Brent Vine
Dept. of Classics / Program in IE Studies, UCLA
vine@humnet.ucla.edu

Studies in Latin Etymology and Phonology, Session 1

"Some Latin *ƒ*-Words (and some *qu*-words, *g*-words, etc.): Initial-syllable Syncope and the Prehistory of Italic Accent"

OVERVIEW: A. Introductory: PIE and Italic accent
                      B. An etymological mystery: Lat. *focus* 'hearth'
                      C. A similar problem (but with a good solution): Lat. *crās* (Fal. *cra*) 'tomorrow'
                      D. Initial-syllable syncope in Late Latin and elsewhere
                      E. Possible Classical and prehistoric Lat. instances already in the literature
                      F. Application to Lat. *focus*
                      G. Additional possible instances
                      H. On the chronology of initial-syllable syncope in Latin
                      I. Preliminary notes on exceptions
                      J. Conclusions and implications for the prehistory of Italic accent

A. Introductory: PIE and Italic accent

PIE accent

1   PIE was a "mobile pitch-accent" language: all accented words (vs. enclitic particles and pronouns) had distinctive high pitch on a single syllable
[Fortson 2010:68 for PIE; see Hyman 2009 on the typology of so-called "pitch-accent" systems]

2   some accented zero grades exist (Rasmussen 1997); but in general, accented syllables tended to have "stronger" allomorphs (i.e. with full-grade or lengthened-grade vocalism) than unaccented syllables

preservation in the daughter languages

3   more or less direct preservation in Vedic Sanskrit and (Ancient) Greek; partial or indirect preservation in other branches (e.g. Anatolian, Balto-Slavic, Germanic)

4   especially useful comparandum here: preservation of PIE mobile accent in Proto-Germanic, but visible only indirectly on the basis of the segmental voicing alternations defined by Verner's Law

Italic accent: the "handbook" view

5   the traditional assumption: PIE mobile accent was lost without a trace in Italic; the oldest recoverable system is an initial-stress accent, demonstrable for the pre-stages of all Italic languages (cf. medial syncope and vowel reduction, alliterative poetics)
[e.g. Sommer-Pfister 1977:73, Sihler 1995:239, Meiser 1998:53, Baldi 2002:269, Weiss 2009:109, Fortson 2010:278, 284; discussion and earlier references: Nishimura 2008, cf. also 2010a, 2010b, 2011a, 2012 and Sen 2012 on vowel reduction and medial syncope in Latin and Sabellic]

6   the familiar "penultimate stress" system of Classical Latin is a relatively late development (perhaps based on secondary stresses in the older initial-stress system)

new directions in the study of early Italic accent

7   a series of proposals (some more widely accepted than others) for interpreting segmental phenomena in ways that may point to an early period of mobile accent in Italic; thus Italic would be similar in this respect to Germanic (**4**)

8   some examples:
        a double reflex of PIE unaccented vs. accented syllabic resonant + laryngeal (when interconsonantal), i.e. *$C\dot{R}HC$* > Ital. /CrāC/ vs. *$C\dot{R}'HC$* > Ital. /CaRaC/
[Meiser 1998:108f., Weiss 2009:110; not accepted by Leiden scholars, see *EDLIL* passim (s.vv. *palma, calvus,* etc.)]

b apocope of final PIE unaccented short vowels (but final accented vowels remain)

[Rix 1996:158n7 (updating Hirt, see Nishimura 2008:6n14), cf. Meiser 1998:74, Weiss 2009:147n77]

    c medial vowel reduction allegedly related to certain types of PIE unaccented syllables

[Pultrová 2006; contra: Hartmann 2008, cf. Weiss 2009:121n22]

    d verbal *i*-apocope related to PIE main-clause prosody (unaccented verb in SOV)

[Hock 2012, with earlier references]

    e [Vine 2004:622ff., 2006] reanalysis of "Thurneysen-Havet's Law" (PIE **owV́* > Ital. /awV/) in terms of PIE accentual patterns

[cf. *EDLIL* 8f. and passim; recent discussion: Novikova 2012]

    f [Vine 2012] raising of PIE unaccented **e* to Ital. /i/ before **y* (providing solutions to some classic problems of Italic morphology: "*ī*-conjugation", *i*-stem nom. pl. in -*īs*)

9   here: a new proposal of the same type, based on "initial-syllable syncope" (whence possible solutions to various etymological problems)

B. An etymological mystery: Lat. *focus* 'hearth'

10 Lat. *focus* 'hearth, fireplace', dimin. *foculus* (both OLat.+): no clear etymology — the older connection with Arm. *boc^c* 'flame', *bosor* 'blood-red' < ***'fiery' (*WH* s.v., *IEW* 162, etc.; no other comparanda) must be rejected (*EM* s.v., *EDLIL* s.v.)

[unsatisfactory on Lat. *focus* and Arm. *boc^c*: *EDAIL* s.v. *boc^c* (p. 192), both as "substratum words"; cf. Džaukjan 1982:224]

11 more recent attempts (Hamp 1992, Matasović 2010) are also unsatisfactory, for phonological and morphological reasons; but both operate with an attractive basis in PIE **dʰegʷʰ-* 'burn, be warm' (cf. Ved. *dáhati* 'burns', Lat. *fovēre* 'keep warm', etc.)

