On the Phonological Mystery in Latin *suspīciō*:
A Trick of *suspectus*?

Kanehiro Nishimura

nishimura.kanehiro.6e@kyoto-u.ac.jp

Abstract

The goal of this paper is to lay out a historical scenario as to how the Latin compound *suspīciō* 'suspicion' came to have a long vowel *-ī-* 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 *suspīciō* following a morpho-semantic modulation in the related form *suspectus* 'viewed with mistrust'.

1. The long vowel in the root of the composite *suspīciō* '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: **suspíciónem** máximám sum vísa sústinére. (ia^7)
Pl.*Ps*.562: **suspíció** est mihi núnc vos súspicáriér (ia^6)
Ter.*Eu*.436: immo áuge mágĭs **suspíciónem**. — quór? — rogás? (ia^6)
Ter.*An*.501: renúntiátumst; nám qui istáec tibi íncidít **suspíció**? (ia^8)

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., − ˇ): e.g.,

Pl.*Bac*.436: ínnocéns **suspíciónem** hanc sústinét causá meá (tr^7)
Ter.*An*.317: ábin hinc ín malám rem cúm **suspícióne** istác, scelús? (tr^7)

Further, the lack of attestation of *suspīciō* in works in hexameter also indicates the length in an indirect manner, as the sequence − ˇ − after the prefix does not fit with this metrical scheme.

Meiser (1998: 69) posits **sub-spēciō* as a preceding stage (subject to the sound change **ē > ī* like *subtīlis* 'fine in texture' [cf. *tēla* 'woven stuff'] triggered by the *i*-vocalism in the following syllable), by which he seems to suggest the lengthened grade of the root **spek̑-*. On the other hand, Vine (1993: 99)

---

remarks that "an old *spēk- (beside the *spek- of speciō etc.) is difficult to justify".[2] 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 vṛddhi 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. πατήρ 'father' (*-ter-), ποιμήν 'shepherd' (*-men-), κῆρ 'heart' (*ḱerd-).

■ Following one of the acrostatic 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):[3] e.g., Gk. ἧπαρ 'liver' (< *Hi̯ēkʷ-ṛ ~ *Hi̯ék ʷ-(n-) as in Ved. yákṛt- / Lat. iecur); Hitt. e-eš-ḫar / Gk.ἧαρ [Hsch.] 'blood' (< *h₁ésh₂-ṛ); Gk. γῆρας 'old age' (< *ĝérh₂-s) / γέρας 'gift of honor' (← *ĝérh₂-s-). The (endingless) locative singular can also be a locus of the lengthened grade: e.g., Av. dąm (< *dḗm; cf. *dom- ~ *dem- 'house', which exemplifies the other acrostatic type [*-o- ~ *-e-]).

■ The so-called Narten present also displays the lengthened grade in its acrostatic ablaut pattern (see Narten 1968, Tichy 2004: 107-108, and Fortson 2010: 96): e.g., Ved. inj. stáut 'praise' (< *stḗu̯- [~ *stéu̯-]). The lengthened-grade perfects in Latin such as lēgī (← legō 'collect') and ēgī (< *h₂ēĝ- ← 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. áprāṭ (< *(h₁)é-prēḱ-s-t; pres. pṛcchāti 'ask'), Lat. vēxī (< *u̯ēĝʰ-s-; pres. vehō 'carry'), rēxī (< *h₃rēĝ-s-; pres. regō 'direct'). This type, the one before, and the *-ē-/*-e- acrostatic pattern may have backed up some "Narten root nouns" (cf. Nussbaum 1986: 203 n. 17 and Weiss 2009: 260): e.g., Lat. rēx / OIr. rí 'king' (< *h₃rēĝ- [agent noun] ← *h₃reĝ- 'extend'; cf. *h₃rēĝ-ṛ/n- [abstract noun] in GAv. rāzar/n- 'rule' / Ved. rā́jáni 'under the rule [?]'); Lat. lēx 'law' (< *lēĝ- 'collection' ← *leĝ- 'collect').[4]

