

FROM THE PROTO-INDO-EUROPEAN TO THE CLASSICAL LATIN ACCENT¹

LUCIE PULTROVÁ (Praha)

Latin, in general, is considered a language with practically no relevance to reconstructing the Proto-Indo-European accent.² This article attempts to prove the opposite: it tries to show that the transition from the Proto-Indo-European to the Classical Latin accent was in fact an uncomplicated one and, more importantly, that it was not fundamentally different from the development in the other languages that the reconstruction of the Proto-Indo-European accent is based on. At the same time, the article asks an almost heretical question: was the accent in Classical Latin indeed consistently (ante-)penultimate?

1. Accent in Archaic Latin

Before addressing the given problem, I must at least very briefly sum up what I have already dealt with in my other work³ and what is vital for the understanding of the following text. The question of eventual sta-

¹ The concise version of this article (under the title *Constitution of the Classical Latin Accent*) was published in *Latin Linguistics Today (Proceedings from the 15th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics, Innsbruck, April 4 – 9 2009)*, (eds.) PETER ANREITER – MANFRED KIENPOINTNER, Innsbruck 2010, pp. 71–82.

² Cf. e.g. MICHAEL MEIER-BRÜGGER, *Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft*, Berlin – New York 2000, p. 147: „Im Lateinischen sind keine offensichtlichen Spuren der uridg. (= ved. und gr.) Tonstellen erhalten, höchstens indirekte.“

³ LUCIE PULTROVÁ, *The Vocalism of Latin Medial Syllables*, Praha 2006.

bilization of the accent on the penultima, or the antepenultima, in Classical Latin has been repeatedly dealt with; however, the scholars have largely researched the way of transition from the presumed Archaic⁴ initial accent to the Classical (ante-)penultimate one.⁵ I, nevertheless, do not believe in the existence of – otherwise so far almost generally accepted⁶ – initial accent in Archaic Latin and, very briefly, I have the following reasons therefore.⁷

1.1 Criticism of the theory of initial accent

The theory of initial accent was founded on purely theoretical basis. In 1852, the German scholar A. Dietrich writes in his article⁸ that in the second element of Latin compounds a qualitative change often occurs of the root vowel. Although he does not explain the phenomenon in any more detail in his article, Dietrich uses it as a basis for what becomes a widely spread, revolutionary theory: the initial syllables (the sole syllables with no vowel change) must have possessed at the time when the changes occurred a special characteristic quality, which, according to Dietrich, was the accent. Thus the famous theory originated of Archaic Latin accent bound on the first word syllable, and it is still acknowledged as valid. There is no other evidence of initial accent in Archaic Latin.⁹

⁴ I use the term “Archaic Latin” in the wide sense here to denote Latin approximately up to the time of the first literary records, when, according to all supporters of the theory of initial accent, that accent should have been replaced by the Classical (ante-)penultimate one.

⁵ The change of the place of accent took place according to the advocates of the theory of Archaic initial accent first in the four- and multisyllabic words; it is where the need for the double accent should have occurred. It is assumed that what occurred first was so-called secondary accent, e.g. *maledixit*, *periculum*, *periculósus*, which eventually prevailed and turned into the principal one.

⁶ For the theories by other scholars disagreeing with the traditional theory of Archaic initial accent in brief see 1.2.

⁷ For detailed information, including also other than here briefly summarized aspects, see the monograph listed in the note 3.

⁸ A. DIETRICH, *Zur Geschichte des Accents im Lateinischen*, in: *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete des Deutschen, Griechischen und Lateinischen* 1, 1852, pp. 543–556.

⁹ As supporting arguments the scholars sometimes use first the fact that there occurs no syncope in initial syllables, and second the popularity of alliteration in early

The truth is, however, that vowel weakening in medial Latin syllables is not by far a general feature. The words where, contrary to the theory, vowel weakening does not occur, are even more numerous than those in accord with the theory. There is no change at all of the vowels *o* and *u* in compounds (*admoneō*; *cōn fugiō* etc.); concerning the words with the root vowels *a* and *e* and diphthongs *ae* and *au* the ratio is approximately 3,2 : 1 in favour of the words where no change takes place.¹⁰ Besides, apart from the questionable *FHE:FHAKED* from the *Fibula Praenestina*, in the inscriptions we find practically no words in the form “before the vowel weakening” – thus we have no relevant evidence that the words in the form ***confaciō* etc. ever existed in Latin. In any case, we certainly do not have any factual basis for chronologically classing the vocalic changes in, for example, the 5th, or any other century B.C., as is often proposed in handbooks.