12 Hamp (1992): *focus* was back-formed from *foculus,* an original instrument noun **dʰgʷʰ-e-tlo-* (: PIE **dʰegʷʰ-* 'burn'); but

    a problematic premise (no evidence that the synchronic diminutive *foculus* is in any way basic)

    b definitively refuted on phonological grounds by de Vaan (*EDLIL*)

13 Matasović (2010): basis is a root noun **dʰōgʷʰ-s* 'flame' — Lat. /-k-/ generalized from nom. sg. (> "**fōx*"), and *fŏc-* generalized from acc. sg. **dʰogʷʰ-m̥* (or "introduced … analogically with the other thematic stems"); but

    a there is no such root noun (vs. e.g. Lat. *vōx* 'voice', *vŏcāre* 'call' : Ved. *vā́k,* etc.), and (despite Matasović) no real support for it from Pr.-Celt. **degʷ-i-* (OIr. *daig* 'flame')

[vs. e.g. OIr. *mruig* 'uninhabited land' < **mrog-i-* to **morǵ-s/*mr̥ǵ-,* cf. Gaul. tribal name *Allobrox*; Weiss (forthc. §4.1)]

    b given **a**, no clear account for the *o*-grade ("analogically with the other thematic stems" too vague)

    c no account provided for the thematization

14 cf. Fruyt's useful discussion of the problem (1986:236); in short:

    a given formal and semantic similarities between *focus* and *fovēre* (and its derivatives, e.g. ptcple. *fōtus* [→ *u*-stem noun *fōtus* 'warming'], *fōmes* 'tinder', *fōmentum* '(warm) compress', *fōculum* 'stove', *fōcillāre* 'warm up'), "il serait étonnant que les deux termes [scil. *focus, fovēre*] ne soient pas historiquement apparentés, mais il est difficile de préciser les modalités de ce lien"

    b specifically: if *focus* is deverbative to *fovēre,* one expects **fowV-ko-* (plus medial syncope) > ˣ*fūcus* or ˣ*fōcus* (Schrijver 1991:227f.); analogical influence from *fovēre* fails to explain *fōculum, fōcillāre* vs. *fŏcus/fŏculus*

    c thus, to maintain a connection with PIE **dʰegʷʰ-,* "il reste à expliquer phonétiquement comment *focus* pourrait être fait directement sur la racine i.-e. ou être bâti sur le thème verbal latin de *foveō*"; in short: "[d]iachroniquement, la formation n'est pas claire"

C. A similar problem (but with a good solution): Lat. *crās* (Fal. *cra*) 'tomorrow'

15 equally difficult etymologically (and in a similar way): Lat. *crās* (OLat.+), Fal. **cra** 'tomorrow'; but surely an old and probably inherited word (Meillet, *EM* s.v.: "isolé … doit être ancien")
[no mention in *IEW,* Leumann 1977, Sihler 1995, Meiser 1998, etc.; Weiss 2009:288 only as the basis for *crāstinus*]

16 widely assumed (Meillet and others): Lat. *crās* somehow belongs with Indo-Iranian forms based on PIE *$\acute{k}eu$-'(be[come]) bright' (cf. *$\acute{k}eu$-b^h- 'shine', *$\acute{k}eu$-$\acute{k}$- 'glow, inflame'), such as
    a *$\acute{k}\acute{e}w$-es-: *sauuah- 'morning; east' → YAv. *sauuahī-* 'the East'
    b *$\acute{k}w$-$\acute{e}s$: Ved. *ś(u)vás* 'tomorrow'
    c *$\acute{k}ou$-no-: Ved. *śóṇa-* 'fiery red, blood red'
    d *$\acute{k}u$-ro-: YAv. *sūrəm* 'in the morning'
    e and some MIr. material: e.g. Osset. *sæw-* 'morning', Khot. *svī* 'tomorrow'
[probable Caland system, cf. Dunkel *LIPP* s.v. *$\acute{k}ew$]

17 in truth: the Av. evidence is very problematic (O. Skjærvø, p.c.), and so will be left aside here; but the Indic (and MIr.) material remains

18 the essential problem: comparison of all this with *crās* is phonologically impossible, at least on the basis of ordinary assumptions; cf. *WH* s.v.: "Zurückführung von *crās, śváḥ* auf eine gemeinsame Gdf. unmöglich"

19 proposed connection with PIE 'head', via (gen. sg.) *$\acute{k}r(-)eh_2$-(e)s (Eichner, de Vaan; see *EDLIL* s.v.), i.e. *'head' > *'front', "partitive gen." *'up front, at the front' > 'tomorrow': not remotely credible

20 by far the best approach: Dunkel (*LIPP* s.v. *$\acute{k}ew$), via "initial-syllable syncope" — "wohl nur unter Annahme einer unregelmässigen Vereinfachung (Allegroform?) *kro- < *kuro- an idg. *$\acute{k}ew$ (und ved. *śvás*) anschliessbar"

21 thus Lat. *crās* < *kurās*; various morphological and semantic details open to discussion, e.g.
    a adj. *$\acute{k}u$-ro- '(becoming) bright' → abstr. *$\acute{k}u$-$\acute{r}eh_2$ 'brightening (time)' > 'daybreak'
    b gen. (of time) *$\acute{k}u$-$\acute{r}eh_2$-(e)s 'at daybreak' > Ital. *kurās* (> "allegro form" /krās/)
    c i.e.: another archaic 'day'/'night' gen. of time form (cf. Ved. *sadyás* 'on the same day', νυκτός 'by night', perh. OLat. *dius* 'by day', *nox* 'by night', etc.)
    d Fal. **cra**: multiply ambiguous —
        (i) simplest (as traditionally): = Lat., but with *s*-loss
        (ii) abl. /krād/ 'as of tomorrow', with *d*-loss
        (iii) frozen nom. sg. /krā/ (as possibly also for Lat. *dius, nox* if nom. sg.)
        (iv) instr. sg. *$\acute{k}u$-$\acute{r}eh_2$-(e)h_1 'towards daybreak' (cf. *hāc* 'over here', *aliā* 'in another direction', etc.) [**d**(iv), instr. sg. in *hāc, aliā* et sim.: Vine 2010]

