

ROBERT S. P. BEEKES

KADMOS AND EUROPA, AND THE PHOENICIANS

1. The discussion in *Der Neue Pauly* (by K. Meister) of the Phoenicia-problem of the Kadmos-story is quite inadequate. Especially a mere reference to Edwards' monography on Kadmos the Phoenician is insufficient to settle the matter. (Vian interprets the story of Kadmos as containing traces of an Indo-European tripartite society. As I do not believe in Dumézil's theories on this point, I shall not discuss them.)

2. Kadmos and Europa

The story of Europa is quite straightforward: While she was on the shore with her companions, Zeus approached her in the shape of a bull. She mounted the bull, it went into the sea and took her to Crete. There it mated with her. The children were Minos and Rhadamanthys. Afterwards she married king Asterios.

There is in her story nothing about Kadmos. He would have gone to continental Greece, not to Crete, to search for her. And so he did not find her and instead founded Thebes. He would have been her uncle. So there is no story about his search: it is only said that he went the wrong way and did not find her. It is clear, then, that there was no (story of the) search. It would have been a story that did not begin. So it becomes clear that Kadmos' adventures were only later linked to the story of Europa, and that originally he had nothing to do with her. This means that his connection with Europa cannot be used as an argument to show that Kadmos came from Phoenicia.

Also there is a story parallel to that of Europa, the story of queen Pasiphae. This makes clear that it was expected that the queen 'married' the supreme god, in the shape of a bull. The cult of the bull was essential in Crete – one need only think of the ceremonial games, sports around the bull. The conclusion is that the story of Europa is a typically Cretan story, which has nothing to do with Phoenicia.

Further, the name of Europa is reminiscent of names beginning with Εὐρώπ- or Εὐροπ-, found in Greece north of the Gulf of Corinth. This name cannot be Indo-European, and as it is well established in northern Greece, must be of Pre-Greek origin. (The word cannot contain εὐρυ-, of which the second -υ- would have been preserved.) On these names see Sommer 1937, 185 n. and 255ff. (Krahe's *Balkanillyrische geographische Namen* 73f. is insufficient; see Beekes 1995/6, 18–21). There are two towns called *Eurōpos* in Macedonia (one in Almōpia) and a third on the Peneios (see the map in Ninck 1946, 16); there is a river *Eurōpos* (that flows into the Peneios; Ninck 17).¹ Cf. further the *Κασσωποί*.

It has been suspected that she was a supernatural being, perhaps an earth goddess (Berve 1966, 468). This is rather uncertain, as our data are very meagre. However, they make it clear that she was not merely a human being. We find a Demeter *Europia* and a Hera *Europia* (Ninck 1946, 17). It is told that Europe was hidden by Zeus in a grotto near Teumessos, east of Thebes (id. 17). Less clear Bühler 1968, 44f.

The conclusion is clear: Europa was an old, supernatural figure in Greece, a goddess or semi-goddess, probably of Pre-Greek date. And her story fits completely with what we know of Crete. There is no basis for a Phoenician origin. Several things remain unclear, however. First, we do not know what exactly she was. Then, her provenance is uncertain. She seems at home north of the Corinthian Gulf. How she came to be associated with Crete is not known. Perhaps she was a Pre-Greek figure which was also venerated in Crete. I am very sceptical about theories on peoples moving to Crete. In spite of the unanswered questions, however, it remains clear enough that she was a Greek, rather a Pre-Greek figure which had nothing to do with Phoenicia.

As to the question how Europa came to be associated with Phoenicia, I think that it is not too difficult to imagine a possible origin. Her father was called Phoenix in Homer (Ξ 321), which may have been one reason to suppose a Phoenician origin. Then, the question may have arisen from where she came, carried by the bull. If one imagines a shore from where she could have come, one may think of Greece, or Anatolia, Phoenicia, or Egypt. The connections of Phoenicians with Crete, which have been demonstrated by archaeology,

¹ Dura-Eurōpos in Syria, well known from the excavations, got its name when the town was re-founded by Seleukos Nikator in 280, from the Macedonian *Eurōpos* (Ninck 1946, 251 note 17: 1).

may have been a factor that made it natural for Greeks/Cretans to think of Phoenicia. (In fact, of course, it is hardly possible to assume a Phoenician origin, or how did she come to Crete; few shall be willing to consider the possibility, suggested in Antiquity, that she was abducted from there.) Returning to Kadmos, we conclude that the connection with Europa was not original, and that Europa did not come from Phoenicia.

As to Kadmos and Europa, I would keep open the possibility that they were associated because both would have lived in Boeotia. But this cannot be verified.

3. The continent Europa

The name for the continent was originally also a country in Macedonia; Hdt. 6, 43; 7, 8 β1. In hAp. 251, 291, it is Central Greece. This fits exactly with the origin of the names with -ωπ/οπ-. It is, then, a Pre-Greek name, the name of a country. A direct connection with the goddess Europa does not seem to exist (though it is possible that the name, of which the meaning is unknown to us, was ultimately the same). It is improbable, then, that the word had a Semitic etymology. On names of countries in -η see Sommer 1937, 254.² See Ninck 1946, 17–19 (who still tries an IE etymology).³ (Very daring speculations in Andrews 1969.) Iustinus writes that east of the Thracian mountains, in Europe, a king Euryps ruled (Iust. VII.1). Ammianus Marcellinus puts the Roman province of Europe south of Constantinopel, on the Sea of Marmara, with the town of Perinthos (XXVII. 4. 12).⁴ In Byzantine times there was a diocese Europa on the eastern coast of Thracia. (See Gommers 32, without reference.)

