθίοπας, τοὶ διχθὰ δεδαΐαται, ἔσχατοι ἀνδρῶν, οἱ μὲν δυσομένου Ὑπερίονος, οἱ δ' ἀνιόντος*. It has been proposed that this



is based on pure logical speculation. Black-faced people live where the sun comes closest to the earth, that is in the extreme east, where the sun rises; but also in the extreme west, where the sun sets. The origin of the idea of two groups of Aithiopes is perhaps given in the 'ad-struction' given in  $\alpha$  24. It is reasoned in the same line that, as the sun rises from the (flat) earth, in the extreme east, the morning must be the hottest period (Hdt. 3, 104). This interpretation of the text makes it probable that by this time the Greeks interpreted the word Aithiopes as 'Burnt-Faces', because the whole reasoning is based on it. So far Lesky's article.

Now as it has been shown that the etymology is only a folk etymology, there must have been an earlier stage at which there were Aithiopes who were not black-faced and therefore did not live in the extreme east. Thus, the question arises if we can find the real Aithiopes, of the pre-mythical stage. It goes without saying that what follows from this point on is highly speculative.

I have already stated (section 6) the name must most probably be compared with the other names of peoples in  $-\sigma\pi-$ . These are found in north and north-western Greece. That peoples in this region could become mythical is shown by the Centaurs. The case of the Amazons may not be too different: they appear to have been a real people that once lived in Asia Minor, in Thrace or in southern Russia.

We have already pointed to the  $\text{A}\dot{\iota}\theta\dot{\iota}\pi\epsilon\varsigma$  and considered the possibility that they were the Aithiopes.

Perhaps we have actual evidence for Aithiopes in classical Greece. Pietschman (RE s.v. Memnon, p.645f.) mentions the name for Lesbos, Samothrake, Rhodes and Cyprus. I am not in a position to check these data. It may be noted that they have never been studied with the idea that they could point to a historical tribe of Aithiopes. In the next section we shall consider the figure of Memnon.

7.2. *The Aithiopsis; Memnon.* If the Aithiopes once were a real people, one might reconsider the story of the Aithiopsis: Memnon, king of the Aithiopes, comes to the aid of Troy, but is killed by Achilles. It is argued that the Aithiopsis may contain stories that are as old as or older than that of the Iliad (Kullmann 1960, 226, 379 et passim; Edwards 1991, 17 ff., 62, 140, et passim). I find it rather surprising that the Aithiopes are called in as a fighting force unless they were a real people.

Memnon is called their king. As far as I can see this has never been questioned. I mean, one might suppose that there was a hero which

could well be employed in the Trojan war, but that he had no famous people to bring with him, so that the Aithiopes were just allotted to him. A hero with a further unknown people seems to have been no problem: but for Achilles we might never have heard about the Myrmidons.

Memnon seems to have been well-known. He is mentioned λ 522, the fact that he killed Antilochos is implied in δ 188. His armour seems to have been very famous, more so than that of Achilles' (Pietschman s. v.; Edwards 1991, 19, referring to Virgil).

We have a mention that Memnon was killed in an ambush by the Thesalians (FGrHist II 441 f., from Kephalion). Pietschman calls this story "ganz abseitig", which is of course correct, but exactly for that reason it is worth of attention. Does it mean that Memnon was "originally" killed in a war in Thessaly?

Memnon's brother was Ἡμαθίων (Hes. Th. 984 f.). It seems evident to connect this (and perhaps we should say, Hesiod did that) with the country Ἡμαθίη, which is mentioned Ξ 226 and lies to the north of Pieria, i. e. in Macedonia. One might think that this implies that the Aithiopes of Memnon lived next to his brother.

So it could be argued that Memnon was a hero who fought Achilles in northern Greece. If he was king of the Aithiopes, they would also have lived in northern Greece. (And the identification with the Aithikes would confirm this.)

