νόσος AND ὁσίη:
ETYMOLOGICAL AND SOCIOCULTURAL OBSERVATIONS ON THE CONCEPTS OF DISEASE AND DIVINE (DIS)FAVOUR IN ANCIENT GREECE

Abstract: After a brief discussion of earlier etymological theories, this article proposes a new analysis of the Greek noun νόσος 'disease' as a possessive compound *n-osw-os 'not having *(h₁)osu', the second constituent of which is cognate with Hitt. *āssu* 'well-being'; just like the latter, Greek νόσοι are characteristically sent or removed by divinities. Moreover, the reconstruction of an abstract noun *(h₁)osu 'well-being (resulting from divine favour)' can serve as the etymological basis for the somewhat obscure Greek notion of ὁσίη, which refers to the state of something that is endowed with such *(h₁)osu; in fact, phraseological parallelisms between texts from various parts of the Greek world as well as ancient Anatolia point to a common conceptual framework behind all these words.

I. νόσος

To think about diseases is not particularly pleasant, and this may be why the Greek word for 'illness' or 'disease', νόσος, has not yet been adequately explained from an etymological point of view. Although numerous attempts have been made, none of them deserves unreserved approval. In this paper, a new theory will be presented, which aims at taking into account the morphological as well as the semantic aspects of the question. In doing so, it will also open up a new perspective on a second problem case of Greek etymology and help to elucidate a central term of religious life in the ancient world: the notion of correct conduct before the gods, Homeric ὁσίη.

In an article published in 1990, Michael Meier-Brügger has reopened the search for an etymology of Greek νόσος.[1] Meier-Brügger connects νόσος with the root *nek- of νεκρός 'corpse' and Latin *necare* 'to kill'. An original feminine noun *nók-ih₂ would have been remodelled into *nókyo-, and this in turn would have yielded *νόσσος. An earlier stage of the development *ky > σσ would be reflected in the Mycenaean personal name *a-no-zo-jo*, which Meier-Brügger translates as 'der, welcher keine Krankheit hat'.[2]

Meier-Brügger himself admits that 'der innergriechische Weg von *nósso- zu nóso- bleibt (...) mit Hypothesen behaftet'. While we would expect *νόσσος in Ionian, where we do get νοῦσος, *nókyos should have become *νόττος in Attic, where νόσος is attested. That *nósso- < *nókyo- was secondarily brought in line with τόσσος/τόσος < *tótyo- and therefore substituted in Ionic by *nóso- in order to make it sound 'epichoric', and that the remodelled νόσος then replaced *νόττος or *νόσσος in other dialects (e.g. Attic) under the influence of Ionic medicine, is difficult to accept.[3]

As for the semantic side, it should be borne in mind that a νόσος is not always lethal, as the use of the root *nek- might suggest; the great philologist Karl Brugmann had already pointed out that from Homer onward νοῦσος/νόσος refers more generally to any 'Erregtheit, Störung des seelischen Gleichgewichts und des Wohlbefindens'.[4]

---

[1] For older theories see e.g. Prellwitz (1905) 316, *s.v.* νόσος ('*νόσϝος weist auf νέομαι'), and Brugmann (1897), later abandoned by Brugmann (1911) 363 himself; Brugmann's subsequent derivation from *nortswo- 'leidenschaftliche Erregtheit' (Brugmann (1911) 364-5, with a root *nert- and a suffix *-swo- not found elsewhere in Greek, as well as a doubtful change *-ρτσϝ- > -σϝ-) and the theory proposed by Thieme (1984) 370-1 (*νοσ-σϝος 'die Nase erschütternd/schüttelnd') are indeed 'nicht recht glaubhaft' (Meier-Brügger (1990) 246).

[2] Meier-Brügger (1990), elaborating on ideas of Curtius (1878) and Szemerényi (1979) 214; *a-no-zo-jo* of course allows many alternative interpretations (*cf.* Aura Jorro (1985-93) 1.71, s.v. *a-no-zo-jo*; Peters (1988-90) 690v, no. G1436).

[3] *Cf.* Meier-Brügger (1990) 248; a general word for 'disease' is hardly a lexeme that is easily replaced by a variant used in technical discourse.

[4] Brugmann (1911) 363. In a reply to Meier-Brügger, Martin Peters suggests connecting νόσος with the family of νωθής, νωθρός 'sluggish, slothful' instead and reconstructing *n̥h₃dʰs-wo- 'mit Lähmung, Schwächung versehen' (Peters (1988-90) 690v, No. G1436; *cf.* already Brugmann (1897) 30-1), but this does not lead very far either: one would expect an outcome *νῶσος and even the comparison with νωθής cannot account for the sibilant in *-dʰsw-.

Thus, the foremost problem with the word νόσος is the parallelism of the dialect forms Attic νόσος vs Homeric (Ionic) νοῦσος, the latter with compensatory lengthening. The case is similar to that of Attic ἴσος vs Homeric ἶσος 'equal'; just like νοῦσος, ἶσος also occurs in post-Homeric Ionic (e.g. Semonides *fr.* 7.36 W., Bacch. 1.172 Sn.-M., Solon *fr.* 24.1 W.). The long vowels of the two words cannot therefore just be artificial epicisms.

In the case of ἴσος, an earlier form ϝίσϝος is actually attested (*DGE* 175.2 (Gortyn, fifth cent.); *DGE* 665 A^1.4 (Orchomenos, fourth cent.); *cf.* Hsch. γ 574 γίσγον· ἴσον). Unfortunately, this rather complicates the issue. Intervocalic original *-sw-* normally disappears in historical Greek, no doubt in a process which involves the stages *-sw-* > *-hw-* > *-w-* (*-ϝ-*) (with compensatory lengthening) > Ø: thus, να(ϝ)ός 'temple' goes back to *nas-wos*, a word based on the root *nas-* of ναίω 'to live'. Hence, the adjective ἴσος is often derived from something other than *wiswos*, for instance *ϝιτσ-ϝος*.[5] However, this leaves its origin unexplained and has become particularly unlikely in view of Mycenaean *wi-so-wo-*:[6] given Myc. *a₃-ka-sa-ma* for /aiksmans/ ~ acc. pl. αἰχμάς 'spear-points' with a group *-ksm-*, a similar cluster *-tsw-* in *ϝιτσ-ϝος* should be reflected by Myc. *wi-to-so-wo-*, *wi-zo-wo-* or the like. If, on the other hand, ἴσος goes back to *wiswos*, the word can be directly connected with Skt. *viṣu-* 'to different sides' (with derivations such as *viṣu-ṇa-* 'varied, of different kinds'): ἴσος < *wiswos* will then simply be a thematized variant of *wisu-*. This was first suggested by Georg Curtius, and Hermann Jacobsohn subsequently explained the semantic divergence between the Greek and the Indic words.[7] One has to imagine a central view-point, from which the shares 'towards both sides' are 'equal' (*cf.* Vedic 'viṣuvánt- "Mitteltag, Scheitelpunkt" (...) aus *viṣuvát-vant-* "charakterisiert durch Auseinanderstreben"'[8]). Following Wilhelm Schulze, Jacobsohn also tried to account for the seemingly irregular development of *sw*: according to him, *sw* was retained *after* the accent, but lost *before* the accent.[9] Whereas να(ϝ)ός < *naswós* 'temple' would show a regular loss of pretonic *-sw-*, ἴσος/ἶσος and νόσος/νοῦσος could be derived from *wiswos* and *nóswos* respectively, with posttonic *-sw-* and with or without compensatory lengthening after the later loss of *-ϝ-* according to dialect.

It is true that Jacobsohn's explanation of the development of *sw* remains somewhat mechanical. It is not clear why the accent seat of a pitch language such as Greek should have the postulated effect. At the same time, the etymological case of ἴσος/ἶσος is strong enough for us not to abandon the reconstruction of 'simple' *sw* (rather than *tsw* etc.) too quickly. Fortunately, there is a prosodic factor other than Jacobsohn's accent position which can explain the double treatment of *sw*.

Despite the superficial similarity of *naswos* 'temple' and *wiswos* 'equal', their morphological structure is quite different. As mentioned above, *naswos* is derived from the root *nas-*, to which a nominal suffix *-wos* has been added, whereas *wiswos* is a thematized version of an athematic adjective *wisu-*. Morphologically, we thus have to distinguish *nas-wos* from *wisw-os*. The syllabic structure of *nas-wos* will correspond exactly to the morphological one: *nas.wos*. This is not the case with *wisw-os*: because *sw* was not an acceptable syllable-final consonant cluster

[5] *Cf.* Schwyzer (1939) 308 after Bechtel (1886) 15 and Brugmann (1897) 31 and (1906) 205, whose explanation of *ϝιτσ-* (in *ϝιτσ-ϝος*) as a by-form of εἶδος, *ϝιδσ-*, is most doubtful, not least because of the double zero grade preceding the *-wo-* suffix; Frisk (1960-72) 1.738, *s.v.* ἴσος; Chantraine (1968-80) 1.470, *s.v.* ἴσος. To Meillet (1925) 12-13, who derives ἴσος from *(d)wi-* 'two' + *-two-*, one must object with Kretschmer (1928) 195 that intervocalic *-tw-* yields Attic -ττ-, Ionic/Doric -σσ- in e.g. τέτταρες, τέσσαρες < *kʷetwₚres* or Doric ἥμισσον < *sēmi-twon* (*cf.* Lejeune (1972) 82-3, 105).

[6] PY Sh 740 *wi-so-wo-pa-na*, a compound with an obscure second element; *cf.* Aura Jorro (1985-93) 2.436, s.v. *wi-so-wo-pa-na*.

[7] Curtius (1873) 381-2; Jacobsohn (1909) 89-91. The connection is tentatively accepted by Wackernagel and Debrunner (1954) 927 and Pokorny (1959) 1.1175-6, s.v. 1. *u̯i-*.

[8] Mayrhofer (1992-2001) 2.565, s.v. *viṣu-*.

[9] Jacobsohn (1909) 93 after Schulze (1892) 88 n.4, 404 n.2; in forms such as εἴωθα < *sé-swōdʰ-a* paradigmatic levelling would have caused the loss of *-sw-*.

in Greek, a syllabification *wisw.os was excluded. On the other hand, there was no reason why the syllabic structure of the underlying *wi-su- should have been abandoned after the thematization, for *sw- was acceptable as a syllable-initial cluster. Hence, one may postulate that the syllabification was *wi.swos, not *wis.wos.[10]

Confirmation for this comes from Mycenaean wi-so-wo-. In Linear B, syllable-final -s- is not normally written (cf. e.g. pa-i-to /Pʰaistos/). Only the sequences /sw/ in wi-so-wo- and /sm/ in do-so-mo /dosmos/ 'tribute' are treated differently. This alone suggests a syllabification /wi.swo-/ and /do.smos/ (as opposed to /Pʰais.tos/). Moreover, if – as is commonly assumed[11] – Mycenaean ka-ko na-wi-jo (PY Jn 829.3) stands for /kʰalkon na(h)wiyon/ 'bronze for the temple', we obtain definitive evidence for the different syllabification in the 'temple' word (/na(h).wiyon/ < *nas.wion).

