

At *Od.* III. 245 Nestor is said to have been king over three generations of men: *τρὶς γὰρ δὴ μὲν φασιν ἀνάξασθαι γένε' ἀνδρῶν*. Perhaps Homer is here interpreting himself. Eustathius believes that the Poet is briefly summarizing at *Od.* III. 245 what he has stated at greater length in *Il.* I. 250–2.⁴) At any rate *Od.* III. 245 seems to me to show the most natural understanding of *Il.* I. 250–2, as we have construed it.⁵)

The Senate and the Essence: γερούσια and οὐσία

By N. E. COLLINGE, Toronto

The council of elders is a noteworthy component of the Lycurgean constitution at Sparta, and there is no need here to rehearse modern discussions of it. By ancient writers subsequent to Xenophon it is called *γερούσια*, as is the ostensibly equivalent body in other states, Carthage, Rome, the Sanhedrin. It is obvious that the original Laconian form of the name, as long as the dialect retains any individuality, is something else—not merely in the sense that there, as elsewhere, the more common expression was *οἱ γέροντες* or its equivalent, but in that (for example) Plutarch's use of *γερούσια*, in speaking of the 'great rhetra' (or in declaring that Lycurgus himself used this name for the Spartan council from the start),¹) is a reflex of atticized koine and nothing more.²) In Attic itself *γερούσια* occurs no earlier than *Rhesus*; in Laconian it occurs nowhere in any form, except in the attestations of outsiders like Aristophanes, Xenophon and ultimately Hesychius. It is likely that a whole series of oddities lies in wait for the Laconian etymologist.

To begin with, Hesychius's relevant entry, unpunctuated so as not to prejudice the argument, is rather curious:³) *γερούσια γεροντία*

⁴) Eustath. on *Il.* I. 250, p. 96. 44f.

⁵) I wish to thank Leslie Bolding, Nell Duncan and Jane Ritter for discussing *Il.* I. 250–252 with me.

¹) Plutarch, *Lycurgus* 5, 6; *Moralia* 789.

²) As with Lysimachus's council at Ephesus and its offspring at Athens (saec. 2–3 A. D.), the *ισπὰ γερούσια*. See *CR* 1. 1887. 43; 56. 1942. 86; Oliver, 1941.

³) Latte, in his 1953 edition (no. 449), simply brackets *γερούσια* and (after Ahrens) *καὶ Λακεδαιμονίους*, thus reducing the entry to a presentation of the

παρὰ Λάκωσι καὶ Λακεδαιμονίοις καὶ Κρησί. It is trivial that the placing and spelling of the vox nihili *γερονία* obscure the intended *γερωλία*, the confusion of *h* with *v* being like that in *κασεργνον*, for *καθαιρηγον* (so Bourguet, 1927. 146). The real oddities are rather these:

(1) glosses of this type have two normal presentations: *either* (a) lemma + translation—(or transliteration-) equivalent + relevant speech-group in the nominative: e.g. *αἰκχοννα· αἰσχύνη. Λάκωνες* or *τοννη· σύ. Λάκωνες* or (b) lemma + explanation + relevant socio-political group in the form *παρὰ* + dative (with varying order of entities): e.g. *Ταινάρια· παρὰ Λακεδαιμονίοις ἐορτή Ποσειδῶνος* or *πρωτεῖραι· οἱ περὶ εἴκοσι ἔτη παρὰ Λάκωσι* where the differing presentations reflect the separate purposes of glossing (a) a dialectal term, or (b) a localized *Kulturgut*⁴). The *γερωλία* gloss appears to combine these two formats, unusually.

(2) the Spartans are named twice; yet it seems suspiciously facile to emend the second name to *Καρχηδονίοις* (as Meursius, adducing Aristotle, *Pol.* 1272b 37) or to omit it. There seems, moreover, to be a lexicologists' distinction between the Spartans as a linguistic group (*Λάκωνες*) and the same as a politico-social entity (*Λακεδαιμόνιοι*): so Herodian, 2.48: . . . *κατὰ γλῶσσαν Λακώνων* but . . . *βείδιοι λέγονται οἱ ἄρχοντες παρὰ Λακεδαιμονίοις* and Hesychius, s.v. *βειέλοπες· ἱμάντες οἷς ἀναδοῦσι Λακεδαιμόνιοι τοὺς νικηφόρους*. But the difference is not universally observed: Thucydides uses *Λάκων* as the singular ethnic—perhaps because of the awkward name of Cimon's son—and Aristophanes has *Λακωνικοί*.

