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Abstract
The goal of this paper is to lay out a historical scenario as to how the Latin compound suspicio ‘suspicion’ came to have a long vowel -i- in the root. A PIE lengthened grade cannot be responsible for this. In view of other compounds which show the same type of phenomenon, the verbal root that is used as a main part of these examples involves Lachmann’s Law to obtain vowel length in the past participles in Latin. This must be is the origin of long vowels in such compounds. Further, in some cases, the nasal infix in the present stem is in tandem with vowel length in compounds. All these factors indirectly contributed to the long vowel of suspicio following a morpho-semantic modulation in the related form suspectus ‘viewed with mistrust’.

1. The long vowel in the root of the composite suspicio ‘suspicion’ [Pl.+] has long been intriguing for many scholars.1 The length is ascertained by the scansion in Pre-Classical poetry: e.g.,

Pl.Mil.388: suspicio ném máximam sum visa sústinire. (ia7)
Pl.Ps.562: suspicio est mii nün vos súspicáriér (ia6)
Ter.An.501: renúntiamst; nán qui istáec tibi incidít suspicio? (ia8)

In these iambic verses the part suspi- should form a spondee (i.e., – –), which guarantees the length of -i-. This is also secured in trochaic verses; the part -pici- should be scanned as trochee (i.e., – -): e.g.,

Pl.Bac.436: Innocens suspicio ném hanc sústinét causá meá (tr7)
Ter.An.317: hinc in malam rem cún suspicio ném istác, sceulúś? (tr7)

Further, the lack of attestation of suspicio in works in hexameter also indicates the length in an indirect manner, as the sequence – - – after the prefix does not fit with this metrical scheme.

Meiser (1998: 69) posits *sub-spécio as a preceding stage (subject to the sound change *e > I like subtilis ‘fine in texture’ [cf. têla ‘woven stuff’] triggered by the i-vocalism in the following syllable), by which he seems to suggest the lengthened grade of the root *spek-. On the other hand, Vine (1993: 99)

1 suspício instead of suspicio appears in several manuscripts. Though Wagner (1979: 145) argues that “the word is a contraction from suspicito, an etymology which at the same time accounts for the different quantity of suspicio (noun) and suspicor,” how his “contraction” engendered the vowel length is linguistically unclear. It is more likely that the spelling -tió came from abstract nouns such as áctio ‘performance’ and nátió ‘birth’.
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remarks that “an old *spēk- (beside the *spek- of speciō etc.) is difficult to justify”. This issue can be examined in light of recent developments in Indo-European nominal morphology.

2. In Indo-European there are several cases which show lengthened grade or a type of vrddhi in a more or less consistent manner:

- The nominative singular of consonant stems is one such case, whether its long vowel is original (cf. Rix 1992: 118, 121) or secondarily engendered by Szemerényi’s Law (see Szemerényi 1999: 116-117, Tichy 2004: 37, and Clackson 2007: 79-80); e.g., Gk. πατέρ ‘father’ (*-ter-), ποιμέν ‘shepherd’ (*-men-), κηρ ‘heart’ (*kerd-).

- Following one of the acrostic ablaut patterns (*-ē- ~ *-e-) seen often in r/n-stem nouns, the strong cases show a long vowel (see Schindler 1975a, Nussbaum 1986: 123, and Weiss 2009: 257): e.g., Gk. ἄρα ‘liver’ (*Hēık*w- ~ *Hēık-k-(n) as in Ved. yákṛt- / Lat. iecur); Hitt. e-ēs-har / Gk. ἄρα [Hsch.] ‘blood’ (< *hēs-har-); Gk. γῆρας ‘old age’ (< *gērh-ς) / γῆρας ‘gift of honor’ (< *gērh-ς). The (endingless) locative singular can also be a locus of the lengthened grade: e.g., Av. ḍam (< *dēm; cf. *domh- ~ *dem- ‘house’, which exemplifies the other acrostic type [*-o- ~ *-e-]).

- The so-called Narten present also displays the lengthened grade in its acrostic ablaut pattern (see Narten 1968, Tichy 2004: 107-108, and Fortson 2010: 96); e.g., Ved. inj. staut ‘praise’ (< *stēu-[~ *stēu-]). The lengthened-grade perfects in Latin such as légī (← legō ‘collect’) and égī (< *hēg- ~ agō ‘drive’) are thought to continue old imperfects of Narten presents (see Weiss 2009: 412-413).

- The s-aorist is added here as a source of forms that illustrate the lengthened grade in the root (see Tichy 2004: 126-127 and Weiss 2009: 171, 412); e.g., Ved. ápṛāt (< *hṛj-e-prēk-s-r; pres. prcchāt ‘ask’), Lat. vexī (< *gēb-s-s; pres. vehō ‘carry’), rēxī (< *hṛgō-s-s; pres. regō ‘direct’). This type, the one before, and the *-ē-/*-e- acrostic pattern may have backed up some “Narten root nouns” (cf. Nussbaum 1986: 203 n. 17 and Weiss 2009: 260); e.g., Lat. rēx / OIr. rī ‘king’ (< *hṛg- [agent noun] ← *hṛg- ‘extend’; cf. *hṛgō-r̥n̥ [abstract noun] in GAv. rōzarīn- ‘rule’ / Ved. rājāni ‘under the rule [?]’); Lat. lēx ‘law’ (< *lēg- ‘collection’ ← *leg- ‘collect’).