Incidentally, the sibilant-plus-labial clusters *-sw- and *-sm- show a similar behaviour not only as far as Mycenaean orthography is concerned. Words like Mycenaean /dosmos/ or classical Greek δεσμός 'bond' contravene the 'general' rule by which *-sm- is simplified via *-hm- into -μ- (with compensatory lengthening) in exactly the same way in which *wiswos contravenes the rule *-sw- > *-hw- > *-ϝ- (p. 154). But again, whereas there is a morphological boundary in a word such as εἷμα ~ /hēma/ 'dress' < *wes-mn̥ (root *wes-: cf. Lat. ves-tis), there is no such boundary in δεσμός and /dosmos/ < *de-smos and *do-smos with the suffix *-smos (added to the roots of δέω 'to bind' and δίδωμι 'to give' respectively). Here too, the original syllabification reflects the morphological structure.[12] So, just as syllable-initial *-sm- was preserved, syllable-initial *-sw- also survived (except that *-ϝ-, unlike -μ-, was of course later lost).[13] It may be noted that all of this makes good sense also from a general phonetic point of view: syllable-initial consonants (like the *-s- of /do.smos/ and /wi.swo-/) tend to be articulated more strongly than syllable-final consonants.[14]

Despite his arguments in favour of original *noswos, Jacobsohn did not suggest an etymology of his own. However, it has long been seen that the feminine gender of νόσος is easiest to explain if the word has an adjectival origin; at the beginning, it must have accompanied a feminine noun such as φύσις or ψυχή.[15] In Greek, of course, most adjectives have a separate feminine form in *-ā. The most notable exceptions to this 'rule' are adjectives in -ιος (e.g. πάτριος) and all the compound adjectives. Thus, ἡ αὔλειος 'house-door' stems from an adjective in -ιος which accompanied θύρα 'door', and ἡ διάλεκτος 'dialect' is originally a compound adjective agreeing with γλῶσσα 'tongue, language'.[16] If we derive νόσος from a feminine adjective *nóswos, which does not end in -ιος, the most economic way of doing so is therefore to analyse it as a compound

[10] Similarly Ion. τό.σος < *to.tyos (~ *toty-os: cf. Lat. tot(i)) vs μέλισ.σα < *melit.ya (~ *melit-ya).

[11] Cf. Aura Jorro (1985-93) 1.466, s.v. na-wi-jo, with literature; however, an interpretation /kʰalkon nāwiyon/ 'bronze for ships' cannot be ruled out completely.

[12] This does not mean that the syllable boundary was fixed for all time. Given Ionic ἶσος with compensatory lengthening, the boundary in *wi.swos seems to have shifted to *wis.wos, perhaps in analogy with adjectives in *-wos such as *mon-wos ~ *mon.wos 'single'. However, there are also Ionic instances of preserved *wi.swos (> short-vocalic ἴσος: e.g. Hes. Op. 752; Thgn. 678; Bacch. 5.46 Sn.-M.), which testify to the older state of affairs. Conversely, in Attic *mon.wos and the like became *mo.nwos (> μόνος without compensatory lengthening), but *wi.swos remained unchanged. The situation is reminiscent of the unstable boundary in muta-cum-liquida groups (e.g. Attic πα.τρός, but Ionic πατ.ρός).

[13] Exactly the same fluctuation between *sm > μ or σμ and *sw > *ϝ or *σϝ obtains word-initially, where it must

be due to different sandhi environments affecting the syllabification at the juncture with a preceding word: note for instance σέλας 'light, brightness' (cf. Skt. svàr-: Mayrhofer (1992-2001) 2.793-4, s.v. svàr-) or σιγάω 'to be silent' (cf. OHG swīgen, Germ. schweigen) with *sw- > σ(ϝ)- vs ἔθω 'to be accustomed' with *sw- > (ϝ)- and σμερδνός 'terrible' (cf. OHG smerzan, Germ. schmerzen) with *sm- > σμ- vs μειδιάω 'to smile' (cf. Skt. smáyate, Engl. smile) with *sm- > μ- (see Lejeune (1972) 120-1 and 135, with further examples). The case of σμικρός/μικρός 'small' illustrates how easily the syllable boundary could shift in such cases.

[14] Cf. e.g. Krakow (1999) 25: 'syllable-initial position is a "stronger" position in two senses. It is generally associated with tighter articulatory constrictions and with greater stability'.

[15] Brugmann (1897) 31-2 and (1911) 365; Meier-Brügger (1990) 247.

[16] Cf. Schwyzer (1939) 457-8, 458 n.1.

(whose compound character was obviously no longer felt in historical Greek). Given the limited length of the word-stem before the thematic ending -os, the most sensible place to divide the lexeme is right after the initial *n-, i.e. *n-osw-os.

To separate off the initial *n- is suggested by a great number of adjectives such as νήνεμος 'without wind' in which the initial consonant has the same function and origin as the α privativum in adjectives like ἄδικος 'without justice'. Both times one has to postulate an original *n- in a possessive compound with the stems of ἄνεμος and δίκη respectively. It is tempting to see in this *n- a zero-grade variant of the negation particle *ne,[17] but there are no good reasons to postulate *ne- itself as the underlying form in negative compounds (as was occasionally done some decades ago[18]); the long vowel in adjectives like νήνεμος regularly results from *n-h₂nem-os, not from a prehistoric contraction of *ne-anem-os.

The comparison with words like νήνεμος is instructive in another respect too. In historical Greek, ἀν- is the negative particle in compounds whose second element starts with a vowel (cf. e.g. ἀν-άποινος 'without ransom', ἀν-έστιος 'without hearth'). Here the initial ἀν- is usually explained as *n̥(n)-V-,[19] and the morpheme boundary following original *n- is made responsible for the irregular treatment of *n-V- (i.e. ἀν-άποινος instead of †ν-άποινος). That is, ἀν- is the result of an analogical process triggered by the existence of compounds with regular *n̥-, where a consonant followed. One may tabulate the situation as follows:

(1) *n- + C-   > *n̥-C-   > ἀ-C-   (e.g. ἄδικος)
(2) *n- + VC- > *n-VC-→ analogy with (1) *n̥(n)-VC- > ἀν-VC-   (e.g. ἀνάποινος)
(3) *n- + HC-> *n̥-HC-   > ν-V:C-   (e.g. νήνεμος)

In group (3) an analogical process similar to the one in group (2) also took place, though at a later stage. This explains the existence of pairs such as ἀν-ώνυμος and ν-ώνυμος (both Homeric) or ἀν-ωφελής (Aeschylus, Sophocles and later) and ν-ωφελής (cf. Myc. no-pe-re-a₂ /nōpʰeleha/). Here the α privativum was added to the original result because it had come to be felt as the negation marker par excellence. We may therefore subdivide (3):

(3a) *n- + HC- > *n̥-HC- > ν-V:C-   (e.g. νώνυμος)
(3b) *n- + HC- > *n̥-HC- > ν-V:C-   → analogy with (1) ἀ- + ν-V:C- (e.g. ἀνώνυμος)

Since group (3) demonstrates that compounds with *n- were already built at a time when the laryngeals still existed, another look at group (2) is also called for. The formula for most (if not all) compounds which belong here and which were not built 'late' (i.e. after the laryngeals had been lost) should more properly read as follows:

(2') *n- + HVC- > *n̥-HVC- > *n-VC-   → analogy with (1) *n̥(n)-VC-   > ἀν-VC-

[17] Interestingly this analysis of the initial ν- in νόσος was already suggested in antiquity: cf. Et. Magn. p. 607.32-8 (νόσος· παρὰ τὸ ἐστερῆσθαι τοῦ σώου, κατὰ μετάθεσιν τοῦ ω εἰς ο· (τὸ γὰρ νο στερητικόν ἐστι, κατὰ μεταβολὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ νω στερητικοῦ·) καὶ πλεονασμῷ τοῦ υ, Ἰωνικῶς, νοῦσος, ὡς κόρος, κοῦρος· μόνος, μοῦνος. ἢ παρὰ τὸ νο στερητικὸν καὶ τὸ σεύω, τὸ ὁρμῶ, ἡ μὴ ἐῶσα ἡμᾶς κινεῖσθαι καὶ σεύεσθαι. ἢ παρὰ τὸ νο στερητικὸν καὶ τὸ διὰ τοῦ ο γραφομένου σόος, ὁ ἀκέραιος 'The word νόσος comes from being deprived of what is "alive and well" (σῶος), by replacement of ω by ο (for vo- is a privative element, transformed from privative νω-); by addition of υ Ionic νοῦσος arises (cf. κόρος/κοῦρος and

μόνος/μοῦνος). Alternatively, it could come from the privative element vo- together with σεύω ~ ὁρμῶ "to set in motion, drive" because an illness does not allow us to move and to be put in motion. Or else, it could come from the privative element vo- together with the word σόος "unharmed" written with o.').

[18] E.g. in Schwyzer (1939) 431; cf. Chantraine (1968-80) 2.732, s.v. ν-, νε-. According to Beekes (1988) word-initial *nHC- would yield *n-VC- except in the negative compounds, but this is irrelevant here since we gain nothing with a reconstruction *nh₃s- > νοσ-.

[19] Cf. e.g. Risch (1974) 215.

It is sometimes assumed that the vocalic nasal in a sequence *n̥-HVC- remains syllabic when the laryngeal has fallen away (i.e. *n̥-HVC- > *n̥-VC-). However, this view contradicts the regular syllabification rule, and Matthias Fritz has recently shown that all the examples typically adduced to illustrate it are better explained either by analogy or by the effects of the Sievers-Lindeman law. Instead, 'in einer Sequenz *R̥.HV (...) gerät durch den Ausfall des Laryngals der Sonorant in antevokalische Position, und es tritt sein unsilbisches Allophon ein: *RV'.[20] Thus, the pre-analogical development proposed in (2') corresponds to Fritz's law.

As is always the case when analogical levelling takes place, some forms may be left out – especially if they had for some reason 'lost touch' with the group to which they originally belonged. My suggestion is that νόσος represents such a stray sheep of group (2'). Its initial ν- is the negative particle, which was not remodelled into ἀν- because the word, though starting off as an adjective, had become substantivized at an early stage and developed the concrete meaning 'disease'. It thus lost contact with the other possessive adjectives, whose meaning 'not having X or Y' remained easily recognizable. Instead, *noswos was now perceived as one of the non-compound nouns with suffix *-wos (cf. e.g. *nas-wos > *nah.wos > να(ϝ)ός 'temple', *kor-wos > κόρος/κοῦρος 'boy', *(s)od-wos (?) > ὀδός/οὐδός 'threshold'). By analogy with this group, the syllable boundary was shifted (*no.swos > *nos.wos, like *kor.wos etc.), and this ultimately led to the different vowel quantity of Ionic νοῦσος vs Attic νόσος.

It might be objected to the above scenario that it is difficult to cite an exact parallel for such a 'stranding' of a privative compound. However, it is somewhat unreasonable to ask for a similar case. Firstly, the number of potential candidate lexemes is limited as it includes only negative compounds with *n- whose second element started with a vowel (~ *HVC-, but not *HC-). Secondly, the semantics of such a word would also have had to become sufficiently independent for its original compound character no longer to be recognized.