(3) *γεροντία* appears to be cited as the standard Greek form, but it is not equated with the Cretan usage, which is odd, as we have no evidence for a competing form. (Hence Ahrens inserted *ῆ* between the two forms of the noun in the citation.)

These nuisances can be collectively removed by supposing the conflation of two distinct entries, possibly of this sort:

(a) *γερωλία· γεροντία. Λάκωνες* (the choice of *γεροντία* as the stock translation is reasonable after Xenophon, *Lac. Pol.* 10. 1).

(b) *γεροντία· πλῆθος γερόντων* or *σύστημα γερόντων*⁵) *παρὰ Λακεδαιμονίοις καὶ Κρησί* (where the Cretans figure simply as the ostensible originators of much of Lycurgus's political thinking, as Plutarch's account suggests).

Alternatively, the gloss as we have it is an ill-digested attempt to say that *γερωλία* = *γεροντία*, this being a constitutional body com-

second type mentioned in the present discussion (without 'explanation'), and reducing the evidence for a Laconian form other than *γεροντία*.

⁴) The types can approach each other, to be sure. So the 'linguistic' entry type *ἀνθρωπώ· ἡ γυνή παρὰ Λάκωσι* is presumably affected by the entries like *σιαδες· θυσία παρὰ Λάκωσι*, which are half cultural. Cf. *ἄτα· ὄτα. Ταραντίνοι* yet *ἔστ' ὄκα· ἐνίστε παρὰ Ταραντίνοις*.

⁵) Both phrases are Hesychian; v.s. vv. *γερονσία, γερωία*.

mon to Sparta and Crete, but respectively so titled (see Baunack, 1911. 486f.; Wackernagel, 1916. 208A 2).

So far, we have contrived to isolate *γερωμία* as the, or a, Laconian form, reflecting an earlier **γερωσία*, the secondary loss of intervocalic *s* in Laconian (and Argolic, and sometimes Elean and Cyprian) needing no discussion here. Perhaps *γεροντία* passed into Xenophon's vocabulary from some other source, or perhaps the Spartans re-formed their word between 414 (*Lysistrata*) and about 390; the present evidence permits no resolution of these questions. The immediate crux is how to offer a sensible history of **γερωσία*, for which there stands surety (as well as Hesychius's testimony) the Aristophanic *γερωχία*.⁶) The word *γέρον* and its congeners will be considered shortly.

There is a proto-Indo-European feminine noun-formant *-yā*; but there are many mysteries about its reflexes in various phonetic environments. We may follow that line of speculation which runs from Brugmann, through Sievers and Edgerton and Kuryłowicz, to (for instance) Nagy. Then we may with some plausibility convince ourselves that **-yV* and **-iyV* first emerge as environmental variants (as in Vedic), subsequently coexist as free variants or compete as markers of differing productiveness (or even stand as potential semantic differentiators), and finally, in Greek, merge with identical traces, either gemination of the preceding consonant or (and this by effect of accent) retention of vocalic *i*. Clearly, it is unimportant to Greek that Sanskrit preserves an Edgertonian purity of reflex (as in *samajyā*, 'council')—just as unimportant as the consonantization of the semivowel in Aeolic or Dhimotiki (*kardhyan*), for these are fringe areas, temporally or spatially, for Greek speech. Yet the idiosyncrasy of classical Greek in producing the usual *-ía* is notable. Nagy (1970. 104ff.) opines that the placing of the acute accent on the vocalic element of the *-iy-* variant precludes gemination (and palatalization) of the preceding consonant; whence *μειλιχίως* (in turn generating *μειλίχιος*), but *μειλίσσω*. However, either the place of accent may be similarly presumed on *-iyō* in verbs (and then why *μειλίσσω* etc. if not *-yā* in nouns, with the preceding consonant thereafter affected?), or if that presump-

⁶) *Lysist.* 980. For the understandable writing of *h* as *χ*, see Bourguet, 1927. 146; Schwyzler; 1939. 218; von Fritz, 1945. 196f. That Aristoph. ms.B (saec. 16) has *γερωσία* is a valueless circumstance. (Von Fritz rightly chides Berve's addiction to Wackernagel's relating of *γερωχία* to *γέρας ἔχειν*.)

tion is not possible (Nagy, 113, relies on a stage when all non-enclitic verbal accent fell upon the thematic stem vowel) then $-(i)y-é(t)(i)$ will indeed revert to the $-yV-$ form and leave $-iyā > -ia$ as an unexceptionable development—but we still have to believe that dative $-iyōi$ dominates nominative $iyos$ phonologically, which is hardly consistent with the Greek norm. The whole business remains murky enough for it to be wise to hold in reserve the possibility that $-yā$ in Greek was initially unsatisfactory, because it might quickly be formally obscured when preceded by a consonant and become incapable of adequately marking the category of abstracts, whereas the verbal $-yō$ had no such special semantic onus. It may have died out in those cases before the onset of the processes which would have resulted in $-i(y)ā$, and have been reimposed later in the more durable form.

