

MÍR CURAD

STUDIES IN HONOR OF CALVERT WATKINS

Edited by
Jay Jasanoff, H. Craig Melchert
and Lisi Olivier

SONDERDRUCK

Innsbruck 1998

Hades and Elysion

ROBERT S. P. BEEKES

University of Leiden

1. *Hades*

1.1 There is no agreement as yet on the etymology of Hades. I think, however, that it can be shown that one of the solutions proposed is the correct interpretation.

As many names of gods are pre-Greek, one might see whether there is reason to assume this also for Hades. There are no variants of the forms Ἅιδ-, Ἀΐδᾱ- that might point to a non-Indo-European word. In such a case the argumentation becomes more difficult. A disyllabic sequence of two vowels is not very frequent in substratum words, as far as I see.¹ Also, short forms such as this are rare. Thus there is no consideration that points in this direction.

There is a good possibility, then, that the word is Indo-European or made, in Greek, of Indo-European elements. A Thessalian inscription from the fifth century from Larissa (*SEG* XVI 380) which has εἰς Ἀΐδαν proves a wau. I start from the form with lenis (and short α-), on which see below. The form could reflect a PIE root **h₂u(e)id-*, but such a root is unknown. If the form is not a root, it might be a compound. Two proposals have been made to this effect: **h₂u-id-* 'invisible' and **sm₁-uid-* 'zusammentreffen' (Thieme). Both explanations are given in recent literature, but without any strong conviction as to which of the two is the correct one; cf. the dictionaries of Frisk (1955-72), Chantraine (1968-80), and Snell (1955-) s.v.; Burkert 1985:426 (note IV 2, 13 to p. 196); Bremmer 1995:726f.; Henrichs 1996 s.v.

1.2 Thieme's theory (Thieme 1952:35-55), however, is clearly incorrect. Several scholars have expressed doubts; cf. also Meid 1958/9. Thieme connected the word with Skt. *sam vid-* 'das Sichzusammenfinden [i.e. of the family in the underworld]'. I shall not go into the Indian part of the problem; the underworld is not often, and not early referred to in this way: in the Rigveda *sam gam-* is used. In Greek, of course, such an expression is unknown, but it could once have existed. The real problem is that, as Thieme himself explicitly states, this expression cannot have yielded the name of a god, only of the Underworld, the Realm of the Dead. Therefore Thieme has to argue that Ἅιδ- designated the Underworld, whereas the god was indicated by the derivative Ἀΐδᾱ-. Whereas there is no difficulty with the second point, the first—which is essential here—is incorrect. Thieme starts from the observation that in Ψ 244 Ἅιδι κεύθωμαι the word cannot refer to the

¹ In the index of Fumée 1972, I found e.g. the following words: ἀγλαίος, ἄδειος, ἄερος, αἰήσυλος, αἰσινες, ἐπάκλα, ἥερος, ἥϊων, ἥπιαλος, ἥπιος, οἰστός, σιαγών, σίαλον, ὕαλος, ὕελ(λ)ος.

god, but must refer to the Underworld. Then he tries to show that in the other instances the meaning 'Underworld' is also possible. This is the wrong way to approach the problem. Looking at all the occurrences of Ἄιδ- in Homer, it appears that actually all of them refer to the god, except the place mentioned, Ψ 244. The other instances are highly formulaic and therefore most probably represent the older usage of the form. We find:

δόμον Ἄιδος εἴσω# (13 times; once δόμον Ἄιδος; Γ 322; Ζ 284, 422; Η 131; Λ 263; Ξ 457; Υ 336; Χ 425; Ω 246; ι 524; λ 150, 627; ψ 252)
 εὐρυπυλὲς Ἄιδος δῶ# (twice; Ψ 74; λ 571)²
 #εἰς Ἄιδος (... πυλάρταο κρατεροῖο) (3x; Ν 415; Ω 593; κ 502)
 Ἄιδόσδε with a verb of movement (10x; Η 330; Π 856 = Χ 362; Υ 294; Ψ 137; γ 410 = ζ 11; κ 560=λ 65; λ 475)
 (ψυχᾶς) Ἄιδι προίαψε/προιάψει(ν)# (3x; Α 3; Ζ 487; Λ 55)
 Ἄιδι κλυτοπόλωρ# (3x; Ε 654 = Λ 445; Π 625)
 Ἄιδι κεύθωμαι (once; Ψ 244)

Thieme argues for example that Ἄιδι προίαψε refers to the Realm. This is improbable: one throws the souls before the god so that he can snatch them away. Otherwise we would have expected 'send them to the underworld'. This is confirmed by Ἄιδωνῆι προιάψειν Ε 190, which Thieme suggests to be an early misunderstanding.