Even so, there may be such a word. The noun νόθος 'bastard, illegitimate child' (opp. γνήσιος) is classified as 'unerklärt' by the etymological dictionaries.[21] The same goes for the Homeric verb ὄθομαι 'to take heed, take thought for, regard', which must be related to the noun ὄθη in the gloss Hsch. o 147 ὄθη· φροντίς, ὤρα 'care, respect'. Now just as an ἄτιμος (< *n̥- + τιμή 'honour') is someone to whom no τιμή is paid, it makes sense to see in a νόθος someone for whom no one has ὄθη. Again, the compound adjective would have been substantivized with a specific (in this case, legal) meaning in which the negative particle was no longer recognizable; hence, no remodelling into *ἀν-οθος took place.[22]

Returning to ν-όσος/*n-ósw-os, it is now surprisingly easy to find a convincing etymon. Compounds whose second element is not an original o-stem often become thematic. For instance, in Homer one finds both πολύδακρυς and πολυδάκρυος derived from the neuter u-stem δάκρυ 'tear', and the privative compound adjective belonging with πῦρ 'fire' is thematized as ἄπυρος (for *ἄπυρ).[23] That such a thematization could take place already at a very early stage is shown by the compound νώνυμν-ος 'without name', where ὄνυμα/ὄνομα is treated as an n-stem: hence, the formation of νώνυμνος must date back to a time when the underlying noun was not yet remodelled into an -nt-stem (cf. gen. ὀνόματος < *-n̥t-os). In order to account for *n-ósw-os, we should therefore

---

[20] Fritz (1996) 5-6, who gives various examples (e.g. 'Gr. νεο-γνός, lat. prīvīgnus < uridg. *-ǵn̥h₁-o-', p. 7) and re-formulates the law as 'Silbenanlautender Laryngal vor Vokal schwindet, wenn die vorausgehende Silbe auf das silbische Allophon eines Sonoranten auslautet, und dessen silbisches Allophon tritt ein' (p. 9).

[21] Cf. Frisk (1960-72) 2.321-2, s.v. νόθος; Chantraine (1968-80) 2.755, s.v. νόθος.

[22] Much later ἀ-νοθος 'genuine' was built after νόθος, just as ἀ-νοσος 'without illness' was built after νόσος

(pp. 161-2). A further connection of νόθος with νωθής 'sluggish, slothful (< careless)' (cf. n.4) becomes possible if there was a near-synonymous s-stem noun *ὄθος < *h₃edʰ-os (n.) next to ὄθη < *h₃odʰ-eh₂ (cf. Homeric ὄχος (n.) for *(ϝ)έχος < *wegʰ-os ~ Myc. wo-ka /wokʰā/ < *wogʰ-eh₂ 'vehicle'; Meissner (2006) 97): hence *n̥-h₃dʰes- > νωθής vs *n-h₃odʰ-os > νόθος.

[23] See Risch (1974) 226-7 with further examples.

postulate a noun *(H)ósu (n.) or *(H)ósus (m./f.), a *u*-stem derivative of a root *Hes-.[24] The possessive adjective from which νόσος developed would then have meant 'not having *(H)ósu(s)*'.

The vocalism of the hypothesized *u*-stem noun *(H)ósu(s) is identical to the vocalism seen in the Greek neuters δόρυ 'wood' and γόνυ 'knee'.[25] Masculine and feminine *u*-stem nouns rather show an *e*-grade (e.g. νέκυς, γένυς, πῆχυς). A reconstructed neuter *(H)ósu is therefore preferable to the masculine/feminine alternative.

Admittedly, a neuter *(H)ósu – or more precisely: *$h_1$ósu – is not directly attested in Greek. However, the assumed root *$h_1$es- provides the *u*-stem adjective ἐύς < *$h_1$sú- 'good', and it has been plausibly suggested that a derivative *$h_1$ósu underlies the Homeric noun οὖρος 'fair wind'.[26] Even more crucially, *$h_1$ósu is well-known from Anatolian. In Hittite, āssu- (n.) means 'favor, good treatment, good(ness), well-being; good stuff, good things, goods, chattels, valuables, wealth, possession(s)'.[27] The small formal difficulty with this traditional[28] derivation of āssu- from *$h_1$ósu does not cast doubt on the equation as such. The geminated consonant may be surprising,[29] but there are several ways of accounting for the irregularity. Sara Kimball, for instance, assumes that *s was regularly doubled before accented syllables and that nominal āssu- < *$h_1$ósu obtained its geminate 'from the adjectival oblique stem *h_1s-ów- and adjectival nominative-accusative singular *h_1s-ú- > Pre-Hitt. *(saw-), *(su-) → *asáw-, *asú- with analogical full grade assāw-'.[30]

For our argument, the abstract meaning 'well-being' of Hittite āssu- (n.) is of prime importance. It is found for example in *KBo* XV 10 II 33-4:[31]

nu idālu ḫarnikten nu ANA BELI ANA DAM-ŠU DUMU^{MEŠ}-ŠU *āssu namma ēstu*

'destroy evil; to the lord, to his wife (and) to his children let there again be good/well-being'.

From here it is a small step to reach the semantics of Greek νόσος: 'not having well-being' corresponds exactly to what we should expect to be the original meaning of the 'possessive adjective' *n-(h_1)ósw-os: a νόσος (sc. ψυχή/φύσις *vel sim.*) is a physical or psychical state of 'un-well-ness'.

---

[24] It is uncertain whether an athematic *n-osu-s ever existed alongside *n-ósw-os (cf. πολύδακρυς/πολυδάκρυος); if so, it was doomed to disappear after the loss of intervocalic *-s-.

[25] See further πῶυ 'flock' (< *póHy-u), οὐ 'not' (< *$h_2$óy-u 'eternity': Cowgill (1960)), and perhaps also Hsch. κ 3247 κοῖλυ· τὸ κοῖλον; other neuters (μῶλυ, σῶρυ) are of uncertain origin, but the vocalism of πολύς, which is hard to reconcile with the expected *p̥lh₁-ús, may also be due to the former existence of a noun *pólh₁-u (cf. Benveniste (1935) 52-6).

[26] See Nussbaum (1998) 152, who explains οὖρος as a possessive denominative derivative *$h_1$osu-ro- (cf. Skt. amhú- 'distress' → amhu-rá- 'distressed').

[27] Puhvel (1984) 199, s.v. *ass-, assiya-*, who also gives the translation of *KBo* XV 10 II 33-4 quoted above.

[28] The connection of Hittite āssu- with *$h_1$sú- (*esú-) 'good' was first suggested by Friedrich (1923) 370-2; for āssu- < *$h_1$ósu cf. e.g. Benveniste (1935) 68; Watkins (1982) 261; Catsanicos (1984) 150; Lamberterie (1990) 2.807-11 and Nussbaum (1998) 152.

[29] Cf. Puhvel (1984) 205-6, s.v. *ass-, assiya-*, whose argument that '*assu- does not basically denote that which is intrinsically and objectively good' (cf. already Puhvel (1980)) is weak: terms for 'good' and 'bad' always tend to be (or become) subjectively loaded.

[30] Kimball (1999) 439 (cf. 142), with further details and reference to Kimball (1987) 181 n.48; for a somewhat different approach see Melchert (1994) 63 (Hittite āssu- as 'a blend of PA *ássu- < *ésu- < PIE *$h_1$ésu- and PA *ásu- < *ósu-').

[31] Edited in Szabó (1971) 24; for a different way of expressing the same wish see *KUB* XLI 23 II 10 with *nu labarnan āssu suuai* 'porte (littér. pousse) le labarna vers le bien(-être)' (Catsanicos (1984) 144; cf. Friedrich and Kammenhuber (1975-84) 497, s.v. *aššu-* II.2), *KUB* II 2 III 12-13 with *dankuuai-ma taknī [idalauua(?)] munnandu, assū-ma (sic, prob. for āssū-ma)* LUGAL-*i labarn[ai piiandu]* 'But in the dark earth may they conceal the bad things; but the good things may they give to the king, the labarna' (Watkins (1982) 253), or magical formulae with analogical structures as in *KUB* XVII 10 II 13-16 ^{GIŠ}GEŠTIN ḪÁD.DU.A *maḫḫan* GEŠTIN-ŠU ŠÀ-*it ḫarzi* ^{GIŠ}ZÉ-IR-TUM *maḫḫan* Ì-ŠU ŠÀ-*it ḫarzi* ^{D}IŠKUR-sa ŠA LUGAL SAL.LUGAL ŠA DUMU^{MEŠ}-ŠU-NU *āssu* TI-*tar innarauuatar* MU^{ḤА} GÍD.DA *tusgarattan* QA-TAM-MA ŠÀ-*it ḫark* 'Wie die Rosine ihren Wein mit dem (Leibes-)Inneren hält, wie die Olive ihr Öl mit dem (Leibes-)Inneren hält, ebenso halte auch du, Wettergott, des Königs, der Königin (und) ihrer Söhne Gutes, Leben, (Lebens-)Kraft, lange Jahre, Freude mit dem (Leibes-)Inneren' (Friedrich–Kammenhuber (1975-84) 500, s.v. *aššu-* III.2a), where āssu- is as comprehensive a term as 'life, life-force'.

Moreover, it is interesting to note that the Hittite sentence just quoted occurs in a religious (magical) context: a propitiatory prayer spoken in an expiation ceremony.[32] The divinities who are invoked are thought of as dispensing *h₁ósu to (or withdrawing *h₁ósu from) the people who are praying – in this case the royal family of Tuthaliya. Now compare what is certainly the earliest, and probably the most famous, occurrence of νόσος (νοῦσος) in Greek literature. Immediately after the prologue of the *Iliad*, the Homeric narrator sets off with a question-and-answer sequence in which the origins of the quarrel between Agamemnon and Achilleus and the wrath of the latter are explained (*Il.* 1.8-12):

τίς τάρ σφωε θεῶν ἔριδι ξυνέηκε μάχεσθαι;
Λητοῦς καὶ Διὸς υἱός· ὃ γὰρ βασιλῆϊ χολωθείς
νοῦσον ἀνὰ στρατὸν ὦρσε κακήν, ὀλέκοντο δὲ λαοί,
οὕνεκα τὸν Χρύσην ἠτίμασεν ἀρητῆρα
Ἀτρείδης. (...)

Who of the gods brought the two (Agamemnon and Achilleus) together to fight? The son of Leto and Zeus; for he in wrath against the king sent a horrible plague upon the army, and the men were perishing because the son of Atreus had dishonoured Chryses the priest.

Apollo is offended by the Greek commander and therefore sends a plague or disease: his divine 'favour', *h₁ósu, is no longer granted to Agamemnon's army. This is by no means an isolated instance. As was already noted in antiquity,[33] throughout Greek epic νοῦσοι do not just happen by law of nature or as a consequence of unhealthy behaviour, but they are typically sent by a divinity:[34] Apollo (*Il.* 1.10), Zeus (*Od.* 9.411; Hes. *Theog.* 527; Hes. *Op.* 102), some δαίμων (*Od.* 5.395), or even Styx (Hes. *Theog.* 799).[35] In the utopian world of the past, on the other hand, νοῦσοι were absent like all other κακά later brought by Pandora (Hes. *Op.* 90-95 (v. 93 secl.); cf. also *Od.* 14.408):

πρὶν μὲν γὰρ ζώεσκον ἐπὶ χθονὶ φῦλ' ἀνθρώπων
νόσφιν ἄτερ τε κακῶν καὶ ἄτερ χαλεποῖο πόνοιο
νούσων τ' ἀργαλέων αἵ τ' ἀνδράσι κῆρας ἔδωκαν·
ἀλλὰ γυνὴ χείρεσσι πίθου μέγα πῶμ' ἀφελοῦσα
ἐσκέδασ'· ἀνθρώποισι δ' ἐμήσατο κήδεα λυγρά.

For earlier on the tribes of mankind used to live on the earth separated and apart from evils and bad war and painful diseases which provide death to men; but by taking away with her hands the big lid of the jar, the woman scattered them – and contrived for mankind mournful griefs.