4. West's alternative

The idea that the hero Kadmos was secondarily derived from *Kadmeioi/Kadmeia* is quite possible. The idea has been advanced earlier; see Edwards 1979, 188. The last to do so was M. L. West (1997, 448ff.). He explains *Kadmeioi* from *Qadmiyūma* ('peoples of the east', Ugaritic *qdmym*) or **Qadmiyyim* (a plural, I think, but West does not indicate what form it is). The words would mean either 'the men from the east' or 'the men of old'. He then argues that Phoeni-

² The gloss Εὐρώπη: χώρα τῆς δύσεως H. is understandable (it has the addition ἡ σκοτεινή); a second gloss εὐρώπης: ἡ πατρίς H. is called *obscurum* by Latte.

³ The idea of the European Union to take Europa on the bull, generally known as a Phoenician princess, as a symbol for the union, was not a happy one.

⁴ This Europa is indicated on the (second) map XII of Kiepert.

cians in Greece might have called themselves ‘Men of the east’, just like the Norsemen called themselves Norsemen. In n. 33, however, he mentions that the Phoenicians, where we know it, did not call themselves thus, but ‘Canaanites’. He himself prefers a different theory: “seeing the impressive ruins of the Mycenaean citadel, they attributed them to ‘the men of old’, the **qadmīyîm*. They might also have applied the word to those occupants of ancient graves who in the eighth century were beginning to be the object of hero cults: we recall its use [of the word *qdmym*] of the Ugaritic Healer-heroes. Its ambiguity, together with the immigrants’ natural desire for status, might then have encouraged the notion that those **qadmīyîm* were actually *bnê qadm*, sons of the east – or sons of Kadmos.” I find this such a complicated and improbable series of assumptions that it hardly deserves further discussion.

Luisa Prandi (1986, 46f.) comes close to the idea of West. She assumes that “a group of people” travelling from east to west reached the coast of the Aegean (first in Thracia). She does not specify their exact origin, but they must have spoken West-Semitic, for she accepts the Kadmos etymology. Nor does she say explicitly that they came by ship, though I think that this is what she means. What we see, then, is that she does no longer simply say that the Phoenicians settled in Boeotia (in the same way as in the case of their other settlements in the Mediterranean).

West’s hypothesis too is more vague than about the usually assumed arrival of Phoenicians (449). He says that “a group of Semitic-speakers, presumably Phoenicians” lived in Boeotia. He adds: “We need not think in terms of an invading horde: a peaceful trading colony is much more likely.” West apparently does not reject the possibility of an invasion.

Now if both authors assume Phoenicians coming in the well-known way, we are back to the traditional conception. But they clearly want to leave open the possibility of a different scenario. I discuss here very shortly this proposal: they were Semites, but perhaps no Phoenicians, migrating toward the Greek mainland, by ship or even over land.

West defends the presence of a Semitic people by saying (p. 449) that “it is no more out of the way than the well-attested settlements of (1) Achaeans in Crete or Cyprus, (2) of Assyrians in Anatolia, or (3) of Phoenicians in Sicily, Sardinia, Spain, and North Africa.” (The numbers are mine.) This looks imposing, but it is not convincing.

Nr. (3) refers to the well-known Phoenician settlements and is not now under discussion. (1) concerns Greeks, but we are looking for a

Semitic people travelling to Europe. (2) shows the maximum range of migration (though in this case again it concerns only a settlement of merchants) of a Semitic people. But Anatolia is not very far from the home of this Semitic people; it can be reached overland; it is an adjoining country. So the conclusion is that there is no evidence for a Semitic people migrating to Europe, other than the Phoenicians through their trade-settlements. An even better parallel are the Etruscans migrating from north-western Asia Minor to Italy. However, they are not Semitic, nor coming from the area of the Semitic peoples. The point is not whether the supposed migration is in itself imaginable, but that no Semitic people is known ever to have made such a migration. This means that the alternative is without any support and therefore quite improbable. The traditional view thus is replaced by a more improbable one.

5. Kadmos from Kadmeioi

In her 1986 article, p. 42f., Luisa Prandi discusses the occurrences of the name Kadmeioi in Homer.⁵ She draws a conclusion I cannot agree with.

Kadmeioi and its derivative Kadmeiōnes occur seven times in the Iliad; in the Odyssey only in λ 276; that is eight times in all. Kadmos is mentioned only once, ε 333, as the father of Ino. Now, Prandi concludes from the frequency of the term Kadmeioi and the near-absence of the name Kadmos that the name of the hero was later derived from Kadmeioi. The passages in book Δ recount the story how Tydeus visited Thebes and in athletic games won the victory of all his opponents. Furious, fifty Kadmeioi laid an ambush, but Tydeus killed them all (except one). So in fact these three passages can be reduced to one, where the Kadmeioi are mentioned. There was no reason to refer to Kadmos. It would have been much too long, and out of place in the context. In Ψ too, a hero is mentioned who defeated the Kadmeioi in games; again this is a very short remark, where a mention of Kadmos would be out of place. The place in the Odyssey mentions the reign of Oidipous, where mentioning Kadmos would be hardly possible. So what we find is that Kadmos is not mentioned because Homer had no need to mention him. No conclusion on the origin of the name Kadmos can therefore be drawn from Homer, though it is quite possible of course that Kadmos was derived from Kadmeioi or Kadmeia.