■ Thematization to derive genitival or possessive adjectives (substantivized in some cases) may occasionally trigger vṛddhi (see Nussbaum 1986: 30, 111-118, 134): e.g., *ḱér-h₂ 'head-bone (material)' → adj. *ḱēr-h₂-ó- 'made of this material' > subst. *ḱēr-h₂-o- 'object made of head-bone, skull' = Av. sāra- 'head'; Ved. párśu- / Av. parəsu- 'rib' → Ved. pārśv-á- (neut.) 'side' (← 'of the rib(s)'). Cf. Fortson (2010:130), who refers to Gk. βιός 'bow' < *gʷih₂-ó- '(thing) having a bowstring' [no vṛddhi] (← *gʷi̯eh₂- 'bowstring' > Ved. jyā́) and Ved. devá- 'god', Av. daēuua- 'demon' < *dei̯u-ó- 'one belonging to the sky' [vṛddhi in the wrong place] (← *di̯u-, Ø-grade of *di̯eu-). Vṛddhi may also be

---

[2] An objection to the change *-ē- > -ī- alleged for suspīciō can be found in Vine (1993: 98-104). According to him, this change only occurs when an -l- lies between *-ē- and a following -i-.
[3] The length in Lat. ēbrius 'drunk' can also be associated with this acrostatic type: *h₁ég ʷʰ-ṛ + *-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., lēgāre 'send as an envoy' [XII Tab.+], lēgerupa 'law-breaker'), so that the long vowel is thought to have emerged in a rather earlier period. See also footnote 19.

applied to forms which are already thematized: e.g., Skt. *śvāśura-* 'relating to one's father-in-law' / OHG *swāgur* 'father-in-law's one = brother-in-law' < **su̯ēḱuró-* (← **su̯éḱuro-* 'father-in-law' > Ved. *śvásura-*; see, e.g., Szemerényi 1999: 113, 115, Ringe 2006: 14, and Fortson 2010: 130); Toch. A *śaru* / B *śerwe* 'hunter' < **ḱḗru̯o-* 'he of the stag' (← **ḱéru̯o-* 'stag' > Lat. *cervus*; see Nussbaum 1986: 8).

■ Some *i*-stem genitival adjectives derived from *o*-stem substantives also show *vṛddhi*, in which lengthening is often based on the vocalism after *einzelsprachlich* sound developments. This pattern is particularly common in Indo-Iranian: e.g., Ved. *purukútsa-* → *páurukutsi-* [patronymic], *aruṇá-* → *āruṇi-* (ŚB) [patronymic], Av. *ahura-* 'lord' → *āhūiri-* 'belonging to Ahura Mazdā', *mazdaiiasna-* 'one who sacrifices to Ahura Mazdā' → *māzdaiiasni-* '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 *vṛddhi* appears,[5] we can consider whether the *-ī-* in *suspīciō* reflects such a phenomenon. First, there is no Narten character in the verbal root **speḱ-* to directly engender **spēḱ-* in its derivatives. Even for the "Narten root nouns" such as *rēx* 'king' and *lēx* 'law', when the same roots are suffixed by **-ion-* as with *suspīciō*, the resulting derivatives are *rĕgiō* 'district' and *lĕgiō* 'large military force' with a short vowel at least in Latin. Nor do the other morphological categories / formations listed above match the situation of *suspīciō*. Another possible factor may be that *suspīciō* is a compound and the verbal root appears in the second member. It is true that Greek has some apparent parallels to *suspīciō*, where the initial vowel of the second member is long and could be regarded as having lengthened grade:[6] e.g., ὑψ-ηρεφής (= ὑψ-ερεφής) 'high-roofed' / ὑπ-ώροφος 'under the roof' (cf. ἐρέφω; *LIV* 2001: 496-497, s.v. **(h₁)rebʰ-* 'überdecken');[7] εὐ-ήνεμος 'well as to the winds' (cf. ἄνεμος 'wind' < **h₂enh₁-mo-*);[8] εὐ-ώδης 'sweet-smelling' (cf. ὄζω; *LIV* 2001: 296, s.v. **h₃ed-* 'zu riechen beginnen'); ὑπερ-ηνορέων 'exceedingly manly', Ἀγ-ήνωρ [personal name ← 'man-leader'] (cf. ἀνήρ 'man' < **h₂ner-*); στρατ-ηγός 'commander of an army' (cf. ἀγός 'leader', ἄγω 'lead'; *LIV* 2001: 255-256, s.v. **h₂eǵ-* '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 $[...e/o-]_{1st\ member} + [He/o...]_{2nd\ member}$ with vowel contraction (cf. Lejeune 1955: 293 n. 1) following intervocalic laryngeal loss or $[...e/o-]_{1st\ member} + [HC...]_{2nd\ member}$ 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 *suspīciō*, on the other hand, does not contain an initial laryngeal if it is **speḱ-* — 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 (-ερεφ-, -ηρεφ-, -ώροφ-), cf. Chantraine (2009: 352).