D. Initial-syllable syncope in Late Latin and elsewhere
Late Latin
22 the best-known example: Class. Lat. *quirītāre* 'shriek, shout publically' > Late Lat. **crītāre,* the source of Romance forms like Ital. *gridare,* Fr. *crier* (→ Eng. *cry*) (Leumann 1977:547, with ref.)
[*quirītāre* a "delocutive" verb, lit'y 'yell out "O Quirites!" (fellow-citizens)'; more on Lat. *Quirīt-* below]

23 similar examples in Late/Vulgar Lat. (Szemerényi 1959, cf. Hackstein 2011:111), these with /ko(w)ā-/ > /kwā-/:
    a INQVATA (*CIL* XI 4127, 3rd c. AD) for Class. Lat. *inco(h)āta* 'begun'
    b a series of forms based on *co-agere* 'put together' (ptcple. *co-āctus*) —
        (i) *coāgulum* 'rennet' > Late Lat. *quāglum,* cf. *quāglāre* 'curdle' (> Ital. *quagliare,* Fr. *cailler,* etc.)
        (ii) Late Lat. **coācticāre* 'pack together' > **quācticāre* (> Fr. *cacher* 'hide')
        (iii) QVACTILIARI 'wool workers' (*CIL* IV Suppl. 7809, 7838; Pompeii, 1st c. AD)

English and other Germanic languages
24 English at various periods (further detail in Jespersen 1961:157, 274):
  a Anglo-Norman/ONo.Fr. > ME:
        (i) (Lat. *corōna* 'crown' >) A-N *coroune* > ME *crowne*
[cf. Eliz./dial. *crowner,* replaced by *coroner*]
[similarly Gmc. currency terms: Swed. *krona,* Dan./Norw. *krone,* etc. < MLG *krūne/krōne*]
        (ii) (Lat. *carō* 'flesh' → VLat. **carōnia* 'carrion' >) ONo.Fr. *carogne* > ME *crone* 'old hag'
  b later developments, with both variants remaining (sometimes with semantic differentiation):
        (i) [*thoróugh* >] *through* (vs. *thórough*)
        (ii) [*spirít* >] *sprite/spright,* cf. *sprightly* (vs. *spírit*)
        (iii) [*towárds* >] *t'wards* [Shakesp.+] (beside various other pronunciations)
  c modern examples:
        (i) [Jespersen] *pram* 'baby carriage' (< *peram[bulator]*), *p'raps* for *perhaps*
[cf. Jespersen on maintenance of voiced /r/ in *c'reer, c'rrect,* etc.]
        (ii) very widespread in American English: *p'lice, p'litical, g'rage, b'lieve,* etc.

25 well-attested in the history of High German for unaccented *ge-, be-* (OHG *gi-, bi-*), esp. before [l] and other sonorants:
  a NHG *glauben* (OHG *gilouben*) 'believe', *gleich* (OHG *gilīch*) 'like', *bleiben* (OHG *bilīban*) 'remain', *Gnade* (OHG *gināde*) 'mercy', etc.
  b similarly for Yiddish: *gleibn, glaich, blaibn,* etc. (Bin-Nun 1973:241, Timm 1987:231f.)
[widespread, with more varied phonological environments, in German dialects (Schirmunski 1962:166ff.)]
[Low German: cf. **24a**(i) on MLG *krūne/krōne*]

Greek and other marginal material
26 descriptively similar (cf. esp. Eng. *towárds,* **24b**(iii)): Greek (so-called) "reverse Lindeman" forms (Peters 1980:290n243), e.g. σάος 'safe' < **twáwo-* < **tu(w)áwo-* < **tuh₂-éwo-* (: PIE **teuh₂-* 'be strong', Ved. *távīti* 'is strong', etc.)
[differently (but in my view unconvincingly) on σάος: Hinge 2007:151ff. (**h₁tuh₂-wo-*)]

27 very little "syncope" in Gk. otherwise; but
  a there is *some*, and it's certainly correlated with lack of accent (see recently Hackstein 2012b on ἤλυθε → ἦλθε 'went')
  b cf. **2** on correlation of "strong" vs. "weak" allomorphs with PIE pitch-accent
  c typologically: cf. Méndez Dosuna 2007:373 on vowel deletion in Thessalian Greek (with comparison to Japanese deletion phenomena)
[broader typological comparison between Japanese and Greek pitch-accent systems: Devine and Stephens 1994:211-15]

28 in principle, perh. involved in some cases of "dereduplication", though difficult to distinguish from haplology; for Italic, e.g. perf. stem **wort-* (OLat. ADVORTIT, U. *couortus*) ← **wowort-* < **we-wort-/*we-wṛt-* (Meiser 2003:162)

29 a probable *non-example* of the reduplicated type: Pael. *pperci* (Pg 4 = Ve 203), almost certainly with "syllabic notation" (Vine 1993:333, Untermann 2000:565f.), if not just an error