⁵ Europa e i Cadmei: la 'versione beotica' del mito. The title just means the part of the myth that is situated in Boeotia; we do not have a Boeotian version.

6. The name Kadmos

Above we mentioned the etymology that connects the name with West-Semitic *qdm* ‘east’. This idea is very old; e.g. Movers 1841, 516f., but it is even older (see Edwards 1979, 58 n. 60). We saw it in section 4 above. This etymology can easily be wrong. Further the name has been connected with *κέκασμαι* ‘excel’, ‘be equipped’ (on its etymology see García-Ramón 1988/90; he does not discuss the name, and I do not know what to conclude from it, perhaps he found it too uncertain; I see no proper names in -μος). Given the evident Pre-Greek etymology, there is no reason to consider an Indo-European origin. (The connection with Armenian *kazm-* ‘equipment, ornament’ is impossible, as Greek should then have a voiced stop.) The note in Hesychius *κάδμος*: *δόρου, λόφος, ἄσπις. Κοῦητες* does not help much.

It has long since been observed that the name is found as the name of a mountain and a (nearby) river in Caria; e.g. Fick, 1905, 24, 84, 128 and 135. This is very important, as it shows that the name is a Pre-Greek element. I call ‘Pre-Greek’ the substratum language of Greek (German ‘Vorgriechisch’). See my discussion in 2003b. The basic study of these elements is Furnée 1972. We know that this language was also spoken in western Anatolia, as is shown most clearly by the geographical names; see the study by Haley and Blegen 1928. Further see Krahe 1954, 143–180, and Katičić 1976, 16–97. As to these names, Haley says (in Haley and Blegen, 1928, 142): “Certainly it is not likely that places so far inland as Hermos, Kadmos, ... owe their names to Greek influence.” Thus also Sakellariou (1958, 370). Fick (24) further mentions *Καδύανδα* in Lycia and *Κάδηνα* in Lycaonia, but we cannot be sure that these forms are related. One might object to the comparison of a personal name with geographical names, but we know that, in Anatolia, the same name can be used for a mountain, a river or a person. See on the point Sundwall 1913, 271 and my note on Pylaios in 2002, 236 n. 42. Note further the presence in Asia Minor (in the north-west) of *Καδμῖλος*, one of the Cabires; it is generally accepted that the form is derived with the well known suffix -ιλ- from *Κάδμος* (on the name see Beekes, 2004, 466); this suffix clearly shows that the word is of Anatolian origin. A further important indication is a gloss of Stephanus of Byzance which says: *Καμμανία μοῖρα Θεσπρωτίας· ἕξ ἧς Κάδμος ὁ ποταμός*. The area and the river have not been identified with certainty, as the Barrington Atlas does not give it. Kiepert gives the river as flowing north into the Thyamis, with a question mark.

The structure of the word as a whole also fits well, compare the island Πάτμος, the mountain Λάτμος, and the mountain Λάκμος in Athamania, east of Ioannina. All these forms have *CaC-m-(os)*, and we find them over the whole area (from Greece to Asia Minor).

The sequence -δμ- is rare in Greek. It is hardly found outside derived or inflected forms, as in σκυδμαίνω. But we find it in Pre-Greek forms. Cf. Ἰάδμων of Samos, which is clearly Pre-Greek (with ἰα-, cf. Ἰάπετος). Further there is ἀδμωλή, ἀδμενίδες.

There is also a form Κάσσμος. The development -δμ- > -σμ- is problematic in Greek. The treatment by Schwyzer 208 does not give a solution. Furnée 1972, 248ff. notes that τ/σ (or δ/σ) is a well known phenomenon in Pre-Greek. Note that we also have Κάσμλος.

The conclusion is that the name is either derived from Καδμεία ‘the Theban citadel’ (or Καδμείοι ‘its inhabitants’, as we saw in section 5), or a name that is evidently identical with the name (of the mountain and river) Κόδμος, which means that in both cases we are concerned with the same Pre-Greek word.

7. The improbability of Phoenicians

There are several reasons which make the story that Phoenicians founded Thebes improbable.

1. As far as we know, no other Greek city was founded by Phoenicians, i.e. the assumed occurrence is without parallel in Greece.
2. Thebes is not a probable place to be founded by foreigners; it lies in the heart of the country, and not on the water. It may well be said to be the most improbable place one could think of to have been founded by foreigners.
3. There is no trace whatever of Phoenicians in the town or its surroundings.
4. The Phoenician expansion to Europe begins around 1000 B.C., not earlier. A date like 1400 or earlier, as is supposed for Kadmos, is therefore impossible.
5. In the course of the discussion I have not seen any separate argument in favour of the Phoenician hypothesis. One thinks of such arguments as those proposed by Astour (1965, 113–224) about “mythical” aspects, where he argues that the stories about Kadmos originated in West-Semitic myths. Edwards refutes the arguments

one by one, and concludes that none of them can be maintained; they are unreliable (139–159).⁶

6. The Greeks had no idea about these dates and about the possibility of foreign peoples entering Greece; thus they accepted that the Danaoi came from Egypt.