Thus he interprets Ἄιδος εἴσω as 'into the Underworld', in spite of the use of εἴσω with a genitive. If one looks at the evidence, however, it is clear that this syntagm is a shortening of the formula δόμον Ἄιδος εἴσω, with the correct use of εἴσω with the accusative, and in this formula Ἄιδ- refers to the god. Other considerations of Thieme's are even less convincing and can be passed over here.

Thus we conclude that Ἄιδ- indicates the god, and also, sometimes, probably due to a later development, the Underworld. Thieme's explanation, therefore, cannot be correct. The situation, then, is the same as in Vedic: the underworld has no name, but is referred to with the name of its ruler, Yama in India, Hades in Greece.

1.3 Thus only one explanation remains. This does not mean that it is necessarily correct, but I see no objections whatever to this explanation, and I can add one minor argument in its favour.

A compound **h₂-uid-* can mean both 'not seeing' and 'unseen, invisible'; thus e.g. Ruijgh (1970:307), who compares ἄ-ζυξ 'not brought under the yoke'. The notion is quite apt, as the god of the underworld does not walk on earth (disregarding a few exceptions) as the other gods do. That the other gods usually *make* themselves invisible is another matter: Hades *is* invisible, or perhaps rather *unseen*. Thieme's objection (p. 43) that Hades can be seen by those who

² εὐρυπυλὲς δῶ is clearly shaped after ὑπερεφὲς δῶ, χαλκοβατὲς δῶ. Through the separation, by the insertion of Ἄιδος, the ending -ες had to be counted as long.

descend in the underworld (like Herakles, Odysseus), is not to the point: Hades is invisible, unseen for mortals, simply because he stays in the underworld. Those who descend to the underworld are seeing what they should not see; it is against the order of things.

The Attic form Ἄιδης, with aspiration and long \bar{a} , was explained by Kamerbeek (apud Ruijgh 1970:307) from crasis of ὁ Ἄιδης, cf. ἄνθρωπος (one could also compare οὐνεκά). This is a simple explanation, which solves both problems at the same time.

1.4 The extension of the form with $-\bar{\alpha}-$, indicating a person, as in δεσπότης, is unproblematic.

Here I would add the following observation. The occurrence of Ἄιδης, $-\alpha\omicron$ (twice $-\eta$, once $-\eta\nu$) beside Ἄιδος, Ἄιδος-δε, Ἄιδι is completely parallel to cases like φυγ-ή : φύγα-δε, ἄλκ-ή : ἄλκι, οἶκος : οἶκα-δε. The root noun forms are retained as archaisms, e.g. in the fixed form with $-\delta\epsilon$. That the nominative was first reshaped will be due to the tendency to avoid monosyllables like *φύξ. Our forms exactly fit into this picture. *Ἄις, though often given in discussions, does not occur. This confirms that our word was a (compound ending in a) root noun. And also, I think, it confirms that this word is of an old, inherited type, and therefore a Greek formation built according to an old Indo-European pattern.

There can be no doubt, then, that Ἄιδ(ᾱ)- was the 'Invisible', the 'Unseen' God of the dead.³

2. Elysion

2.1 Burkert (1960/61), following an idea of Vürtheim (1925), explained the word Ἠλύσιον from ἐνελύσιος, which means 'struck by lightning'. The origin of this word is 'in whom (lightning) has entered' ('etwas, in das der Blitz hineingefahren ist'), from the root ἐλευθ-. This word would have been misunderstood (a 'Leumannsches Missverständniss') as ἐν Ἠλυσίῳ. This explanation is incorrect for several reasons. As it is repeated in Burkert (1985:198), and considered definitive by Mrs. Sourvinou-Inwood 1995:17-56, it may be useful to discuss it. Puhvel (1969:67) also rejected the idea, but with a very short remark: 'too many reinterpretations and [this explanation] never explains why the simplex Ἠλύσιος has no fulgural connotations whatever' and that the word ἐνελύσιος 'may well be a post-epic formation'.

In the first place, words of this type remained productive (see Chantraine 1968-80:337b), e.g. προσήλυτος (LXX), which means that these words remained analysable for the speaker, and that a wrong analysis is improbable. Further, the examples given by Burkert are not really comparable: ἡνωρέη, for example, maintains the original meaning of the compound from which it was taken,

³ Later Greek has ἄδης 'unseen'. The formation * \bar{n} -uid-s is found in OIr. *ainb* 'not knowing'.

whereas in our case a completely different interpretation (the name of an afterlife) would have arisen. στήτη 'woman' from διαστήτην is a bizarre example of learned reanalysis, only used by a few poets. I do not know of any parallel from which a name originated. Then, such words remain limited to the epic language, or in any case to highly poetical language. It seems excluded that for such an important concept (the happy afterlife) a name would have arisen in this way.