7.3. *Myc. Aitijoq-*. In Mycenaean a man called *Aitijoq-* is mentioned in the Pylos tablets. He was not just a slave, but holder of a piece of land (*kitimena kotona*). Until now there were two possibilities. Either he was a mythical Aithiopian, which seems out of the question, or he was a real Ethiopian. The latter possibility seems quite improbable to me. In the first place, it is quite improbable that an Ethiopian would have come to live in the Peloponnesus, and have a position of some status there. Moreover, the whole scenario is improbable: it would mean that the Mycenaeans used the word for Ethiopians; that the name later came to stand for a mythical people at the end of the world; and that, after Homer, this name accidentally again came to be used for the Ethiopians. This scenario is not absolutely impossible, but it does not seem probable. (There is a name *Aiguptios* in Knossos. I do not know whether this means that an Egyptian came to live in Crete, but if so this is still quite different from an Ethiopian in the Peloponnesus. Perhaps it was the name of somebody who visited Egypt.) So I think that his name means that he belongs or belonged to the tribe of

the Aithiopes, in Thessaly or farther to the north. Note that we also have an Αἴθιξ, a Δόλοψ, a Μέροψ. If this is right, we have found at least one original Aithiopian.

*7.4. Alternative views.* The oldest statements about the Ethiopians, in Homer, comprise three, or rather two things: they are the ἔσχατοι ἀνδρῶν, they live on the Okeanos (these two points being identical), and the gods visit them to eat there. If we accept their position as a ‘fact’, the question arises why the gods visit them. In recent handbooks I have not found an answer to this question, which has always puzzled me. There are perhaps two aspects that are surprising: why do the Greek gods go so far away (which they never do on other occasions), and additionally all together? It is important to note here that the latter holds true only in the Iliad (A 423, Ψ 206), not in the Odyssey (α 22 ff., ε 282 and 287), where only Poseidon visits them (the only other place is δ 84, where Menelaos’ visit to them is mentioned). I assume that the Iliad has the older picture. A visit of all the gods together is certainly quite remarkable and requires an explanation; that a single god visits a far away land is much less unusual.

Stephanie West in her comment on α 22 says that it was their righteousness (rettitudine) which owed them the friendship of the gods. Their righteousness, however, is not stressed in Homer (the adjective ἀμύμων is in fact very flat), and Romm (1992, 49 ff., esp. 53 f.) precisely denies that the Aithiopes were praised for their high morals. Romm himself (p. 51) thinks that the fact that they lived at the edges of the world meant that they lived in an almost paradisiac land and that “this prosperity forms the bond that ties Olympians and Ethiopians together, and thus the sharing of feasts by the two societies must be seen, at least in part, as a celebration of shared values.” I don’t think that this is the basic explanation; there were more prosperous peoples, and it is not clear that this was a sufficient reason for their visits. If one would think of such a general consideration, I would rather propose that it is typical of a paradisiac land, not only that there is prosperity and no sorrows, but also that you can meet the gods there (see below on the Phaeacians).

I found a much more convincing, because more straightforward and ‘down to earth’, explanation in Wikén, 1937, 18. He discusses the point that the Garden of the Hesperides, which lies beyond Okeanos, is the garden of the gods, and then adds: “Zu ihren nächsten Nachbarn diesseits des Okeanos, den Aithiopen . . . , kommen die Götter zum Essen.” This explanation seems to me quite obvious. It ex-

plains both remarkable aspects: the gods simply are in the neighbourhood, so they do not have to go far away (that is, especially to visit the Aithiopes), and the gods are all there.

That this is the explanation seems to be proved by a passage in Homer himself. In the passage quoted Wikén added (after Aithiopes) “und die Phaiaken”. We don’t have to go into speculations about the Phaeacians but we can simply read η 201 ff.: the gods used to eat with us and did not hide themselves, ἐπεὶ σφισιν ἐγγύθεν εἰμέν, (ὥς περ Κύκλωπές τε καὶ ἄγρια φῦλα Γιγάντων.)<sup>13)</sup> The Phaeacians, like the Aithiopes, lived at the end of the world, cf. ζ 203 ff.: (μάλα γὰρ φίλοι ἀθανάτοισι.) οἰκέομεν δ’ ἀπάνευθε πολυκλύστῳ ἐνὶ πόντῳ, ἔσχατοι. The Aithiopes are also called ἔσχατοι ἀνδρῶν.

This observation may have consequences for the question of the eastern and western Aithiopes, for the garden of the Hesperides lies in the west. In general, “the archaic and early classical era could not see very far into the East” (Romm 1992, 78) and looked west. The indications that the Aithiopes lived in the east are not very convincing, and all date from after the time (i. e. the Odyssey) when they were located in the west *and* the east. – If one again takes into account that the Aithikes may be identical with the Aithiopes, one might argue that the Aithiopes/Aithikes lived in the north-west of Greece, near the coast, which may well have been the place where Okeanos was thought to begin: it was clearly the end of the world for some time.