At all events, $-Vt-$ or $-nt-$ when preceding $-iā$ always behave as befits prevocalic items. And this means that the presumed interim form $*γερονσία$ cannot evolve from $γεροντία$, even in dialects which tolerate sibilantization of $-t-$. So much is clear from the scatter of forms in figure 1.

At this point one may pause to consider the stem *geront-* itself. Its etymology is not obscure. To the PIE verb-root $g'er(H?)$, as in Vedic (H -less) *jarati*, Cl. Skt. *jāryati*, *jīrnā-* (cf. Av. *za^urvan-*, 'age')—where the H would help to handle $γέρας$ and perhaps *jarás*; cf. Hirt's $*g'erē$ —we may assign a thematic participial derivative $*g'eront-$ (Skt. *jarant-*, *jaratī*, Oss. *zāronđ*). Its nominative singular masculine form should emerge, by the usual Greek dialectal processes, as $-os$ or $-o:s$ or $-ois$, or retain the 'interim' shape $-ons$. Thus in Attic we expect $*γέρονς$, like $διδούς$. In thematic participles, however, the universal result is in $-ων$ (*λέων* etc.), which needs a credible source. If *λέων* (in which the originally t -less nominal declension, like *γείτων*, $-ορος$, is shown by fem. *λέαινα*, Lat. *leōn-*) took to itself the participial oblique stem $-οντ-$, because it was reinterpreted as 'the roaring one' (< $*(s)lew-$: so Thieme, 1953, 567 ff., citing Lefmann), then it may well have offered a new hybrid paradigm in $-ων$, $-οντος$. This would have proved useful as a (nom.) marker of a sub-category, namely thematic-stem participles, as of present and 'strong' aorist. (Thieme, 568, notes semantic confusion between $*(s)l(e)w-$ and *λύειν*). Formal uncertainty then appears: some participles with redesigned nominatives were accentually distinguished from nouns with gen. $-ορος$ (so *εἶκων* ppl., but *εἰκῶν* noun), and some nominalized or re-interpreted participles were

Figure 17

	Attic-Ionic	Arcadian	Argolic	Cretan	Laconian
A 1	-VtyV(-) δσς ^A	δσς	ἰόσσαπερ	δσσα	τόσσοσ (τόσαι < epic? Aleman) γελοδνντία ^C (Hsch.)
A 2a	-VtiV(-) πλόουσιος ^B	-κάσιου δαμόνιον	-κάτιου (καταθέσιος gen.)	-κάτιου (δαίσιος gen.)	
A 2b	-VtiC(-) φύσις ^B	Φησι(ς)	(κατάθεσις)	(δαίσις)	Λιμαντι(ς)
A 2c	-Vti# εἴκοσι ^D	εἴκοσι	Φίκατι	Φίκατι	Φίκατι ^C
B 1	-nityV(-) πᾶσα	πάνσα	ἄπανσαν	ἐώσας (ιόνσας)	ἐνῆεβήλαις
B 2a	-ntiV(-) πόντιος ^E	Θεομάντιος ^F	προμάντιες	Ὀλόντιου	ἄριοντια
B 2b	-ntiC(-) μάντις ^G	non liquet	(μάντις)	ἐντιός ^G	γεροντίας (Hsch.)
B 2c	-nti# ἀντι ^H	ἐξαντι ^H ἀντι (a-ti) Cypr.	δίδοντι	πδόντιοντι	non liquet ἐντι

A. One ignores the debate on the relative priority of the *δσς* and the *μέλιττα* type.

B. Different *états de langue* produce *αἴσιος* and *αἴτιος* (Nagy, 1970. 135). If dating allows, *μῆτις*, *μῆτιος* may be analogical restorations, in poetry (ibid., 136).

C. Yet Cret. *Αἰτόσιον*, Lac. *Αιθέλια*; cf. Bechtel, II 319, but see Nagy, 140. Coan *-κόσιου*, like Meg., Cor. *εἴκοσι*, is from Ionic. Choeroboscus's 'W. Gk. *εἴκοσι*' is an invention.