[8] Compounds without lengthening (i.e., -ανεμο-) also exist. On the other hand, there are derivative adjectives such as ἠνεμόεις (Dor. ἀνεμόεις) 'windy' with metrical lengthening. See Chantraine (2009: 82).

[9] Chantraine (2009: 16) suggests influence from ἡγέομαι of the similar meaning ('go before, lead the way'; cf. *LIV* 2001: 520, s.v. **seh₂ǵ/g-*).

Further, "downgrading" of the root vowel, alongside the retention of the full grade (cf. *obsidium* 'siege' [Pl.+] < *-sed-*; *sacrilegus* 'guilty of any impious act' [Pl.+] < *leĝ-*), seems to be much more common in compounds:[10] e.g., Lat. *condiciō* 'contract' (< *-dik̂-*; cf. *dīcō* 'to talk' < *deik̂-*); Lat. *coniugium* 'marriage' (< *-iug-*; cf. *iūgerum* [a measure of land; Cato+] < *ieug-*); Lat. *prīvī-gnus* 'stepson' / Gk. νεογνός 'new-born' (< *-ĝnh₁-o-*); Gk. ὑγιής 'sound, healthy' (< *h₁su-gʷih₃-és*); Gk. στεροπή 'flash of lightning' (< *h₂ster-h₃kʷ-éh₂*); Gk. μολο-βρός 'greedy fellow' / Ved. *tuvi-grá-* 'devouring much' (< *-gʷrh₃-o-*); Gk. ἴγκρος (· ἐγκέφαλος) 'brain' [Hsch.] (< *en-k̂r-(h₂)-o-* '[residing / belonging] in the head'); Gk. νήνεμος 'without wind' (< *n̥-h₂nh₁-mo-*); Ved. *ánupatha-* 'going along the path' (< *-pn̥t-h₂-o-*; cf. *pánthāḥ* < *pent-oh₂-s*). In view of this productive pattern, a PIE lengthened grade is hardly tenable for compounds like *suspīciō* (thus, not *-spēk̂-*), 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 *-ī-* in *suspīciō*.

3.1. Rix (1992: 39) regards the compound *ambāgēs* (f.pl.) 'long-winded speech, circumlocution' [Pl.+] as reflecting "Dehnstufe" in contrast to *ăgō* 'drive'. See also *indāgō* 'ring of huntsmen (etc.) to prevent the escape of game' [Verg.+] (cf. *indāgātor* '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 *h₂eĝ-* at face value, a lengthened grade *h₂ēĝ-* would not procure the desired *-ā-*, following the standard version of the Laryngeal Theory (Eichner's Law, in particular).[11]

Regarding *-āg-* (~ *ag-* < *h₂eĝ-*) in *ambāgēs*, *indāgō*, 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 *agō* is *āctum*, whose *ā-* is accounted for via Lachmann's Law. See also *āctiō* 'performance' (< *ag-tiō*). Such a long vowel may thus have been extended by analogy to other related forms such as *ambāgēs*, *indāgō*, and *coāgulum*.[13] The fact that these forms are all compounds probably strengthened the analogy between them. When *āctum* was prefixed, the length in the root vowel enabled the form to resist vowel reduction (otherwise, **-ăktom* > **-ectum*; cf. *kom-păktom* > *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-agō* > *sub-igō* '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 *-ā-* is of lengthened-grade origin could only be brought into question based on the different root reconstruction *h₁aĝ-* (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 *ā* (lengthened grade).

[12] Cf. Hamp (1988: 196-197), which is based on a now obsolete treatment of laryngeals (*-oh₂o-* > *-ā.a-*) for such forms.

[13] While de Vaan (2008: 31) suggests that the long *-ā-* in *ambāgēs* and *indāgō* as well as *coāgulum* is analogical to that in *contāgēs* and *propāgēs*, he circularly writes that the long *-ā-* in *contāgēs* (etc.) may be analogical to forms such as *ambāgēs* and *indāgō* (2008: 606-607).

[14] Another nominal compound *exāmen* 'swarm' [Pl.+] (< *eks-ag-s-men*; see Leumann 1977: 114) with *-ā-* in an open syllable perhaps also played a role in the extension of *-ā-*. Discussion of this issue will be resumed in footnote 20.