The words wherein vowel weakening occurs actually belong only to certain word-formative categories; namely, only to the adjective type *inermis*, and then to the prefixed derivatives of some primary verbs and their further secondary derivatives. Apart from the very rare exceptions, vowel weakening never occurs in denominative verbs (*collaudō* etc.) or prefixed adjectives (*subamārus* etc.). That already excludes the possibility that the reason for vowel weakening (if we actually can call the phenomenon a weakening at all) was accent: if it were, it would have to have the same effect everywhere (as it is the case in other languages with umlaut in unstressed syllables: Russian, English, etc.), not only in the limited word-formative categories.

Vowel weakening occurs in the derivatives from primary verbs which have the root in zero grade; on the other hand, vowel weakening does not occur in the derivatives from verbs with the root in full grade. Ergo: what we call vowel weakening is according to my theory actually a way of vocalization of zero grades in medial root syllables. Therefore, what we see is not a weakening, but an alternation of vowels.

Latin poetry. I do not consider those arguments relevant. Synopes in initial syllables do not occur in any period of Latin development, not only in the Archaic period. Similarly, concerning alliteration, it is a popular figure not only in the earlier poetry, but also in the Classical one. Thus, neither of these phenomena can be used as evidence of the existence of initial accent in Archaic Latin.

¹⁰ For detailed information on excerpted words see LUCIE PULTROVÁ, *The Vocalism of Latin Medial Syllables*, p. 21, and appendices on pp. 121–132.

This theory can also be applied to the following word types, frequently cited as the examples of vowel weakening in Latin: the nouns of the 3rd declension (type *nomen*, *nom̄inis*) and the compounds with the compositional vowel *-i-* (type *agr̄icola*).

All in all, the theory of initial accent in Archaic Latin has in my opinion no foundation, and thus we may leave the problematic¹¹ shift of accent from the initial syllable to the (ante-)penultima aside. Certainly, we cannot rule out the possibility that the accent of Archaic Latin and that of Classical Latin did somehow differ. We, however, have no evidence for that; therefore what I consider the only possible course is to research the direct transition from the presumed (late) Proto-Indo-European accent to the accent of Classical Latin.

1.2 Other theories denying the existence of the Archaic initial accent

Scholars who doubt the existence of initial accent are more numerous; altogether they reasonably argue that the transition from the free Indo-European accent through fixed initial to fixed recessive accent is too complicated and unparalleled. However, in contrast with the theory briefly outlined in chapter 1.1, they proceed from the fact that vowel weakening does relate to accent, and that it must be explained accordingly.

One such opponent of the theory of initial accent in preliterary Latin is E. Pulgram.¹² He says that in Latin there existed, as it also does in spoken language in many modern languages, so-called emphatic accent, which occurred on the prefix in compounds beside the common grammatical accent according to the penultima law. The emphatic accent in those words was stronger and, in contrast with the weaker grammatical accent, it influenced the phonological system of the language, i.e. it effected the umlaut in medial syllables. The existence of this emphatic accent was according to Pulgram limited only to a certain period.

¹¹ The accent according to the penultima law is derived from the end of the word; it is therefore an absolutely different type of accent than the accent on initial syllable. Moreover, in threesyllabic words with long penultima the accent would have to move to the originally weakest (postaccented) position in the word.

¹² ERNST PULGRAM, *Prosodics and Metrics*, München 1974, pp. 103–113.

Another opponent of the theory of initial accent is M. Nyman.¹³ Nyman rejects Pulgram's idea of emphatic accent, either, and what he considers the most probable for Archaic Latin is the existence of a transitional type of accent, closer to the original Indo-European accent. The characteristic feature of such accent could be, according to Nyman, that in determining compounds it fell on a determining element (so called modifier). Among determining compounds he classes also the words derived by prefixation, wherein then the accent fell on the prefix. This is how Nyman explains the existence of Latin umlaut, which he considers to be related to unstressed syllables.