D. Yet *ἔτι*.

E. A shift *-ntiV-* > *-(:)siV-* is sometimes argued, credibly enough. So Myc. *ko-ri-si-jo* (cf. Thumb-Scherer, 1959. 336) or Att. *Προβαλίσσιος* etc. (most recently Nagy, 137, citing Heubeck). Also *ti* in *ἐπιλοσίη* etc. (The par-

allelism of *ty* and *thy* is irrelevant, as the aspirate there would vanish in the stridency generated by the *t + y* sequence.) All this suggests that *-ntiV-* and *-tiV-* should agree; but there is no factual evidence.

F. Bechtel, I 353 (cf. Xen. *Hell.* 6. 5. 9 *Παλλάριον*; Paus. 8. 27. 4 *Τραπεζώντιος BCH* 33. 171. 1¹). One could wish for evidence outside proper nouns in Arc. and Cret.

G. *-n + tis*, from verbs in *-ω* sometimes gives *-nsis* (Hippocrat. *Φλέγμασις*, Epid. *ἀλυσίς*, Cret. *ἀπάνσις*).

H. 3 pl. in verbs is perhaps affected by dat. pl. of participle *(-ντ + σ-)*, > Att. *-σι*, Arc. *-σι*; cf. Vaillant, *BSL* 37. 1936. 106. (For converse in W. Gk., see Meillet and Hoëg, *MSL* 22. 1922. 56 and 107f.)

similarly set apart (so *δρακῶν* ppl., but *δράκων*, now a noun, both with *-ντος*). No such marking occurs if the verb is disused (*λέων* noun, but not **λέϜω*, or **λέϜων* ppl.), or if it is varied in its type of formation (as when *-ω* passes to *-ιω*; so *τέλιω* beside *τένων*, *τρύζω* beside *τρυγῶν*, where a sort of 'double insurance' cuts out **τρύγων*). Despite *εἰκῶν*, the difference of declension may suffice: so *τρίβων*, *-ωνος* noun, but *τρίβων*, *-ντος* ppl. And, after all, there remains the interesting noun of participial origin, *ὀδούς*, *ὀδόντος*.

Now one understands the absence of **γερώων* noun, so accented, in view of the supersession of *γέρων* as a pure participle. As one presumes **πέτω* (*πάτατι*, *πέτομαι*), so **γέρω* can be the base for the 'dissociated ppl.' *γέρων* (like *τένων*); the lack of **γέρονος*, **γέραινα* causes no concern. Yet the issue is a little obscured by the existence of *γέρας* 'gift of honour', and its related forms,⁸⁾ for which one must either reconstruct with a laryngeal at root-position *C*₃ or else internally justify an underlying **γέραϝ*.⁹⁾

Reverting to the presumable PIE form of the feminine derivative (and bypassing the need for clear understanding of the effect of the final laryngeal), one may start from *g'eronty(e)H*₍₂₎ (or *g'eronty(a)H* or *g'eronty(e)A*). The varying grade of the final syllable permits the differentiation we know in Greek as between the *τιμά* and *θάλαττα* declensions. The universal prime reflexes in Greek, if Sievers and those who have followed up his rule are to be believed, would be *gerontiā* (which then either vanishes or submerges until the pages of Xenophon—certainly it does not sire **geronsiā*) and **geronsā*, or **gerontiā* and **geronsǎ*. Why **gerontiǎ* (with genitive **gerontiās*) is not a visible Greek type has never been adequately explained;

⁷⁾ No dialect is cited which adds nothing relevant, nor any which is here idiosyncratic (e.g. Thera). Arcadian may have affected Laconian considerably, being geographically close and not set apart by 'Dorian' politics, as was Argolic; note Lac. *Ποιοιδάν*, *Ἐρμάν* as arcadisms, and for such in Doric generally see Thumb-Kieckers, 1932. §§ 91, 102, 112, 120, 186.

⁸⁾ *γεραῖος* hardly shows a 'block addition', like *νησαῖος* (from *Ἀθηναῖος* < *Ἀθηνᾶ* + *ιο-*, the accent affecting even *ἀναγκαῖος*). One must suppose *γέρασ* + *ιο-*.

⁹⁾ Benveniste, 1935. 31 ff., esp. 33, argues so, and adduces *πεῖρας*, *πεῖραϝ* and *λαῖς*, *λαῖρον* (< **λαῖϜαϝ-*); it is not clear whether or not he finally includes *κρέας* (his starting-point) in the assumed shift of neuters in *-r* > *-ar* > *-as*. But the forms and meanings of 'plus *H*' and 'minus *H*' origin are too interwoven (cf. *γεραῖος*, 'old'; and *γῆρας* accepting that formant), for it to be safe to divorce these words (*γέρων*, *γέρας*) on such slender evidence at root level.