3.2. Such an alternation *a ~ ā* may be paralleled by some other compounds. There are well-known cases which contain the phonological configuration *-Cāg-* (similar to the above *-āg-*), such as *contāgiō* 'contact' [Cato+] (cf. *contāgēs* 'contact' [Lucr.] and *contāgium* 'id.' [Lucr.+]) and *propāgēs* 'that which continues (a stock)' [Pac.; P. F] (cf. *prŏpāgō* [tr.] 'reproduce [a plant] by layers; cause to continue' [Cato, Pac.+] and *prŏpāgō* [f.] 'space for planting' [Cato+]). The related present forms of these are *tangō* 'touch' and *pangō* 'fix, arrange', respectively, and if one follows the root shape provided by the *LIV* for *tangō* and *pangō*, that is, **teh₂ĝ/g-* and **peh₂ĝ-* (see also Vine 2002: 345 for the latter; cf. **paĝ-* in Watkins 2000: 61), he would claim that the long vowel in *contāgiō* and *propāgēs* 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 *dīcō* 'to talk' (< **deiĥ-*, *e*-grade) vs. *condiciō* 'contract' (< **-diĥ-*, Ø-grade), as cited above, we need to examine the issue of ablaut more carefully. Moreover, Oscan **prupukid** 'by previous agreement (?)' (< **prō-pakiịo-*; see Buck 1928: 56-57 and Weiss 1993: 39)[16] 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 *-ā-* (< **-eh₂-*) is excluded. The root of this form is identified with that of Latin *pāx* 'pact, peace', that is, **peh₂ĥ-*, according to the *LIV* (2001: 461-462); see also de Vaan (2008: 452); cf. **paĥ-* in Watkins (2000: 61). This root is known as a variant of the root **peh₂ĝ-* (cf. *pangō*).[17] Thus, the possible realization of the Ø-grade of the related root in a nominal compound (i.e., **-ph₂ĥ-*) would be significant in considering *propāgēs* and further *contāgiō*.

If the Ø-grade in the root is the starting point for *contāgiō* and *propāgēs*, the emergence of the long vowels can be explained as a byproduct of Lachmann's Law; the past participles *tāctum / pāctum* for *tangō / pangō* may have been the source of the length (thus, e.g., **-ph₂ĝ-* > **-pag-* → *-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-tāgiō / 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 *vṛddhi*-looking formation.[19] These two things can also be found side-by-side in *-frāctum* (← *frangō* 'break'; *LIV* 2001: 91-92, s.v. **bʰreĝ/g-* 'brechen [intr.]') ~ *suf-frāgium* '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 **-ō-* (< **-oh₂-*), but this view is considered less likely by Weiss (1993: 36-39).

[17] See Ernout and Meillet (1985: 473) and Lamberterie (1996: 135-136). This type of alternation [±voice] in the root final dorsal is occasionally noted in the *LIV* (2001): e.g., *?*bʰelk- ~ *bʰelĝʰ-*, **Hmelk- ~ *h₂melĝ-* (?), *?*h₁ek/k- ~ *h₁eĝ/gH-*, **meiĥ- ~ *meiĝ/ĝ-*, **peiĥ- ~ *peig-*, **peuĥ- ~ *peug/ĝ-*, **pleh₂k- ~ *pleh₂g-*, **(h₂)rek- ~ *reĝʰ-*, **seuĥ- ~ *seug-*, **sleuk- ~ *(s)leug-*, **tụenk- ~ *tụenĝʰ-* (?), *?*ụelk- ~ ?*ụelg-* (2).

[18] Cf. Lamberterie (1996: 144) for a less direct process to reach *pag-*.

[19] The correspondence between p.p. *lēctum* (← *legō* 'collect'; *LIV* 2001: 397, s.v. **leĝ-* 'sammeln') ~ *collēga* 'colleague', *collēgium* 'guild, society' [Pl.+] looks similar to the cases discussed above. But the presence of the root noun *lēx* (a "Narten root noun"; see §2) may be a likelier origin of the long *-ē-* in such compounds (see footnote 4). Vowel lengthening in simplex nouns *tēgula* 'roof-tile' (cf. *tēctum* 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 *contāgiō*, another nominal compound **contāmen* (< **kom-tag-s-men*; see Weiss 1994b:

4. We have confirmed the connection between verbs related to Lachmann's Law and nominal compounds with *vṛddhi* vowels. Viewing the above examples from a different angle, we see another connection emerging. The verbs discussed in §3.2, *tangō*, *pangō*, and *frangō*, 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. *suspīciō* is one such candidate.[21]