[32] For the precise setting see Szabó (1971) 88: 'Aus diesen Zeilen (sc. col. I 13-21) ergibt sich, dass Ziplantaụi(ịa) über ihren Bruder den König Tuthaliịa, seine Gemahlin Nikalmati und ihre Söhne mit "bösen Zungen" zu reden pflegte, die Königsfamilie bei den Göttern verleumdete und sie mit einem Zauber belegte. (...) Der Zweck des Rituals (...) besteht darin, den Zorn der Götter den Opfermandanten gegenüber zu besänftigen, diese vom Zauber zu befreien und den Zauber auf seine Urheberin zurückfallen zu lassen.'

[33] Cf. Cels. *Prooem.* 4: *eodem vero auctore* (sc. *Homero*) *disci potest morbos tum ad iram deorum immortalium relatos esse, et ab isdem opem posci solitam* 'From the same author (Homer) we can learn that at that time illnesses were explained through reference to the wrath of the immortal gods, and that people used to seek help from them.'

[34] Though not always, as Lloyd (2003) 16-17 stresses (while admitting that 'the picture Hesiod paints (...) is one of diseases as the instruments of divine retribution', p. 21). The belief in divine agency continued to live in classical times, as shown for instance by the attacks on professional 'healers' formulated in the treatise περὶ ἱερῆς νόσου (Hp. *Morb. Sacr.* 1.1-2.3) or by some of the measures taken against the great plague in Athens (Thuc. 2.47.4 ὅσα τε πρὸς ἱεροῖς ἱκέτευσαν ἢ μαντείοις καὶ τοῖς τοιούτοις ἐχρήσαντο, πάντα ἀνωφελῆ ἦν 'however much they went to the temples as suppliants or turned to oracles and such things, everything was useless'); on this theme see further Lloyd (2003) esp. 40-83.

[35] No divine agent is named at *Il.* 13.667/670, *Od.* 11.172/200, Hes. *Scut.* 43; cf. W. Beck in *LfgrE*, 3.439, *s.v.* νοῦσος. On diseases as divine punishments in epic see Laser (1983) S 62-3.

This particular passage shows a division between general κακά, hard work (πόνος), and deadly diseases (νοῦσοι), but in early epic the meanings of νοῦσος are not always narrowly medical ('disease, illness'). In the *Odyssey* πείνη 'hunger' is counted among the νοῦσοι which do not befall the people living on the paradise island Syrie (*Od.* 14.407-8),[36] and in Hesiod's *Theogony* the term νοῦσος includes both Prometheus' 'suffering' from his liver being eaten by Zeus' eagle (Hes. *Theog.* 527) and the 'unconsciousness' (κῶμα) into which a god falls when he has committed perjury by Styx (Hes. *Theog.* 799). In later literature, too, νόσος covers a whole range of undesirable states or phenomena: 'What is said to suffer from *nosos* or *nosema* may be a city or a state [Soph. *Ant.* 1015, 1141, Pl. *Prot.* 322d, *Rep.* 544c, Dem. 2.14], or its affairs [Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 6.4], or a tyranny [Aesch. *Prom.* 224-5], or Greece as a whole [Dem. 9.39], or the worship of the gods [Eur. *Tro.* 27], or a person's eyes, that is their ability to see straight [Eur. *Hel.* 575]. What these various subjects may suffer from includes faction [Hdt. 5.28, cf. Pl. *Soph.* 228a], or folly [Pl. *Leg.* 691d], or wickedness [Xen. *Mem.* 3.5.18], or injustice [Pl. *Gorg.* 480b], or an unrestrained tongue [Eur. *Or.* 10], or childlessness [Eur. *Ion* 620], or hatred of enemies [Aesch. *Prom.* 978], or love [Eur. *Hipp.* 767, Soph. *Trach.* 591], or madness [Aesch. *Pers.* 750-1] or any terrible affliction, anguish or distress [Soph. *OT* 1293, *OC* 544].'[37] Thus, the literary evidence supports the idea that νοῦσος/νόσος originally referred to all kinds of unpleasant states of 'unwellness' rather than to a specific class – a semantic development closely mirrored by the English word *dis-ease*.

A divinity who sends a disease can also remove it. Healing measures can therefore be associated with cathartic ceremonies and prayers reminiscent of the Anatolian example cited on p. 158.[38] In particular, healing is the domain of Apollo (Paion: cf. e.g. Solon *fr.* 13.61 W.) and of Asklepios, who was originally a hero rather than a god. Asklepios is addressed as son of Apollo and as 'healer of νοῦσοι' in one of the shorter Homeric 'hymns' which, despite its probably late date of composition (fifth/fourth century?), bears testimony to pre-scientific thinking about diseases and healing (*h. Hom.* 16):[39]

Ἰητῆρα νόσων Ἀσκληπιὸν ἄρχομ' ἀείδειν,
υἱὸν Ἀπόλλωνος τὸν ἐγείνατο δῖα Κορωνίς
Δωτίωι ἐν πεδίωι, κούρη Φλεγύου βασιλῆος,
χάρμα μέγ' ἀνθρώποισι, κακῶν θελκτῆρ' ὀδυνάων.
καὶ σὺ μὲν οὕτω χαῖρε, ἄναξ· λίτομαι δὲ σ' ἀοιδῆι.

Of the healer of diseases, Asklepios, I begin to sing,
the son of Apollo, to whom divine Koronis gave birth
in the plain of Dotion, the daughter of King Phlegyas,
a big joy for mankind and a soother of evil pains.
Welcome, then, to you, O Lord: I pray to you with song.

In our context, the name of Asklepios is of particular interest. The variety of attested forms points to a non-Greek origin,[40] and in such cases the idioms of Asia Minor are always good candidates for having acted as donor-languages. Hence, an etymological theory developed by Oswald

---

[36] *Cf.* Laser (1983) S 69-70 on hunger as a 'disease'.

[37] Lloyd (2003) 12 n.2, who refers to the examples cited here between square brackets.

[38] See Laser (1983) S 117-19, who comments on the cathartic measures taken in *Iliad* 1 (including a prayer to Apollo: *Il.* 1.456 ἤδη νῦν Δαναοῖσιν ἀεικέα λοιγὸν ἄμυνον 'now turn away the shameful ruin from the Danaoi' corresponds to the Hittite *nu idālu ḫarnikten*).

[39] *Cf.* Càssola (1975) 572: 'θελκτήρ (...) si riferisce agli scongiuri in senso proprio, cioè alle formule magiche della medicina primitiva'. On Apollo, Παιήων and the human Asklepios as epic healers see Laser (1983) S 88-90, S 93-5, S 96-7.

[40] Ἀσκλαπιός, Αἰσκλαπιός, Αἰσκλαπιός, Ἀσχλαπιός, Ἀσκαλαπιός, Ἀσκαλπιός and Αἰσχλαβιός: *cf.* Kretschmer (1943) 116; Frisk (1960-72) 1.164, *s.v.* Ἀσκληπιός; Chantraine (1968-80) 1.124, *s.v.* Ἀσκληπιός, and R. Dyer in *LfgrE*, 1.1411, *s.v.* Ἀσκληπιός.

Szemerényi deserves mention, although it is no less speculative than all other attempts to 'explain' Greek Ἀσκληπιός: according to Szemerényi, Ἀσκληπιός is the Hellenized form of an Anatolian *ass(u)lā-piya* 'health-giver' – the first element of which would be *assul(a)-* 'well-being', an (attested) derivative of our *āssu* (n.).[41]

Be that as it may, we can conclude that the derivation of Greek νόσος from a thematized possessive adjective with privative *$*n-$* + the stem of a neuter noun *$*h_1ósu$* 'good, well-being, (divine) favour' is formally possible and semantically plausible, both from an inner-Greek perspective and in relation to non-Greek (Anatolian) material. If the argument presented so far is accepted, it can serve as the starting-point for tackling the second etymological question referred to on p. 153.

II. ὁσίη, ὅσιος

It was suggested above (pp. 3-5) that the word νόσος 'disease' should be analysed on the basis of the following formula, which is repeated for convenience:

(2') $*n-$ + *HVC-* $> *ṇ\text{-}HVC\text{-}$ $> *n\text{-}VC\text{-}$ → analogy with (1) $*ṇ(n)\text{-}VC\text{-}$ $> ἀν\text{-}VC\text{-}$
      $*n-$ + $h_x os\text{-}$ $> *ṇ\text{-}h_x os\text{-}$ $> *n\text{-}os\text{-}$

Unlike normal possessive adjectives with a privative first element, the lexeme $*n\text{-}(h_1)osw\text{-}os$ ($> νόσος$) was not analogically remodelled into $*ṇ(n)\text{-}osw\text{-}os$ ($> *ἀν\text{-}οσ(ϝ)ος$) because it had begun an independent life as a common noun with the meaning 'disease' (rather than adjectival 'not having well-being/divine favour'). However, this does not necessarily mean that the analogical remodelling did not take place at all. If it *did*, we would have a classical example of Kuryłowicz's fourth rule of analogy:[42]

> Quand à la suite d'une transformation morphologique une forme subit la différenciation, la forme nouvelle correspond à sa fonction primaire (de fondation), la forme ancienne est réservée pour la fonction secondaire (fondée).

In other words, if the adjective $*n\text{-}(h_1)osw\text{-}os$, which had acquired a separate substantival function and meaning, was remodelled into $*ṇ(n)\text{-}osw\text{-}os$ according to the second part of (2'), the older form may have survived precisely because its secondary (substantival) function/meaning had become detached from the primary (adjectival) function/meaning. At the same time a remade adjective $*ṇ(n)\text{-}osw\text{-}os$ 'not having well-being' can have come into existence at some point. Of course, no such $*ṇ(n)\text{-}osw\text{-}os > *ἄνοσ(ϝ)ος$ survives in historical Greek, and it is easy to see why: with νόσ(ϝ)ος 'disease' existing next to it and with $*h_1ósu$ having disappeared (in favour of, e.g., εὖ[43]), adjectival $*ἄνοσ(ϝ)ος$ would naturally have been analysed not as $*ἀν\text{-}οσ(ϝ)ος$ 'not having well-being' but as ἀ-νοσ(ϝ)ος 'without disease' (*cf.* already *Od.* 14.255; later e.g. Pind. *fr.* 143 Sn.-M.; Hdt. 1.32.6).

---

[41] Szemerényi (1974) 155, whose idea 'richly deserves rejection' according to Puhvel (1984) 206, s.v. *ass-, assiya-.* Puhvel (1984) 216, s.v. *asku-,* prefers the semantically startling and phonologically dubious connection with σκάλοψ/ἀσπάλαξ 'mole' (*cf.* for this Grégoire (1949) esp. 40-7, refuted by Edelstein (1954); the controversy is still open: see e.g. Francis (1992) 487-8; Katz (2002) 297 n.5).

[42] Kuryłowicz (1973) 79; on p. 81 Kuryłowicz speaks of 'la différenciation en tant que résultat d'un réarrangement incomplet amenant le scindement d'une forme *A* en deux formes *A'* et *A*, dont la nouvelle représente la fonction primaire de *A*, la fonction secondaire étant réservée à l'ancienne forme *A'*. Lehmann (1992)

231-2 illustrates Kuryłowicz's rule with analogical *brothers* and *older* replacing *brethren* and *elder*, the latter surviving in peripheral functions.

[43] For a possible formal reason why $*h_1ósu$ may have been lost see pp. 164-5. When Laser (1983) S 67 observes that 'während die Krankheit (...) begrifflich ins Bewusstsein gerückt ist, fehlt ein eigenes Wort für "Gesundheit"' and 'erst mit der älteren Lyrik des ausgehenden 7. Jhs. v. Chr. erscheint ein eigener Begriff für "Gesundheit" im Rahmen der Wortfamilie um ὑγιαίνω', we may even suspect that this curious lexical gap results from the disappearance of $*h_1ósu$.