A. L. Prosdocimi¹⁴ is a supporter of the existence of initial accent in Archaic Latin that effected the weakening of vowels in the following syllables; nevertheless, he slightly deviates from the traditional theory. In his opinion, the original place of the Latin accent is the penultima. He believes Italic languages have seen the following development: free Indo-European accent – accent bound on the penultima – accent bound on the penultima with the coaccent on the first syllable – accent on the first syllable. Latin diverted from other Italic languages in the last phase: the coaccent on the first syllable in Latin did not prevail over the penultimate accent, but it influenced establishing of the Classical Latin accent (i.e. partial retraction of the accent from the penultima to the antepenultima). It was during the transitional period, while according to Prosdocimi the penultimate accent coexisted with the initial, that Latin umlaut occurred.

According to X. Ballester,¹⁵ the vocalic changes can be explained equally well, if we define the place of prehistoric Latin accent as the first long syllable in a word, or, should there be no long syllable, the first syllable of a word.¹⁶

¹³ MARTTI NYMAN, *Reconstructing Compound Accentuation: on the Pre-Latin Initial Stress*, in: *Arctos* 17, 1983, pp. 31–47.

¹⁴ ALDO LUIGI PROSDOCIMI, *Sull'accento latino e italico*, in: *O-o-pe-ro-si. Festschrift für Ernst Risch zum 75. Geburtstag*, (Hrsg.) ANNEMARIE ETTER, Berlin 1986, pp. 601–618.

¹⁵ XAVERIO BALLESTER, *La posición del acento prehistórico latino*, in: *Emerita* 58, 1, 1990, pp. 33–50.

¹⁶ In his next article (XAVERIO BALLESTER, *La tipología y el acento prehistórico latino*, in: *Emerita* 64, 1, 1996, pp. 59–63) Ballester comes to a conclusion that Latin “vowel weakening” does not have to be necessarily associated with accent.

R. Oniga¹⁷ considers the theory of initial accent absolutely unsubstantiated, while he – in my opinion, quite rightly – doubts that there is a connection between Latin “vowel weakening” and accent.

Finally we should mention yet another relatively known theory, which does not speak directly about the non-existence of initial accent in Archaic Latin, as it deals with the accent of the literary period; nevertheless, it also offers a possible solution to the problem of vowel weakening. We talk about the theory of so-called quartultimate recessive accent: in the words with both short penultima and short antepenultima (e.g. *familia*, *miseria*, *ceciderit* etc.), according to this theory, the accent would have retracted as far as the fourth syllable from the end. The theory arose on the grounds of the analysis of verses by Plautus and Terence, revealing a strong tendency to harmonize ictus and accent.¹⁸ However, this theory, claiming that what dominates as a building principle in the verses of the early playwrights is accent, not quantity, is by no means generally acknowledged.

2. Known starting-points for researching the development of Latin accent

Before actually attempting to describe the way of establishing Latin accent we must first make clear what exactly we know about the both end types of accent, i.e. the Proto-Indo-European accent on the one hand, and the accent of Classical Latin on the other.

¹⁷ RENATO ONIGA, *L'apofonia nei composti e l'ipotesi dell'“intensità iniziale” in latino (con alcune conseguenze per la teoria dell'ictus metrico)*, in: *Metrica classica e linguistica*, (a cura di) ROBERTO M. DANESE – FRANCO GORI – CESARE QUESTA, Urbino 1990, pp. 195–236; RENATO ONIGA, *Un'eccezione all'apofonia latina*, in: *Studi linguistici in onore di Roberto Gusmani*, (a cura di) RAFFAELLA BOMBI – GUIDO CIFOLETTI – FABIANA FUSCO – LUCIA INNOCENTE – VINCENZO ORIOLES, Alessandria 2006, pp. 1337–1339. Unfortunately, I did not have the work by R. Oniga at my disposal when writing the monograph cited in note 3.

¹⁸ First one to research into this problem was English classical philologist R. BENTLEY in his book *Schediasma de metris Terentianis* in the 18th century (on Bentley see JOSEPH VENDRYES, *Recherches sur l'histoire et les effets de l'intensité initiale en latin*, Paris 1902, p. 74).

2.1 Indo-European accent

Let us sum up as briefly as possible what we already know about the Proto-Indo-European accent.