Non-IE: e.g. Siouan, Algonquian
30 Biloxi (Siouan; cf. Rankin 1986:80, with additional examples):
  a Siouan instr. prefix *ka-* 'by striking': *k-ca* 'he chops', *k-sedi* 'he breaks'
  b Siouan instr. prefix *pa-* 'by pushing': *p-stuki* (~ *pa-stuki* 'she sews')
  c loanwords: *tkana* 'peaches' (cf. Choctaw *tákkon,* Chickasaw *takkonlo* 'peach'), *ktu* 'cat' (cf. Choctaw *kátos,* Span. *gato(s)*)

31 Yurok: miscellaneous forms and categories (see Garrett 2001:274f., 275n18), e.g. Pr.-Algonqu. **pekiwa* 'gum, pitch, resin' vs. Yurok *pkenc* 'pitch'

E. Possible Classical and prehistoric Lat. instances already in the literature

quaerō/quaesō

32 the best approach to Lat. *quaerō* 'ask, seek' (desid. *quaesō* 'seek'): **ko-ais-e/o-* (to **h₂eis-* 'id.': Ved. *iccháti* 'desires', etc.; **h₂eis-* in Lat.: cf. *aeruscāre* 'beg')
[Szemerényi 1959; Meiser 1998:193, 2003:126; *LIV* s.v. **h₂eis-* (with query); Hackstein 2011:111]
[semantic value of **ko-*: cf. Haug 2007 on "illative **ko-*" (*colloquor* 'speak to', etc.)]

33 another contender (Nussbaum 2007b, 2011, favored by de Vaan, *EDLIL*): cf. **kweh₂-* 'acquire' (Dor. πέπᾱμαι 'possess', Boeot. τὰ ππάματα 'possessions'), i.e. desid. **kweh₂-i-s-* built to an "*i*-present"; but
  a no actual evidence for such an *i*-present
  b not clear why the original desid. **kwais-* would (or could) be re-"desiderativized" as **kwais-s-* > *quaesō*, which looks more like an old basic desid. (like *vīsō* 'visit')

34 on the phonetic interpretation of **ko-ais-e/o-* > **kwaise/o-*:
  a [Szemerényi] raising, then "consonantalization": **koaise-* > **kuaise-* > **kwaise-* (+ rhotacism)
  b but the glide formation implies a syllabic reduction, which could be conceived of in terms of "initial-syllable syncope"; e.g. (assuming a transitional glide)
        (i) [without raising] **kowaise-* > **kwaise-*
        (ii) [with raising] **kowaise-* > **kuwaise-* > **kwaise-*

  and like **b**(i): Lat. *co(h)āt-* > *quāt-, coāg-/coāc-* > *quāg-/quāc-* (**23**); cf. also **35-37**

quaxāre

35 Lat. *coaxāre* 'croak (of frogs)' (Sueton.+; cf. Gk. κοάξ 'croaking-noise') > *quaxāre* (F. 312.21L, P.F. 313.9L)

quirīt-/Quirīno- etc.

36 with surface glide (vs. "transitional" glide): OLat. *quirīt-* '(fellow-)citizen' and related forms —
  a ritual funeral announcement *ollus quiris leto datus* (F. 304.2L)
  b formulae/collocations *populus Romanus quirites, quirites Romani,* etc. (cf. *quirītāre,* **22**)
  c *Quirīnus* 'deified Romulus; Janus', cf. adjs. *Quirīnus/Quirīnālis* (→ festival *Quirīnālia*)
  [see in detail Dumézil 1970:Ch. 5]
  d cf. *virīt-* forms:
        (i) adv. *virītim* 'man by man, individually' (Cato+) → *virītānus (ager)* '(field) equally divided among members of a group' (P.F. 511.13L)
        (ii) *virītēs*: attributes (or divinities) associated with the god *Quirīnus* (Gell. 13.23.2)

37 thus standardly (von Planta 1899:57, Kretschmer 1920, and many others) comitative **ko-* 'together' + **wir-o-* 'man' → *t*-stem **ko-wir-ī-t-, no*-adj. **ko-wir-ī-no-*
  [*EDLIL* (s.v. *quirīs*) contra ("not credible phonetically (cf. *cūria*) and not very compelling semantically", but without alternative]
  [*cūria* with 2nd-syllable syncope, thus presumably formed at the time of initial stress; cf. Vine 1993:379ff., Hackstein 2011:110]

glōs

38 Lat. *glōs* 'sister-in-law' (: γάλως < **γάλαϝο-*, OCS *zŭlŭva* [cf. Russ. *zolóvka*]):
  a probable amphikinetic *u*-stem nom. **ǵélh₂-ōw-s / **ǵ̣lh₂-w-ós* etc.
  b Lat. stem-form seems to show nom. sg., but **ǵélh₂-ō[w]-s* > ˣ*gelōs*
  c Lat. *gl-* suggests a basis in the zero grade root form, but **ǵ̣lh₂-ō[w]-s* > ˣ*galōs*
  [even worse: **ǵ̣lh₂-w-* as basis > ˣ*glāv-* or ˣ*galav-*]

39 suggestion (without argument) by Anttila (1969:83): **galōs* > *glōs* by syncope; independently also Gąsiorowski (forthcoming), explicitly via initial-syllable syncope

40 Anttila's suggestion rejected by Schrijver (1991:131f.) as "completely ad hoc" since it "runs counter to the normal rules of Latin syncope, which leave the vowel of a word-initial syllable intact" — a reasonable point, unless "initial-syllable syncope" is a phonological reality worth considering