The question becomes more complicated when we realize that there is evidence that peoples and places have been brought from the east to the west. Thus, the island Aia, which is put in the west by Homer, is said to lie where Eos has her house and where Helios rises (μ 3 f.), which irrefutably points to an eastern location. Here I come to a point where I must leave the questions to others, as I am not competent in these matters. I only note that the question of eastern and western Aithiopes may find its answer in this connection.<sup>14)</sup>

---

<sup>13)</sup> The phrase “because we are close to the gods” is mostly taken metaphorically, but the text, which says that somebody of the Phaeacians, when walking alone, could meet a god, proves to my mind that it must be taken in a local sense. (The next line, η 206, “like the Cyclopes and the ... Gigantes” is probably a later addition to the story; see the comments by Hainsworth on ζ 5 ff. and η 54–66 and 58 ff.)

<sup>14)</sup> If the *Aithiopes* lived in northern Greece, one may consider the possibility that they lived on the west and on the east coast.

8. *Summary.* I tried to demonstrate that αἶθ- means 'bright' or 'burning' but not 'burnt'; that there is no support for the explanation of the -ι- of Αἰθίοπ- as a Caland-*i* (there is no other explanation); and that -οπ- does not mean 'face'. As the idea that the Aithiopes lived in the extreme east (and west) where the sun rises (and goes down), at the hottest places of the earth, is probably derived from the etymology which now proves to be a folk etymology, we are left with the name of a people called Aithiopes (of which the meaning is unknown). As names of peoples in -οπ- are found in northern Greece, it seems probable that the Aithiopes were in origin a 'normal' people living in that area. The story of the Aithiopsis, about a king Memnon of the Aithiopes fighting Achilles might have a reminiscence of that people. Myc. *Aitijoq-*, in Pylos, may be a man originating from these Aithiopes rather than an Ethiopian.

It is further suggested (following Wikén) that the visits of the gods to the Aithiopes are explained by the fact that the gods had their garden, the Garden of the Hesperides, at the other side of Okeanos. This might point to a location of the Aithiopes in the west. It is then reminded that there is evidence that peoples and places were moved from the east to the west.

### Bibliography

- Aly, W. (1914): Lexicalische Streifzüge. *Glotta* 5, 57–79.  
 Bader, F. (1975): La loi de Caland et Wackernagel en grec. *FS E. Benveniste*, 19–32.  
 Bader (1984): Autour de Polyphème le Cyclope à l'oeil brillant: diathèse et vision. *Die Sprache* 30, 109–137.  
 Beekes, R. S. P. (1969): *The Development of the PIE Laryngeals in Greek*. The Hague.  
 Beekes, R. S. P. (1987): Gr. ἀστερόπη. *Münch. Stud. z. Sprachwiss.* 48, 15–20.  
 Bonfante, G. (1941): The Name of the Phoenicians. *Classical Philology* 36, 1–20.  
 Chantraine, P. (1933): *La formations des noms en grec ancien*. Paris.  
 Deroy, L. (1948): La renaissance des mots homériques. *Les études classiques* 16, 4, 329–353.  
 Dunkel, G. (1987): *heres, χηρωσαί: indogermanische Richtersprache*. *FS H. Hoeningswald*. Tübingen (Narr).  
 Edwards, M. W. (1991): *The Iliad, A Commentary*, V. Cambridge.  
 Forbes, Kathleen (1958): Medial intervocalic -ρσ-, -λσ- in Greek. *Glotta* 36, 235–272.  
 Fraenkel, E. (1950-1): Das Sein und seine Modalitäten. *Lexis* 2, 2, 163–204.  
 Furnée, E. J. (1972): *Die wichtigsten konsonantischen Erscheinungen des Vorgriechischen*. The Hague/Paris.