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

In this state of affairs, it may be better to seek a reason why *suspīciō* is so extremely isolated (cf. *auspĭcium* 'auspices' [Pl.+]). 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 *suspīciō* consists of **subs-* and **speḱ-*, one would identify the same combination of elements in the prefixed verb *suspīciō* [Enn.(?),[22] 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 -ūs* 'high regard' [Ov.+]) that is normally not associated with

---

139), supposed as the basis of the verb *contāminō* 'pollute' [Ter.+], might also have exercised some influence. Recall *exāmen* with reference to *ambāgēs*, *indāgō*, and *coāgulum*, 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., **eks-ag-s-men* > **eks-āksmen*; cf. Leumann 1977: 114, 208). If so, these forms can align with *-āctum* and *-tāctum* as corroborating factors to *ambāgēs*, *contāgiō*, etc. (2) On the other hand, simple compensatory lengthening may also be workable (i.e., **eks-ag-s-men* > **eks-agzmen* > *exāmen*; cf. Weiss 2009: 178). If this is the case, *exāmen* and **contāmen* only have limited significance for the spreading of *-ā-*, in view of the fact that *propāgēs* and *suffrāgium* have no such forms or similar ones as far as we know. Note, in passing, that one more intermediate stage between **eks-agzmen* and *exāmen* would have been **eks-āzmen*. The consonant before *-z-N-* disappeared earlier than *-z-*. Cf. *CIL* I² 549 LOSNA (< **louksnā-*) and 25 TRIRESMOS (< **-retsmo-*). It appears that at this stage the vowel before *-z-N-* was already lengthened. *CIL* I² 25 that contains TRIRESMOS, traced back to the original around the mid third century BCE, also includes CAPTVM (~ CAPTOM), CARTACINIENSIS (< **-gon-*), [MA]XIMOS / [MAX]VMAS (< **maksomo-*), which resulted via vowel reduction. If one assumes that **eks-agzmen* changed into **eks-āzmen* (spelled as -ASM-, if attested) without compensatory lengthening, this form must also have undergone vowel reduction, ending up as ***eks-ezmen* (> ***exēmen*). (3) Further, as a third option, one can conjecture that **eks-agzmen* became **eks-āgzmen* before consonant cluster simplification on the model of *-āctum*. If so, *exāmen* and also **contāmen* can be regarded as pointing to secondary extension of the vowel length from *-āctum* and *-pāctum*, respectively, like *ambāgēs*, *contāgiō*, etc.

Here I adopted the reconstructions with *-s-* for *exāmen* and **contāmen* (cf. IOVXMENTA in *CIL* I² 1). The existence of *ag-men* 'stream; crowd' perhaps leads us to the *s*-less reconstruction **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, *ammentum* ~ *āmentum* 'thong attached to a spear' might continue **ag-mento-* (?) (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 *convīcium* 'angry noise; insulting talk' [Pl.+] (Nishimura 2011), an updated discussion of which is underway.

[22] Cf. *suspexit* suggested by Vahlen (1928: 28) in Enn.*Ann.*145Sk, but Skutsch (1985: 301) retains the MSS reading *prospexit*.

the nominal compound *suspīciō*. The verb that has more of negative sense, whatever the semantic details, is the deponent *suspicor* (p.p. *suspicātus*) 'guess; suspect, have an inkling of (something wrong)' [Pl.+].[23] On the other hand, the past participle of *suspīciō*, namely, *suspectus* [Pl.+], is used with negative meanings such as 'viewed with mistrust' and '(regarded as) of doubtful character' as imagined from *suspīciō*. This semantic difference between *suspīciō* and *suspectus* may be a starting point for morphological reconsiderations of these forms and further *suspīciō*. Note that the finite forms of the verb *suspīciō* 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)spīkiō* 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)' [← *sub-*; cf. *sublīnō* '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 praecipuo 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. *conspiciō* and *conspicor*, semantically akin to each other ('catch sight of').
[24] Cf. Vine (2002: 334), where *mīrus* '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,   35
> 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.   65

> '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   50
> **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 ἀπο 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 **spek̂*- '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 —

Liv.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 Amphion] *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 *suspecti* 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), *obtrectationem* 'captious criticism' (28.43.2), *nihil hostile* 'nothing hostile, no attack' (30.6.3), and *aditūs* '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,   395
maxume volo doque operam ut clam eveniat partus patrem,
atque adeo omnes: sed si fieri id non potest quin sentiant,
dicam abortum esse: scio nemini aliter **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)

Ter.*Hec*.577-578:

Non clam me est, nate mi, tibi me esse **suspectam** uxorem tuam
propter m⟨eo⟩s mores hinc abisse, etsi ea dissimulas sedulo.