Nagy, 1970, offers no reasons for the directions of his presumed processes of generalization (of accent-conditioned reflexes). That Hesychius has a form *γερω̄α* seems to suggest that **geronsǎ* occurred (and thence a denominative verb **γερωάδδω* led to an agent noun **γερωάκτας*, which appears as Hesychian *γεροακται· οἱ δῆμαρχοι παρὰ Λάκωσιν*).¹⁰ But (apart from the accent of *γερω̄α*) **geronsǎ* would answer as well; and nominalization of a feminine participle, which is what **geronsǎ* originally must be, is not a Greek usage, as we shall shortly see in the case of *οὔσα*. Even less credible is it, if the feminine and masculine participle forms are thought to be respectively nominalized into abstract (category) and concrete (individual).

Now an adjectival *-ont-yo-* might have arisen independently from **geronsǎ* (though hard to illustrate; it would be comparable, despite ablaut grade, to Skt. *satyá-*). But it is far more likely that an evolution of the form N *-ǎ* → Adj. *-io-* (as in *τιμά* → *τίμιος*, or Latin *noxa* → *noxius*) occurred in **geronsǎ* → **geronsios* > Homeric *γερούσιος*.¹¹ One cannot know what currency **geronsǎ* had; it may never have been Cretan in any form. Its general submerging is like that of **(ǎ)φεκοντια*, **(ǎ)εκονσα* → *(ǎ)εκούσιος*, *ἄκούσιος*, from the feminine of which adjective (itself found in e. g. Theognis) an abstract or summarizing noun is thereafter generated. And as this *ἄκουσία* (first in Sophocles), so arises post-Homeric *γερουσία*, Lac. *γερωήια* (feasible there, despite the non-attestation of **γερωήιος*). Here we have ellipsis, akin to the process undergone by Homeric *ἄκη* (sc. *πόλις*) or by medical terms like *ἀρθροῖτις* (sc. *νοῦσος*). In Latin, to the first projection *noxa* → *noxius*, one may add the second → *noxia* (noun): so likewise here in Greek. Besides, *valeant qui ante nos!* . . . Chantraine declared as much, baldly, many years ago (1933. 78). He adduced the projections *ἀγώνιος* → *ἀγωνία*, *αἴτιος* → *αἰτία*, *ἐλευθέριος* → *ἐλευθερία* and other N → Adj. generations of varying degrees of credibility. All needed, in fact, separate proof; nor was this process meant as the overall origin of *-iā* nouns. (It may be that a pattern was established which overruled other processes: so *πυγών* is related to the Odyssean *πυγούσιος*—I doubt if the relative

¹⁰ See Bourguet, 1927. 147 and fn. 1, for a view different in essentials from the above. Baunack, 1911. 487, points out that the placing in Hesychius shows that he meant *γερωακται*.

¹¹ Collocated only with *ὄρκος* (? 'taken by councillors', ? 'of senatorial solemnity') and *οἶνος* (in the formula *γερούσιον αἴθοπα οἶνον*, which is usually taken as 'of senatorial standard', although it might mean 'good enough for a gift'—cf. *Od.* 9. 196f.). See *Il.* 22. 119; 4. 259; *Od.* 13. 8. Note also Hesych. *γερούσιον· τὸ τοῖς ἐπῆμοις κατὰ γέρας διδόμενον*.

chronology matters—even though *πυγον-* would have needed a (non-existent) *-tio-* formant to achieve this result by normal suffixation).¹²⁾ Thereafter, alternative forms co-exist. Koine influence produces *γερονσίας*, ‘senator’, in first-century Laconian; before that, in early and mid fourth century, reformation from *γέροντες* (probably) gives *γεροντία* (Xenophon) and *γεροντεύω* (*IG V. 1* 1317). Later are *γεροντεία* at Ephesus (*OGI* 534) and Eustathius’s ascription (971. 23) of *γεροντίας* to Laconian (v. schol. ad *Il.* 14. 118).¹³⁾ And so one may conclude that **geronsiā* was not only not a possible Greek inheritance but never came to be Greek at all, in that form, and that the likely path of evolution was **gerontyǎ* > **geronsǎ* → **geronsios* > *γερούσιος* etc. → *γερονσία* etc. Finally, *γέρας* seems to be a disguised irrelevance.