The problem regarding the religious aspect is also insurmountable. A man or a place struck by lightning has experienced the full power of a god; a man is consumed by it. The man, the place is ἱερός, (Lat.) *sacer*; Nilsson (1967:1.71ff) uses the word tabu; the place is ἄβατον. One may well compare the story of the death of Semele. On her own request Zeus visits her in his full glory, strength, power, and Semele is consumed by it. This notion is well known. Now Burkert states the following (1961:211): 'der vom Blitz Erschlagene ist nicht tot wie die anderen Toten, eine besondere Kraft ist in ihn eingegangen, er ist in ein höheres Dasein entrückt.' For the first statement there is no evidence, however; the second is correct (see above); for the last statement, again, there is no evidence. As far as I can see it is nowhere stated, directly or indirectly, that a man struck by lightning goes to Elysion. This can best be seen from the examples given by Burkert.

He mentions Semele and Asklepios as examples, and (1961:211, n. 3) Kapaneus. We have mentioned Semele already (she was killed by Zeus' appearance only, but sometimes it is said that she was killed by his lightnings; the difference is irrelevant here). Semele became a goddess, but that is not the same thing as going to Elysion; there are no gods in Elysion. As Gantz (1993:476) says: 'Such a development [Semele becoming a goddess] seems obvious enough, given the status of her son'; her son was Dionysos. That she was not in the Elysion appears from the fact that (according to some stories, Gantz *ibid.*) Dionysos went to Hades to fetch her. Thus, she was in Hades, dead like the other dead.

As to Asklepios, he was killed by Zeus with a thunderbolt. However, the stories say nothing more. They continue by telling that his father, Apollo, in wrath killed the Kuklopes, who made the lightnings, but there is no word about a special fate for Asklepios. If he was later invoked as a god, it was, of course, because people needed the famous Healer.

Of Kapaneus Burkert (1961:211, n. 3) states that he too was ἱερός, 'sacred' ('heilig'). That is correct in the sense discussed above. But there is no evidence that he went to Elysion. On the contrary, it is said that Asklepios raised the dead Kapaneus (Gantz 91). This again implies that Kapaneus was in Hades, as it would be ridiculous (for the myth-maker) to bring someone back from Elysion.

Cocco (1955:421—he has the same idea about people struck by lightning, but maintains the old etymology which derives ἐνηλύσιος from Ἠλύσιον; cf. note 5) mentions Salmoneus. He was killed by Zeus' lightning because he tried to be another Zeus. Greek sources say nothing about what happened after his death; one would expect that Apollodorus (1, ix 7) would have mentioned that there

was a story that he went to Elysion. Vergil (Aeneid 6, 585) places him in Tartarus, which he would not have done if there was a tradition that he was in Elysion. In fact Vergil says: *Hic* (in Tartarus) ... *fulmine dejecti fundo voluntur in imo* (580f). I conclude that there is no evidence at all that people killed by lightning went to Elysion. On the contrary, there are cases where we know that such people went to Hades.

Then, Burkert assumes that Ἠλύσιον was a place struck by lightning, as did the ancients: Hesychius s.v. calls it κεκεραυνωμένον χωρίον ἢ πεδίον. There are two problems with this idea. First there is no evidence at all that Elysium was ever conceived as a place struck by lightning. The explanation by the ancients is a pure etymological guess. Burkert thought that people struck by lightning went to Elysium, which is not correct, as we saw. But even if this were correct, there is no reason at all to suppose that these people went to a place which was (itself) struck by lightning. Thus, there is no evidence at all for Burkert's explanation.

There is a further difficulty in the word πεδίον. One would expect 'a place struck by lightning', hardly a plain. (Did a whole plain become sacred after it had been struck by a lightning, or are we to suppose that it was struck time and again?). Burkert tries to overcome this in the following way (1961:212): 'denn dies darf man den zitierten Lexikographen entnehmen: ein kleines, vom Blitz gezeichnetes Stück Land, nicht nur eine grosse "Ebene", kann wie χωρίον so πεδίον heissen, wie auch Euripides die Stelle, wo Semele vom Blitz getroffen wurde, ἄβατον πέδον nennt (Bacch. 10).' This is again quite wrong. That the lexicographers added πεδίον after χωρίον was clearly because they wanted to explain the term Ἠλύσιον πεδίον. In classical Greek πεδίον means 'plain' and nothing else; thus 'ein kleines... Stück Land' cannot be called πεδίον. A second mistake is his quotation from Euripides to show that πεδίον can be used for a small piece of land, for Euripides uses πέδον, and this means 'ground, earth, site', i.e. Euripides uses exactly the word we would expect, but not πεδίον.

The conclusion is that there is no evidence at all in favour of Burkert's explanation, and that several considerations make it impossible.