41 Schrijver's own suggestion: "it may be surmised that the laryngeal was lost before a PIE. lengthened grade at an early stage, i.e. before antevocalic *ClH- yielded *Cal-" — but this is completely ad hoc (as Schrijver admits)

grūs
42 another plausible item: Lat. *grūs* 'crane', besides cognates mainly with onset *ger…*; see now Gąsiorowski (forthcoming), who posits two basic forms —
    a PIE *gérh₂-no-* (Gk. γέρανος, Pr.-Celt. *garano-*)
[Pr.-Gmc. *krana-* as a borrowing from Celtic, with the Gmc. initial-syllable syncope as in **25**]
    b PIE compound *gerh₂ó-h₂awi-* (BSl. *gerHōw-/*gerHw-,* Ital. *gerṓwis > Lat. *grūs*)

F. Application to Lat. *focus*
43 the phonetic profile of the IE material (with selected examples from above):
    a onset of the initial syllable: voiced and voiceless obstruents (and some clusters)
        (i) voiceless stop (pre-Lat. *kurās,* A-N *coroune,* Eng. *peram[bulator]*)
        (ii) voiceless fricative (Eng. *thoroúgh*)
        (iii) voiced stop (OHG *gilouben, bilīban*; pre-Lat. *galōs, *gerōwi-*)
        (iv) clusters: [kw-] (Lat. *quirītāre,* unless still [kʷ]), [sp-] (Eng. *spirít*)
    b nucleus of the initial syllable: any short vowel (/i e u o ə a/ attested)
    c onset of the (original) 2ⁿᵈ syllable: sonorants, esp. liquids and [w]
        (i) frequently [r], [l] (cf. examples in **a**)
        (ii) also [w]: Eng. *towárds,* pre-Gk. *tuwawo-,* pre-Lat. *kowirīt-* (and forms with probable transitional glide: *ko(w)ais-, *ko(w)āg-,* etc.)
        (iii) rarely [n] (OHG *gināde*)
    d accent: non-initial in all verifiable cases
        (i) usually on 2ⁿᵈ syllable
        (ii) but also later in the word: Lat. *quirītā́re, coaxā́re, coāctiliā́riī*

44 application to the problem of Lat. *focus* (**B.**): with initial-syllable syncope, both the probable connection with PIE *dʰegʷʰ-* 'burn, be warm' and the /ŏ/ of *focus* become straightforward

45 several possibilities; first, some key morphological ingredients:
    a PIE > Lat.: so-called "τομός form" verbal adjs. and "τόμος form" verbal nouns
[e.g. Fortson 2010:129f.]
    b a productive Lat. derivational pattern: PIE *-ko-* and *-ḱo-* (both > Lat. *-cus*) added to nominal and adjectival bases (often with nominalizing or concretizing/particularizing force)
["PIE *-ko-/*-ḱo-* in Latin: Fruyt 1986, Weiss 2009:295]

46   **a** PIE *dʰegʷʰ-* 'burn, be warm' (**11**, **14**) → τομός form *dʰogʷʰ-ó-* 'burning (adj.)' or τόμος form *dʰógʷʰ-o-* '[act of] burning'
    b PIE *dʰogʷʰ-ó-/*dʰógʷʰ-o-* regularly > Proto-Italic *θowó-/*θówo-*
    c then a number of possible scenarios, e.g.
        (i) *θowó-* 'burning (adj.)' [+ syncope] > *θwó- + *-ko-* '(thing for) burning, burner', hence *θwóko- > *focus* 'hearth' (*θ- > f- and loss of *w in this context both regular)
[Ital. *θwó- > pre-Lat. ˣfo-, but monomoraic words banned (Mester 1994:20ff.), as are CVC inflected forms (nom. ˣfos, acc. ˣfom, etc.); thus ko-suffixation in *θwo-ko-* perh. a phonological repair]
        (ii) as above, but syncope follows the ko-formation: *θowó-ko- > *θwóko- > *focus*
        (iii) *θówo-* '[act of] burning' → *θowo-kó-* '(thing for) 'burning, burner' (cf. evidence for accented *-kó-/*-ḱó-*: [Ved. *yuvan-* 'young' →] *yuvaśá-* 'heifer', Gk. -κό- [μάντις 'priest', adj. μαντικός, etc.]); then *θowo-kó- [+ syncope] > *θwokó- > *focus*

[**c**(i) and (ii) also work fine with accented *-kó-]

47 as a "bonus": initial-syllable syncope allows for a *second* plausible etymology, via PIE *$d^h euh_2$- 'produce smoke' (as in Lat. *fūmus* 'smoke', *suffīre* 'fumigate', *fūlīgō* 'soot', *favīlla* 'ashes'), workable with both *o*-grade and zero grade forms of the root:

    a *$d^h ouh_2$-ó-* (τομός form) > Proto-Ital. *$\theta owó$- > pre-Lat. *$\theta awó$- (by Thurneysen-Havet's Law, **8e**)
    b *$d^h óuh_2$-o-* (τόμος form) > Proto-Ital. *$\theta ówo$-
    c *$d^h uh_2$-ó-* > Proto-Ital. *$\theta uwó$-

and then various scenarios involving initial-syllable syncope and *-ko-/*-kó-,* as in **46c**

[somewhat similarly (but incoherently) Wood (1926:40): *focus* < "*$d^h wokos$", to <u>both</u> *foveō* and *fūmus,* without explanation]