The most problematic point is the date. If the story that the Kadmeioi were Semites who settled in Boeotia is true, when could this have happened? The myth is usually dated (several generations) before the Trojan War, on the basis of which modern scholars think of about 1400 BC. West (1997, 449f.) e.g. adds: “It seems to me just as plausible a hypothesis, however, that our immigrants were Phoenicians of the Iron Age, say in the ninth or eighth century, . . .” Against such a late date can be argued that there would be a lively remembrance, and that it would be archaeologically recoverable.

The early date seems hardly possible for two reasons. First, it is most improbable that Semites settled in Greece, except the Phoenicians. There is not the slightest evidence that other peoples than the Phoenicians ever settled in Europe. Second, even if this were so, it is improbable that the Greeks would have any remembrance of it. In general they have only few and vague or incidental recollections of the Mycenaean Age (I think of such things as the boar’s tusk helmet). The fact that one assumed that Phoenicians could have arrived before the Trojan War proves that they had no idea about the chronology: if it is true that the Trojan War occurred in or near the thirteenth century, this is far from the ninth or eighth century which are the probable dates for Phoenicians (as indicated by West).

The conclusion seems simple: the high date is impossible for the Phoenicians.

Several negative comments have been given. I mention Emily Vermeule who wrote (1971): “it appears that there is no early connection, in the Greek mind at least, between Kadmos and the Near East”. Phoenicia was popular after the notorious ‘Medizing’ of Thebes in the Persian Wars. “His genealogy is late and confused.” “Pindar the Theban has no idea of any eastern connections in the history of his city’s founder.” The finds from the east found in Thebes are what one might expect, it is nothing spectacular, it is like elsewhere (p. 185).

It is also remarkable that no other persons around Kadmos are known. Most often mentioned is Membliaros (e.g. Hdt. 4, 147). Now

⁶ The conclusions of Edwards’ research are often ‘negative’. As a result, the reader is quite surprised that she gives at the end often a ‘positive’ comment on the possibility that the Kadmos story has a historical background. See also on section 10.

we know that this was the name of an island, Anaphe, east of Thera. It was also called Bliaros. This means that the name was reduplicated: **Me-mliaros* > Μεμβλίαρος, beside **Mliaros* > Βλίαρος. This is no doubt a Pre-Greek name, reduplication in geographical names of (Indo-European) Greek origin are unknown. (Fick 57 added: “aber die Namen haben eher karischen als phönizischen Klang”. I don’t know whether here again the man has the same name as an island, or whether this was just due to a wrong interpretation.) (I assumed that Pre-Greek did not have the phonemes *e* and *o*; so the reduplication vowel may have been *i*, with *e* as a (phonetic) variant. Cf. Μεμβλίς· Μήλος ἢ νῆσος H. and Μίμαλλις.) So it is strange to see that people said to have belonged to Kadmos’ group had a Pre-Greek name. It is remarkable that nothing has been found that could confirm a Phoenician origin of Kadmos. On the other hand, there is no problem to assume that the story is Greek fiction.

8. Edwards’ treatment

I shall now discuss the arguments of Edwards’ book more in detail. I shall follow her sections (pp. 45–204; ch. I and II, pp. xii–44, are introductory).

III. Phoenician origin (45–65). There is a long list of scholars who have rejected Phoenician origin or assumed that Kadmos was derived from Kadmeia (which means that the figure is fictitious). There are now two groups, one that interprets ‘Phoenicians’ as Minoans, or Carians, or Illyrians, or Pelasgoi; and another one that considers Kadmos as a real Phoenician, supported by the etymology of his name (p. 57). Archaeology came to show that there have been no Phoenicians in Thebes or Thera. Then, with the discovery of Ugarit, a parallel to the story of Europa was found. Edwards is rather negative on scholars who accepted Phoenician origin, as Graves, J. Bérard (who connected the Hyksos), Huxley (who connected the Luwians), Stubbings, Astour; Dussaud and Schaeffer were impressed by the discovery of the new texts from Ugarit. So no clear positive argument is given.

IV. How ancient is the Phoenician element? She refers that Gomme and Vian opposed to a Phoenician origin. Gomme (1913) pointed out that the oldest sources do not mention a Phoenician relation. Edwards answers that this is an argumentum e silentio. The oldest source is Pherekydes, who stresses Kadmos’ Egyptian origin (!). She then states (74): “We must agree with Gomme that Kadmos and Europa may not have been originally related, as is suggested by the fluctuation

in the later tradition about their precise blood-relationship (...) as well as by the silence of the earliest sources, which however may not be quite so complete as Gomme argued” (referring to a fragment of Stesichorus). She then concludes that it has not been proven that Kadmos did not come from Phoenicia (86).

V. Kadmos, Minoan Crete and the meaning of Φοῖνιξ (87–115). There was no colonisation of Greece by the Cretans, but there were settlements on the islands (Rhodes, Thera). She then points out that there are indications for the presence of Cretan settlements. There is no firm conclusion of this section, but Cretan presence in Boeotia is not a point of discussion.