---

[27] Some of the glosses are based on the translations by Foster and Moore.

'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' ~ *byōki-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)spīkiō* 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 *pacīscor / pacīscō* 'make a settlement / arrangement' [Pl.+] (← **peh₂k̂-*). 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-pecīscor*[28] 'agree' [Ter.+] (that is, the root vowel was not qualified for Lachmann's Law due to the root final voiceless stop *-c-*). *sus-pectus* would thus have been interpreted as continuing **su(b)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 (**peh₂k̂-*) is a variant of **peh₂ĝ-*, whose voiced consonant **-ĝ-* in the root

---

[28] The *e*-vocalism in the root is accounted for via vowel-harmonic effect caused by the *-ē-* in the preceding syllable. See Nishimura (2010: 227, 241-242 n. 62).

[29] With regard to the phonological change in the prefix, cf. *sus-pendō* '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 *suspĭkiō* (cf. also Osc. **prupukid** < *prō-pakiio-* via vowel reduction in the second syllable in the labial context; see §3.2). As the etymologically related form *suspectus* was secondarily associated with $*peh_2\hat{k}$- and further $*peh_2\hat{g}$- on the semantic basis, *suspĭkiō* 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 **suspicionem**, 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.   565

'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 *suspicionem* 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 *suspīciō* 'mistrustful feeling';[30] e.g.,

Pl.*Bac*.436:

innocens **suspicionem** hanc sustinet causa mea.

---

[30] These two different meanings are indirectly reflected in the definition of *suspīciōsus* by Pertsch (1973: 613).

'Though innocent, he's being subjected to this suspicion for my sake.' (trans. by de Melo)

The semantic overlap between *suspectus* / **suspĭkiō* and **peh₂k̂-* ~ **peh₂ĝ-* (> *pangō* with the nasal infix) may have affected **suspĭkiō* and caused it to follow the pattern, that is, nasal infix ↔ long vowel in compounds.[31] What we now have is thus *suspīciō*. This process is also favorable for avoiding homonymy with the verb *suspiciō* '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 **suspĭkiō*, 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.

Brown, Peter (2006) *Terence: The comedies*. Oxford / New York: Oxford University Press.

Edwards, H. J. (1917) *Caesar: The Gallic War*. Cambridge, MA / London: Harvard University Press.

Fairclough, H. Rushton (1929) *Horace: Satires, Epistles and Ars Poetica*. Rev. ed. Cambridge, MA / London: Harvard University Press.

Foster, B. O. (1919) *Livy: History of Rome, books I-II*. Cambridge, MA / London: Harvard University Press.

Foster, B. O. (1922) *Livy: History of Rome, books III-IV*. Cambridge, MA / London: Harvard University Press.

Greenough, J. B. (1900) *Bucolics, Aeneid, and Georgics of Vergil*. Boston: Ginn & Co.

Moore, Frank Gardner (1940) *Livy: History of Rome, books XXIII-XXV*. Cambridge, MA / London: Harvard University Press.

Moore, Frank Gardner (1949) *Livy: History of Rome, books XXVIII-XXX*. Cambridge, MA / London: Harvard University Press.

Nixon, Paul (1932) *Plautus: The Little Carthaginian, Pseudolus, the Rope*. London: William Heinemann / New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

---

[31] As for such 'analogical transference of length,' see Þórhallsdóttir (2007: 335-339), who suggests a similar process for the retention of the dat.sg. in *-u* in Old Norse (< **-ū*; the length is secondary) and presents other parallels.

A classic case is the Sanskrit ninth class of verbs, where the strong stem shows *-nā-* (< **-ne-H-*; e.g., 1.sg.act. *gr̥bh-nā-mi* 'seize') and the weak stem *-nī-* (← **-ni-* < **-n-H-/__C*; e.g., 1.pl.act. *gr̥bh-nī-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 Hittite nasal-infixed presents.