And yet there may be a trace of *η (n)-osw-os (*ἄν-οσ(ϝ)ος) 'not having well-being'. It is well-known that -ία 'bildet von Homer bis zur Gegenwart Abstrakta zu adjektivischen und substantivischen Stämmen auf -o- (bzw. -o/ā-) und auf Konsonant'.[44] Whereas derivations from nouns (e.g. Homeric ἀγγελίη, μαρτυρίη) may represent the oldest layer among these, Homer also has many deadjectival examples, but 'fast nur bei Komposita: ἀεργίη, κακοεργίη, ἀτιμίη, ἀμηχανίη, πολυμηχανίη, ἀδαημονίη, ἀμμορίη, ῥηξηνορίη (...), νηνεμίη (...)'.[45] Thus, if *η (n)-osw-os ever existed, one might also postulate a feminine abstract noun *η (n)-osw-iyā 'the state of not having well-being, the state of not being favourably looked upon by the divinity' (cf. ἄτιμος 'not having honour' → ἀτιμίη 'the state of not having honour'). In alphabetic Greek, *η (n)-osw-iyā should result in a lexeme *ἀνοσία (Ionic *ἀνοσίη[46]). Again, the pressure of νόσος would be strong, and it is therefore not surprising that ἀνοσία is twice attested with the 'recent' meaning corresponding to ἄ-νοσος, i.e. 'freedom from sickness' (Hp. *Praec.* 6 (p. 9.258.14 Littré); Poll. 3.107).

Apart from these attestations, however, there is at least one more instance of ἀνοσία[47]– or rather *a-no-si-ja* since the word is written in the Cyprian linear script on a bronze tablet found at the sanctuary of Athena in Idalium and dated to the fifth century BC. It hardly needs stressing that the dialect of Cyprus often preserves very archaic lexical items. The tablet records a contract between the city of Idalium on the one hand and the physician Onasilos and his brothers on the other. The city guarantees certain property rights to Onasilos and his descendants. The last paragraph of the text first states that the king and the city have sworn oaths not to break the contract and then invokes divine sanctions against whoever offends against the terms set down (*ICS* 217.26-9, with Masson's transcription and translation[48]):

[...] i-te ta-ta-la-to-ne ta-te ta-we-pi-ya ta-te i-na-la-li-si-me-na pa-si-le-u-se ka-se a-po-to-li-se ka-te-ti-ya-ne i-ta-ti-o-ne ta-na-ta-na-ne ta-ne-pe-re ta-li-o-ne su-no-ro-ko-i-se me-lu-sa-i ta-se we-re-ta-se ta-sa-te u-wa-i-se za?-ne o-pi-si-si-ke ta-se we-re-ta-se-ta-sa-te lu-se a-no-si-ya-wo-i-ke-no-i-tu [...]

(...) ἰδὲ τὰ(ν) δάλτον τά(ν)δε, τὰ ϝέπιγα τάδε ἰναλαλισμένα(ν), βασιλεὺς κὰς ἀ πτόλις κατέθιγαν ἰ(ν) τὰ(ν) θιὸν τὰν Ἀθάναν τὰν περ' Ἐδάλιον σὺν ὄρκοις μὴ λῦσαι τὰς ϝρήτας τάσδε ὑϝαις ζα(?)ν. Ὄπι (?) σίς κε τὰς ϝρήτας τάσδε λύση, ἀνοσίγα ϝοι γένοιτυ (...)

(...) Et la tablette que voici, inscrite avec les présentes clauses, le roi et la ville l'ont fait déposer auprès de la déesse Athéna, celle d'Idalion, avec des serments de ne pas rompre les présentes conventions, pour toujours (?). Au cas où (?) quelqu'un romprait les présentes conventions, que le sacrilège retombe sur lui. (...)

On ἀνοσία Masson notes 'hapax dont le sens est clair', and he renders the word with 'sacrilège'. Similarly, the *Supplement* of LSJ (*s.v.* ἀνοσία (B)) translates 'impiety'. It is obvious, however, that this is somewhat imprecise: with the following optative γένοιτυ 'may there be' we have a curse

---

[44] Schwyzer (1939) 468, with further examples.

[45] Risch (1974) 116-17, with an exhaustive (and much longer) list.

[46] Note that we are *not* bound to expect Ionic †ἀνουσίη (and with it †ουσίη: *cf.* pp. 163-4). In the remodelled adjective *η(n)-osw-os, no analogical reason would have caused the shift of the syllable boundary which we observe in *no.swos > *nos.wos (p. 157). Syllabically, *η (n)-osw-os would have remained *η.(n)o.swos (with tautosyllabic *-sw-), with the same distribution of syllable length before and after the loss of *-w- and therefore no 'compensatory lengthening'. Similarly, as pointed out in

n.12, *wi.swos remains unchanged in some parts of Ionic (> ἴσος), but is analogically treated as *wis.wos (> ἶσος) in others.

[47] On *SIG*³ 1199.8 see p. 168.

[48] Masson (1983) 237, 244. The lack of -ϝ- in ἀνοσίγα (*a-no-si-ya*) can be ascribed to the fact that postconsonantal -ϝ- was lost early in Cyprian (*cf.* Morpurgo Davies (1988) 101-8, 124); after (segment-initial) -s- this loss may have occurred even earlier than after liquids. For a similar spelling of an original group *sw cf. the name Ἰσάγαθος/Ἰσαγάθας (gen.) written as *i-sa-za(?)-to/ta-se* in *ICS* 79 and 154.

against offenders, and ἀνοσία must therefore denote not 'impiety' as such, but the 'state of someone who has committed an act of impiety' and who has therefore lost 'divine favour'. In a sense, then, the curse ἀνοσίγα ϝοι γένοιτυ is the exact opposite of the Hittite prayer quoted above (p. 158: ANA X āssu ēstu).

Obviously, the Cyprian ἀνοσίγα has a more common positive counterpart, ὁσίη/ὁσία. In support of the idea that this is an innovation *vis-à-vis* ἀνοσίη, one may once again point to the fact that deadjectival derivatives in -ία were first formed from compound adjectives (p. 162). Moreover, the two Homeric attestations of ὁσίη deserve a closer look. The first occurs in Penelope's reproach to the suitor Antinoos for plotting against Telemachus (*Od.* 16.421-3):

> μάργε, τίη δὲ σὺ Τηλεμάχωι θάνατόν τε μόρον τε
> ῥάπτεις, οὐδ' ἱκέτας ἐμπάζεαι, οἶσιν ἄρα Ζεὺς
> μάρτυρος; οὐδ' ὁσίη κακὰ ῥάπτειν ἀλλήλοισιν.

You are crazy! Why do you devise death and doom to Telemachus and show no respect for suppliants, to whom Zeus acts as a guarantor? It is not right to devise bad things against one another.

In the second passage Odysseus tells Eurycleia not to be openly triumphant over the dead suitors (*Od.* 22.411-13):

> ἐν θυμῶι, γρηῦ, χαῖρε καὶ ἴσχεο μηδ' ὀλόλυζε·
> οὐχ ὁσίη κταμένοισιν ἐπ' ἀνδράσιν εὐχετάασθαι.
> τούσδε δὲ μοῖρ' ἐδάμασσε θεῶν καὶ σχέτλια ἔργα·

Rejoice in your mind, old woman, restrain yourself and don't shout out loud! It is not right to boast over men who are killed. The fate of the gods and their own evil deeds brought these people down.

In both cases it depends on the (presumed) perception of the gods (or of Zeus) whether a particular action fulfils the requirements of ὁσίη; that is, acts of which one cannot say ὁσίη (ἐστίν) + *inf.* are acts which are not 'favourably looked upon' (and therefore not 'permitted') by a divinity. But the central point in the present context is that ὁσίη is preceded by a negation in both Homeric passages: 'positive' ὁσίη – mostly in the secondary sense of ('act which is favourably looked upon (and thus permitted) by a divinity' >) 'rite, ritual act, sacrifice'[49] – first occurs later, in the Homeric hymns (*h. Cer.* 211;[50] *h. Ap.* 237; *h. Merc.* 130, 173, 470). Thus, the chronological priority of the negative concept perfectly matches the semantic priority which Ulrich von Wilamowitz observed a long time ago:[51]

> Die Frömmigkeit, von der die Ethiker reden, zu bezeichnen wird ein Wort gebraucht, das man am liebsten neben die Gerechtigkeit stellt, um die Rücksichten, die der Mensch den Göttern schuldet, gleich denen gegen die Menschen zuzugesellen. Die Gesinnung liegt in dieser Bezeichnung der Frömmigkeit, dem Hosion, auch nicht notwendig; was es ist, fasst man am besten von seinem Gegensatze her, dem Anosion. Das ist etwas Schlimmes, Unverzeihliches; darin liegt, sei es Tat oder Wort oder Gesinnung, eine direkte Kränkung, Verletzung der Götter; es ist nicht viel weniger als gottlos. Von diesem Gegensatze her erhält das Hosion allein einen positiven Inhalt.

---

[49] *Cf.* Chadwick (1996) 222 and M. Schmidt in *LfgrE*, 3.830-1, *s.v.* ὁσίη, who rejects earlier attempts to understand as ὁσίη 'l'acte qui rend le "sacré" accessible' by 'désacralisation' (Benveniste (1969) 200; *cf.* Jeanmaire (1945) 74-86, criticized by van der Valk (1951)).

[50] The exact meaning of ὁσίης ἕνεκεν in *h. Cer.* 211 is unclear: *cf.* Richardson (1974) 225-6. By taking the cup,

Demeter may be bestowing her favour upon Metaneira whose first offer she had refused.

[51] Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1919) 61; the examples compiled by Terstegen (1941) 157-68 illustrate the continuing frequency of οὐχ ὅσιος and ἀνόσιος in postclassical texts.

The reason why there are two occurrences of οὐχ/οὐδ' ὁσίη in the *Odyssey*, but none of *ἀνοσίη is easy to see. Even if *ἀνοσίη still existed in eighth-century Ionic (and not just in marginal dialects such as Cyprian), it did not fit into a hexameter. The two Homeric attestations of ὁσίη are therefore indirect evidence for an older lexeme *ἀνοσίη. It is impossible to say when the step towards unnegated ὁσίη was first taken, but it may have been at a post-Homeric stage. In any case the analytical replacement of the original *ἀνοσίη by οὐχ ὁσίη in hexametric poetry must have contributed to the spread of the retrograde simplex formation ὁσίη. *Mutatis mutandis* one may compare the creation of a noun ἠνορέη (= semi-Aeolic for Ionic *ἠνορίη) 'manhood, prowess' from a compound such as *εὐηνορέη.[52]

Given the existence of an adjective ὅσιος, this account of the history of ὁσίη may seem unnecessarily complicated. Why should we not argue that ὁσίη is one of the rarer cases in which an abstract noun in -ίη is based on a simplex adjective (*cf.* e.g. ἀγλαΐη/ἀγλαός, σοφίη/σοφός).[53] From the noun *(h₁)ósu 'well-being, divine favour', an adjective *(h₁)ósw-(i)yos > *ὅσιος 'characterized by (well-being resulting from) divine favour' could be derived without difficulty.[54] The main reason which speaks against this simpler model is again the chronology of attestations. If ὁσίη were based on ὅσιος, it would be surprising that the former is relatively common in Homer and the Homeric hymns, whereas the latter is not found before Theognis (Thgn. 132) and Aeschylus (*Sept.* 1010, *Supp.* 27, *Cho.* 377); the concept expressed by ὅσιος is hardly unusual enough to explain its complete absence from earlier literature.[55] Moreover, the isolated occurrence of Cyprian ἀνοσία would be more difficult to explain since this looks much more like an archaism preserved in the terminology of religious law (and cursing) than like an ad hoc innovation based on the negative adjective ἀν-όσιος. Thus, although there is no ultimate proof for this, ὅσιος is likely to be a secondary formation based on ὁσίη. A parallel case is probably seen in the adjective ἐλευθέριος, whose first attestations are equally late (Plato, Xenophon[56]) and which may be based on ἐλευθερία (← Homeric etc. ἐλεύθερος). Just as people who are ἐλευθέριοι are 'characterized by enjoying ἐλευθερία', someone who is ὅσιος is 'characterized by possessing/performing ὁσίη'.[57] Formally the evolution must be summarized as (*)ἀνοσίη → (οὐχ) ὁσίη → ὅσιος rather than as *(h₁)ósw-(i)yos > *ὅσιος.