VI. Bronze Age Phoenicians at Thebes? Edwards notes two problems: the date of the Phoenician expansion, and the position of Thebes (not on the sea). She points out that there was not much contact in the 9th and 8th centuries, but that there was contact in the period 1600–1100, as seen in objects and in Mycenaean pottery (in 1365 Ugarit was destroyed but it soon recovered; when it was destroyed for the second time at the end of the 13th cent., it did not recover). However, what we need is Phoenicians (at least Semites) coming to Greece, not the other way round (which may have made little difference for the Greeks). Edwards calls this “not at all implausible” (128), but the fact remains that this presence has not been demonstrated.

She gives much attention to Ugarit. She points to a text where the king of Ugarit says that “all his ships now happen to be in Lycia”. Another ship is said to have been in Kptr = Kaphtor, i.e. in Crete. Elsewhere is spoken about 150 ships (Edwards 126–129). Though she admits that only a handful of ships is mentioned in the relevant journeys, it must be admitted that the Ugaritians apparently sailed to the Aegean. However, essential is for our problem that we have no evidence pointing to settlements made by the people of Ugarit in these regions.

As to the position of Thebes, Edwards refers to Mycenaean material in the Gulf of Euboea and farther, and to Aulis from where the Homeric fleet departed. She further refers to trade goods found in Thebes. But Emily Vermeule stated that this is nothing particular: this is what you may expect in a rich town. Edwards concludes (134ff.) that there was contact. However, the essential point is not made: there is no evidence for Phoenicians coming to Boeotia or Greece; there is no evidence for expeditions so far away from the Syrian coast.

VII. Oriental parallels to the Kadmos legend. Influence of West-Semitic religion is open to grave criticism. She then points to the

etymology (*qdm* ‘the man from the east’). This etymology of course may be simply rejected: it could well be a look-alike. Astour’s connection with the Cabires is rejected (as I did above). She ends with: “this would not rule out the possibility of an oriental presence in Mycenaean Boeotia”. Again: it might have been, but there is no evidence.

VIII. Chronological problems. The founding of Thebes is dated to around 1400. Here we return to what was said above: the founding would have been long before the expansion of the Phoenicians, so the Kadmos story is next to impossible. (Edwards repeats the point of the introduction of the alphabet, which is generally considered post-Kadmos.)

So the conclusion is that the objections have not been removed: the story is too early for the arrival of the Phoenicians, and there is no evidence for another origin. We cannot just say that “it could have been”. Combined with the position of Thebes, which is most improbable for a Phoenician settlement, the negative arguments are decisive. So Edwards’ arguments fail to convince. My conclusion is that Edwards’ book does not adduce any serious evidence for a Phoenician (or other oriental) group that settled in Greece. Therefore the Phoenician option must definitely be given up.

I combine this with the fact that the name Kadmos is most probably either (re)constructed from Kadmeia (and so purely fictitious), or Pre-Greek, like the mountain and river in Caria. Another man mentioned is Membliaros, which is the name of an island, which is also Pre-Greek.

It seems that there is more. It is stated that Kadmos was the son of the Boeotian king Ogygos. Edwards rejects this (p. 49), because the source is very late (it appears in Photius and in the Suda). But Ogygos is also mentioned in Pausanias (9.5.1), though he does not say that Kadmos is his son and duly relates that Kadmos is Phoenician. It is apparently an old story, as Pausanias adds: “from him the mass of poets have given Thebes the title Ogygian”. Ogygos is known as a kind of Primeval Man, so when Kadmos lived in his time, he will have been there from The Beginning Of Time; he will have been there of old and will not have come from a far country. Here we may have an element of the original background of Kadmos in Boeotia. It shows him as an (extremely) old local figure.

More difficult is the following. “Der samothrakische Kadmos ist oft mit dem gleichnamigen phoinikischen Gründerheros von Theben verschmolzen” (Ch. Tsochos in DNP 11,27 s.v. Samothrake). The

relation between Kadmos and Harmonia is unclear. Kadmos would have married her in Thebes, or in Samothrake. She is sometimes called the daughter of Elektra, not of Ares and Aphrodite. Also, Kadmos would have abducted her, after which there was a (ritual) search for her. If one accepts this version that Kadmos was so much involved with religious conceptions, it is improbable that we have to do with a Phoenician. As to Harmonia, Roscher s.v. noted that her name may have been altered by popular etymology, which I find a very attractive idea. Vian (142 n. 4) mentions a reading Ἀρμενία, which he considers as a simple mistake (it is found in Schol. T on Il. Γ 189); but how can we know? (Vian also mentions a reading Hermioné, e.g. Hygin. Fab. 155.)⁷

The last point is not very strong, but we saw that there are no positive arguments, and that so early operations in Greece must be called impossible. This item of Greek imagination should now finally be forgotten.

9. How did they come to be 'Phoenicians'?

The most vexing point is the question how the relevant people came to be considered as Phoenicians.

Europa could easily have been made to come from Phoenicia. The essential part of her story seems to be that she was brought to Crete by a bull from the sea. The Cretan story just seems to be that a bull came from the sea . . . without any question being asked from where the bull came. When the question was asked, Crete was strategically positioned with respect to Phoenicia: apart from Rhodes, Crete is the part of Greece that lies nearest to Phoenicia. In Homer she is called daughter of Phoinix. This name may have induced her Phoenician origin.

As to Kadmos, Vian 56–69 argues for Miletus as the place where the change occurred, in the international port. This seems quite possible. (He suggests that it happened in the period 650–550, so rather late.) Of course, Kadmos may simply have followed Europa. The Greeks will have accepted the idea without difficulty, unaware of any problem; it was just 'interesting'.