2.2 Puhvel (1969) finds a meadow in the otherworld in Hittite and equates this with Elysion. (The same idea was suggested earlier by Szemerényi, *Gnomon* 43 (1971) 670). The Hittite word used for 'meadow' is *wēllu-*. Puhvel argues that the word Ἠλύσιον is cognate with this word, and posits **wł-nu-tiyo-* > **Fαλνυτιο-* > **Fαλυσιο-*. The meaning of Ἠλύσιον πεδίον would then be 'meadowy field'. The proposed meaning, 'meadowy', seems to me rather unnatural (and I would expect a compound, as in βαθύλειμος, or an adjective in **-uent-*), but the formal aspect gives more certainty. The root shape might be explained in the way indicated, but the suffix is not so easy as Puhvel suggests. The point is that forms in *-σιος* contain the suffix *-iō-* added to forms ending in *-τ-*; cf. Chantraine 1933:40f and Schwyzler 1939-53:1.465. Puhvel compares νεκύσια, μεθύσιον (· εἶδος ἀμπέλου), τηύσιος and θαλύσια. The last word has long *ū* and is therefore irrelevant. νεκύσια has been shaped after γενέσια (Schwyzler l.c.). μεθύσιον may have

been derived from μέθυος (Chantraine 1968-80). There remains only τηύσιος, but this form is unexplained and cannot therefore be adduced as evidence for a suffix -σιος added after an *u*-stem.⁴ Διαπρύσιον is also unclear. Thus, Greek does not have a suffix -σιος that could be added to a *u*-stem. The explanation is therefore impossible. Combined with the strange meaning of the expression, this means that we have to reject the hypothesis.⁵

2.3 I think that we can say something positive about Ἠλύσιον. In a way, it makes an etymology unnecessary.

The word should first be analysed within Greek. It is an adjective, formed with -ιο-. (We have seen that Greek had no suffix -σιος; and where -σιος is found it is derived from a noun in -τ-). This suffix makes predominantly denominative adjectives, meaning 'gehörend zu ...'. etc. (Risch 1974:112); it indicates 'l'appartenance d'une manière générale' (Ruijgh 1967:99). This means that the adjective probably does not have a qualifying value like 'fertile' or 'rich in water, or meadows', but that the phrase Ἠλύσιον πεδίον rather means 'the Plain of ...'. What we expect in this case is a proper name, probably a geographical one. Compare *LSJ* s.v. πεδίον: 'freq. with gen. or adj. of particular plains'. Thus we find in Homer, with the suffix -ιο-: πεδίον Σκαμάνδριον, Ἰλίου, Νύσιον; in Herodotus: Ἀλίου π., Θριάσιον. We have seen that -σιος originated from a stem in -τ-. In names, it is also derived from a stem in -σ- (which remains between vowels, which mostly implies that the word is pre-Hellenic, "Helladic"). Thus we have a Λαρίσιον π., near Hierapytna in eastern Crete, derived from (*)Λάρισα (the name is of course well known, but not in this area). We now know that the -σ- can also originate from -(v)θ-, as shown by Myc. *korisijo* /kori(n)sios/ from Κόρινθος, *zakusijo* /zaku(n)sios/ from Ζάκυνθος. In classical Greek we also have several forms of this type: Προβαλίσσιος, Τρικορύσιος and Λαρύσιον beside (Ζεὺς) Λαρύν-θιος (cf. Heubeck 1972:92). Cocco (1955:410f) mentions: Ἀμαρυσία, an epithet of Artemis, from Ἀμάρυνθος; Ὀλυσία, a town in Chalcidice, from Ὀλυνθος; Κικύσιον, a town in Elis, beside Κικυνθός, an island in the gulf of Pagasae.⁶ A form in -υνθος is improbable in our case, as the adjective would have had in that case a long vowel (as a result of the loss of the -n-), while the υ in our word is short. However, beside the suffixes -υνθος and -υνθος we have forms without -n- (αἶγινθος - αἶγιθος etc.; cf. Kuiper 1956:216),

⁴ The meaning 'idle, vain' makes connection with the word for 'to steal' improbable; the connection is given with much hesitation by Frisk and Chantraine. If τητάομαι 'be deprived of' contains this root (cf. OCS *tati*), this might show that Greek knew the form **teh₂-t-*, and not **teh₂-iu-*. τηύσιος is compared with ἐτώσιος, which has the same meaning, but this word is also unclear.

⁵ Cocco (1955) defends the idea that Ἠλύσιον is derived from El, the name of the Semitic god, assuming that it is a vestige of an old layer of Semitic populations in Crete. The idea has little to commend itself.