The original Proto-Indo-European accent was free in the sense that it could occur on any syllable in a word, even though not arbitrarily but according to strictly given rules. The place of accent (or its change throughout the paradigm) was characteristic of individual word-formative types; that is to say, the words of the same word-formative types had the same accent – not on the syllable of certain place in a word, but on a specific morpheme (root, stem, or ending). For primary verbal stems¹⁹ and primary nominal derivatives the accent paradigms can be established with a high degree of probability according to their ablaut structure. For secondary derivatives, however, the (simplified) ablaut relations “accented syllable = *e*-grade, unaccented syllable = zero-grade” do not hold, as secondary derivatives retain the phonological form of their founding word. Thus we can often get the information about the place of the Proto-Indo-European accent only while comparing the place of accent in, principally, Vedic and Greek, or the intonation in Balto-Slavic languages. However, significant shifts from the original Proto-Indo-European state naturally took place in all languages. Concerning nouns, M. Meier-Brügger summarizes briefly: “Die einzelsprachliche Fortsetzer haben den markanten Ablaut im Suffix i.d.R. beibehalten. Bei Wurzel und Akzent sind aber Vereinfachungen die Regel: Vom schwachen Stamm aus wurde bei der Wurzel i.d.R. die Schwundstufe verallgemeinert, beim Akzent wurzelhafte oder suffixale Kolonnenbetonung.”²⁰ Even more fundamental changes took place in verbs: Proto-Indo-European finite verb, as we know, would originally stand unaccented in main clauses (i.e. as an enclitic), and it bore accent only in subordinate clauses. But this state of affairs was not preserved, the originally unaccented word (= finite verb in the main clause) must have later acquired an accent, which provided the space for fundamental changes in accentuation, e.g. in Greek (here, and henceforth, “Greek” refers generally to Classical Attic) the placement of verbal ac-

¹⁹ See especially the introduction to HELMUT RIX ET ALII, *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*, Wiesbaden 2001², pp. 10–25 (abbrev. *LIV*).

²⁰ MICHAEL MEIER-BRÜGGER, *Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft*, p. 194.

cent as far as possible from the end of a word, with the limitation on the last three syllables.²¹

2.2 Classical Latin accent

2.2.1 Testimony of ancient grammarians

All known testimonies of the ancient grammarians on the nature and place of the Latin accent are collected in the book by F. Schoell.²² The oldest record about the rules of placement of the Latin accent is Cicero, *Orator*, 58: *Ipsa enim natura, quasi modularetur hominum orationem, in omni verbo posuit acutam vocem nec una plus nec a postrema syllaba citra tertiam.*²³ More precise when writing about the place of the Latin accent is Quintilian: *Namque in omni voce acuta intra numerum trium syllabarum continetur, sive eae sunt in verbo solae sive ultimae, et in iis aut proxima extremae aut ab ea tertia. Trium porro, de quibus loquor, media longa aut acuta aut flexa erit, eodem loco brevis utique gravem habebit sonum ideoque positam ante se id est ab ultima tertiam acuet.*²⁴

However, we fail to find any older evidence; on the other hand, we can meet with relatively numerous comments on the place of the Latin accent in the writings of later grammarians (see chapter 5, pp. 100–126, in the book by F. Schoell cited in the note 22). The authors often take over the texts of their predecessors, and that is also why the recorded fragments are almost absolutely unanimous. It is well known that the influence of Greek originals on Latin grammar books was immense. We can commonly find explanation of the grammatical phenomena that do not actually exist in (Classical) Latin (for example the aorist, etc.) mechanically taken over from the interpretation of Greek system. That is also the case of the treatises on Latin accent, mostly dealing with the question where to find the acute and the circumflex accent in Latin (a question quite irrelevant for our current research): reportedly, the acute accent can be on the penultima or the antepenultima, the circumflex only on the naturally long penultima. After all, even in the Quintilian's formulation cited earlier the inspiration by the Greek examples is

²¹ Briefly and clearly on the topic: MICHAEL MEIER-BRÜGGER, *Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft*, pp. 171f.

²² FRIEDRICH SCHOELL, *De accentu linguae latinae veterum grammaticorum testimonia*, Leipzig 1876.

²³ CICERO, *Orator*, 58.

²⁴ QUINTILIANUS, *Institutio oratoria*, I,5,30.

quite obvious: he first says that the accent is “on one of the last three syllables”, and only then he adds that “out of these three, it is either on the penultima, or the antepenultima”.

