and $\varkappa^w\acute{\varepsilon}\nu\tauο\varsigma$. The ϑ was generalized, giving $*\varkappa^w\acute{\varepsilon}\nu\vartheta ο\varsigma$, while the other vocalism gave a duplicate $*k^w\acute{a}\vartheta ο\varsigma$. Then, with a levelling of the latter stem, $*\varkappa^w\acute{\varepsilon}\nu\tau α$ ultimately became $\pi\acute{α}\vartheta\eta$. It is possible that the spread of ϑ, which started in the noun, was aided by the ϑ which would have been regularly produced independently in the perfect $\pi\acute{\varepsilon}\pi ο\nu\vartheta α$.

Locatival -ου

By Eric P. Hamp, Chicago

Edda Gebhard has shown (*MSS* 22, 1967, 21–4) that *AYTO* (IG I² 56,3) is to be read $αὐτοῦ$, a locatival 'hierselbst', that this must contain the locatival adverbial *-ου*, and that this ending which is seen also in $(ὅ)\pi ου$ and Dor. (Hesych.) $\pi\tilde{ω} = \pi οῦ$ must consist of "unechtes *-ου*". Now it is clear that $\pi οῦ$ must go back to $*k^w οο$ (we shall see that $*k^w οε$ does not lead to a fruitful result) since $*k^w ε\text{-}s\text{-}ο$ is known to yield $τ\acute{ε}ο > τοῦ$ by the familiar palataliza-

---

nouns. Ad p. 265 § 4.1.4, I would refer to my discussion of the type $*kreuH$ (with Gk. *a* = Skt. *i*), *IF* 82, 1977, 75–6 and *Ricerche linguistiche* 6, 1974, 231 ff.; it should be noted in connexion with our present case that $\pi\acute{α}\vartheta ο\varsigma$ shows no *-ας*. I agree entirely with Schindler (p. 266 § 4.2.2) that Indo-Iranian $*m\acute{a}ns\ dh\bar{a}\text{-}$ and $*i\acute{a}u\check{s}\ dh\bar{a}\text{-}$ represent very ancient formations; however I must simply withhold opinion on the thesis of the *proterokinetic paradigm and the claim that the nom.-acc. *-os* was not original. In fact, this formation in *-s* is reminiscent of the ancient neuter in *-u*, but it does not exclude an equally ancient (recoverable) form in *-os*. Schindler admits (p. 267) that an *acrostatic Dehnstufe is speculative, but in the nouns cited by him there is an interesting correlation of a phonetic nature to be noticed, i.e. a possible ancient morphophonemic function. Observe that $ἄγο\varsigma$, Skt. $v\acute{a}has\text{-}$, $γῆρα\varsigma\ γ\acute{ε}ρα\varsigma$, $ἦθο\varsigma$, and OIr. *síd* all involve (a possible) IE $*H$; on $ἄγο\varsigma$ and OIr. *síd* see the two comparative sets adduced above. Though I do not pretend to explain the genesis of these long vocalisms, I cite this as a possible vestige of an unexplained correlation with $*H$ in parallel fashion to the striking skewed correspondences to which I have drawn attention in *Ériu* 23, 1972, 230–1.

In this thought-provoking article Schindler actually touches on our present class of problem only at one point, and that is the matter raised on p. 267, i.e. a possible laryngeal interaction, a matter which is left aside and not explored.

Finally, I must thank Klaus Strunk for having forced me to clarify the differences between the problem which I address and that tackled by Schindler.

160   M. D. Mac Leod, Two Names from the *Dyscolos*

tion; for the segmentation *k^we-s-o* see my analysis *Studia Celtica* x–xi, 1975–6, 68–9.

Frisk *GEW* 2.570 s. v. πόθεν, following Schwyzer, thinks that ποῦ was a petrified genitive. But aside from the vagueness of such a value for the genitive, it is far preferable on syntactic grounds and on considerations of parsimony if we can derive a locatival expression from a locative inflexion and equate it with other attested locatives. I therefore derive *k^woo* from *k^woi̯o* and *-ov* from *-oi̯o*, and equate these in segmental content with ποῖ and in function with πόθι. This is then to be segmented in the first instance *-oi-o*, with the semantically (nearly) empty *-o* seen in *k^wes-o* > τέο, and in the alternative declensional endings in *-ā* of Avestan, etc.

Now we know that *k^woi* cannot be an original IE locative for this pronoun, since the common IE form was *ku*; see *Studia Celtica* x–xi, 66; *Papers from the Parasession on Diachronic Syntax* (Chicago Linguistic Society 1976) 349; *AJP* 97, 1976, 20–1; *ZCP* 37, 1979, 171–3. In any event, it is not certain that *-o* could originally be affixed to a structure with *+i*; on the last, see *Papers* . . . 349. But it is further clear that the earlier structure was -ει < *-e-i; see *IF* 75, 1970, 104–5.

Therefore *k^wo-i-o* must be a later, but common Greek, innovation, as I have argued (*SC* x–xi, 66 footnote 3) for πό-θι and πό-θεν. So too for *-oi-o*.

Two Names from the *Dyscolos*

By M. D. Mac Leod, Southampton

The name Cnemon in Menander, Lucian and perhaps Heliodorus may be derived not from κνήμη or κνημός, but from κνάω. The emended form Simiche in Menander is partially supported by MSS. evidence in Lucian. Simiche in Lucian's *Cataplus* may be a pretty hetaera but her name involves an etymological joke.

1. The Etymology of Cnemon

The admirable commentary on Menander by Gomme and Sandbach takes the apparently fictitious name Cnemon as derived from κνήμη and applied to one with remarkable lower legs, the name