10. Kadmos and the alphabet

This is not a real problem. Herodotus (V 59?) states that the Phoenicians who came with Kadmos brought writing to Greece. That the

⁷ Such a 'speaking' name as Harmonia (taken as ἁμόνοια) I have always considered to be a mistake. If it was an older goddess, she will not have had such a Greek abstract as a name. Also, there can have been two names that resembled each other.

Greek alphabet derives from the Phoenician one is certain, but we do not know exactly when and where it was taken over. The earliest texts date from the end of the eighth century. The actual adoption may have been a century earlier, that is at the end of the ninth century. (Presently Ruijgh 1998 argues for a much earlier date, around 1000 BC, assuming that earlier texts were written only on perishable material.) But the suggestion is probable that the arbitrary choices made in the adaptation of the Phoenician alphabet prove that it was adapted by one man at one moment. Wachter in DNP (1, 537ff.) refutes earlier dates than the usual around 800.

The Greeks clearly remembered that they had their alphabet from the Phoenicians. For Herodotus all Phoenician activity in Greece was associated with Kadmos. So it is only evident that the introduction of the alphabet was also ascribed to him and his men, once Kadmos had become a Phoenician. Of course, it is unacceptable to base the date of the introduction of the alphabet on the dating of Kadmos. As the coming of Kadmos is generally dated to 1400 or earlier, the alphabet was not introduced by Kadmos. It can easily be a later addition to the story of Kadmos. The point, then, does not interest us here.

Edwards' treatment is not too clear (174–179). She discusses the idea, sometimes proposed, that it was not the alphabet that Kadmos brought, but Linear B. She rejects this idea, but then remarks that "the possibility that Kadmos' association with writing goes back to the Bronze Age cannot be wholly excluded". Here, as in other places, she rejects an idea as improbable if not impossible, but then at the same time keeps the possibility open. This is a most unhappy way of presenting the issue.

11. Schachter's hypothesis

In 1985 Schachter, the author of the *Cults of Boeotia*, proposed quite a different interpretation of the myth of Kadmos. He points to movements of people from Asia Minor to Greece in the Geometric and early Archaic periods. The first is the advent of Hesiod's father from Aeolis (Kyme) to Askra in Boeotia. The second would concern those who brought the service of the Cabires to Thebes. (Here he suggests that the name Cabires may have been of Semitic origin. I have just shown conclusively that this name is Pre-Greek, i.e. not Semitic; Beekes 2004.) These immigrations might have been the example for the myth of Kadmos. One problem is that we are here concerned with Greeks, not with Phoenicians (as the author admits; though he points to the traces of a non-Greek language in the cult of

Samothrace). Also there is no indication that these movements were ever connected with the founding of Thebes. I don't think the facts mentioned had any impact on the myth of Kadmos. Also, to connect two facts with the Kadmos story, does not make the case stronger; it rather gives the reaction that one of them will not do.⁸

12. Kadmos in Cilicia

Nonnos (1. 154–2.634) has the story that it was Kadmos who saved Zeus in the struggle with Typhon, near Korykos in Cilicia. The monster, which had taken Zeus' weapons while he was after Europa, subdued him and took his sinews. Then Kadmos arrived in Cilicia, in his search for Europa. He gets from Pan a herd and a herder's flute. The monster is enticed by Kadmos' music. Then Kadmos asks Zeus' sinews, pretending that he will make a new musical instrument that will be even more beautiful. Zeus gets back the sinews and this time conquers the monster. As was suggested by Edwards (p. 41) and proven by Tanja Scheer (1993, 307–320, esp. 316f.), Nonnos himself invented this version. It is well known that the Typhon story originated in this corner of the world, as there is e.g. the Hittite story of Illuyankas who takes the god's (= Zeus') heart and eyes. We have two Greek versions of the Typhon story earlier than Nonnos, where Typhon takes Zeus' sinews, in Apollodorus (1.6,3) and Oppianus' *Halieutika* (3.7–15). In the first author Hermes and Aigipan get back the sinews, in Oppian it is Hermes with his son Pan of Korykos.

Now it is clear that Kadmos has been put in the place of Hermes and/or Pan; e.g. he gets his instruments from Pan. There are several circumstances that form a connection between Hermes and Kadmos. In the cult of Samothrake, Hermes was equated with Kadmilos, one of the Kabeiroi. And Kadmilos is easily connected with Kadmos, who can be well used in another dragon battle. Also, there is no confirmation anywhere that Kadmos played a part in this story, therefore it will be Nonnos' invention (Scheer, 316f.). Nonnos will have ascribed this feat to Kadmos, because he was the grandfather of Dionysos, who is honoured in his *Dionysiaka*. Further, a connection between Kadmos and Cilicia was suggested by the fact that Kadmos had a brother called Kilix. The story, then, is late fiction that is irrelevant to the Kadmos-myth.

⁸ Schachter analyses (151) *Καδμειῶνες* as *Καδμε-* plus the suffix *-ων*, which is impossible; Greek (and Indo-European) did not have stems in *-e*; see Beekes 1994.