[32] Secondary lengthening of vowels in a period after vowel reduction is chronologically not surprising. The sound change **(-)enC-* > **(-)inC-* (e.g., *endo* 'in' [XII Tab.+] > *indu-*) 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 *quīntus* 'fifth' (< **kʷinkʷto-* < **kʷenkʷto-* < **penkʷto-*; see Leumann 1977: 113 and Allen 1978: 66-67) followed **(-)enC-* > **(-)inC-*. Therefore, vowel lengthening in a post-reduction period is entirely plausible.

Shackleton Bailey, D. R. (1999) *Cicero: Letters to Atticus*. 3rd vol. Cambridge, MA / London: Harvard University Press.

Shackleton Bailey, D. R. (2009) *Cicero: Philippics 7-14*. Rev. by John T. Ramsey and Gesine Manuwald. Cambridge, MA / London: Harvard University Press.

Williams, Theodore C. (1910) *Vergil: Aeneid*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

References

Allen, W. Sidney (1978) *Vox Latina: The pronunciation of Classical Latin*. Second edition. Cambridge / New York / Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Bader, Françoise (1962) *La formation des composés nominaux du latin*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Bammesberger, Alfred, ed. (1988) *Die Laryngaltheorie und die Rekonstruktion des indogermanischen Laut- und Formensystems*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.

Beekes, Robert S. P. (2010) *Etymological dictionary of Greek*. 2 vols. Leiden / Boston: Brill.

Buck, Carl Darling (1928) *A grammar of Oscan and Umbrian*. Second edition. Boston: Ginn & Company. (Reprint, Hildesheim / Zurich / New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 1995)

Chantraine, Pierre (2009) *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: Histoire des mots*. New edition. Paris: Librairie Klincksieck.

CIL = Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum (1862-). Berlin: Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences and Humanities.

Clackson, James (2007) *Indo-European linguistics: An introduction*. Cambridge / New York: Cambridge University Press.

de Vaan, Michiel (2008) *Etymological dictionary of Latin and the other Italic languages*. Leiden / Boston: Brill.

Ernout, Alfred and Antoine Meillet (1985) *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine: histoire des mots*. Fourth edition, revised and enlarged. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck.

Fortson, Benjamin W., IV (2010) *Indo-European language and culture: An introdution*. Second edition. Malden / Oxford / Chichester: Willey-Blackwell.

Frisk, Hjalmar (1938) Über lat. *ācer*, gr. ἄκρος. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 56: 113-114.

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

Hamp, Eric P. (1988) Lengthened *ā* in Latin compounds. In: Bammesberger, ed., 195-197.

Jamison, Stephanie W. (1988) The quantity of the outcome of vocalized laryngeals in Indic. In: Bammesberger, ed., 213-226.

Lamberterie, Charles de (1996) Latin *pignus* et le théorie glottalique. In: Hannah Rosén (ed.) *Aspects of Latin: Papers from the seventh International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics, Jerusalem, April 1993*, 135-152. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

Lejeune, Michel (1955) *Traité de phonétique grecque*. Second edition. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck.

Leumann, Manu (1977) *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*. New edition. Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.

LIV = Rix, Helmut, ed. (2001) *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*. Second edition. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.

Lodge, Gonzalez (1962) *Lexicon Plavtinvm*. 2 vols. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagbuchhandlung.

Mayer, Roland, ed. (1994) *Horace: Epistles, Book I*. Cambridge / New York / Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Meiser, Gerhard (1998) *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Meyer-Lübke, W. (1935) *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Third edition. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.

Narten, Johanna (1968) Zum "proterodynamischen" Wurzelpräsens. In: J. C. Heesterman, G. H. Schokker, and V. I. Subramoniam (eds.) *Pratidānam: Indian, Iranian and Indo-European studies presented to Franciscus Bernardus Jacobus Kuiper on his sixtieth birthday*, 9-19. The Hague / Paris: Mouton.

Nishimura, Kanehiro (2010) Patterns of vowel reduction in Latin: Phonetics and phonology. *Historische Sprachforschung* 123: 217-257.

Nishimura, Kanehiro (2011) Vr̥ddhi-like vowels in nominal forms in Latin. Paper presented at the 23rd Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference, October 28-29, UCLA.

Nishimura, Kanehiro (2012) Vowel reduction and deletion in Sabellic: A synchronic and diachronic interface. In: Benedicte Nielsen Whitehead, et al. (eds.) *The Sound of Indo-European: Phonetics, phonemics, and morphophonemics*, 381-398. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press / University of Copenhagen.