At this point it would be distinctly inconvenient to find a recognizable reflex of **geronsiā* actually occurring, and before *γερούσιος*, at that. One may, therefore, be somewhat dashed to come upon the word *ke-ro-si-ja* in the Mycenaean archives (Pylos tablets An 261, 616).¹⁴⁾ Confidence in the argument so far may justify the assertion that the tablets here do not offer **γερονσία* (not, at least, as a derivative of *γέροντ-*). For the relevant tablet entries the formula is, regularly, genitive of a name + *ke-ro-si-ja* (nom. or gen.?) + *either* nominative of a name and the VIR ideogram with the number ‘1’ or just the VIR ideogram with a larger number (10, 14, 17, 18, 20 probably). It is hard to believe that an official (if he is such) should possess ‘his’ council of elders, and of such curious numbers. Besides, the ‘rank’ *qa-si-re-u* has been progressively diminished as interpretation has proceeded (and the first name of each entry here seems to belong to that category); from this, and from cross-context comparison of the names, Palmer has judged (1963, 228f., 427; 1965, 111) that *ke-ro-si-ja* means some kind of craft-group or craft-status. Palmer’s similar treatment

¹²⁾ In the normal examples the *t* is part of the (sometimes extended) root: *πλοῦτ-ος* → *πλούσιος*, *δημό-τ-ης* → *δημόσιος* (cf. *θύτης* and *θυσία*, *συμπότης* and *σμπόσιον*).

¹³⁾ Other derivatives (*γερονσιάζης*, *γεροντικόν*, *γεροντιάω*) are not in point here. But Thasian *γερονσιάζω* is interesting (a new word in *LSJ* Suppl.).

¹⁴⁾ See Ventris-Chadwick, 1956. 172f., 396; Chadwick-Baumbach, 1963. 180, for the view that what is meant is something like ‘group of counsellors’; and Palmer, 1963. 427; 1965. 111, for the interpretation as ‘craft-group’ vel sim. *χείρων* might be relevant, but etymologies based on this, or on *χείρ* or anything else, are hard to substantiate. (*Ta-ra-si-ja* seems not to be of any value as evidence, to judge by the short second vowel of Attic *ταλασία*.)

(1963, 427) of *ke-ro-te* at Knossos B 800, Pylos Jn 881, as a craftsman's title, together with the known interplay of the formants *-τηρ* (Myc. *-te*) and *-της, -τας* (Myc. *-ta*)—as in *ἐθελοντήρ, ἐθελοντής*—prompts the surmise that *ke-ro-si-ja* is the abstract counterpart of *ke-ro-te* just as is *e-qe-si-ja* that of *e-qe-ta*, with the normal East Greek shift of *-ti-* > *-si-*. This notion demands the absence of *n* in the preceding syllable (really, not just graphically) and finally rules out connexion with *geront-*.

Another, more troublesome, complication arises. From Herodotus on, Greek has at its disposal the word *οὐσία*.¹⁵) The evolution here proposed for *γερουσία* etc. may not serve for *οὐσία*. For example, uncompounded **οὔσιος* is not citable, and compounded *-ούσιος* is no earlier than Philo's *ἐξούσιος* (and if this is a pattern for later compounds its meaning, 'dispossessed', shows direct derivation from the phrase *ἐξ οὐσίας*). A glance at Buck-Petersen, 162, shows that unrelated words of a comparable formation are very few (unless *ἀλουσία* is to be treated as **ἀλου-ουσία*), and apart from *γερουσία, ἀκουσία* and *οὐσία* nothing exists except the range *ἀμουσία, εἰμουσία* et sim.—and these seem to derive either from *ἄμουσος* (cf. *ἄκαρπος* → *ἀκαρπία*) or directly from *μοῦσα* with no intervening **(-)μούσιος*.¹⁶) It is reasonable to wonder whether *σῶσα* had a similar projection to *οὐσία*, a form which Hofmann, 1950, s.v., calls an arbitrary philosophic derivative from the feminine participle—cf. the late Latin calques *entia, essentia*. This idea, however, demands that a palpable nominality attach itself to the feminine participle; it probably did not do so with **γέρουσα* or *ἄκουσα*. Admittedly, there is the startling history of *αἰθουσα*; and one may adduce names like *Ἀρέθουσα* and *Μέδουσα*, not to mention the improbable catalogue of Nereids at *Il.* 18. 39ff., which includes *Φέρουσα, Δυναμένη* and *Δεξαμένη*. But names are a very special case; and, despite some relevant uses of *ὄν, Οὔσα* as 'Mother Nature' is not a Greek locution.

Before summarily dismissing the participial derivation, however, one must pause over a line of defence of it which rests on faulty observation. The variants *ἔσσία* and *ὠσία* are sometimes cited, and linked with the participial forms *ἔσσα* and *ῶσα*—which still leaves

¹⁵) The word operates in two separate technical spheres, that of law (cf. Hdt.) in the sense of 'actual property', and that of philosophy in the sense of 'being', 'reality', etc.