48 incidentally: why *R-o-ko-* (in *θowo-kó-* etc. above), and not *R-e-ko-,* as with (e.g.) dimin. *R-e-lo-* (OFal. **arcentelom** 'a little silver')? perh. an old feature of *-ko-,* cf. Lat. (*ūno-* 'one' ~) *ūnicus* 'the one (and only)', with

    a Go. *ainahs** 'only' < *oino-kó-* (accent: cf. OIc. *einga* 'id.') (and cf. Go. *stainahs** 'stony')
    b OCS *inokŭ* 'monk' < *eino-ko-* (cf. general Slav. adj. derivation in *-ŭkŭ*)
    c similarly *eiko-lo-* > U. *ecla* 'every', *eiko-wo-* → *eiko-wyo-* > U. **ekvi** 'one (time?)', and formations like *-o-t(e)r-o-*

49 in short: the solution to the problem of *fŏcus* is that (if one assumes initial-syllable syncope) the previously unexplained [ŏ] is actually the old (presuffixal) stem vowel *-o-, not* the original root vowel (which would have lengthened, **14b**)

G. Additional possible instances
Lat. *fimus/fimum* 'dung'
50 Lat. *fimus* (m.), *fimum* (n.) 'dung, manure' (OLat.+): generally thought to be based on PIE *$d^h euh_2$- 'produce smoke' (**47**, cf. parallels like Ved. *śaka-dhū́ma-* lit. 'dung-smoke'); but the /ĭ/ is totally unexpected and unclear — thus a problem very much like Lat. *fŏcus* (**B.**)

51 more specifically:

    a *fimus* appears to be a *mo*-formation; cf. PIE *$d^h uh_2$-mó-* > Lat. *fūmus* 'smoke' (= Ved. *dhūmá-,* Gk. θῡμός, OCS *dymŭ,* etc.)
    b other vocalisms: no help — PIE *$d^h euh_2$-mó-* and *$d^h ouh_2$-mó-* probably also > Lat. *fūmus* (or maybe ˣ*fuimus*)
    c the "*pius*-rule" (*-ūyV-* > Ital. *-īyV-*) can produce /ī/ (as in *suffīre* [**47**] < Pr.-Ital. stem *-$\theta ūye/o$-,* not ˣ*suffūre*), but not /ĭ/ (except prevocalically, cf. **d**); but there is no *y*-suffix here
    d Lat. 1 sg. *suffiō,* 3 pl. *suffiunt* (with /ĭ/) arise regularly from the late rule of prevocalic V-shortening (as in Lat. *pīus* > *pius*), not applicable to *fĭmo-* (with preconsonantal /ĭ/)

52 most recent attempt: *EDLIL* s.v., suggesting a *mo*-formation based on the stem *fĭ-* (as in 1 sg. *suffiō,* **51d**); but this is unacceptable —
    a the vowel-shortening in question (**51d**) occurred very late, whereas
    b PIE *-mo-* is unproductive in Lat. (Leumann 1977:319, Weiss 2009:286), and is found only in inherited forms (like *fūmus,* **51a**)

53 a possible solution: begin from a PIE adj. *$d^h uh_2$-i(-)mó-* or *$d^h uh_2$-í(-)mo-* 'smoky, smoking' —
    a cf. possible *i*-stem *$d^h óuh_2$-i-* 'smoking (stuff)' underlying Lat. *favīlla* 'ashes'? (Vine 2006:241ff.)
    b or secondary *-imo-?* cf. Ved. *-imá-* and *-íma-* (e.g. RV *agrimá-* 'foremost', *kṛtríma-* 'artificial'); rare in Lat., but perh. *sacrima* F. 422.5L, P.F. 423.1L ("appellabant mustum, quod Libero sacrificabant …")
    c perhaps directly attested in Hitt. *tuhhima-* 'gasping'? (some details at Vine 2006:242n93)
    d (e.g.) *$d^h uh_2$-i-mó-* > Pr.-Ital. *$\theta uwimó$-* [+ initial-syllable syncope] > *$\theta wimo$-* > Lat. *fimus*

[masc. *fimus*: substantivization of the original adj.; neut. *fimum* probably analogical to *stercus* 'id.' (neut.); so *EM*]

Lat. *bonus* 'good'

54 OFal. **dueno-**, OLat. ᴅᴠᴇɴᴏ- (> ᴅᴠᴏɴᴏ-) > Class. Lat. *bonus* 'good' (cf. *beāre* 'favor, make happy'):
   a sometimes considered to be without etymology (e.g. Martzloff 2006:479n868)
   b sometimes given outlandish explanations, e.g. Heidermanns (1993:170): original compound, with reduced grade "*d-" (of *ad-*) + *wen- (of *Venus*)
   c pre-/non-laryngealistic analyses lead nowhere, e.g. *LEW* s.vv., *HED* 1-2:205 via "*dw-eno-", "*dw-eyā-" (similarly *EDLIL* s.v. *beō*: "*dwe-no-", "*dwe-yo-")
   [Pinault 1987: *bellum/duellum* 'war' with *bonus,* dimin. *bellus*; aliter Martzloff 2006:478ff.]