Nussbaum, Alan J. (1986) *Head and horn in Indo-European*. Berlin / New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Nussbaum, Alan J. (2009) So how's the little woman? Genitivals, diminutives, and PIE $*g^w énh_2$ etc. Paper presented at the GSAS Workshop on Indo-European Linguistics, April 3, Harvard University.

OLD = Glare, P. G. W., ed. (1996) *Oxford Latin dictionary*. Corrected edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Pertsch, Erich (1973) *Langenscheidt Handwörterbuch Lateinisch – Deutsch*. Berlin / Munich / Vienna / Zurich / New York: Langenscheidt.

Rau, Jeremy (2009) *Indo-European nominal morphology: The decads and the Caland system*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck

Ringe, Don (2006) *From Proto-Indo-European to Proto-Germanic*. Oxford / New York: Oxford University Press.

Rix, Helmut (1992) *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen: Laut- und Formenlehre*. Second edition. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Schindler, Jochem (1975a) L'apophonie des thèmes indo-européens en *-r/n*. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 70: 1-10.

Schindler, Jochem (1975b) Zum Ablaut der neutralen *s*-Stämme des Indogermanischen. In: Helmut Rix (ed.) *Flexion und Wortbildung: Akten der V. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Regensburg, 9. — 14. September 1973*, 259-267. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.

Schindler, Jochem (1980) Zur Herkunft der altindischen *cvi*-Bildungen. In: Manfred Mayrhofer, Martin Peters, and Oskar E. Pfeiffer (eds.) *Lautgeschichte und Etymologie: Akten der VI. Fachtagung der*

Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Wien, 24.-29. September 1978, 386-393. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.

Skutsch, Otto, ed. (1985) *The* Annales *of Q. Ennius*. Oxford: Clarendon Press / New York: Oxford University Press.

Szemerényi, Oswald J. L. (1999) *Introduction to Indo-European Linguistics*. Translation with additional notes and references. Oxford / New York: Oxford University Press.

Þórhallsdóttir, Guðrún (2007) The dative singular of *ō*-stems in Old Norse. In: Alan J. Nussbaum (ed.) *Verba Docenti: Studies in historical and Indo-European linguistics presented to Jay H. Jasanoff by students, colleagues, and friends*, 329-341. Ann Arbor / New York: Beech Stave Press.

Tichy, Eva (2004) *Indogermanistisches Grundwissen*. Second edition. Bremen: Hempen Verlag.

Vaahtera, Jyri (1993) The origin of Latin *suffrāgium*. *Glotta* 71: 66-80.

Vahlen, Ioannes (1928) *Ennianae poesis reliquiae*. Iteratis curis. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.

Vine, Brent (1993) *Studies in Archaic Latin inscriptions*. Innsbruck: Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

Vine, Brent (2002) On full-grade **-ro*-formations in Greek and Indo-European. In: Mark R. V. Southern (ed.) *Indo-European perspectives*, 329-350. Washington D. C.: Institute for the Study of Man Inc.

Wackernagel, Jakob (1957) *Altindische Grammatik: I. Lautlehre*. Second unchanged edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Wagner, Wilhelm (1979) *T. Macci Plauti Aulularia: With notes critical and exegetical and an introduction*. New York: Arno Press.

Walde, A. and J. B. Hofmann (1965) *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 3 vols. Fifth edition. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.

Watkins, Calvert, ed. (2000) *The American Heritage dictionary of Indo-European roots*. Second edition. Boston / New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Weiss, Michael (1993) Studies in Italic nominal morphology. Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University.

Weiss, Michael (1994a) On the non-verbal origin of the Greek verb νήφειν 'to be sober'. *Historische Sprachforschung* 107: 91-98.

Weiss, Michael (1994b) Life everlasting: Latin *iūgis* "everflowing", Greek ὑγιής "healthy", Gothic *ajukdūþ* "eternity" and Avestan *yauuaējī*- "living forever". *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 55: 131-156.

Weiss, Michael (2009) *Outline of the historical and comparative grammar of Latin*. Ann Arbor / New York: Beech Stave Press.

Yoshida, Kazuhiko (2012) Wackernagel strikes back: The weak suffix *-nī*- in Sanskrit ninth class presents. Paper presented at the Indo-European Roundtable, August 17, Department of Linguistics, Kyoto University.

ラテン語 *suspīciō* 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 *suspīciō*「疑い」がどのようにして語根部分に長母音 *-ī-* 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。印欧祖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根である場合がある。こうしたことが間接的要因として、*suspīciō* 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、*suspīciō* 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）