⁶ Ζεὺς Ἀλύσιος and the mountain Ἄλυσις mentioned in the scholia on Aratos, *Phaenomena* 33, is too uncertain; see Martin 1974, ad loc.

so perhaps our word ended in -υ(ν)θος. There are names in -υθος, e.g. Σίβυθος, but they are not frequent. With -υτ- I know Ἄφντις, Μόδντος. Names in -υσ- are also known: Ἰάλυσος (with long *ū*), Κικύσιον (see above), Ἄμφρυσος/Ἄμβρυσος, a river in Thessaly and a town in Phocis (with the adjective Ἄμφ/βρύσιος).

So it seems most probable that Ἠλύσιον πεδίον meant 'the Plain of *Elusos*' or some such form. In fact there are several possibilities for the name. The word could have had a *μ*- (see Puhvel 1969:68, who suggested reading σε Φηλύσιον for σ' ἐς Ἠλύσιον in d 563); if the *η*- is metrically lengthened (*ελυσιο- is impossible in the hexameter), the word might have had *ε*-; also *ᾱ*- is possible (cf. Ἀῆμνος) or even *α*- with metrical lengthening (cf. Ἠμαθῆ); then -τ- or -θ- or -σ-; the ending could have had many forms: -ς, -ος, -α, -ις. Ruijgh 1967:155 suggested for the personal name Myc. *erusijo* (in Pylos, Vn 130, 3) Ἠλύσιος (a name later found in Plutarch). This form may have had *ἐ*-, *ῆ*- and -*s*- from -τ/θ/σ-. However, Mycenaean *r* may also represent *r*. Disregarding the length of the *e* and possible *a* we may note **Eluth/s*- as the most probable form, name of a city or a district, a mountain, or perhaps an island. Note that, if the *η*- is metrical, the basic word closely resembles Eleusis, Ἐλευσίς < Ἐλευσ/θ-ῖν-; comparison with Cretan Ἐλευθ-έρνα suggests a base Ἐλευθ-, which may have had an "ablaut" form *ΕΛυθ-. (I consider these names as "Helladic", see section 3). It may seem nonsensical to look for the Elysian Plain on the map, but this is no more strange than to look for the *Olympos*. (Note the agreement in structure of this word with **Eluth/s*-). As in the case of *Olympos*, it is of no use to ask for the etymology of **Eluth/s*-. Finally, one may recall the 'Garden of Eden' for another designation of a paradise with only a place name (which is also further unknown).

2.4 Was Elysion a Minoan concept, as has mostly been assumed on the basis of the non-Greek name? This question is not settled if it is accepted that the word Elysios (or rather the word from which it was derived) is pre-Greek. For if indeed it was a place-name, this does not prove much, as most geographical names in Greece are pre-Greek: the fact that *Olympos* or Athens are pre-Greek names does not imply that concepts associated with them are of pre-Greek origin. On the other hand, this remains quite possible. I would like to stress that Elysion is probably different in origin from the Islands of the Blest; thus Sourvinou-Inwood 1995:51 ('two early versions of paradise'). It is possible that the Plain was thought to be on an island, but there is no indication for that. The position of Elysion at the end of the world and near Okeanos does not mean much: it is an obvious place to put paradise. One might consider the possibility that this position was taken over from the Islands of the Blessed, which would mean that in our earliest source the two concepts had already started to converge. Mrs. Sourvinou-Inwood (1995:51) thinks that the fact that there are two versions 'can best be explained if the concept of paradise was new in the eighth century'. This is possible, but it is in no way decisive, I think. She objects to transposing archaic Greek concepts in their totality to Minoan times, with which I agree. Nevertheless I see no reason why the basic concept could not be of Minoan origin.

3. *Eleusis and Eileithuia*

Heubeck (1972), who follows Burkert's explanation of Elysion, derives from the root ἐλευθ- 'to come' also *Eleusis* and *Eileithuia*. This interpretation is most improbable.

3.1 For 'ἐλευσίς < *ἐλευθ-ιν- derivation from 'to come' seems quite inadequate. Heubeck takes it as 'wo die Menge der Gläubigen zusammenkommt, oder die Gottheit einzutreffen, zu erscheinen pflegt?'. (Note that there was another Eleusis south of Lake Kopais, and one on Thera).

For the suffix -ιν- one should first compare other geographical names. It is found, close to Eleusis, in Salamis (Σαλαμ-ιν-), which is evidently non-Greek (as Heubeck admits). This is a strong indication of non-Greek origin for Eleusis too. (The suffix may also be found in Λετρίνοι, a place-name in Elis, and in the name of the Τελχίνες on Rhodes; Heubeck mentions the Τραχίνες).

One might also compare 'Ελεύθερνα, in Crete, where the suffix is also non-Greek (cf. *Phalasarna* etc.).