- Hainsworth, J.B. (1982): *Omero, Odissea*, II. (No place.)
- Hamp, E.P. 1968 *Anthrōk<sup>w</sup>os*. *Atti 1° congresso internazionale di Micenologia*. Roma, 786-790.
- Hamp, E.P. (1973): Formations indo-européennes à second élément \*(H)k<sup>w</sup>-. *Bulletin de la Société Linguistique* 68, 77-92.
- Heubeck, A. (1983): *Omero, Odissea*, III. (No place)
- Kiparsky, P. (1967): Sonorant clusters in Greek. *Language* 43, 619-635.
- Kirk, G.S. (1985): *The Iliad, A Commentary*, I. Cambridge.
- Kluge, F. – Seebold, E. (1989): *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. Berlin/New York.
- Koller, H. (1968): Πόλις Μερόπων Ἀνθρώπων. *Glotta* 46, 18-26.
- Kuiper, F.B.J. (1933): Beiträge zur griechischen Etymologie und Grammatik. 9. κλοτοπεύω. *Glotta* 21, 267-294.
- Kuiper, F.B.J. (1951): Νώροπι χαλκῶ. *Med. Kon. Ned. Akad. Wet., Letterk.*, NR 14, 5, 201-227.
- Kuiper (1956): The Etymology of ἄνθρωπος. *FS P. Kretschmer* 211-226.
- Kuiper (1968): Prehellenic Labio-velars? *Lingua* 21, 269-277.
- Kullmann, W. (1960): *Die Quellen der Ilias*. Wiesbaden.
- Landau, O. (1958): *Mykenisch-griechische Personennamen*. Göteborg.
- Leaf, W. (1900-2): *The Iliad*. London.
- Lejeune, M. (1972): *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien*. Paris.
- Lesky, A. (1950): Hethitische Texte und griechischer Mythos. *Anzeiger Oesterr. Akad. d. Wiss., Ph.-hist. Kl.* 87, 137-159.
- Lesky, A. (1959): Aithiopika. *Hermes* 87, 27-38.
- Mehler, J. (1965): *Woordenboek op de gedichten van Homeros*. 12e dr. Den Haag/Rotterdam.
- Otrębski, J. (1967): Beiträge zur indogermanischen Wortbildungslehre. *Zeitschr. f. vergleich. Sprachwiss.* 81, 217-224.
- Pastor de Arozena, Barbara (1993): ΜΕΡΟΠΕΣ 'glitter-ish'. *Class. Phil.* 88. 137f.
- Peters, M. (1980): *Untersuchungen zur Vertretung der indogermanischen Laryngale im Griechischen*. Wien
- Peters, M. (1988): Zur Frage strukturell uneinheitlicher Laryngalreflexe in idg. Einzelsprachen. In: *Die Laryngalthorie*, ed. A. Bammesberger. Heidelberg.
- Pietschmann, R. (1894): Aithiopes. *Realenzyklopedie der Altertumswissenschaft*.
- Pöhlmann, E. – E. Tichy (1982): Zur Herkunft und Bedeutung von κόλλωψ. *Serta indogermanica*, Fs. G. Neumann. Innsbruck.
- Risch, E. (1974): *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*. Berlin/New York.
- Romm, J.S. (1994): *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought*. Princeton.
- Ruijgh, C.J. (1967): *Études sur la grammaire et le vocabulaire du grec mycénien*. Amsterdam.
- Ruijgh, C.J. (1970): Review of Chantraine, *Dict.* *Lingua* 25, 302-321.
- Ryce, A. (1836): *The works of Richard Bentley*. London.
- Schaefer, G.H. (1811): *Gregorii Corinthii De dialectis linguae graecae*. Leipzig.
- Schmitt, R. (1967): *Dichtung und Dichtersprache in indogermanischer Zeit*. Wiesbaden.
- Schmitt, R. (1968): Die Avestischen Adjektivstämme auf -añc-. In: *Pratidānam*. *FS F. B. J. Kuiper*. The Hague, 134-141.
- Solmsen, F. (1909): *Beiträge zur griechischen Wortforschung*. Straßburg.
- Sommer, F. (1948): *Zur Geschichte der griechischen Nominalkomposita*. München.

- Szemerényi, O. (1964): *Syncope in Greek and Indo-European, and the nature of Indo-European accent*. Naples.
- Szemerényi, O. (1971): Review of Chantraine, *Dict. Gnomon* 43, 641–675.
- West, Stephanie (1981): *Omero, Odissea*, I. (No place.)
- Wikén, E. (1937): *Die Kunde der Hellenen von dem Lande und den Völkern der Apenninhalbinsel bis 300 v. Chr.* Lund.
- Wilkes, J. (1992): *The Illyrians*. Oxford.