- Thematization to derive genitival or possessive adjectives (substantivized in some cases) may occasionally trigger vrddhi (see Nussbaum 1986: 30, 111-118, 134); e.g., *kō- ‘head-bone (material)’ → adj. *kōr-h-ō- ‘made of this material’ > subst. *kōr-h-ō- ‘object made of head-bone, skull’ = Av. sāra- ‘head’; Ved. pāῡsu-/ Av. parasu- ‘rib’ → Ved. pārśv-ō- (neut.) ‘side’ (< ‘of the rib(s)’). Cf. Fortson (2010:130), who refers to Gk. βοῦς ‘bow’ < *gʰih-ṛ-ō- ‘(thing) having a bowstring’ [no vrddhi] (< *gʰihr-ō- ‘bowstring’ > Ved. jyā) and Ved. devā- ‘god’, Av. daēna- ‘demon’ < *dei-ō- ‘one belonging to the sky’ [vrddhi in the wrong place] (< *diu-, O-grade of *dieu-). Vrddhi may also be

---

2 An objection to the change *-ē- > *-i- alleged for suspicō can be found in Vine (1993: 98-104). According to him, this change only occurs when an *-r- lies between *-ē- and a following *-i-.

3 The length in Lat. ebrius ‘drunk’ can also be associated with this acrostic type: *hēg-‘h-r + *-io- (see Weiss 1994a: 96, 2009: 163, and Vine 2002: 331).

4 In contrast to rēx, the PIE status of lēx is uncertain due to the lack of precise cognates (see de Vaan 2008: 337). Note, however, that its length is frequently observed in both nominal and verbal derivatives and compounds (e.g., lēgerupa ‘law-breaker’), so that the long vowel is thought to have emerged in a rather earlier period. See also footnote 19.

Some i-stem genitival adjectives derived from o-stem substantives also show vrddhi, in which lengthening is often based on the vocalism after einzelsprachlich sound developments. This pattern is particularly common in Indo-Iranian: e.g., Ved. purukutsa- → paurukutsi- [patronymic], aramā- → ārani- (ŚB) [patronymic], Av. ahura- ‘lord’ → āhvāri- ‘belonging to Ahura Mazdā’, mazdaiasna- ‘one who sacrifices to Ahura Mazdā’ → māzdaianāni- ‘belonging to Mazdean worshippers’, and probably xšudra- (adj.) ‘liquid’ → xšudra- (subst.) ‘alcohol’ → xšaodri- ‘alcoholic’ (see Frisk 1938: 113, Schindler 1980: 389-390, 390 n. 15, Nussbaum 2009: 3-4, and Rau 2009: 78).

Based on this survey of common loci where lengthened grade or vrddhi appears,5 we can consider whether the -1- in suspicio reflects such a phenomenon. First, there is no Narten character in the verbal root *spek- to directly engender *spek- in its derivatives. Even for the “Narten root nouns” such as rex ‘king’ and lex ‘law’, when the same roots are suffixed by *-ion- as with suspicio, the resulting derivatives are regio ‘district’ and legit- ‘large military force’ with a short vowel at least in Latin. Nor do the other morphological categories / formations listed above match the situation of suspicio. Another possible factor may be that suspicio is a compound and the verbal root appears in the second member. It is true that Greek has some apparent parallels to suspicio, where the initial vowel of the second member is long and could be regarded as having lengthened grade.6 e.g., ὑγ-ηρφής (= ὑγ-ερφής) ‘high-roofed’ / ὑγ-όφυρος ‘under the roof’ (cf. ἐρώς; LIV 2001: 496-497, s.v. *h(e)rebh- ‘überdecken’);7 εὖ-ηνεμός ‘well as to the winds’ (cf. ἄνεμος ‘wind’ < *h2enht-mo-);8 εὖ-ὀδης ‘sweet-smelling’ (cf. ὀζω; LIV 2001: 296, s.v. *h2ed- ‘zu riechen beginnen’); ὑπερ-ηνερόσον ‘exceedingly manly’, Ἀγ-ηνορ [personal name ← ‘man-leader’] (cf. ὁνή ‘man’ < *hesner-); στρατ-ηνός ‘commander of an army’ (cf. ἄγος ‘leader’, ἄγω ‘lead’; LIV 2001: 255-256, s.v. *h2eg- ‘treiben’),9 for some of which Lejeune (1955: 190) assumes a PIE origin. But due to the (possible) presence of laryngeals in word-initial position of the underlying roots, the length may have occurred in phonological sequences such as [...]1st member + [He/o...],2nd member with vowel contraction (cf. Lejeune 1955: 293 n. 1) following intervocalic laryngeal loss or [...]1st member + [HC...],2nd member with laryngeal lengthening (or again vowel contraction after the vocalization of H)-. The length thus engendered may have analogically spread to other phonological contexts. The verbal root in the Latin form suspicio, on the other hand, does not contain an initial laryngeal if it is *spek- — the issue which will be addressed in §4. Nor is there a productive model to promote laryngealistic long vowels among compounds in the language.