Heubeck cannot accept that 'ἐλευθ- is not the Greek root, and objects to a 'trägerisches und verführerisches Spiel des Zufalls', but when a language takes over thousands of words from a substratum language, evidently some will closely resemble words of the superstratum. It is even to be expected that they are adapted to structures of the superstratum.

3.2 The variants Εἰλείθια, 'Ελείθια, Εἰλήθια, 'Ελεύθια, 'Ελευθή, 'Ελευθία are explained by dissimilations, etc. This is to some extent possible, but the point is that inherited words never show such a great number of variants. The Mycenaean form *ereutia* /Eleuthia/ already presents a problem if one assumes a Greek formation in -ια, as Heubeck does. It is much more probable that we have to do with different adaptations of a foreign name. The form Εἰλήθια, which is well attested, can hardly be accounted for otherwise. Cf. for ε/η perhaps 'Αλείσιον, for which also the form 'Αλήσιον is given (Leaf on Λ 757); and λείτωρ/λητ- (see the etymological dictionaries).

The suffix -ια need not necessarily be the perfect participle. In some cases it is probably non-Greek, as e.g. in κώδνια, -ύα, -εα, -ία 'head of a plant, bulb'. I think that these words are all pre-Greek. I shall discuss them in the next section.

One may also compare the nymph 'Ορείθια, whose name has been interpreted as containing ὄρος 'mountain' and -θια from the verb θύω, θύω, with the meaning 'im Gebirge stürmend' (e.g. *Kleine Pauly* s.v.). This is not a probable name for a Nereid (Il. 18, 39ff). Essential is that the long ὀ- cannot be explained. It could only be due to metrical lengthening, but it is quite improbable that a metrical lengthening of such a name, which may have occurred a few times in poetry, was generalized. Therefore the etymology is of the naive type, as found in folk etymologies (it dates back to antiquity). Much more probably

the name is pre-Greek, with the same suffix -via as in Eileithuia. Note that the structure of the two names is completely parallel.

I conclude, then, that both *Eleusis* and *Eileithuia* have to be considered pre-Greek.

3.3 Words in -via. As was argued by Szemerényi 1964:203ff, the Greek words in -via are of pre-Greek origin (with one exception, in his view, on which see below). His main argument is that perfects should have reduplication, which these words do not have. Referring to Szemerényi's treatment, I make a few remarks on each of the relevant words.

The word κώδεια, -ύα, -εια, -εα, -ία 'head of a plant, bulb' has no etymology. The varying suffixes demonstrate foreign origin. αἶθια, a bird, is no doubt a foreign word; cf. Szemerényi 207: the connection with αἶθω 'burn' is '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?' (cf. Beekes forthc.). μάθια · γνάθοι Hsch. has been connected with μασάομαι 'to chew'. In order to do so one has assumed that μασάομαι derives from *μαθ-*i*-. However, to explain μαστάξ 'mouth, mouthful' one needs a 'nebenher laufende τ-Erweiterung μασ-τ-' (aus *μαθ-τ-), deren Funktion indessen unbekannt bleibt' (Frisk s.v.). These derivational problems rather point to a non-IE word, as does the -a- (which is perhaps confirmed by Lat. *mandō*); this could be explained from *mh₂dh-, but together with the other problems it rather is a further argument for non-IE origin. As to μάθια itself, a perfect is semantically quite improbable. ἄγρια 'road' is derived from ἄγω, the word supposed to be a 'Triftweg'. Snell (1955-) s.v. gives the formula σκιάωντο τε πᾶσαι ἄγριαι as evidence, but εὐρύαγρια is used in formulas with πόλις and names of cities, so the word does not only refer to agricultural roads. Szemerényi points to 'insurmountable semantic difficulties' and concludes that it is popular etymology and that the word is an indigenous word. Note that words for road are often of foreign origin, cf. ὁδός,⁷ κέλευθος,⁸ ἀτραπός.⁹

Ἄρπια/Ἀρεπια. Szemerényi argues that a perfect participle gives no satisfactory meaning, and that this alone is sufficient to refute this interpretation, and that the word is pre-Greek. The variation in the vocalism cannot be due to

⁷ ὁδός has been connected with OCS *xodŭ*. This yields a problem, since Winter's law now makes us expect **xadŭ*. Rather than assuming an interchange *d/dʰ*, this points to non-IE origin of the word. (Connection with Skt. *sad-* 'to sit' is improbable: *ā sad-* 'approach' can be easily derived from *sad-* 'to sit'). Kortlandt thinks that *xodŭ* is a Slavic innovation based on **si-sd-*.

⁸ κέλευθος has no etymology. The connection with Lith. *kēlias* is uncertain. The suffixation is non-IE.