¹⁶) *ἄμουσος* etc. represent a different sort of projection, of the *ἄθεος* type, sometimes called *bahuvrihis* (cf. Moorhouse, 1959, 7, 44f., citing Puhvel). As to the doubtful etymology of *μοῦσα*, see Frisk, II. 13. 261).

the process as a speciality of the verb *εἶναι*. Now it is true that Plato mentions *ἔσσία* and *ὠσία* together (at *Cratylus* 401b–d), and although he says nothing of the participles he does link *ἔσσία*, indirectly, with *ἔσσι*. But, in a dialogue partly written for laughs, he deliberately makes Socrates here say ‘please regard these remarks as mere speculation based on ignorance’ (*ταῦτα μὲν δὴ ταύτηι ὡς παρὰ μηδὲν εἰδότεων εἰρήσθω*). One should tread warily. Now *ὠσία*, which Socrates outrageously links to *τὸ ὠθοῦν*, a sort of osmotic initiator of a universe in Heraclitean flux, is a form known to ‘philosophic’ Doric; it appears in Ocellus and Archytas,¹⁷⁾ at least. But the corresponding *ῶσα* is scarcely to be described; it occurs nowhere in Greek except in one fringe dialect (of uncertain group-assignment), Pamphylian, and even there only in one text, the fourth-century Sillyon inscription (cf. Thumb-Scherer, 1959, 190), which is notorious as a repository of linguistic oddities. Such mavericks are known elsewhere (cf. the Sotaerus inscription in Thessalian, or the Andania inscription in Messenian). For the presence of *ὠσία* in South Italian ‘professional’ Doric, a new solution as to its origin is needed.

The other form is no less vulnerable. In this essay on man’s supposed system and logic in noun-formation, Plato links *ἔσσία* with *Ἐστία* (as the deity to whom is owed the first sacrifice), and her in turn with *ἔσσι*. It might have been more sensible to use *ἔστώ*. Anyhow, the punning (of itself more to the point than that on *ὠθεῖν*) induces an invented form, *ἔσσία*, clearly modelled on *ὠσία*. The latter would be known to Plato’s contemporaries with philosophic interests, and needs no gloss; the mock form *ἔσσία*, however, has to be given a pseudo-status, and Plato’s answer is to call it apparent Old Attic: *εἰκόκαμεν . . . ἡμεῖς τὸ παλαιὸν ἔσσίαν καλεῖν τὴν οὔσίαν* (401c 8f.), a piece of ‘local colour’ which commentators ignore (both in particular and as a warning) in attempting to locate a form which offers no evidence of real existence.¹⁸⁾ Chantraine, in

¹⁷⁾ See Stobaeus, *Ecl. Phys.* 1. 20. 2 (Ocellus), 1. 35. 2 (Archytas), and Thesleff, 1961 and 1965, on these authors. Ocellus (Okkelos in Thesleff) has both *ὠσία* and *οὔσία*; Archytas (who also has *ἔστώ*) has both forms in contiguous sentences, as well as mixtures like *κατ’ οὔσίαν μένομεν*, and *εἶναι* alongside *ἡμεν* and *εἶμεν*. But indigestible mixtures can consist of ingredients pure in themselves, and a South Italian philosophic word *ὠσία* must be allowed.

¹⁸⁾ LSJ, s. v. and Buck-Petersen, 161, say *ἔσσία* is Pythagorean Doric, and Boisacq, 1950, s. v. *οὔσία*, also cites *ἔσσία* as Doric. I can find no grounds for

calling it (1933. 117) an arbitrary philosophers' formation, like Hofmann on *οὔσια*, does it more than justice. To be sure, *ἔσσα* does exist (though the usual Doric form is *ἔασσα* or the local equivalent), and in Pythagorean Doric too (Thumb-Kieckers, 1932. 102), occurring otherwise only in Actaeon Argolic and perhaps Lesbian (but see Thumb-Scherer, 1959. 106). But in this pairing it is the noun-form which crumbles at a touch.