---

5 As for other subtypes or marginal cases, see Schindler (1975b: 267) and Ringe (2006: 13).
6 Some of the following data are based on Lejeune (1955: 190, 293 n. 1).
7 For the variation of vocalism and length in the verbal root of these forms (<pro-, -pr-, -pr̩-), cf. Chantraine (2009: 352).
8 Compounds without lengthening (i.e., -νεμο-) also exist. On the other hand, there are derivative adjectives such as ἄνεμος (Dor. ἀνεμος) ‘windy’ with metrical lengthening. See Chantraine (2009: 82).
9 Chantraine (2009: 16) suggests influence from ἄροτον of the similar meaning (‘go before, lead the way’; cf. LIV 2001: 520, s.v. *seh-e-g(e)-).
Further, “downgrading” of the root vowel, alongside the retention of the full grade (cf. *obsidium ‘siege’ [PL+] < *-sed-; *sacriceus ‘guilty of any impious act’ [PL+] < *leg-), seems to be much more common in compounds:1° e.g., Lat. condicio ‘contract’ (< *-dik-; cf. *dicō ‘to talk’ < *deiak-); Lat. coniugium ‘marriage’ (< *-iug-; cf. *iugurum [a measure of land; Cato+] < *iug-un-); Lat. prīvī-gnus ‘stepson’ / Gk. νεογνός ‘new-born’ (< -γνό-); Gk. ὑγής ‘sound, healthy’ (< *hsu-γι-ς); Gk. στεφόπη ‘flash of lightning’ (< *h2ste-ρ-ς-ς); Gk. μολό-βρός ‘greedy fellow’ / Ved. tuvi-gra- ‘devouring much’ (< -γρ-ς); Gk. ἤγκρος (< ἕγκραλος) ‘brain’ [Hsch.] (< -γκ-ρ-ς-ς ‘[residing / belonging] in the head’); Gk. νήνεμος ‘without wind’ (< *-n-h2nhi-mo-); Ved. anupatha- ‘going along the path’ (< *-pnh-ς; cf. pάνθας < *pent-oh-ς). In view of this productive pattern, a PIE lengthened grade is hardly tenable for compounds like suspiciō (thus, not *-spek-), as Vine (1993: 99) rightly claims.

3. Yet, if we take not a PIE but an einzelsprachlich standpoint, vowel lengthening in Latin (or Italic) in compounds (and derivatives thereof) may have a reasonable phonological basis. An examination of possible sources for long vowels will lead us to a better understanding of the -a- in suspiciō.

3.1. Rix (1992: 39) regards the compound ambagēs (f.pl.) ‘long-winded speech, circumlocution’ [PL+] as reflecting “Dehnstufe” in contrast to āgō ‘drive’. See also indagō ‘ring of huntsmen (etc.) to prevent the escape of game’ [Verg.-] (cf. indagātor ‘one who hunts out’ [PL+] and coāgulum ‘bond’ [Var.+]). If Rix uses the term “Dehnstufe” in PIE terms, though uncertain, and one takes his root reconstruction *h2eg- at face value, a lengthened grade *-h2eg- would not procure the desired -a-, following the standard version of the Laryngeal Theory (Eichner’s Law, in particular).11

Regarding -ag- (< *ag- < *h2eg-) in ambagēs, indagō, and coāgulum,12 there is a plausible source for its long vowel in the lexical network based on the same verbal root. The past participle of the verb āgō is actum, whose ā- is accounted for via Lachmann’s Law. See also actō ‘performance’ (< *ag-tiō). Such a long vowel may thus have been extended by analogy to other related forms such as ambagēs, indagō, and coāgulum.13 The fact that these forms are all compounds probably strengthened the analogy between them. When actum was prefixed, the length in the root vowel enabled the form to resist vowel reduction (otherwise, **-aktom > **-ectum; cf. *kom-paktom > com-pectum ‘agreement’ [∼ com-pactum]). This phonological profile, that is, the retention of the a-vocalism, spread to nominal compounds, in contrast to the regular application of vowel reduction in prefixed verbs (e.g., sub-āgō > sub-īgō ‘drive under’).14

---

10 Most of the following examples are based on Nussbaum (1986: 72) and Fritz (1996: 7, and n. 28); see also Beekes (2010: 1016).
11 The hypothesis that the -a- is of lengthened-grade origin could only be brought into question based on the different root reconstruction *h2eg- (see Watkins 2000: xix, 1, LIV 2001: 256 n. 0). Cf. Fritz (1996: 1-2), who refers to the view that the IE word for ‘nose’ shows the alternation between *a (full grade) and *â (lengthened grade).
12 Cf. Hamp (1988: 196-197), which is based on a now obsolete treatment of laryngeals (*-oh-ς > -âς) for such forms.
13 While de Vaan (2008: 31) suggests that the long -a- in ambugēs and indagō as well as coāgulum is analogical to that in contagēs and propugēs, he circularly writes that the long -a- in contagēs (etc.) may be analogical to forms such as ambagēs and indagō (2008: 606-607).
14 Another nominal compound exāmen ‘swarm’ [PL+] (< *eks-ag-s-men; see Leumann 1977: 114) with -a- in an open syllable perhaps also played a role in the extension of -a-. Discussion of this issue will be resumed in footnote 20.

3.2. Such an alternation $a \sim \ddot{a}$ may be paralleled by some other compounds. There are well-known cases which contain the phonological configuration -Cag- (similar to the above -äg-), such as contägō ‘contact’ [Cato+] (cf. contägēs ‘contact’ [Lucr.] and contägium ‘id.’ [Lucr.+]) and propägēs ‘that which continues (a stock)’ [Pac.; P. F.] (cf. pröpägō [tr.] ‘reproduce [a plant] by layers; cause to continue’ [Cato, Pac.+]) and pröpägō [F.] ‘space for planting’ [Cato+]). The related present forms of these are tangō ‘touch’ and pango ‘fix, arrange’, respectively, and if one follows the root shape provided by the LIV for tangō and pango, that is, *teh₂g/g- and *peh₂g- (see also Vine 2002: 345 for the latter; cf. *pao- in Watkins 2000: 61), he would claim that the long vowel in contägō and propägēs is to be explained as a direct reflex of the root-internal sequence *-eh₂- in the full grade (see Bader 1962: 241 and de Vaan 2008: 443, 607).15 Note, however, that because there is also a pattern like dicō ‘to talk’ (< *deik-, e-grade) vs. condicio ‘contract’ (< *-di-, O-grade), as cited above, we need to examine the issue of ablaut more carefully. Moreover, Oscan prupukid ‘by previous agreement (?)’ (< *prö-pakτio-; see Buck 1928: 56-57 and Weiss 1993: 39) shows vowel reduction in the second syllable in a position adjacent to a labial (see Nishimura 2012: 381-386), which indicates that the vowel in question was short and the possibility of -ä- (< *-eh₂-) is excluded. The root of this form is identified with that of Latin pāx ‘pact, peace’, that is, *peh₂k-, according to the LIV (2001: 461-462); see also de Vaan (2008: 61); cf. *pak- in Watkins (2000: 61). This root is known as a variant of the root *peh₂g- (cf. pango).17 Thus, the possible realization of the O-grade of the related root in a nominal compound (i.e., *ph₂k-) would be significant in considering propägēs and further contägō.

