

## On the paradigm of 'knee'

By ERIC P. HAMP, University of Chicago

### 1. Latin *genū*

If one considers both the Indo-European flexion type and the meaning of this noun, the source of the problematic *-ū* (cf. esp. Aen. 1, 320) in the nom.-acc.sg. seems fairly clear. I assume we must start from the following partial paradigm:

NA sg.	<i>*ǵónu</i>	>	Hom. <i>γόνυ</i>		Lat. <i>**gonu</i>
G sg.	<i>*ǵnuós</i>		( <i>γοννός</i> ), Hitt. Isg. <i>ganut</i>		<i>**genuis</i>
L sg.	<i>*ǵnéu</i>		Goth. <i>knīu</i> (thematized)		<i>**gnū</i>
NA du.	<i>*ǵónue</i>		Hom. <i>δοῦγε</i>		<i>**gonue</i>
NA pl.	<i>*ǵónuHa</i>		Ved. <i>dārū(ṇi)</i>		<i>**gonū</i>

It is worth noting that the Hittite nom.-acc.sg. *genu* is not directly to be equated with the Latin vocalism.

Hittite has generalised to a high degree a single vocalism (often *e*-grade) in a paradigm; cf. *ueten-*, the oblique stem of 'water'. The Latin *gen-*, however, represents a levelling of the zero-grade from the cases where the *\*n* syllabified. Thus we would then expect

NA sg.	<i>**genu</i>
GD sg.	<i>genuis</i> (> <i>genous</i> > <i>genūs</i> ), <i>genuī</i> <sup>1)</sup>
L sg.	<i>**gnū</i> or <i>genū</i>
NA du.	<i>**genue</i>
NA pl.	<i>**genū</i>

When the dual atrophied *\*\*genue* would have been replaced by *\*genū*, the old plural. Then, along with the regular formations, a new plural *genua* would have grown up<sup>2)</sup>. This freed the now irregular *genū* for other functions. Because of the frequency of plural (*\*dual*) use of this noun, *genū* persisted, and displaced the old singular shape *\*genū*.

Such a development, as has been remarked before, would be natural with *cornū* and *genū*, which come in pairs. We might further

<sup>1)</sup> In this view of the ablaut of the base, *genuī* would result quite regularly from *\*ǵnuēi* [*ǵnuēi*], and would make irrelevant a possible intervening *\*geneuei*.

<sup>2)</sup> The atrophy of the dual category but the persistence of the shape in *-ū* in fossil constructions might well have promoted the new plural in *-ua* as distinctive.

speculate—though it can be no more than that in view of the sparse attestation—that the original *-ũ* subsisted alongside this *-ū* in some other nouns. This would then give a basis in fact for the conflicting testimony of the ancients: long *-ū* apud Prisc. 2, 362 K., but short *-u* e.g. apud Diom. 1, 308.16 K. It seems unreasonable and arrogant on our part to believe that metrics and learned testimony could be so divergent on this point without some basis in reality; it is our task, then, to frame a plausible hypothesis which will respect the full evidence we have. I propose that the above combined paradigmatic and semantic argument, in just the chronology given, is a strong enough hypothesis to explain all the variegated facts yet not so strong as to exceed the requirements of parsimony.

In this fashion we need not reject metrical testimony (hinted at by Ernout, *Morphologie historique* 104, and strongly proposed by Kieckers, *Hist. lat. gram.* II.75); nor posit “indifferent length” (Ernout *ibid.*); nor look for an underlying Indo-European “collective” (Ernout *ibid.*, Kieckers *ibid.*); nor assume an otherwise otiose antecedent Indo-European dual in *\*-ū* (Kieckers *ibid.*, Kent, *Forms* 49, 51); nor reject apparently out of hand the ancient testimony for some kind of existence of short *-ũ* (Kent 51, § 286, note).

## 2. γνύξ

Frisk, GEW 1.317, recognizes that the *-ξ* is analogical on such forms as *πύξ* and *λάξ*, but for the rest of the formation simply remarks that it is Schwundstufe. Under *λάξ* (GEW 2.82) the formation is said to be “nicht sicher erklärt”. Regardless of the problem with *-ς* on *πύξ*, it is clear that *-ξ* has been added whole to *γνύξ* on their analogy<sup>3</sup>). The remaining problem, then, is just why *γνυ-* appears in that ablaut form.

Since the proto paradigm of *γόνυ* must have been NA *\*gónu*, G *\*gnuos*, etc., any weak-case form with a vocalic ending would have yielded a syllabification *\*γανF-*; Homeric *γουνός* must be presumed to be *\*γανFός*, levelled out from *\*γανFός* or *\*γνFός*<sup>4</sup>). It would be

<sup>3</sup>) We may reject entirely the view, reported by Pokorny, IEW 381, comparing the velar suffix to Armenian *eng-aç* (gen.pl.), *cung-k'* (nom.pl.). The Armenian phenomenon, which is not a case or syntactic feature but a marker of stem derivation and of utterly different function, must be treated together with velar extensions in other body-part nouns, if it is not a reflex of *\*-u-* (as Frisk queries, GEW 1.321).

<sup>4</sup>) It will be noted that I differ utterly from Pokorny both in the supposed IE paradigm and in the separate Greek derivations.

preferable to derive  $\gamma\nu\text{-}\xi$  from the paradigm of  $\gammaόν\omega$  proper, rather than from some compound formation such as  $\gammaνώπεται$ <sup>5)</sup>. We see therefore that only two possibilities realistically offer themselves: either a weak-case form before a consonant of the shape  $*\acute{g}nuC\text{-}$  or  $*\acute{g}nu\#$ , or the old endingless locative sg.  $*\acute{g}neu$ . We have no direct evidence within Greek for the ending seen in Hitt. instrumental sg. *ganut*; schematically, a formation  $*\acute{g}nuT$  would fulfill our requirement, and give automatically  $*\gamma\nu\tau > *\gamma\nu$ . In fact, something like  $*\acute{g}nu\text{-}T\text{-}s$  could have reasonably led to  $*\gamma\nu\varsigma$ , which might have been remodelled to  $\gammaνώ\xi$ , but that is speculation.