The records read quite unambiguously that accent never stood on the last syllable (naturally with the exception of monosyllables) in Latin – this is the fact mentioned by practically all the authors²⁵ and the one differing from Greek. On the other hand, the strong Greek influence exercised on Latin authors slightly devalues the information about the Latin accent being bound on the penultima or the antepenultima (= one of the three last syllables except the last one). The theory about the accentuation of the words of the type *familia* on the fourth syllable from the end, based on the analysis of verses by Plautus and Terence was already mentioned in 1.2. There are not many four- or more-syllabic words with short penultima and antepenultima in Latin, and thus they could have easily escaped the attention of Latin grammarians (because they did not undertake any research of their own into this question). Therefore, suppose I took as the basis for further research just the reports by Latin grammarians, I would deem it indubitable that the accent was never on the last syllable; nevertheless, I would not consider it impossible that it was not limited only to the penultima or the antepenultima.

2.2.2 Exceptions to the (ante-)penultima law

A synoptic list of exceptions is presented e.g. by G. Bernardi Perini.²⁶ They are relatively well-known and there is no need to enumerate them in this place. Some of them serve as evidence that the accent had been, at least at certain period, fixed on a specific morpheme, not on the syllable of certain place in a word, and, consequently, the later changes did not force it to shift. That applies in the first place to the (rather controversial) type *Valéri*,²⁷ but particularly to some types of words with ac-

²⁵ With the sole exception – POMPEIUS, p. 127,15 K (FRIEDRICH SCHOELL, *De accentu*, p. 105): „... Et hoc plus non ascendit accentus, sed aut in finali est, aut in paenultima, aut in tertia a fine. ...“

²⁶ GIORGIO BERNARDI PERINI, *L'accento latino*, Bologna 1967², pp. 43–57.

²⁷ The substantives of the 2nd declension in *-ius*, *-ium* contract *-iī* > *-ī* in the gen. sg. Nevertheless, according to the prevailing opinion the Classical accent retains the place it would have held if the word remained uncontracted (*Vergīlī*, *Valéri*, *impéri*, ...). The evidence on this problem given by the ancient grammarians is, however, by no means unequivocal (see FRIEDRICH SCHOELL, *De accentu*, pp. 127–149); thus we cannot be entirely sure about which place in the given words actually bore the accent.

cent on the last syllable due to various syncope and apocopes: 1) apocope of *-e* in enclitics *-ce*, *-ne*:²⁸ *illíc* < *illíce*; *audín* < *audísne* etc.; 2) apocope of *-e* in the 2nd pers. sg. imperative of the compounds of verbs *dīcō*, *dūco*, *addíc* < *addíce*, *addúc* < *addúce* etc.; 3) syncope of *-i-* in the last syllable of the nouns in *-átis*, *-ítis* (*-átis* > *-āts* [> *-āss?*] > *-ās*): *primás*, *optimás*; *Quirís*, *Samnís* etc.; 4) syncope of *-i-* in the perfect of the type *audīt* < *audīit* < *audívit*; 5) syncope of *-vi-* in the perfect of the type *fumāt* < *fumávit*.

2.3 Italian

A detailed comment on the change of the Latin accent into the accent in Italian or other Romance languages I shall leave to the specialists. However, just a brief look into an Italian dictionary reveals:

- Some word-formative types have the accent on the last syllable, e.g. *bontà*; *virtú*;
- Some word-formative types have the accent which corresponds to the accent on the last syllable in Latin, e.g. *attóre*; *lavóro*; *nazióne*.

In both instances the accent falls on the suffix, i.e. on the place where we can find it in the oblique cases in Latin (*bonitátis*, *virtútis*, *āctóris*, *labóris*, *natiónis*); in Latin nominative, however, the accent should have been on the (ante-)penultima, i.e. in these specific examples on the root.

On the other hand, the words of the type *familia*, that is those with both short penultima and short antepenultima, speculated to have had the accentuation on the quartultima in Latin (see 1.2 above), are – if I am not mistaken – accented strictly on the antepenultima in Italian: *malízia*, *maléfico*, *innúmere*, *insólito*, *implúvio* etc.

Besides, what remains debatable as well is whether the form of the genitive in *-ī* is really the predecessor of *-ī* – in the inscriptions up to 200 B.C. we can find solely the “contracted” forms, i.e. *-ī*.