⁹ The explanation of ἀτραπός from an α- copulativum and τραπεῶ 'kelter' (which is separated from τρέπω) is quite unconvincing. Russ. *tropá* 'path' may be cognate, but does not prove Indo-European origin.

ablaut in the feminine participle. Szemerényi regards the forms without *-ε-* as due to syncope. I doubt this explanation (see the quotes from Rix below), and consider this variation as further proof of pre-Greek origin.

Oreithuia was discussed in the previous section.

The only word which Szemerényi (229ff) regards as an original perfect participle is ὄργυια/ὀρόγυια 'fathom'. I think that this word too is pre-Greek. Szemerényi thinks that it contains reduplication. He assumes *ωρογυια (with *ω-* as reduplication), syncope to *ωργυια, shortening according to Osthoff to ὄργυια, and anaptyxis to ὀρόγυια. In this sequence I doubt the syncope as well as the anaptyxis. Both phenomena were rare in Greek. Compare e.g. Rix 1976:58: 'Synkope ist im Griech. selten. Kombinatorische Bedingungen sind nicht zu erkennen; meist scheint der Vokalverlust in Sprechsituationen mit besonderem Sprachtempo (Anruf, Einschub etc.) eingetreten und von dort verallgemeinert zu sein'. And on the same page he says: 'Anaptyxe ... begegnet im Griech. gelegentlich in nicht-hochsprachlichen Denkmälern (...). Schriftsprachliche Beispiele (...) sind problematisch'. In any case it cannot be demonstrated that the form had reduplication.

The variants with and without *-o-* present a problem. They are not ablaut (rejected by Frisk; the feminine of the perfect participle had no ablaut in the root); syncope or anaptyxis have just been discussed. This points to a substratum word, where anaptyxis (or syncope) is frequent: cf. (σ)κόνυζα, κνύζα, σκόρ(ο)δον, κ(ο)ρόμπος, etc. (see Furnée 1972:378-385).

Semantically one would expect from the current interpretation '(arms) which have stretched themselves out (and are now stretched out)'. Though this is theoretically possible, it seems an unnatural way to indicate 'outstretched arms'. One does not speak of arms that stretch themselves out; arms are stretched (by a person), and one expects a simple verbal adjective in *-to-*, as in ὀρεκτός. (In Greek ὀρέγω mostly means 'to stretch out in order to...', it is first translated with 'reach' in *LSJ*. I will not emphasize this point, as a more literal meaning may have been the older one).¹⁰

Decisive is that this verb (**h₃reg-*) did not have an active perfect. Thus Ernout-Meillet s.v. *regō* say: 'la racine ne fournissait pas de présent radical non plus que de parfait.' Thus it is improbable that Greek had an old (active) perfect. It only has a middle perfect, ὀρωρέχεται Il., ὀρεγμαι Hp., which clearly are recent formations on account of their *e*-vocalism.

Finally we have seen that the other forms in *-υια* are all loanwords. Thus we must conclude that ὄργυια too is a pre-Greek word.

¹⁰ I think that the idea was traditionally expressed with forms of the root **ten-*. Thus ὄργυια is defined by the scholia ad Il. 23,327 as ἡ τῶν δύο χειρῶν ... ἑκτασις. The Indo-Iranian compound Skt. *uttānāhasta-*, Av. *ustānazasta-*, from **-tñH-no-* confirms the antiquity of this syntagm; see Beekes 1982/83:206f.

Bibliography

- Beekes, R.S.P. 1982/83. On Laryngeals and Pronouns. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 96.200-232.
- . forthc. Aithiopes. *Glotta*.
- Bremmer, J.N. 1995. Article *Hades* in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, ed. K. van der Trom et al. Leiden/New York: Brill.
- Burkert, W. 1961. Elysion. *Glotta* 39.208-213.
- . 1985. *Greek Religion*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Chantraine, P. 1933. *La formation des noms en grec ancien*. Paris: Champion.
- . 1968-80. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: histoire des mots*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Cocco, V. 1955. Relitti semitici a Creta: Hom. Ἠλύσιον πεδίων. *Biblos. Revista da Faculdade de Letras de Coimbra* 31.401-422.
- Frisk, H. 1955-72. *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Furnée, E.J. 1972. *Die wichtigsten konsonantischen Erscheinungen des Vorgriechischen*. The Hague/Paris: Mouton.
- Gantz, T. 1993. *Early Greek Myth*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press.
- Henrichs, A. 1996. Article *Hades* in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 3rd edition, ed. by S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth. Oxford/New York: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Heubeck, A. 1972. Etymologische Vermutungen zu Eleusis und Eileithyia. *Kadmos* 11.87-95.
- Kuiper, F.B.J. 1956. The Etymology of ἄνθρωπος. *MNHMHΣ XAPIN. Gedenkschrift Paul Kretschmer*, ed. H. Kronasser, 211-226. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- LSJ. Liddell, H.G. and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th edition revised by H. St. Jones and R. McKenzie. Oxford: 1940.
- Martin, J. 1974. *Scholia in Aratum*. Stuttgart: Teubner.
- Meid, W. 1958/9. Review of Thieme 1952. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 64.187-191.
- Nilsson, M.P. 1967. *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*. I (3rd edition). München: Beck.
- Puhvel, J. 1969. 'Meadow in the Otherworld' in Indo-European tradition. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 83.64-69.
- Risch, E. 1974. *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
- Rix, H. 1976. *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Ruijgh, C.J. 1967. *Études sur la grammaire et le vocabulaire du grec mycénien*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.
- . 1970. Review of Chantraine 1968. *Lingua* 25.302-321.
- Snell, Bruno. 1955-. *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.