On the other hand, a locative sg.  $*\acute{g}neu$  should give  $*\gamma\nu\acute{\epsilon}$ . (There is no need to further complicate the discussion with  $*\acute{g}neu\text{-}i > *\gamma\nu\epsilon\acute{f}i > *\gamma\nu\epsilon\acute{i}$ ). Such an isolated form could early have been reshaped in its final segment(s) to  $*\gamma\nu$ , and thus formed the basis for further extension. On the other hand, an instrumental dual would originally have carried a vocalism comparable to those seen in *φρασί* and *πατράσι*. Schematically, we may picture it as  $*\acute{g}nu\#bhi\dots > *\gamma\nu\phi\iota$ , or the like, directly comparable to Avestan *žnubyō*<sup>6)</sup>. Forms such as these would give a natural basis, with a minimum of shift in form-class and derivation, for the stem shape  $\gamma\nu\text{-}$  to which the unetymological  $\text{-}\xi$  was later added.

We may then tentatively regard  $\gammaνώ\xi$  as evidence at the same time for either the old endingless locative  $*\acute{g}néu$  or the “middle-case”  $*\acute{g}nu\#$  in the paradigm of  $*\acute{g}ónu$ .

To make matters explicit, and to suggest the direction in which I would revise Pokorny's whole entry IEW 380—1, we may now list below, with representative examples drawn from all attested dialects, the range of stem shapes and their contextual incidence that the lexical entry  $*[\acute{g}ónu\text{-}]$  ‘knee’ displayed in common IE; in this fashion, all the various shapes found in the daughter languages are traced to but a single IE phonological shape, plus the rules that are synchronically needed within the proto-language simply to account for the great mass of the more interesting noun paradigms

<sup>5)</sup> Or Skt. *jñu-bādh-* ‘bending the knee’.

<sup>6)</sup> The Av. acc.sg. *znūm* is of course a levelling on this stem. Just after writing this note I have chanced to see B. Forssman's excellent and informative article, KZ 79 (1965) 28—31, which reinterprets *περὶ ἰγνώσι* (Hymn to Hermes 152) as *περὶ γνῶσι* ‘um die Knie’. In striking confirmation of my argument above, Forssman sees here, acutely and surely correctly, an actual attestation of  $\gamma\nu\acute{\nu}\sigma\acute{i} <$  loc. pl.  $*\acute{g}nu\text{-}sú =$  LAv. Abl.pl. *žnubyas.čēt* so far as the stem formation is concerned.

of IE. In this sense, it will be seen how my account differs from the forest of forms to be found in the otherwise prudent balance drawn by Frisk, GEW 1.321.

\**gónu* > Skt. *jānu*, Nuristani \**zān-ʔ*), Pehl. *zānūk*, Gk. *γόνυ*, Arm. *cunr*, (Hitt. *genu* unoriginal);

*gñuós* etc. > (Gk. *γονός*), Hitt. *ganut*, Lat. *genui*;

*gñu* # ... > Av. *žnubyō*, Gk. *γνύξ* (?), *γνυί* (see fn. 6 above);

*gñeu* > Gk. *γνύξ* (?), Goth. *kniu* (derived);

*gónue* etc. > Gk. *γοῦνα*, Arm. *cung-kʰ*, Toch. A *kanwem*, B *kenīne*;

*gñu-* (cpd.) > Skt. *jñu-bddh-*, *abhi-jñu*, Av. *fra-šnu-*, Gk. *γνύ-πετοι*, *ἰγνύη*, Goth. *knussjan* etc.;

*gñu-n-* (deriv. stem) > Gk. *γούνατος* (< \**γονῦν-*), (dissimilated<sup>8</sup>)  
Alb. Geg *gjū(-ni)* Tosk *glū(-ri)*, OIr. *glún*, Welsh *glin* (with unexplained \**ū* in Celtic).

From the ancestors of such forms as these, then, in the separate dialects other commonly attested parts of the descendant paradigms came into being by extension and generalization: Gk. *γόναρα*, Arm. *cung-* (note that Greek and Armenian seem to have generalized \**gón-* in common), Lat. *genū*, the entire Germanic derivative \**knewa-*, and of course the revocalized Hittite stem noted above. Only Balto-Slavic has rejected the stem entirely, probably through a clash with homophones of the shapes \**žan-*, *žin-*.

## Some Attic Kinship Terms

By WESLEY E. THOMPSON, University of California, Davis

### 1. ἀνεψιός

It has been asserted that in classical Greek kinship terminology ἀνεψιός “varies between cousin-german and nephew”<sup>1</sup>), but there is no evidence that the word can mean nephew. If one examines all the occurrences of this word in the orators, he will see that where the context permits us to determine its meaning, ἀνεψιός always means cousin, never nephew. So also in the dramatists and Thucydides. In all certain instances except one it means first cousin, the son of

<sup>7</sup>) Kati *jā/zā*, Waigali and Ashkun *zā*; the timbre *a*, and not *o* or *u*, assures us that the vocalism was \**ā* and not \**ǎ*.

<sup>8</sup>) See my discussion KZ 76.275ff., 1960.

<sup>1</sup>) M. Miller, JHS 73, 1953, 46.