It seems intolerable to be forced back to the belief that an abstract **sont-yǎ* produces *οὔσια* as **geront-yǎ* eventually results in *γερονσία*, in view of the non-occurrence not only of **onsā* but also of such an apparently useful adjective as **οὔσιος* in the chain of development. It is not necessary to cast far for an alternative origin, of greater plausibility. Following the cue of Lat. *noxa* (< **(H)nek' + sā*) one turns to the very relevant PIE abstract formant *-sā*, evidenced in e.g. Skt. *manīṣā*, 'wisdom', 'thought', and available in Greek, as Buck-Petersen show (741): cf. *κόρη* etc. Hence we may start with **sont-sā*. Now it is of interest that in Attic this formant joined in the drift of first declension words of spondaic ending towards the (trochaic) *-V̄Cǎ* type (as did *τόλμα*), for which cf. Solmsen, 1909. 236ff. So **κνῖδ-σā* becomes Homeric *κνίση* but Attic *κνῖσα*. Thus **sont-sā* would pass, via **onsā*, to **ōsā* generally, but to **ōsǎ* in Attic, whence *οὔσα* (N). This end-product, of a useful, indeed necessary, legal and philosophic term, would be tiresomely homophonous throughout with the feminine participle,¹⁹⁾ and re-formation would be called for. The new form would naturally be modelled on what had come to be the most usual pattern for feminine abstracts, the *-ία* (*-ίη*) ending attached to roots whether verbal (*πενία*) or adjectival (*σοφία*); and so *οὔσια*. From this in turn come the subsequent dialectal transliterations into *ῶσία* and *οὔσιη*, not of provably independent origin. And as much historical difference is now assertable between the histories of *γερονσία* and *οὔσια* as the unlikeness of their contexts and testimonia warrants.²⁰⁾

these opinions, beyond the theory that makes the connexion with *ἔσσα* and sees the latter as a Doric variant of importance.

¹⁹⁾ It would not have been so in Ionic, where **ἑούση?* was possible (and distinct from *ἔουσα*); but the Ionic philosophers remained content with *τὸ ἔόν*, and *οὔσιη* is unknown to the philosophic vocabulary before the intervention of Attic and its form.

²⁰⁾ I am grateful to Dr. A. Morpurgo Davies and Professor H. J. Mason for their comments, which have helped to steer my thoughts on this problem.

References

- Baunaack, J. [1911]: Hesychiana, *Philologus* 70. 353—396, 449—488.
- Bechtel, F. [1921—24]: *Die griechischen Dialekte*, I—III.
- Benveniste, E. [1935]: *Origines de la formation des noms en indo-européen*. Paris.
- [1950]: *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* (4th edn.). Heidelberg and Paris.
- Bourguet, E. [1927]: *Le dialecte laconien*. Paris.
- Buck, C. D., Petersen, W.: (undated but = 1945; reprinted 1969, Hildesheim) *A reverse index of Greek nouns and adjectives*. Chicago.
- Chadwick, J., Baumbach, L. [1963]: The Mycenaean Greek vocabulary. *Glotta*, 41. 1963. 3—4. 157—271.
- Chantraine, P. [1933]: *La formation des noms en grec ancien*. Paris.
- Frisk, H. [1954]: *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg.
- von Fritz, K. [1945]: *Γερουσία — γερωχία*, *Am. Journ. Philol.* 66. 196—197.
- Hofmann, J. B. [1950]: *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Griechischen*. München.
- Moorhouse, A. C. [1959]: *Studies in the Greek negatives*, Cardiff.
- Morpurgo (Davies), A. [1963]: *Mycenaeae Graecitatis lexicon*. Rome.
- Nagy, G. [1970]: *Greek dialects and the transformation of an Indo-European process*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Oliver, J. H. [1941]: *The sacred gerusia* (= *Hesperia*, Suppl. vi.) Princeton.
- Palmer, L. R. [1963]: *The interpretation of Mycenaean Greek texts*. Oxford.
- [1965]: *Mycenaeans and Minoans*. (2nd edn.) London.
- Schwyzler, E. [1939]: *Griechische Grammatik*, I. München.
- Solmsen, F. [1909]: *Beiträge zur griechischen Wortforschung*. Straßburg.
- Thesleff, H. [1961]: *An introduction to the Pythagorean Writings of the Hellenistic period* (= *Acta Academiae Aboensis*, A. 24. 3).
- [1965]: *The Pythagorean texts of the Hellenistic period* (= *Acta Academiae Aboensis*, A. 30. 1).
- Thieme, P. [1953]: *Die Heimat der indogermanischen Gemeinsprache* (= *Abhand. Ak. Wiss.-Lit.*, Mainz, 11). Wiesbaden.
- Thumb, A.-Kieckers, E. [1932]: *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte*, I², Heidelberg.
- Thumb, A.-Scherer, A. [1959]: *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte*, II², Heidelberg.
- Ventris, M., Chadwick, J. [1956]: *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*. Cambridge.
- Vilborg, E. [1960]: *A tentative grammar of Mycenaean Greek*. Göteborg.
- Wackernagel, J. [1916]: *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer*. Göttingen.