If the O-grade in the root is the starting point for contägō and propägēs, the emergence of the long vowels can be explained as a byproduct of Lachmann’s Law; the past participles tāctum / pāctum for tangō / pango may have been the source of the length (thus, e.g., *-ph₂g- > *-pao- → -pāg-).18 It is assured that the root vocalism of these participles was resistant to vowel reduction when prefixed, as with āctum (thus, con-tāctum ‘touched closely’ and im-pāctum ‘fixed on’). The relation -tāctum / -pāctum ~ con-tāgō / pro-pāgēs is entirely proportionate to -āctum ~ amb-āgēs, ind-āgō, and co-āgulum, and it would thus be undeniable that Lachmann’s Law played a pivotal role in the vrddhi-looking formation.19 These two things can also be found side-by-side in -frāctum (< frango ‘break’; LIV 2001: 91-92, s.v. *bhreg/g- ‘brechen [intr.]’) ~ sufrāgīum ‘vote case in an assembly’ [Pl.], the latter of which is said to have originally referred to the act of shouting for or against a candidate (see de Vaan 2008: 598) or the act of “signifying assent at an assembly by clash of weapons” (see Vaahtera 1993: 80).20

---

15 Bader argues that the *g-, a root enlargement in her theory, induced e-grade. The phonetic features of this segment should rather be associated with Lachmann’s Law.

16 Buck also suggests the possibility that -u- may continue an ablauting *-eh₂- (< *-eh₂-), but this view is considered less likely by Weiss (1993: 36-39).


18 Cf. Lamberterie (1996: 144) for a less direct process to reach -pao-.

19 The correspondence between p.p. lēctum (< legō ‘collect’; LIV 2001: 397, s.v. *lekg- ‘sammeln’) ~ collēga ‘colleague’, collēgium ‘guild, society’ [Pl.+] looks similar to the cases discussed above. But the presence of the root noun lēct ‘a “Narten root noun”; see §2) may be a likelier origin of the long -e- in such compounds (see footnote 4). Vowel lengthening in simplex nouns rēgula ‘roof-tile’ (cf. lēctum of tegō ‘cover’) and rēgula ‘ruler’ (cf. rēctum of regō ‘direct’) can be explained in the same manner, and it is thus excluded from our discussion.

20 As for the vowel lengthening in contägō, another nominal compound *contämen (< *kom-tag-o-men; see Weiss 1994b;
4. We have confirmed the connection between verbs related to Lachmann's Law and nominal compounds with *vyāḍhī* vowels. Viewing the above examples from a different angle, we see another connection emerging. The verbs discussed in §3.2, *tango*, *pango*, and *frango*, are nasal-infixed presents. Thus, as is briefly pointed out by Vaahtera (1993: 80), the correlation between the nasal infix in the present and long vowels in nominal compounds may have become a morpho-phonological pattern, though restricted to a small group of forms. A possible addition to this pattern is the object of this work. *suspičío* is one such candidate.21

4.1. Based on the traditional view that relates this form to the verbal root *spek-*, any attempt to seek a connection between the nasal infix and vowel lengthening in nominal compounds as in *contāgīō*, *propāgēs*, and *suffragīum* would fail, because *spek-* is not associated with a nasal infix in Latin and many other IE languages (Lat. *speciō*, Ved. *pāśyati*, Gk. *σκέπτομαι < *spek-je-*, but cf. Av. *spāśnūdā < ?*spek-nāyu-mu-*; see LIV 2001: 575). Further, the fact that the root ends in a voiceless stop */-k/- hinders recourse to the side effect of Lachmann's Law.

In this state of affairs, it may be better to seek a reason why *suspičío* is so extremely isolated (cf. *auspiciūm* 'auspices' [P1.+]). Indeed, there is a semantic and morphological complexity in this compound and its alleged underlying or related forms. Based on the morphological interpretation, which is commonly accepted, that *suspičío* consists of *subs-* and *spek-*, one would identify the same combination of elements in the prefixed verb *suspičiō* [Enn.(?); Cic.+]. A bizarre fact is that the literal / physical meaning 'look upwards to, look up to' (< subs- 'from below'; cf. *tollō* 'pick up', p.p. *sublātus*) of this verb, when extended metaphorically, turns to 'admire, esteem' in most cases, according to the *OLD*, a rather positive nuance (cf. *suspectus* -ōs 'high regard' [Ov.+]) that is normally not associated with