²⁸ Accentuation of the words with enclitics is debatable anyway. Roman grammarians left the evidence of the retraction of accent in the words with enclitics to the syllable immediately preceding the enclitic (*virúmque*, *Músáque*). However, for instance W. SIDNEY ALLEN, *Accent & Rhythm*, Cambridge 1973, pp. 158–161, doubts this rule and maintains that Latin scholars borrowed the examples from Greek textbooks and that such accentuation in Latin is relevant only if the penultima of the whole form with enclitic is long (e.g. *virúmque*). The words with the enclitic *-que* thus Allen stresses as accent units according to the classical (ante-)penultima law (i.e. not *Mūsáque*, but *Músáque*).

As if the evidence of Italian is bringing the doubts of quite an opposite nature than the evidence of Latin grammarians: accent is never retracted further from the end than to the antepenultima; on the contrary, what might be considered is the accent on the ultima in some instances (however, not in the words of the type *attóre* and others, cited above following the second centered dot, that are generally thought to have issued from the form of Latin accusative).

3. The transition between the Indo-European and the Classical Latin accent

As was mentioned in the introduction, the Latin accent is considered very distant from the Proto-Indo-European and not relevant for the latter's reconstruction. The same actually applies to the ablaut: only rarely do we work with Latin when establishing Proto-Indo-European accent-ablaut paradigms, while in fact Latin paradigms reflect the original state quite closely. Naturally, there exists quite extensive analogical leveling throughout paradigms; this, however, is not a feature specific to Latin – see the summary by M. Meier-Brügger on nominal accent cited in 2.1; as we shall see later, Latin agrees with the described characteristics almost entirely.

In the following outline we proceed from the fact that in Classical Latin the accent does fall on the penultimate or the antepenultimate syllable, according to the rule every student of Latin is familiar with. In PIE, as we have already said, accent did not fall on a syllable of certain place in a word, but on a certain morpheme, which it either remained on throughout the whole paradigm of the word, or it shifted therefrom according to certain rules. If we look also at Latin accent along those lines, that is, if we survey the movement of the accent on the individual morphs throughout paradigms, what shall we find out?

3.1 Analysis of the place of accent in Latin nouns

3.1.1 The first declension

Let us take various types of nouns of the first declension: in the 1st column, there is a representative of the nouns with the structure root + (regarded synchronically) ending, i.e. without another word-formative suffix (except *-eh₂-*); in the 2nd column a noun with short-syllabic word-formative suffix; in the 3rd column a noun with long-syllabic word-

formative suffix; in the 4th column a noun with disyllabic word-formative suffix with short antepenultima; in the 5th column a noun with disyllabic word-formative suffix with long antepenultima.

rósa	fémina	coróna	família	victória
rósae	féminae	corónae	famíliae	victoriae
rósae	féminae	corónae	famíliae	victoriae
rósam	féminam	corónam	famíliam	victóriam
rósā	féminā	corónā	famíliā	victóriā
rósae	féminae	corónae	famíliae	victoriae
rosárum	fēminárum	corónárum	familiárum	victóriárum
rósīs	féminīs	corónīs	famíliīs	victóriīs
rósās	féminās	corónās	famíliās	victóriās
rósīs	féminīs	corónīs	famíliīs	victóriīs

As follows from the tables, the nouns retain in all instances, with the exception of the plural genitive (of all types), columnar accent. The form of the plural genitive in *-árum* is secondary; the original forms in *-um* (< *-om* < **-h₂-om*) did not upset the columnarity. Concerning the neologisms in *-árum*, it is easy to imagine first the establishing of secondary accent on the penultima and, eventually, its possible predominance.

And what is then the relation of the columnar accent to the presumed original Indo-European accent? Primary *-eh₂*-stems (of the type of Lat. *fuga*, Gr. φυγή) are sometimes considered to be mesostatic, but that is highly questionable; the existence of mesostatic paradigm in PIE is not at all generally accepted.²⁹ What would have corresponded to the original mesostatic accent in the given example (because the suffix and the endings merge into one syllable) is the accent on the ultima – therefore, the accent would have had to shift from the ultima to the preceding root syllable. But *ā*-stems are in their majority secondary derivations, either feminine derivations of masculine nouns, or other nouns, in which the

²⁹ Cf. e.g. ROBERT S. P. BEEKES, *The Origins of the Indo-European Nominal Inflection*, Innsbruck 1985, p. 174.

suffix *-eh₂-* is combined with another word-formative suffix, forming together a complex suffix (columns 2-5). Here, naturally, the ablaut-accent paradigms cannot be applied. However, the accent on the long suffix (columns 3 and 5) and, if the suffix is short, on the root (column 2), looks very natural. The place of accent in the nouns in the 4th column may be considered disputable (see above 1.2 – the quartultimate accent).