55 but most often nowadays: cf. Ved. *dúvas-* 'favor, gift' and/or Go. *taujan* 'do', Gk. δύναμαι 'have power', via one or another of the following interpretations involving a root form "*duH-" (*dúvas* < *duH-es-):
   a PIE *$deuH$- 'offer', with zero grade *duH-
   b PIE *deh_3- 'give', whence a *u*-extended variant *deh_3-u- with zero grade *dh_3-u- $\rightarrow$ *duh_3-
   c *$deuh_2$- (*LIV*^{1}) or *deh_2u- (*LIV*^{2}) 'fit together' (cf. esp. δύναμαι) with (new or secondary) zero grade *duh_2-
   [see e.g. *EWAia* I.734 + refs., adding for **b** (with many) OLat. *duim,* Fal. **douiad**; Mallory and Adams 2006:413, *EDLIL* s.v. *bonus*]

56 somewhat differently Neri (2011:144, with refs.): *duh_1-eno- 'zusammenfügend, zum Zusammenfügen geeignet, passend' (: *deh_1u-/*duh_1- 'zusammenfügen, ordnen', cf. TA *tsuwā-* 'sich fügen, passen', Go. *tewa* 'Ordnung')
   [certainly superior for the "laryngeal coloring" problem (*duh_3-eno- > Pr.-Ital. *duwono-, *duh_2-eno- > Pr.-Ital. *duwano-)]

57 rarely noted (but see *EDLIL* s.v. *bonus,* Neri loc. cit.): presumed preforms like *duH-eno-, *duh_3-eno-, *duh_2-eno-, *duh_1-eno- are not workable as such — they should result in Pr.-Ital. *duweno-, whence Lat. ^{x}*duinus* or ^{x}*dūnus* (not *dweno- > *bonus*)

58 but Pr.-Ital. *duwéno- or (more likely) *duwenó- [+ initial-syllable syncope] > *dweno- directly
   [cf. Ved. zero-grade root + *-ána-* (action nouns) and *-aná-* (agent nouns/adjs.): *kṛpáṇa-* 'misery', *kṛpaṇá-* (AV) 'miserable', etc.]

59 Neri (loc. cit.): "Umkehrung der Lex Lindeman in dreisilbigen Wörtern", cf. Martzloff (2006:479): [duw] > [dw] "en polysyllabe long … par une réciproque de la loi de Lindeman interne au latin" (and Peters on σάος, **26**); thus here a reformulation in terms of syncope/word accent, perh. without restriction on word length (cf. *crās,* **C.**)

Lat. *flōs* 'flower' (and related material in Sabellic)

60 Lat. *flōs* m. 'flower, blossom' (cf. Osc. **fluusaí**, **f<l>uusasiaís**, etc.): animate (amphikinetic) *s*-stem based on PIE *b^hleh_3- 'bloom' (see Schrijver 1991:131f.); but
   a as noted by Schrijver, oldest layer of such forms tends to have zero-grade root, cf. Lat. *cruor* 'gore' (< *$kruh_2$-ōs), *vīrēs* 'strength [pl.]' (*wiH-s-), *liquor* 'fluidity' vs. *līquī* 'flow', etc.
   b *$b^h l̥ h_3$-ōs (with zero-grade root) > Pr.-Ital. *φalōs > Lat. ^{x}*falōs*; thus Lat. *flōs* may be anomalous

61 Schrijver (followed by *LIV*): posits full-grade *$b^hléh_3$-ōs (> *φloōs > *flōs), comparing *aurōra* 'dawn' (< *$h_2éus$-ōs+) for the full grade; but
   a *aurōra* (as an inherited theonym) is arguably a special case, and has a different root structure
   b most other full grades are plausibly secondary, esp. beside parallel verbs: *tepor* 'warmth' : *tepēre* 'be warm', etc.
   [*b^hleh_3-s- (e.g. Untermann 2000:291): difficult format for animate *s*-stem]

62 thus for *flōs* (vs. expected ^{x}*falōs*), if original zero grade is preferable: like *glōs* (vs. expected ^{x}*gelōs,* ^{x}*galōs,* **38**ff.) — easily handled by application of initial-syllable syncope to Pr.-Ital. *φalōs (assuming non-initial accent; more below on this)

H. On the chronology of initial-syllable syncope in Latin

63 like Lat. medial syncope — and as expected for typologically common and phonetically natural sound changes — initial-syllable syncope could have operated at different periods; hence
    a well-documented instances from Late Latin (**22-23**)
    b examples within the recorded period of Classical Latin (**23b**(iii), **35**)
    c other cases suggested above that may have occurred at much earlier periods

64 how early (for the very early cases)? — to begin with:
    a for OFal. **dueno-**, OLat. ᴅᴠᴇɴᴏ-: at least before ca. 600-550 BC (date of the "Duenos Inscription", *CIL* I² 4; Hartmann 2005:432ff.), and in any case before Proto-Latino-Faliscan and before **dw-* > Lat. *b-*; cf. also Lat. *crās* : Fal. *cra* (**C.**)
    b for *focus*: Pr.-Ital. **θw-* > Lat. *f-* is prehistoric (cf. *forum* 'marketplace' < **dʰwor-o-*)
    c for *flōs*: Sabellic cognates show the same result as Lat., indicating a Proto-Italic date

65 the indications in **64** point to a period well before the Classical Lat. penultimate accent (**6**) or even its slightly different OLat. antecedent (as in Plautus); and the process is not compatible with initial stress (the Common Italic precursor of the Lat. penultimate accent); therefore, the earliest version of the process may predate the "period of initial stress" (**5**)

66 if, at this very early period, there existed *both* initial-accented forms (more on this below) *and* forms with non-initial accent (subject to initial-syllable syncope), this amounts to evidence for an early Italic period of mobile accent