139), supposed as the basis of the verb *contāniō* 'pollute' [Ter.+] might also have exercised some influence. Recall *exāmēn* with reference to *ambāgēs*, *indāgō*, and *coāgēlum*, as mentioned in footnote 14. The significance of *exāmen* and *contāmen* depends on how they obtained their vowel length. (1) It may be that Lachmann’s Law was the cause (e.g., *ek-ag-s-men > *eks-āksmen;* cf. Leumann 1977: 214, 208). If so, these forms can align with *-a-ctum* and *-a-tactum* as corroborating factors to *ambāgēs*, *contāgīō*, etc. (2) On the other hand, simple compensatory lengthening may also be workable (i.e., *ek-ag-s-men > *eks-ag-emen > examen;* cf. Weiss 2009: 178). If this is the case, *exāmēn* and *contāmen* only have limited significance for the spreading of *-a-* in *suspičiō*, in view of the fact that *propāgēs* and *suffragīum* have no such forms or similar ones as far as we know. Note, in passing, that one more intermediate stage between *eks-agzmēn* and *exāmen* would have been *eks-āzmen*. The consonant before *-x-N-* disappeared earlier than *-x*. *CIL* II 549 LÓSNA (< *lousn-*) and 25 TRÍRESMOS (< *retsm-*)). It appears that at this stage the vowel before -z- was already lengthened. *CIL* II 25 that contains *trīresmos*, traced back to the original around the mid third century BCE, also includes *captvum* (-CAPTVOM), *cartaciniensis* (< *gon-*), [MAX]IMOS / [MAX]VMAS (< *naksomo-*), which resulted via vowel reduction. If one assumes that *eks-agzmēn* changed into *eks-āzmen* (spelled as *-as-,* if attested) without compensatory lengthening, this form must also have undergone vowel reduction, ending up as *eks-βzmēn (> *βexēmēn). (3) Further, as a third option, one can conjecture that *eks-agzmēn* became *eks-āzmen* before consonant cluster simplification on the model of *-a-ctum*. If so, *exāmēn* and also *contāmen* can be regarded as pointing to secondary extension of the vowel length from *-a-ctum* and *-a-tactum*, respectively, like *ambāgēs*, *coāgēlum*, etc.

Here I adopted the reconstructions with *-s-* for *exāmēn* and *contāmen* (cf. *iovxmenta* in *CIL* II 1). The existence of *agmen* 'stream; crowd' perhaps leads us to the *s*-less reconstructions *ek-ag-men* and further *kom-tag-men* (cf. de Vaan 2008: 31, 132). If one can prove the loss of *-g-* before *-m-*(or the degemination after an assimilation to *-mm-*) followed by compensatory lengthening, the *s*-less forms would become valid. For example, *annentum* > *āmentum* 'thong attached to a spear' might continue *ag-men-* (if so, the *-g-* in *agmen* would be a secondary restoration; see de Vaan 2008: 31). But it is not easy to verify such a process for sure (see also *prō-pag-men* 'extension in time' [Enn.] and *ante-pag-mentum* 'facing of a door- or window-frame' [Cato+]).

21 I have already considered another candidate *convicium* 'angry noise; insulting talk' [PL+] (Nishimura 2011), an updated discussion of which is underway. 22 Cf. *suspectus* suggested by Vahlen (1928: 28) in Enn.Anna.145Sk, but Skutsch (1985: 301) retains the MSS reading *prospexit.*
the nominal compound *suspicio*. The verb that has more of negative sense, whatever the semantic details, is the deponent *suspicor* (p.p. *suspicatus*) ‘guess; suspect, have an inkling of (something wrong)’ [Pl.+] 23 

On the other hand, the past participle of *suspicio*, namely, *suspectus* [Pl.+] is used with negative meanings such as ‘viewed with mistrust’ and ‘regarded as) of doubtful character’ as imagined from *suspicio*. This semantic difference between *suspicio* and *suspectus* may be a starting point for morphological reconsiderations of these forms and further *suspicio*. Note that the finite forms of the verb *suspicio* do not appear in Plautus and Terence (except in Pl.Men.433 as a MS variant; see Lodge 1962: 748) in contrast to *suspectus* and *suspicor*. Hence, it seems that *suspectus* was somewhat disconnected in Pre-Classical Latin. The fact that *suspectus* has comparative and superlative forms like normal adjectives can also lead us to the assumption that its status as a past participle was overshadowed. 24 Based on these observations, I tentatively suggest the following scenario, though it at first sounds speculative but will remain as a possible option for explaining the forms related to our discussion.

4.2. The base verb *su(b)spikio* with the negative connotation (‘view with mistrust’, etc.) expected from *suspectus* may once have existed in an earlier period alongside the homonym with the positive meaning, but later it temporally slipped out of the Latin lexicon for some reason. In the meantime, *suspectus* established its semantic range starting from the original status as a past participle ‘(someone / something) viewed with mistrust (as hiding something bad / evil beneath the surface)’ [← *susb*; cf. *sublino* ‘smear over (a surface)’]. In this interpretation the entity, whether a person or a thing or a fact, with some “surface” is judged by another entity in a *negative* manner (i.e., ‘mistrusted’). This meaning can be said to be a primary one emerging from numerous examples of *suspectus*: e.g.,

Pl.Bac.572:

non maneo, neque tu me habebis falso *suspectum*.

‘I’m not waiting, and you won’t wrongly have me under suspicion either.’ (trans. by de Melo)

Cic.Phil.10.15:

At enim veteranis *suspectum* nomen est M. Bruti. magisne quam Decimi? Equidem non arbitror.

‘But Marcus Brutus’ name is suspect to the veterans. More than Decimus’? I do not think so.’ (trans. by Shackleton Bailey)

Caes.Gal.5.54:

Tantum apud homines barbaros valuit esse aliquos repertos principes inferendi belli tantamque omnibus voluntatum commutationem attulit, ut praeter Aeduos et Remos, quos praecipu quo semper honore Caesar habuit, alteros pro vetere ac perpetua erga populum Romanum fide, alteros pro recentibus Gallici belli officiis, nulla fere civitas fuerit non *suspecta* nobis.