It may have been noticed that we should expect an unaspirated *ὅσιος if the ultimate connection with *(h₁)ósu is correct. However, the initial aspiration of the word is no serious obstacle. Occasional occurrences of ἷσος for ἴσος might suggest that the internal -σ- of the group *-sw- is responsible for the irregularity (*DGE* 708a, 1.3 (Ephesus, fourth century), *DGE* 62.175 (Heraclea, fourth century)), but on the whole ἷσος is too exceptional to postulate this with confidence.[58] More relevant may be the fact that, when intervocalic *-s- started to disappear in Greek, *η(n)-osw-os (*ἄν-οσϝος) suddenly came to stand beside *hóü ←[59] *óhu < (h₁)ósu (which may have been lost

---

[52] *Cf.* Leumann (1950) 109-10, Risch (1974) 133; on 'Aeolic' -εος (-έη) for Ionic -ιος (-ίη) see Wackernagel (1916) 68-9.

[53] *Cf.* Frisk (1945) 220; on the group see Risch (1974) 117. Porzig (1942) 208 suspects in ὁσίη a 'verselbständigte(s) Femininum' originating in the phrase ὁσίη δίκη.

[54] Again assuming a syllabification *(h₁)ó.swi.yos: *cf.* p. 155 with n.12 and p. 162 with n.46 on ἴσος and ἀνοσίη. Earlier attempts to explain ὅσιος as a (direct) derivative from *h₁es- 'to be' are untenable: *cf.* Ruijgh (1961) 201 n.5, Chantraine (1968-80) 2.832, *s.v.* ὅσιος, and Frisk (1960-72) 2.435, *s.v.* ὅσιος, against Brugmann (1906) 401 and now Hinge (2007) 145-8. Peters (1980) 185 n.140 and Pinault (1996) 43-4 start from *sotiyos (positing *set- 'good, true' and *sotos 'order'), whereas Mastrelli (1985)

34-7 connects ὅσιος with a root *yet- 'to stand (at one's place)' attested in Indo-Iranian; but they all fail to elucidate the complex semantics of the Greek lexical family.

[55] *Pace* Shipp (1972) 343 n.4.

[56] In e.g. Pind. *Ol.* 12.1 and Hdt. 3.142.2 ἐλευθέριος is an epithet of Zeus 'guarantor of ἐλευθερία' (see LSJ, *s.v.* ἐλευθέριος).

[57] *Cf.* Bolkestein (1936) 181: 'est appelé ὅσιος celui qui, dans le commerce des hommes et des dieux, observe la ὁσία'.

[58] *Cf.* Schwyzer (1939) 305 n.5; similarly, not much weight should be given to 'parallels' like ἵππος where the aspiration is utterly surprising (Schwyzer (1939) 306).

[59] For this 'Hauchumsprung' *cf.* e.g. Attic εὕω < *euso (Lat. *ūrō*), ἱερός < *ishₗrós; Schwyzer (1939) 219.

only when it had become a near-homonym of the particle *h₂óyu > οὐ). In analogy with *hóü, *ṇ(n)-osw-os could then be reshaped into *ṇ(n)-hosw-os. But perhaps the simplest solution lies in an 'analogische Übertragung von h- (...) in etymologischen oder begrifflichen Reihen'.[60] This is widely attested and sometimes regularized, as in Attic ἡμᾶς after ὑμᾶς and ἡμέρα after ἑσπέρα (?). For ὅσιος, the contrastive association with ἱερός provided an obvious model. Often ἱερά 'possessions/places of the gods, holy possessions/places' and ὅσια 'possessions/places of men, non-holy/profane possessions/places' are referred to in the same breath, as in Thuc. 2.52.3 and Pl. *Rep.* 344a:[61]

(οἱ ἄνθρωποι) ἐς ὀλιγωρίαν ἐτράποντο καὶ ἱερῶν καὶ ὁσίων ὁμοίως.

(Men) no longer cared for either holy or profane places.

ἔστιν δὲ τοῦτο τυραννίς, ἣ οὐ κατὰ σμικρὸν τἀλλότρια καὶ λάθραι καὶ βίαι ἀφαιρεῖται, καὶ ἱερὰ καὶ ὅσια καὶ ἴδια καὶ δημόσια, ἀλλὰ συλλήβδην.

This is tyranny, which does not take away little by little, stealthily and through violence both holy and profane things, both private and public property, but in one single go.

In addition to ἱερός, the adjectives ἁγνός and ἅγιος may also have promoted the analogical transfer of the initial aspiration. The coordination of ἅγιος/ἁγνός and ὅσιος is not as common as that of ἱερός and ὅσιος, but at least once it does occur in a context which is likely to have been both formulaic and well-known. At the same time this is the earliest prose attestation of the lexeme ὅσιος, occurring in a law of Solon quoted by Andocides (1.96):[62]

ἐάν τις δημοκρατίαν καταλύηι τὴν Ἀθήνησιν, ἢ ἀρχήν τινα ἄρχηι καταλελυμένης τῆς δημοκρατίας, πολέμιος ἔστω Ἀθηναίων καὶ νηποινεὶ τεθνάτω, καὶ τὰ χρήματα αὐτοῦ δημόσια ἔστω, καὶ τῆς θεοῦ τὸ ἐπιδέκατον· ὁ δὲ ἀποκτείνας τὸν ταῦτα ποιήσαντα καὶ ὁ συμβουλεύσας ὅσιος ἔστω καὶ εὐαγής.

If someone suppresses the democracy at Athens or holds office when democracy has been suppressed, let him be an enemy of the Athenians and let him be killed with impunity, and let his possessions be nationalised (the tithe being given to the goddess); and the person who kills the one who has done this as well as the person who has taken part in planning it, let them be prosperous and guiltless.

Once again, as in the Cyprian case, we have here a legal disposition operating with the concept of ὀσίη/*ἀνοσίη in determining what shall happen to someone who acts in accordance with (or in the Cyprian case, against) the intention of the law. In the Solonic text this is particularly important since homicide is the prime offence against ὀσίη under normal circumstances (cf. *Od.* 16.421-3, quoted above). Solon's ὅσιος ἔστω (καὶ εὐαγής) is thus a further variation on the prayer/curse wish seen in Hittite ANA X āssu ēstu (positive) (p. 158) and Cyprian ἀνοσίγα ϝοι γένοιτυ (negative) (p. 162): whoever kills a would-be tyrant may do so and nevertheless (or: for that reason) (1) be

---

[60] Schwyzer (1939) 305, who adduces the examples cited above.

[61] *Cf.* Chadwick (1996) 226, who further cites the coupling of ἱερά and ὅσια at Pl. *Leg.* 857b, Isoc. 7.66 and Dem. 24.9.

[62] Given its preamble, by which the law can be dated to 410 BC, MacDowell (1962) 120 argues that it was called a 'law of Solon' simply because 'by And(ocides)'s

time the Athenian homicide laws were called "the ordinances of Drakon" and the rest of the Athenian code of laws "the laws of Solon"'. It is possible, however, that the law was only reproposed in 410 BC, when democracy was restored after the *coup d'état* of 411 BC. Moreover, the law would in any case adhere to the traditional diction of the Solonic code (*cf.* e.g. νηποινεὶ τεθνάτω).

rewarded with divine favour, *(h̥)ósu*, and (2) remain, though not properly speaking 'pure, undefiled' (ἁγνός), at least 'positively affected by ἄγος, the consequences resulting from a murder' (εὐαγής).[63]

At this point, a few more remarks on the semantic development of ὅσιος are necessary. On the one hand it has just been noted that ὅσιος describes a person (or, it may be added, a thing or an action) enjoying divine favour, someone or something who/which is 'characterised by (well-being resulting from) divine favour'. On the other hand John Chadwick has observed that 'many users of LSJ must have been puzzled to find that a word which is translated *holy* can in certain contexts bear the meaning *profane*'.[64] His line of argument is to deny that ὅσιος ever means 'profane'. Unfortunately a series of strained textual interpretations results from this. For instance, Chadwick has to translate ἐς ὀλιγωρίαν ἐτράποντο καὶ ἱερῶν καὶ ὁσίων ὁμοίως at Thuc. 2.52.3 by '(they) became equally contemptuous of the gods' property and their dues', taking ὅσια to mean 'religious revenues'.[65] If the entire context is taken into account, this cannot be defended. The sentence occurs in Thucydides' description of the plague in Athens (Thuc. 2.52.2-3):

οἰκιῶν γὰρ οὐχ ὑπαρχουσῶν, ἀλλ' ἐν καλύβαις πνιγηραῖς ὥραι ἔτους διαιτωμένων ὁ φθόρος ἐγίγνετο οὐδενὶ κόσμωι, ἀλλὰ καὶ νεκροὶ ἐπ' ἀλλήλοις ἀποθνήισκοντες ἔκειντο καὶ ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς ἐκαλινδοῦντο καὶ περὶ τὰς κρήνας ἁπάσας ἡμιθνῆτες τοῦ ὕδατος ἐπιθυμίαι. τά τε ἱερὰ ἐν οἷς ἐσκήνηντο νεκρῶν πλέα ἦν, αὐτοῦ ἐναποθνηισκόντων· ὑπερβιαζομένου γὰρ τοῦ κακοῦ οἱ ἄνθρωποι, οὐκ ἔχοντες ὅτι γένωνται, ἐς ὀλιγωρίαν ἐτράποντο καὶ ἱερῶν καὶ ὁσίων ὁμοίως.

Since there were no houses available and since they were living in huts which were stifling hot during summer, their ruin took place in total disorder: bodies of dying people were lying one on top of the other, and they writhed in the streets and next to all the wells, half-dead with longing for water. The sanctuaries in which they camped were full of corpses of men who had died in there – for as the disaster took over completely, the people, who did not know what was to become of them, began to show no respect for either sacred or profane places.

Obviously, ὅσια has nothing to do with money in this passage. The ὀλιγωρία ἱερῶν consists in the fact that people die in temples although death leads to religious defilement. In contrast to this, it is a different kind of 'negligence' (ὀλιγωρία) when people die in the streets or around the wells; no religious defilement is involved and the gods will therefore be indifferent towards this aspect of the catastrophe, but it is still an intolerable situation. Thus, in the Thucydidean passage ὅσια, unlike ἱερά, are 'places where death (and similar things) do not offend the gods so as to provoke the withdrawal of the gods' divine favour' – or, to put it more simply, 'profane places'. One may further illustrate this with two lines from Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*, where one of the women who have occupied the Acropolis claims to be pregnant in order to be allowed by Lysistrata to leave the place. Giving birth, like dying, is something that would defile the holy ground of the Acropolis (Ar. *Lys*. 742-3):

---

[63] On the difference between ἁγνός and εὐαγής see Rudhardt (1992) 38-46, on the meaning of ἁγνός, ἅγιος etc. also Benveniste (1969) 202-5: '*hagnós* évoque la notion d'un territoire "interdit"', 'chez les Tragiques *hagnós* désigne un être humain comme "rituellement pur, répondant à l'état requis pour une cérémonie"', and '*hágios* comme *sanctus* indiquent que l'objet est défendu contre toute violation'. The etymological link between ἄγος and ἅγιος, ἁγνός etc. has been demonstrated by Chantraine and Masson (1954); here too, the initial aspiration shows some irregularity.