Appendix. The name Phoinikes

We know that *Phoinikes* is the Greek name for the people, who called themselves Canaanites. We have the mention by Herodian (FHG i 17, iv 627; fr. 358?) that Hecataeus used the form Χνα = ἡ Φοινίκη, and from Choeroboscus (Bekker, Anecdota fr. 254) ὁ Χνᾶς, τοῦ Χνᾶ. In the New Testament we find Χαναάν (see Aubet 1996, 5–12).

The first is that we find the name frequently as a geographical name. I base myself on the new atlas (the Barrington Atlas). Here we find names with Phoinik- sixteen times, four times as a river, twice for a mountain, thrice as a ‘water’ (once noted as ‘gulf’, sinus); the other nine occurrences are towns. The name is found nine times in (present-day) Greece (I include here the one in Albania, just across the border) and nine times in Turkey. They are the following (I give the number of the map and the sections and arrange them from northeast to southwest; fl(uvius), M(ons), no siglum is a town (unless stated otherwise); there are three forms: (*Phoinik*)-s, -e, -ous; question marks indicate uncertainty, as in the atlas):

In Greece:

54B2 -e in Epirus; and 54B2 -e in Epirus (two cities close to each other);

55C3 -s? fl.: near Thermopylae;

58B1 -s fl.: N of Peloponnese, W. of Aigion;

58B4 -ous: Gulf in the S. of Messenia;

60 B2 -s: S. coast of Crete, east of Tarra;

60B2 -ous Limen: water, *ibid.*;

60B2 -s?: S. coast of Crete, S. of Rhithumna.

In Turkey:

56C4 -ous Sinus: W. coast, N. of Erythrai;

61G4 -s: SE of Knidos;

61G4 -s M: *ibid.*;

65B5 -e: Lycia, S. of Xanthos;

65D5 -s: Lycia, S. of Limyra;

65D5 -s fl: *ibid.*;

65D4 -ous M: Lycia, E. of Phaselis;

65D5 -ous fl.: Lycia, S. of Phaselis.

So there is an almost continuous chain from Epirus to Phaselis. (This may be important for the origin of the name of Phoenicia: it was just the following step. Note that there are no instances found in Cilicia, map 66.) The word did not refer to (the presence of) Phoenicians, as we have no indication whatsoever that the Phoenicians founded

cities on the southern coast of Turkey; also they would have given their settlements names of their own (and the Greeks would have used these). Nor is it probable that the presence of a minority of Phoenician merchants would have been the reason to call all these places *Phoinik-*. As the word is of non-IE origin, i.e. a loan from the Aegean substratum, one might consider the possibility that the name (e.g. those on the south coast of Turkey), had been there before the Greeks settled in these regions. – Further, of course, Phoinix occurs as a personal name (e.g. the old friend of Achilles). (Athena Phoinike in Corinth is late, Lyc. 658 + schol.)

The second point is that peoples' names with the typical (non-IE) suffix *-īk-* are found in northwestern Greece, the *Aithikes* and the *Temmikes*. Chantraine Dict. s.v. 1. and 2. φοῖνιξ makes distinctions which I cannot accept. Thus he suggests that *Aithīk-* may contain the IE word for 'face', **-h₃k^w-*, but this would have given *p*, not *k*. Further, it is based on an interpretation of *Aithiops* which I consider wrong (see Beekes 1995/6, where I have shown that this word is non-IE., i.e. Pre-Greek). Further, Chantraine mentions that Bonfante assumes that Phoinike in Chaonia (in Albania) may be from a foreign language, perhaps Illyrian. I think that this Phoinike is not different from the other places in Greece, and must rather be a Pre-Greek form. Then he analyses *Phoinik-* as *Phoin-īk-*. Essential is that Greek, or Indo-European, did not have a suffix *-īk-*. I agree completely with Chantraine's analysis in his *Formation*, 382f., where he gives a number of these words which are clearly all non-Indo-European (note βέμβιξ, πέρδιξ, σκάνδιξ, ῥάδιξ, σπάδιξ, κίμβιξ). After discussing forms with *-ικ-* and *-ῦκ-*, *-υκ-*, he concludes: "Les mots empruntés à des parlers méditerranéens mis à part, il existe de petits groupes sémantiques, peu productifs, composés de mots familiers désignant des animaux, des plantes, des termes techniques, des sobriquets ou des diminutifs. Les dérivés constitués en grec rejoignaient ainsi les noms empruntés." I doubt whether there are any words that originated in Greek, cf. my article on κήρουξ Beekes 2003a, where I showed that the Indo-European etymology of this word must be abandoned and that it is Pre-Greek. In the introduction to this section Chantraine wrote: "A ces mots se sont associés des noms propres empruntés, Φοῖνιξ, d'où a été tiré φοῖνιξ 'pourpre'; 'dattier', etc." This treatment is rather different from that in the *Dictionnaire*. (Note also the different treatment by Frisk.) Thus, names of peoples like Phoinikes occur. Now Greek has an adjective φοῖνιξ 'dark red, brown-red'. Maybe the ethnonym had the same meaning; it is possible that a river (thus

Chantraine on the river near Thermopylae) has this meaning; for a mountain too it is possible (the earth containing iron²). Maybe the word had more than one meaning (cf. the meanings 'date-palm' and 'lyre, musical instrument'). Though the meaning 'dark-brown' seems quite possible for people(s), it may have had a different meaning. One reason for naming the Phoenicians thus may have been that they were the people coming along the south coast of Anatolia, always from the same direction, always rounding Lycia and entering the Aegean through the gap between Rhodes and Crete.