23 Cf. *conspeciō* and *conspicor*, semantically akin to each other (‘catch sight of’).

24 Cf. Vine (2002: 334), where mirus ‘wonderful’ is discussed, an adjective that, on the contrary, makes no superlative and rarely shows the comparative form.
‘Indeed, the fact that they had found men to take the lead in a war of offence had so much weight among the natives, and brought about such a universal change of feeling, that, save the Aedui and the Remi, whom Caesar always held in especial honour — the former for their old-established and unbroken loyalty towards Rome, the latter for their recent services in the Gallic war — scarcely a single state was free from suspicion on our part.’ (trans. by Edwards)

**Verg.A.2.35-38:**

at Capys, et quorum melior sententia menti,
aut pelago Danaum insidias **suspecta**que dona
praecipitare iubent, subiectisque urere flammis,
aut terebrare cavas uteri et temptare latebras.

‘But Capys, as did all of wiser heart,
bade hurl into the sea the false Greek gift,
or underneath it thrust a kindling flame
or pierce the hollow ambush of its womb
with probing spear.’ (trans. by Williams)

**Hor.S.1.4.65-65:**

nunc illud tantum quaeram, meritone tibi sit
**suspectum** genus hoc scribendi.

‘To-day the only question I’ll ask is this, whether you are right in viewing it [this kind of writing] with distrust.’ (trans. by Fairclough)

**Liv.3.4.3:**

**Suspecta** et colonia Antium fuit...

‘Suspicion already rested on the colony of Antium...’ (trans. by Foster)

Besides a number of such cases, there are some places in which **suspectus** shows a semantically different behavior. We will start with Hor.**Ep.1.16.50-51:**

cautus enim metuit foveam lupus accipiterque
**suspectos** laqueos et opertum miluus hamum.

‘For the wolf is wary and dreads the pit, the hawk the suspected snare, the pike the covered hook’ (trans. by Fairclough).

Mayer (1994: 28) states that “**cautus**, **suspectos**, and **opertum** should all be taken ἀπὸ κοινοῦ [‘in common’] throughout the sentence since all the animals are cautious and all the snares, though hidden,
are suspect" [my emphasis]. Though it is puzzling to uncover underlying nuances of *suspectos* through its English (borrowed) reflex *suspect*, the context that the snare is not visible would lead us to assume that the action inherent in *spek*- ‘see (the snares)’ was physically not realized here.25 Probably for this reason we find the variant *suspectus* in this passage in some other manuscripts, agreeing with the subject *accipiter* and used as almost equivalent to *suspicātus* (i.e., ‘the hawk which guesses [the presence of snares]’), though such a usage is not common.26 The phrase *suspectos laqueos* may thus be the reflex of a semantic shift from the visual sphere to the invisible background that is the object of speculation. The past participle *suspectos* focuses on the object beneath the surface of something and its high probability of existing or being arranged there. The result of the mental activity involved here is not a negative one (‘mistrusted’, etc.) as assumed in the above cases but a rather positive one like ‘(something) SENSED hidden or arranged in secret (beneath the surface)’, which is almost equivalent to ‘predicted’. This interpretation even implies the intention of someone who set or arranged snares.

The same is true for Verg.G.1.441-444:

> ille ubi nascentem maculis variaverit ortum
> conditus in nubem medioque refugerit orbe,
> **suspecti** tibi sint imbres; namque urget ab alto
> arboribusque satisque Notus pecorique sinister.

> ‘When his springing orb
> With spots he pranketh, muffled in a cloud,
> And shrinks mid-circle, then of showers beware;
> For then the South comes driving from the deep,
> To trees and crops and cattle bringing bane.’ (trans. by Greenough)

What the poet is visualizing here is the cloud (*nubem*), but the past participle *suspecti* modifies *imbres* instead, which are *forecast* from the shape of the cloud though they are not yet realized. This example further suggests a meteorological arrangement orchestrated by the divine will behind a sign in the nature.

Due to the nature of his historical work, a repertoire of conspiracies and treacheries, Livy provides a number of cases of *suspectus* (about eighty), of which about a dozen also point to the same type of interpretation for sure. For example —

Livy.1.51.7:

> **Suspectam** fecit rem et ingenium Turni ferox et oratio hesterna et mora Tarquini, quod videbatur ob
eam differri caedes potuisse.

25 Cf. Hor.Ep.1.18.42-43: *donec suspecta severo conticuit lyra* ‘till the lyre, on which the stern one [Zethus, the brother of Amphiion] looked askance, was hushed’ [my emphasis] (trans. by Fairclough).

26 Cf. Liv.25.23.5: *Non erat conloquii copia, quia multorum animi suspecti omnium curam oculosque converterant, ne quid falleret tale admissum.* The interpretation of *suspecti* in this passage involves some ambiguity. The translation "the suspicious attitude of many men" for *multorum animi suspecti* by Moore seems to imply that *animi* metaphorically served as the agents of having suspicion (of something bad). If this is the case, the meaning of *suspect* here is rather close to *suspicati*, as with the variant reading *suspectus* of Hor.Ep.1.16.50-51.
‘The charge was made plausible both by the aggressive spirit of Turnus and his speech of the day before, and by Tarquinius’s delay, since it seemed that the massacre might have been postponed on that account.’ (trans. by Forster)

As seen from the translation ‘plausible’, the indictment (rem) is positively received on account of the circumstances that are listed. In the following example, too, a manifestation of antagonism is taken as a plausible fact:

Liv.2.16.2:

Adversus eos et ne quid simul ab Tusculo, unde, etsi non apertum, suspectum tamen bellum erat, repentini periculi oriretur, P. Valerius quartum T. Lucretius iterum consules facti.