[64] Chadwick (1996) 221.

[65] Similarly, ὅσια does not mean 'religious revenues' in Isoc. 7.66 ((...) τίς οὐ μνημονεύει (...) τὴν μὲν δημοκρατίαν οὕτω κοσμήσασαν τὴν πόλιν καὶ τοῖς ἱεροῖς καὶ τοῖς ὁσίοις, ὥστ' ἔτι καὶ νῦν τοὺς ἀφικνουμένους νομίζειν αὐτὴν ἀξίαν εἶναι μὴ μόνον τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἄρχειν '(...) who does not remember (...) that Democracy adorned the city so much with holy and profane buildings that even today people who come from elsewhere think that she is worthy to rule not only over the Greeks') or Pl. *Rep*. 344a (quoted above).

ὦ πότνι' Εἰλείθυ', ἐπίσχες τοῦ τόκου
ἕως ἄν εἰς ὅσιον μόλω 'γὼ χωρίον.

O lady Eileithyia, hold back the birth until I have reached a profane spot.

Since 'profane' cannot then be objected to as a (free) translation of ὅσιος, inasmuch as certain things can be done with divine favour (and therefore divine permission) only in places which are not ἱερά, Chadwick's paradox must be solved in a different manner. The real problem lies in the translation of ὅσιος as 'holy'. LSJ, *s.v.* ὅσιος, state that ὅσιος denotes what is 'sanctioned by divine law' and thus stands in complementary opposition to δίκαιος 'sanctioned/allowed by human law'. In all essentials this is just another way of formulating what has been described above as 'enjoying divine favour', 'characterized by (well-being resulting from) divine favour'. To put it differently, what is δίκαιον is 'well looked upon by men' and what is ὅσιον is 'well looked upon by gods' – a distinction clearly illustrated by passages such as Polybius 22.10.8-9:[66]

τοῦ δὲ Φιλοποίμενος καὶ Λυκόρτα, σὺν ⟨δὲ⟩ τούτοις Ἄρχωνος, πολλοὺς καὶ ποικίλους διαθεμένων λόγους ὑπὲρ τοῦ καλῶς μὲν διωικῆσθαι τὰ κατὰ τὴν Σπάρτην καὶ συμφερόντως αὐτοῖς μάλιστα τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις, ἀδύνατον δ' εἶναι τὸ κινῆσαί τι τῶν ὑποκειμένων ἄνευ τοῦ παραβῆναι καὶ τὰ πρὸς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους δίκαια καὶ τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς ὅσια, μένειν ἔδοξε τοῖς παροῦσιν ἐπὶ τῶν ὑποκειμένων (...)

After Philopoimen and Lycortas, and Archon with them, had produced many different and varied arguments supporting the view that things in Sparta were run well and in such a way as to be particularly advantageous to the Spartans, and that it was impossible to change anything in the existing arrangements without violating justice with regard to men and propriety with regard to the gods, those present decided to retain the existing arrangements (...)

Here (and in all such passages) 'holiness' is no issue at all. A 'holy' person or thing belongs to the sphere of the gods (= ἱερός), but this is not necessarily true for persons or things who/which are ὅσιοι/ὅσια. In votive offerings formulae of the type ἱερὸν τοῦ θεοῦ *vel sim.* (e.g. ἱερὸν τῆς Ἀθηναίας) are frequent,[67] but it is unthinkable to replace ἱερόν by ὅσιον in such a text. This does not mean that offerings or rites – i.e. ἱερά – cannot be ὅσια at the same time: we have already seen that ὁσίη is often used to denote a religious rite (p. 163).[68] But while a human can decide to transfer a gift (offering) into the sphere of the gods and thus make it ἱερόν, it is ultimately up to the gods to decide whether they want to show their favour in return and thus make the gift also ὅσιον.

Of course, experience teaches what is *usually* rewarded by 'divine favour' and therefore regarded as ὅσιον by the gods. Hence it becomes possible to establish general rules as in Homeric οὐχ ὁσίη (ἐστί) + *inf.* or later ὅσιόν ἐστι + *inf.* (e.g. Eur. *IT* 1045; Soph. *El.* 433). Even so, however, one may not always be absolutely sure about the gods' reaction. This explains why, in Cyprus, the lawgiver has to formulate a curse ἀνοσί(y)α ϝοι γένοιτυ (instead of just predicting

---

[66] *Cf.* further e.g. Thuc. 5.104, Antiphon 1.25, and, with a contrast νόμιμον (= according to human νόμος) vs ὅσιον, Pl. *Leg.* 861d; see also Benveniste (1969) 198-9, van der Valk (1941) 118, and already Schmidt (1886) 334: 'ἀνόσιος ist der unheilige, der durch seine Denk- und Handlungsweise sich der Gottheit entfremdet und *ihres Segens unteilhaftig* gemacht hat' (italics added). The view of Bolkestein (1936) that the religious meaning of ὅσιος is secondary to the ethical one has been refuted by van der Valk (1941) 114-18.

[67] See Lazzarini (1976) 124-8; on the distinction between ὅσιος and ἱερός *cf.* also Bolkestein (1936) 192-3, Terstegen (1941) 166, Jeanmaire (1945) 73-4, and Rudhardt (1992) 34-6, and on the connection between religious purity and the concept denoted by ὅσιος Parker (1983).

[68] *Cf.* also later examples cited by Terstegen (1941) 158: e.g. 'Vestal virgins perform their religious functions οὐχ ὁσίως if they have violated their virginity (Dion. Hal. 2.67); in chaste condition they perform them ὁσίως (Dion. Hal. 2.68)'.

ἀνοσί(y)α ϝοι γενήσετοι) and why, on a *defixio* from Cnidus, a person has to express the following wish regarding other people who have received a money deposit but refuse to give it back (*SIG³* 1199.1-8 (= *SGDI* 3538); cf. similarly *SGDI* 3539.6-7, *SGDI* 3544.2-4):

> ἀνιεροῖ Νάνας Δάματρι καὶ Κόραι καὶ θεοῖς τοῖς παρὰ Δάματρι καὶ Κούραι τοὺς λαβόντας παρὰ Διοκλεῦς παραθή[καν] καὶ μὴ ἀποδιδόντας ἀλ[λ]' ἀποστεροῦντας. ἀποδοῦσι μὲν αὐτοῖς ὅσ[ι]α ἦι, μὴ ἀποδοῦσι δὲ ἀν[όσια] (...)

> Nanas hands over to Demeter and Kore and to the gods with Demeter and Kore those who have taken a deposit from Diocles and failed to give it back but stole it. If they give it back, may it be alright for them, but if not, may they be struck by divine disfavour.

At first sight, one may be tempted to recognize here a second attestation of the noun (*)ἀνοσία, corresponding to a noun ὁσία in the preceding clause. However, other *defixiones* from the same cache at Cnidus speak against such an interpretation: when a speaker for instance wishes ἐμοὶ (...) ε[ἴ]η ὅσια καὶ ἐλεύθερα (*SIG³* 1180.6 (= *SGDI* 3540)[69]), the parallelism with the adjective ἐλεύθερα suggests that ὅσια is adjectival too. On the other hand, it is slightly odd to ask for 'things which are characterized by divine favour' instead of 'divine favour' itself – just as odd, in fact, as asking for 'things which are free' (ἐλεύθερα) instead of 'freedom' (ἐλευθερία). Moreover, what is meant at least in the latter case is simply ἐμοὶ ὅσιον καὶ ἐλεύθερον εἴη.[70] Hence, the occurrence of ἀν[όσια] on the *defixio* from Cnidus need not cast any doubt on the correctness of Masson's interpretation of Cyprian ἀνοσία as a *hapax* noun.[71] One might rather suspect that this archaism became fossilized in the language of curses and, since it was lost in all other contexts, was later reinterpreted, despite the prosodic difference in the final syllable, as a neuter plural of the living adjective ἀνόσιος because the neuter *singular* was alive in the formula (ἀν)όσιόν ἐστι. This reinterpretation could eventually even lead to the replacement of similar impersonal singulars, such as ὅσιόν ἐστι and ἐλεύθερόν ἐστι, by plurals, as in *SIG³* 1180 with ἐλεύθερα and in *SIG³* 1199 with ὅσια.[72] In any case, what the *defixiones* from Cnidus present us with is another, late, variation of the prayer/curse wish discussed earlier (pp. 158-9, 162-3, 165-6).[73]

CONCLUSION

To sum up, in the second part of this paper it has been argued that Homeric ὁσίη and its lexical family should be linked with the concept of *h₁ósu 'well-being' which we encountered in the first part. The chronology of attestations suggests that the adjective ὅσιος is a secondary formation based upon the noun ὁσίη. ὁσίη itself is the positive counterpart of (*)ἀνοσίη, an abstract formation derived from the same possessive adjective that underlies the 'nominalized adjective' νόσος. Semantically ὁσίη and (*)ἀνοσίη denote states or actions which, respectively, are or are not favourably looked upon by the gods. Since the bestowal or withdrawal of divine favour is

---

[69] Cf. also *SIG³* 1179.16-21 (= *SGDI* 3537) where the same formula is supplemented by dependent infinitives: ἐμο[ὶ δὲ ὅσια κ]αὶ ἐλεύ[θερα] καὶ συμπιεῖν καὶ συμφαγεῖν καὶ ἐπ[ὶ τὸ α]ὐτὸ στέγος ἐ[λθ]εῖν 'may I be allowed and free to join in drinking and eating and going under the same roof'; similarly on further tablets from this group (*SGDI* 3536 b 1; *SGDI* 3541, lines 3, 9-10, and 13-14; *SGDI* 3542, lines 7 and 11; *SGDI* 3545.18; *SGDI* 3546.8-11), which can also be found in Audollent (1904), nos 1-13.

[70] Versnel (1991) 72 translates 'may I be free and innocent of any offense against religion'.

[71] Cf. already Latte (1920) 114, correcting himself (p. 75 n.40) and Baunack (1911) 365.

[72] For ἐλεύθερον εἶναί τινι 'to be legally permissible' cf. *SIG³* 45.42-3 (Halicarnassus, fifth century); within the Cnidian *defixiones* cf. also *SGDI* 3548.6-7 (...) μὴ ἐξ[αφεθεῖ]εν, [ἐμοὶ δὲ καθαρὸν (...) '(...) let them not get away, and [let it be] pure [for me] to (...)' with a different adjective of similar meaning.

[73] 'A date in the first century B.C.E. seems likely' to Gager (1992) 188, who may be consulted on the background of these texts.

typically requested in prayers and curses, it is here that we find some of the most telling evidence for the word history of ὅσιος and ὁσίη. In fact, the formula ὅσιος ἔστω in an archaic Athenian law or the curse ἀνοσί(y)α ϝοι γένοιτυ in a legal text from classical Cyprus can be connected, on the one hand, with the wording of Greek *defixiones* from Roman times and, on the other hand, with a Hittite healing-prayer from fifteenth-century Anatolia. Thus, the pragmatic usages of ὅσιος, ὁσίη etc. appear to reveal once more how the religious ideas of ancient Greece are shared with, or even informed by, those of their Anatolian neighbours.