67 more specifically on the early syncopated forms: most instances are directly comparable to well-established patterns of PIE mobile accent, as in the following:
    a Pr.-Ital. **kurā́s* < PIE **ḱu-réh₂-(e)s* (**21**), with accented PIE **-ró-*, f. **-réh₂*
    b Pr.-Ital. **θuwimó-* or **θuwímo-,* cf. Ved. *-imá-/-íma-* (**53b**)
    c Pr.-Ital. **duwéno-* or **duwenó-* < PIE **duH-éno-* or **duH-enó-* (**58**); cf. Go. *fulgins* 'hidden' (with Verner's Law) and isolated Slav. *R(Ø)-eno-* ptcples., Ved. *-ána-/-aná-*
    d Pr.-Ital. **kowirīnó-* (**37**), with (typically) oxytone PIE adj. **-nó-*
    e Pr.-Ital. **ko(w)aíse/o-,* with thematic or thematized **aíse/o-* (predictably with root accent)
[**e**: similarly already Szemerényi 1959:236, but speculating about the Classical penultimate-accent stage]

68 similarly, for items based on PIE amphikinetic inflection: interpretable via generalization of the strong form of the suffix with weak-stem accent, e.g.:

	early Italic		later Italic
nom.	**φal-ōs* (accent?)	(→)	**φlṓs*
gen.	**φal-ōs-és*	>	**φlōsés*
dat.	**φal-ōs-éi*	>	**φlōséi*
(etc.)			

69 similarly for *glōs* (**38**ff.), *mutatis mutandis*: i.e. with the added complication (needed in any case) of the remodeled suffix (as if with nom. *-s* carried throughout the paradigm) —

nom. **gal-ō[w]-s* (accent?)
gen. **gal-ō[w]-és* → **gal-ō[w]s-és* > **glō[w]sés*

[**gal-ō[w]s-és* with "improper *-s-és*" after forms like **φal-ōs-és*??]

70 for Lat. *focus*: various possibilities (**46-47**), but all compatible with either (a) a PIE τομός form or (b) a PIE τόμος form plus accented PIE **-kó-/*ḱó-*

9

I. Preliminary notes on exceptions

71 was early initial-syllable syncope a regular sound change, or did it apply "sporadically"? (e.g. as a process related to allegro phonology, cf. **20**)

72 conditioning for *medial* syncope (widespread in both Latin and Sabellic [**5**]) is notoriously elusive; no reason to think initial-syllable syncope would be different, though a preliminary assessment is still possible

73 Lat. surface /CVlV-/, /CVrV-/, /CVwV-/: very frequent (including /CVlC-/ etc. < */CVlVC-/, via medial syncope after the "period of initial stress" [**5**]); thus many *potential* exceptions to early initial-syllable syncope

74 but *actual* exceptions are extremely rare; most surface /CVl-/ (etc.) forms (**73**) continue PIE root-accented formations (both nominal and verbal), e.g.:
  a acrostatic or (strong form of mobile-accent) root nouns (e.g. *foris/forēs* 'door')
  b root thematic presents [**67e**] (e.g. *colere* 'inhabit; cultivate')
  c root aorists (e.g. OFal. **douiad** 'may he grant')
  d (strong form of proterokinetic) *men*-stems (e.g. *columen/culmen* 'summit')
  e (strong form of proterokinetic or amphikinetic) *s*-stems (e.g. *color* 'color')
  etc.

75 other cases are accounted for by independently motivated factors; e.g.
  a **dVlV´-* > †/dlV-/ (e.g. *dolēre* 'be in pain', not †*dlēre*) blocked, since *dl-* is not a permitted initial cluster
  b †*fra* (vs. *fera* 'wild beast' → back-formed adj. *ferus*) perh. blocked by a "minimal word constraint" (**46c**)

76 some forms are easily explained via simple analogies; e.g. *Cerēs* (crop goddess, literally 'growth'), gen. *Cereris* (and Sab. cognates) < hysterokinetic *s*-stem **ḱerh₁-és,* gen. **ḱerh₁-(e)s-és,* etc.: secondary root accent, after (overwhelming majority of) root-accented *s*-stems (**74e**)

J. Conclusions and implications for the prehistory of Italic accent

78 an early round of initial-syllable syncope provides attractive solutions for some hitherto difficult etymological problems in Latin and related languages; new proposals discussed here for:
  a Lat. *focus* 'hearth'
  b Lat. *fimus/fimum* 'dung'
  c Lat. *bonus* 'good' (and related forms in Faliscan)
  d Lat. *flōs* 'flower' (and related forms in Sabellic languages)

79 the initial-syllable syncope already hypothesized for some other forms (Lat. *crās, quaerō, quirīt-/Quirīno-, glōs, grūs*) can be assigned to the same early period as the items in **78**

80 the forms in **78** and **79** document the existence of an early stage of Italic characterized by mobile accent, predating the Common Italic "period of initial stress" (**5**); they thus contribute to the growing body of evidence in support of an early Italic period of mobile accent (**7-8**)

81 the non-initial accents presupposed in these forms correspond closely with expected PIE accentual patterns, implying that the PIE mobile accent survived in some form into early Italic (much as with Proto-Germanic, with PIE mobile accent visible via Verner's Law [**4**, **7**])

82 syncope tends to be stress-related; thus the early Italic mobile accent may reflect a system of *mobile stress accent* (vs. the PIE mobile pitch-accent); cf. well-known developments of this type elsewhere, e.g. with Greek: inherited mobile pitch-accent (**1**) → new mobile stress accent (by ca. 3rd c. AD)

83 hypothesized here:

PIE mobile pitch-accent → early Italic mobile stress accent → later Italic initial stress accent

vs. traditional "handbook version" (**5**):

PIE mobile pitch-accent (→ mysterious intermediate system?) → Italic initial stress accent