‘To confront them, and to prevent any sudden peril arising from Tusculum, in which quarter hostility, though not openly avowed, was none the less suspected, Publius Valerius was made consul for the fourth time and Titus Lucretius for the second.’ (trans. by Foster)

In other places in Livy, various things are expected or predicted (i.e., suspected) to exist covertly or occur (or not to, if in negative sentences): certamen tribunorum ‘the quarrel of the tribunes’ (4.46.10), fraus ‘guile , fraud’ (23.35.4, 26.17.13), bellum ‘war’ (24.40.1), bella ‘wars’ (24.44.6), dolus ‘ruse’ (28.3.12), obtrcationem ‘captious criticism’ (28.43.2), nihil hostile ‘nothing hostile, no attack’ (30.6.3), and aditus ‘approach, attack’ (44.13.3).27

Such an “affirmative” value of suspectus is also observed in infinitival clauses:

Ter.Hec.395-399:

nunc si potis est, Pamphile,
maxume volo doque operam ut clam eveniat partus patrem,
atque adeo omnes: sed si fieri id non potest quin sentient,
dicam abortum esse: scio nemini alter suspectum fore
quin, quod verisimile est, ex te recte eum natum putent.

‘Well, Pamphilus, if possible, what I most want, and what I’m working on, is that the birth should happen without her father’s knowledge, and indeed without anyone’s knowledge. But if it’s not possible to stop them finding out, I’ll say she’s had a miscarriage. I know there will be no suspicion in anyone’s mind that it’s not your legitimate baby; it’s a reasonable assumption.’ (trans. by Brown)

27 Some of the glosses are based on the translations by Foster and Moore.
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‘I’m well aware, darling, that you suspect it was my behaviour that caused your wife to leave our home, although you’re doing your best to cover up your suspicion.’ (trans. by Brown)

Cic.Att.11.20.2:

Omnino dicitur nemini negare; quod ipsum est suspectum, notionem eius differri.

‘He is said to be denying nobody whomsoever, and that in itself has aroused suspicion, as suggesting that his investigation is only deferred.’ (trans. by Shackleton Bailey)

In these cases, suspectus serves as a marker of what the speaker senses or predicts. In other words, the form introduces some existent fact or information affirmed to some extent by him or her.

Based on the examples discussed so far, the noun object or the content represented by the infinitival clauses can be said to be detected and highlighted beneath the “surface” of some entity. Such complete shift in weight or focus from the “surface” to the interior may be a most far-reaching result of the semantics of suspectus. Many other cases such as those cited at the beginning of this subsection also more or less shed light upon something hidden that may be harmful. Thus, what I posited there as a basic meaning ‘(someone / something) viewed with mistrust (as hiding something bad / evil beneath the surface)’ varies in emphasis with regard to the content in the parentheses. Some cases may be closer to the variant type ‘(something) sensed hidden or arranged in secret (beneath the surface)’. Such a variation may be typologically common with the verb of this meaning (cf. Japanese kare-o utagau ‘(I) suspect him’ — hyōki-o utagau ‘(I) suspect a sickness [under some symptom]’).

With this semantic dimension, we return to suspectus to consider its lexical status. The base verb *su(b)spiko with the negative sense became obsolete in Latin. Its practical absence would thus have caused some etymological uncertainty about the remaining past participle suspectus. This situation became more advanced due to the delicately different nuances possessed by the form. Then a morphological twist was added. If the form was re-segmented as sus-pectus, the second element would be still acceptable and morphologically identifiable as the past participle of paciscor / pacasco ‘make a settlement / arrangement’ [Pl.+] (— *peh2k-). The vowel in the first syllable of the original simplex pactus was a target of vowel reduction when the form was prefixed, as seen from com-pectum (~ com-pactum) ‘agreement’ [Pl.+] and dē-peciscor28 ‘agree’ [Ter.+] (that is, the root vowel was not qualified for Lachmann’s Law due to the root final voiceless stop -c-). suspectus would thus have been interpreted as continuing *su(b)j-s-paktos by some Latin speakers,29 meaning something like “arranged beneath / in secret”. Such a sense fit in many contexts where suspectus was used, as the above discussion shows, because it coincides in part with the meaning ‘(something) sensed HIDDEN or ARRANGED in secret (beneath the surface)’.

At this stage, suspectus became indirectly associated with the words derived from the same root such as pāx ‘pact, peace’ and pācātus ‘peaceful, settled’ [Pl.+] (cf. pācō ‘impose a settlement on’ [Cic.+]). As mentioned in §3.2, the root (*peh2k-) is a variant of *peh2geh-, whose voiced consonant *g- in the root

29 With regard to the phonological change in the prefix, cf. sus-pendo ‘hang’ < *subs-. See Leumann (1977: 157).
final activated Lachmann's Law. The long vowel in the root is thus ascribed to either this sound change or
(less likely) the possible lengthening caused by the laryngeal. In any case, the length is widespread in the
lexical group based on this verbal root, a fact that is expected from the nasal-infixed present pangō
vis-à-vis propāgēs (see §3.2).