The only conclusion we can draw at the moment is that the name Phoinik- occurred in Greece, also in the neighbourhood of Boeotia, and that it may have been more widespread than we know; it may have facilitated the adoption of that qualification for Kadmos.

Bibliography

- Andrews, P. B. S. 1969: The Myth of Europa and Minos, Greece and Rome 16, 60–66.
- Astour, M. C. 1965: Hellenosemitica: An Ethnic and Cultural Study in West Semitic Impact on Mycenaean Greece, Leiden.
- Aubet, M. E. 1996: The Phoenicians and the West, Cambridge.
- Barrington Atlas 2000: Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World, Princeton, Oxford.
- Beekes, R. S. P. 1994: The neuter plural of thematic nouns. Derivatives from a stem in -e from thematic nouns, in: Früh-, Mittel-, Spätindogermanisch. Akten der IX. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft 1992 in Zürich, edd. G. E. Dunkel et al., Wiesbaden, 1–15.
- Beekes, R. S. P. 1995/6: Aithiopes, Glotta 73, 12–34.
- Beekes, R. S. P. 2002: The Prehistory of the Lydians, the Origin of the Etruscans, Troy and Aeneas, BiOr. LIX,3–4, 205–242.
- Beekes, R. S. P. 2003a: Indo-European or substrate? φάτινη and κῆρουξ, in: Bammesberger, A. – Venneman, Th., Languages in Prehistoric Europe, Heidelberg, 109–115.
- Beekes, R. S. P. 2003b: Pre-Greek, on the Internet, <http://indoeuropean.nl>
- Beekes, R. S. P. 2004: The origin of the Kabeiroi, Mnemosyne LVII, 465–477.
- Berve, H. 1966² (= 1949¹): Der Europe-Begriff in der Antike, in: Gestaltende Kräfte der Antike, München, 467–484.
- Bühler, W. 1968: Europa. Ein Überblick über die Zeugnisse des Mythos in der antiken Literatur und Kunst, München.
- Chantraine, P. 1933: La formation des noms en grec ancien, Paris.
- Crusius, O. 1890–1894: Kadmos, in: Roscher, W. H., Lexikon der Griechischen und Römischen Mythologie, Hildesheim.

- DNP 1996–2002: Der Neue Pauly, Stuttgart.
- Edwards, R. B. 1979: *Kadmos the Phoenician*, Amsterdam.
- Fick, A. 1905: *Vorgriechische Ortsnamen*, Göttingen.
- Furnée, E. J. 1972: *Die wichtigsten konsonantischen Erscheinungen des Vorgriechischen*, The Hague/Paris.
- García-Ramón, J.-L. 1988/90: Homérico *κέκασμαι* : védico *śāsād-*, protoario **śānd-*, IE **(s)kēnd-*, ‘aparecer, hacerse visible’, *Die Sprache* 34, 127–158.
- Gomme, A. W. 1913: The legend of Cadmus and the logographi, *JHS* 23 53–72, 223–245.
- Gommers, P. H. 2001: *Europe – What’s in a name?*, Leuven.
- Haley, J. B. – Blegen, C. W. 1928: The coming of the Greeks, *AJA* 32, 141–154.
- Katičić, R. 1976: *Ancient Languages of the Balkans*, Vol. 1, The Hague/Paris.
- Kiepert, H. 1892: *Atlas antiquus*, Berlin.
- Krahe, H. 1954: *Sprache und Vorzeit*, Heidelberg.
- Latacz, J. 1990: Die Phönizier bei Homer, in: Gehring, U. – Niemeyer, G. *Die Phönizier im Zeitalter Homers*, Mainz.
- Movers, F. C. 1841: *Die Phönizier*, Vol. I, Bonn.
- Ninck, F. M. 1946: *Die Entdeckung von Europa durch die Griechen*, Basel.
- Prandi, L. 1986: Europa e i Cadmei: la ‘versione’ beotica del mito, in: *Contributi dell’ Istituto di storia antica dell’ Università del Sacro Cuore* 12, 37–48.
- Ruijgh, C. J. 1998: Sur la date de la création de l’alphabet grec, *Mnemosyne* 51, 658–687.
- Sakellariou, M. B. 1958: La migration grecque en Ionie, Athènes.
- Schachter, A. 1985: Kadmos and the implications of the tradition for Boiotian history, in: *La Béotie antique*, ed. P. Roesch, 145–153.
- Scheer, T. S. 1993: *Mythische Vorväter. Zur Bedeutung griechischer Heroenmythen im Selbstverständnis kleinasiatischer Städte*, München.
- Sommer, F. 1937: Ahhiyavā und kein Ende?, *Indogerm. Forsch.* 55, 169–297.
- Sundwall, J. 1913: *Die einheimischen Namen der Lykier nebst einem Verzeichnis kleinasiatischer Namenstämme (Klio Beih. 11)*, Leipzig.
- Vermeule, E. 1971: Kadmos and the Dragon, in: *Studies G. M. A. Hanfmann*, Mainz, 177–188.
- Vian, F. 1963: *Les origines de Thèbes. Cadmos et les Spartes*, Paris.
- West, M. L. 1997: *The East Face of Helicon*, Oxford.