ANDREAS WILLI
Worcester College, Oxford

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Audollent, A. (1904) *Defixionum Tabellae* (Paris)

Aura Jorro, F. (1985-93) *Diccionario micénico* (Madrid)

Baunack, J. (1911) 'Hesychiana', *Philologus* 70, 353-96

Bechtel, F. (1886) Review of 'K. Brugmann, *Griechische Grammatik* (Nördlingen 1885)', *Philologischer Anzeiger* 16, 1-25

Beekes, R.S.P. (1988) 'PIE. *RHC-* in Greek and other languages', *Indogermanische Forschungen* 93, 22-45

Benveniste, E. (1935) *Origines de la formation des noms en indo-européen* (Paris)

— (1969) *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes. 2: Pouvoir, droit, religion* (Paris)

Bolkestein, J.C. (1936) *ὅσιος en εὐσεβής: Bijdrage tot de godsdienstige en zedelijke terminologie van de Grieken* (Amsterdam)

Brugmann, K. (1897) 'Beiträge zur Wortforschung im Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen', *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der königlich sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Classe* 49, 17-38

— (1906) *Vergleichende Laut-, Stammbildungs- und Flexionslehre nebst Lehre vom Gebrauch der Wortformen der indogermanischen Sprachen. II: Lehre von den Wortformen und ihrem Gebrauch. 1: Allgemeines, Zusammensetzung (Komposita), Nominalstämme (Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik* 2.1, 2nd edn, Strasbourg)

— (1911) 'Griechische und lateinische Etymologien', *Indogermanische Forschungen* 28, 354-79

Càssola, F. (1975) *Inni omerici* (Milan)

Catsanicos, J. (1984) Review of 'E. Neu (ed.), *Investigationes philologicae et comparativae: Gedenkschrift für Heinz Kronasser* (Wiesbaden 1982)', *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 79/2, 129-58

Chadwick, J. (1996) *Lexicographica Graeca. Contributions to the Lexicography of Ancient Greek* (Oxford)

Chantraine, P. (1968-80) *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots* (Paris)

Chantraine, P. and Masson, O. (1954) 'Sur quelques termes du vocabulaire religieux des Grecs: la valeur du mot ἄγος et de ses dérivés', in *Sprachgeschichte und Wortbedeutung: Festschrift Albert Debrunner* (Bern) 85-107

Cowgill, W. (1960) 'Greek οὐ and Armenian *oc*'', *Language* 36, 347-50

Curtius, G. (1878) 'Νοῦσος, νόσος', *Studien zur griechischen und lateinischen Grammatik* 10, 328

— (1873) *Grundzüge der griechischen Etymologie* (4th edn, Leipzig)

Edelstein, L. (1954) Review of 'H. Grégoire, *Asklèpios, Apollon Smintheus et Rudra. Études sur le dieu à la taupe et le dieu au rat dans la Grèce et dans l'Inde* (Brussels 1949)', *Gnomon* 26, 162-8

Francis, E.D. (1992) 'The impact of Non-Indo-European languages on Greek and Mycenaean', in E.C. Polomé and W. Winter (eds), *Reconstructing Languages and Cultures* (Berlin) 469-506

Friedrich, J. (1923) 'Einige hethitische Etymologien', *Indogermanische Forschungen* 41, 369-76

Friedrich, J. and Kammenhuber, A. (1975-84) *Hethitisches Wörterbuch. Vol. I: A* (2nd edn, Heidelberg)

Frisk, H. (1945) 'Griechische Wortprobleme', *Eranos* 43, 215-35

— (1960-72) *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg)

Fritz, M. (1996) 'Das urindogermanische Wort für "Nase" und das grundsprachliche Lautgesetz *RHV* > *RV̥*', *Historische Sprachforschung* 109, 1-20

Gager, J.G. (1992) *Curse Tablets and Binding Spells from the Ancient World* (New York and Oxford)

Grégoire, H. (1949) *Asklèpios, Apollon Smintheus et Rudra. Études sur le dieu à la taupe et le dieu au rat dans la Grèce et dans l'Inde* (Brussels)

Hinge, G. (2007) 'The authority of truth and the origin of ὅσιος and ἔτυμος (= Skt. *satyá-* and *tūtumá-*) with an excursus on pre-consonantal laryngeal loss', in C. George, M. McCullagh, B. Nielsen, A. Ruppel and O. Tribulato (eds), *Greek and Latin from an Indo-European Perspective* (Cambridge) 145-61

Jacobsohn, H. (1909) 'Beiträge zur Sprache und Verstechnik des homerischen Epos', *Hermes* 44, 78-110

Jeanmaire, H. (1945) 'Le substantif *hosia* et sa signification comme terme technique dans le vocabulaire religieux', *REG* 58, 66-89

Katz, J. (2002) 'How the mole and mongoose got their names: Sanskrit *ākhú-* and *nakulá-*', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 122, 296-310

Kimball, S.E. (1987) 'Initial *h_1s*- in Hittite', in C. Watkins (ed.), *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill (1929–1985). Papers from the Fourth East Coast Indo-European Conference* (Berlin and New York) 160-81

— (1999) *Hittite Historical Phonology* (Innsbruck)

Krakow, R.A. (1999) 'Physiological organization of syllables: a review', *Journal of Phonetics* 27, 23-54

Kretschmer, P. (1928) 'Literaturbericht für das Jahr 1925: Griechisch', *Glotta* 16, 161-98

— (1943) 'Die vorgriechischen Sprach- und Volksschichten', *Glotta* 30, 84-218

Kuryłowicz, J. (1973) 'La nature des procès dits "analogiques"', in J. Kuryłowicz, *Esquisses linguistiques* (2nd edn, Munich)

Lamberterie, C. de (1990) *Les adjectifs grecs en -υς. Sémantique et comparaison* (Louvain-la-Neuve)

Laser, S. (1983) *Archaeologia Homerica, S: Medizin und Körperpflege* (Göttingen)

Latte, K. (1920) *Heiliges Recht. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der sakralen Rechtsformen in Griechenland* (Tübingen)

Lazzarini, M.L. (1976) *Le formule delle dediche votive nella Grecia arcaica* (Rome)

Lehmann, W.P. (1992) *Historical Linguistics* (3rd edn, London and New York)

Lejeune, M. (1972) *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien* (Paris)

Leumann, M. (1950) *Homerische Wörter* (Basel)

LfgrE: Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos (Göttingen 1955–)

Lloyd, G.E.R. (2003) *In the Grip of Disease. Studies in the Greek Imagination* (Oxford)

MacDowell, D.M. (1962) *Andokides: On the Mysteries* (Oxford)

Masson, O. (1983) *Les inscriptions chypriotes syllabiques. Recueil critique et commenté* (revised edn, Paris)

Mastrelli, C.A. (1985) 'Il problema etimologico del gr. ὅσιος', *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 70, 33-7

Mayrhofer, M. (1992-2001) *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen* (Heidelberg)

Meier-Brügger, M. (1990) 'Zu griechisch νόσος/νοῦσος', *Historische Sprachforschung* 103, 245-8

Meillet, A. (1925) 'Remarques sur l'étymologie de quelques mots grecs', *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 26/1, 1-22

Meissner, T. (2006) *S-Stem Nouns and Adjectives in Greek and Proto-Indo-European. A Diachronic Study in Word Formation* (Oxford)

Morpurgo Davies, A. (1988) 'Problems in Cyprian phonology and writing', in J. Karageorghis and O. Masson (eds), *The History of the Greek Language in Cyprus* (Nicosia) 99-130

Nussbaum, A.J. (1998) *Two Studies in Greek and Homeric Linguistics* (Göttingen)

Parker, R. (1983) *Miasma* (Oxford)

Peters, M. (1980) *Untersuchungen zur Vertretung der indogermanischen Laryngale im Griechischen* (Wien)

— (1988-90) 'Indogermanische Chronik 34 – G. Altgriechisch', *Sprache* 34/2, 498-690z

Pinault, G.-J. (1996) 'La base radicale *sat-* et la notion de loi dans les hymnes védiques', in N. Blabir and G.-J. Pinault (eds), *Langue, style et structure dans le monde indien. Centenaire de Louis Renou* (Paris) 33-69

Pokorny, J. (1959) *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Bern and Munich)

Porzig, W. (1942) *Die Namen für Satzinhalte im Griechischen und im Indogermanischen* (Berlin)

Prellwitz, W. (1905) *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der griechischen Sprache* (2nd edn, Göttingen)

Puhvel, J. (1980) 'On the origin and congeners of Hittite *aššu-* "good"', *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 94, 65-70

— (1984) *Hittite Etymological Dictionary. 1: Words beginning with A. 2: Words beginning with E and I* (Berlin, New York and Amsterdam)

Richardson, N.J. (1974) *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (Oxford)

Risch, E. (1974) *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache* (2nd edn, Berlin and New York)

Rudhardt, J. (1992) *Notions fondamentales de la pensée religieuse et actes constitutifs du culte dans la Grèce classique* (2nd edn, Paris)

Ruijgh, C.J. (1961) 'Le traitement des sonantes voyelles dans les dialectes grecs et la position du mycénien', *Mnemosyne*, ser. 4, 14, 193-216

Schmidt, J.H.H. (1886) *Synonymik der griechischen Sprache, IV* (Leipzig)

Schulze, W. (1892) *Quaestiones epicae* (Gütersloh)

Schwyzer, E. (1939) *Griechische Grammatik. I: Allgemeiner Teil, Lautlehre, Wortbildung, Flexion* (Munich)

Shipp, G.P. (1972) *Studies in the Language of Homer* (Cambridge)

Szabó, G. (1971) *Ein hethitisches Entsühnungsritual für das Königspaar Tuthaliia und Nikalmati* (Heidelberg)

Szemerényi, O. (1974) 'The origins of the Greek lexicon: *ex oriente lux*', *JHS* 94, 144-57

— (1979) 'Etyma Graeca IV, 22-29', *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 20, 207-26

Terstegen, W.J. (1941) εὐσεβής en ὅσιος *in het Grieksch taalgebruik na de IVe eeuw* (Diss. Utrecht)

Thieme, P. (1984) 'Nugae etymologicae', in F.J. Oroz Arizcuren (ed.), *Navicula Tubingensis: Studia in honorem Antonii Tovar* (Tübingen) 369-75

van der Valk, M.H.A.L.H. (1941) 'Zum Worte ὅσιος', *Mnemosyne*, 3rd ser., 10, 113-40

— (1951) 'Quelques remarques sur le sens du nom "hosia"', *REG* 64, 417-22

Versnel, H.S. (1991) 'Beyond cursing: The appeal to justice in judicial prayers', in C.A. Faraone and D. Obbink (eds), *Magika Hiera. Ancient Greek Magic and Religion* (New York and Oxford) 60-106

Wackernagel, J. (1916) *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer* (Göttingen)

Wackernagel, J. and Debrunner, A. (1954) *Altindische Grammatik. II/2: Die Nominalsuffixe* (Göttingen)

Watkins, C. (1982) 'Notes on the plural formations of the Hittite neuters', in E. Neu (ed.), *Investigationes philologicae et comparativae: Gedenkschrift für Heinz Kronasser* (Wiesbaden) 250-62

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1919) *Platon, I: Leben und Werke* (Berlin)