The derivational compound which means 'suspicion, mistrustful feeling' may originally have been
*su(b)-spekiō with the verbal root in the full grade, and then being targeted by vowel reduction in the
medial syllable, it became *suspiktiō (cf. also Osc. prupukid < *prō-pakijo- via vowel reduction in the
second syllable in the labial context; see §3.2). As the etymologically related form suspectus was
secondarily associated with *peh₂-k- and further *peh₂ .. on the semantic basis, *suspiktiō itself
incidentally followed the same track. This noun also shows exactly the same semantic dimension as
suspectus, a fact that can be deduced from the following examples:

Caes.Gal.6.7:

Labienus noctu tribunis militum primisque ordinibus convocatis, quid sui sit consili proponit et, quo
facilius hostibus timoris det suspicitionem, maiore strepitu et tumultu, quam populi Romani fert
consuetudo castra moveri iubet.

'At nightfall Labienus summoned the military tribunes and the senior centurions, and propounded
his plan; and, the more easily to give the enemy a suspicion that he was afraid, he ordered the camp
to be struck with greater noise and disorder than was customary among Romans.' (trans. by
Edwards)

Pl.Ps.562-565:

suspicio est mihi nunc vos suspicarier,
me idcirco haec tanta facinora promittere,
quo vos oblectem, hanc fabulam dum transigam,
neque sim facturus quod facturum dixeram.

'I have a suspicion that you folks suspect me now of promising these mighty deeds just to amuse
you during the course of this play and of not doing what I said I would.' (trans. by Nixon)

In the first excerpt, timoris is the objective genitive of suspicitionem and thus semantically serves as a
target of prediction (← 'suspicion'). The second example represents the same semantic structure by
means of the infinitival clause vos suspicarier. These patterns are in contrast to the default use of suspicio
'mistrustful feeling', e.g.,

Pl.Bac.436:

innocens suspicitionem hanc sustinet causa mea.

---

3° These two different meanings are indirectly reflected in the definition of suspiciosus by Pertsch (1973: 613).
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‘Though innocent, he’s being subjected to this suspicion for my sake.’ (trans. by de Melo)

The semantic overlap between suspectus / *suspikio and *peh2k- *peh2g- (> pango with the nasal infix) may have affected *suspikio and caused it to follow the pattern, that is, nasal infix ↔ long vowel in compounds.\(^{31}\) What we now have is thus suspicio. This process is also favorable for avoiding homonymy with the verb suspicio ‘look up to; admire, esteem’. The lengthening is, therefore, merely of secondary origin,\(^{32}\) though widespread in view of the avoidance of the word (with the — — sequence) in Classical poetry (see in §1), and this fact also speaks to the resistance of *suspikio, which thus survived in the Romance languages (e.g., Fr. soupçon; see Meyer-Lübke 1935: 699, Walde and Hofmann 1965: 570).*

Translations of Latin texts

de Melo, Wolfgang (2011) Plautus: Amphitryon, the Comedy of Asses, the Pot of Gold, the Two Bacchides, the Captives. Cambridge, MA / London: Harvard University Press.


---

\(^{31}\) As for such ‘analogical transference of length,’ see hörhallsdóttir (2007: 335-339), who suggests a similar process for the retention of the dat.sg. in -i in Old Norse (< *-*; the length is secondary) and presents other parallels.

A classic case is the Sanskrit ninth class of verbs, where the strong stem shows -ni- (< *-ne-H; e.g., 1.sg.act. grbh-ni-mi ‘seize’) and the weak stem -ni- (< *-ni- < *-n-H-; e.g., 1.pl.act. grbh-ni-mas ‘id.’) unless followed by a vowel. The lengthening of -i- in the weak stem is a copy of length of the strong stem, according to Wackernagel (1957: 20). Though Jamison (1988: 224) is skeptical of this view, Yoshida (2012) strengthens it by showing a possible parallelism in Hititie nasal-infixed presents.

\(^{32}\) Secondary lengthening of vowels in a period after vowel reduction is chronologically not surprising. The sound change *(c)enC- > *(c)enC- (e.g., endo ‘in’ [XII Tab.+] > inda-) historically postdates vowel reduction; e.g., attingō ‘touch’ developed from *attengō, which in turn came about via vowel reduction from *ad-tangō (see Leumann 1977: 83 and Nishimura 2010: 245-251). It is certain that the lengthening in quintus ‘fifth’ (< *-tink- > *-tink-; see Leumann 1977: 113 and Allen 1978: 66-67) followed *(c)enC- > *(c)enC- . Therefore, vowel lengthening in a post-reduction period is entirely plausible.

* The production of this paper was supported in part by the Grant-in-Aid for Research Activity Startup of the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (23820025). I owe a debt of gratitude to A. Catt, R. Kim, W. Knobl, M. Majer, T. Minamimoto, and G. hörhallsdóttir for their useful comments and suggestions. Special thanks are extended to M. Miyasaka for her cooperation in collecting Latin data. Naturally, all remaining errors are my own.
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ラテン語 suspiciōにおける音韻上の謎：
suspectusによる企みか

西村周浩

キーワード： 延長階梯、複合語、Lachmannの法則、鼻音折中辞

要旨
本論の目標は、ラテン語の複合語 suspiciō「疑い」がどのようにして語根部分に長母音をもつにいたったか、その歴史的なプロセスを明らかにすることである。印欧語の延長階梯に出発点を求めることはできない。同様の現象を示すほかの複合語を観察すると、主要部として用いられている動詞語根は、過去分詞を形成する際、ラテン語においては Lachmann の法則により母音が延長される。これが複合語に見られる長母音の起源と考えられる。さらに、長母音の出現は、現在語幹において鼻音折中辞を伴う語幹である場合がある。こうしたことが間接的要因として、suspiciōに関連する語である suspectus「疑わしい」の形態・意味における再解釈と相俟って、suspiciōに長母音をもたらしたと考えられる。

（にしむら・かねひろ 京都大学）