- Sourvinou-Inwood, Christiane. 1995. *'Reading' Greek Death*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Szemerényi, O. 1964. *Syncopé in Greek and Indo-European and the Nature of Indo-European Accent*. Naples.
- Thieme, P. 1952. *Studien zur indogermanischen Wortkunde und Religionsgeschichte*. *Berichte der Sächsischen Akad. der Wiss. zu Leipzig, Phil.-Hist. Kl.* 98/5. Also in: *Indogermanische Dichtersprache*, ed. R. Schmitt, 133- 153. Darmstadt: 1968.
- Vurtheim, J.J.G. 1925. Rhadamanthys, Ilithyia, Elysion. *Mededelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde*, 59. Amsterdam.

Charles de Lamberterie: Langues de feu. Grec hésiodique λελιχμότες : sanskrit védique <i>ririhvás-</i>	373
Winfred Lehmann: Explanation of Syntactic Changes in Late Indo-European by Use of Universals	391
Fredrik Otto Lindeman: On the Origin of the Present Subjunctive of the Substantive Verb in Old Irish	405
A. Lubotsky: New Phrygian Metrics and the δεως ζεμελωσ Formula	413
Horace Lunt: What Makes Slavic Slavic?	423
Proinsias Mac Cana: Complex Adjectival Predicates in Insular Celtic	439
J. P. Mallory: The Old Irish Chariot	451
Kim McCone: "Double Nasal" Presents in Celtic, and Old Irish <i>léicid</i> 'leaves'	465
Wolfgang Meid: Zum Ruhm des Namens im Altirischen	477
H. Craig Melchert: Poetic Meter and Phrasal Stress in Hittite	483
Gregory Nagy: Is There an Etymology for the Dactylic Hexameter?	495
Erich Neu: Hethitisch <i>hur-dant-</i> 'verletzt, angeschlagen, erschöpft' vs. hethitisch <i>hu(ua)rtant-</i> 'verflucht'	509
Günter Neumann: Zur Trilingue vom Letoon. Der letzte Satz der lykischen Version	513
Alan Nussbaum: Severe Problems	521
Norbert Oettinger: Semantisches zu Pan, Pūsan und Hermes	539
Lisi Oliver: Towards Freeing a Slave in Germanic Law	549
Hayden Pelliccia: The Transposition of Aeschylus, <i>Agamemnon</i> 1203-1204, and the Uses of μῶν	561
Steve Peter: Healfdene's Honey: A Bear Bearn in <i>Beowulf</i>	573
Martin Peters: Homerisches und Unhomerisches bei Homer und auf dem Nestorbecher	585
Edgar C. Polomé: Some Considerations on Dutch <i>erg</i> , etc.	603
Jaan Puhvel: Latin <i>furor</i> : Help from Hittite	607
Donald Ringe: Schwa-rounding and the Chronology of Sound Changes in Tocharian	611
Helmut Rix: Bemerkungen zu den lateinischen Verbformen des Typs <i>faxo faxim</i>	619
Rüdiger Schmitt: Tradition und Innovation. Zu indoiranischen Formeln und Fügungen im Altpersischen	635
P. O. Skjærvø: Eastern Iranian Epic Traditions I: Siyāvaš and Kunāla	645
Klaus Strunk: Lateinisches Gerundium / Gerundivum und Vergleichbares	659
Richard Thomas: Voice, Poetics and Virgil's Sixth <i>Eclogue</i>	669
Johann Tischler: Calque-Erscheinungen im Anatolischen	677
Brent Vine: The Etymology of Greek κόμη and Related Problems	685
Michael Weiss: On Some Problems of Final Syllables in South Picene	703

INNSBRUCKER BEITRÄGE ZUR SPRACHWISSENSCHAFT

Herausgeber: Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Meid
Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck
A-6020 Innsbruck, Innrain 52

Bestell- und Auslieferungsadresse:
A-6020 Innsbruck, Elisabethstraße 11
Telefon und Telefax: (+43-512) 561945