So what does the columnarity actually imply here? Above all, it suggests the replacement of possible mobile paradigms (should they at all come into account) by static paradigms. In most nouns the accent evidently remained in the original place (type *fēmina*, *corōna*, *victōria*). Concerning the nouns with the original accent on the suffix *-eh₂-* (if they existed), there must have happened the only thing: after the endings had been “swallowed” (= suffix + ending form one syllable), the accent moved forward, and, eventually, the already unstressed suffix was shortened.

3.1.2 The second declension

In the following chart there is again in the 1st column a representative of the nouns without word-formative suffix, e.g. with the structure root + (regarded synchronically) ending; in the 2nd column a noun with short-syllabic word-formative suffix; in the 3rd column a noun with long-syllabic word-formative suffix; in the 4th column a noun with disyllabic word-formative suffix with short antepenultima; in the 5th column a noun with disyllabic word-formative suffix with long antepenultima.

lúpus	pópulus	Rōmánus	Valérius	armárium
lúpī	pópulī	Rōmání	Valériī	armáriī
lúpō	pópulō	Rōmánō	Valériō	armáriō
lúpum	pópulum	Rōmánum	Valérium	armárium
lúpō	pópulō	Rōmánō	Valériō	armáriō
lúpī	pópulī	Rōmání	Valériī	armária
lupórum	populórum	Rōmānórum	Valeriórum	armáriórum
lúpīs	pópulīs	Rōmánīs	Valériīs	armáriīs
lúpōs	pópulōs	Rōmánōs	Valériōs	armária
lúpīs	pópulīs	Rōmánīs	Valériīs	armáriīs

Concerning the *o*-stems, there applies exactly what has been said of *ā*-stems: with the exception of the plural genitive, which is not original, the accents in all types are columnar, and that either on the root, or on the long word-formative suffix, or on the disyllabic word-formative suffix (if we strictly observe the (ante-)penultima law).

Nor we can generalize and speak about a single paradigm concerning primary *o*-stems: there are the types with accent on the root as well as on the suffix (e.g. **-tós* etc.). In primary *o*-stem nouns with the suffixal accent (e.g. in perfect passive participles, but also in other types of deverbative adjectives) thus the original accent on the ultima (where the suffix merges with the ending) must have moved forward.

3.1.3 The third declension

In the 1st column is a root noun, in the 2nd an *i*-stem noun without another word-formative suffix; in the 3rd column a consonant stem with short-vocalic word-formative suffix; in the 4th column a consonant stem noun with long-vocalic word-formative suffix; in the 5th column as well, but with an inserted syllable between the root and the suffix, in the 6th column an *i*-stem with another word-formative suffix (or inserted syllable between the root and the *i*-suffix), in the 7th column a consonant stem with disyllabic word-formative suffix (with the long antepenultima; similar type with the short antepenultima apparently does not exist, but according to the (ante-)penultima law there would be no difference as regards the accent between those two types anyway).

mós	cívīs	génus	dólor	nóvitās	fácilis	magnitúdō
móris	cívīs	généris	dolóris	novitātis	fácilis	magnitúdinis
móri	cívī	généri	dolóri	novitātī	fácilī	magnitúdinī
mórem	cívem	génus	dolórem	novitātem	fácilēm	magnitúdinem
móre	cíve	gére	dolóre	novitāte	fácilī	magnitúdi ne
mórēs	cívēs	génera / triplícia	dolórēs	novitātēs	fácilēs / facília	magnitúdi nēs
mórum / múrium	cívium	génerum / triplícium	dolórum	novitātum	fácilium	magnitúdi num
móribus	cívibus	genéribus	dolóribus	novitātibus	fácilibus	magnitúdi nibus
mórēs	cívēs	génera / triplícia	dolórēs	novitātēs	fácilēs / facília	magnitúdi nēs
móribus	cívibus	genéribus	dolóribus	novitātibus	fácilibus	magnitúdi nibus

We cannot but repeat: also in the third declension Latin accent is columnar, with the following few exceptions:

- Nom. sg. of the words of the type *dolor* and *novitās*, e.g. those with long word-formative suffix, accented in oblique cases. The interesting thing is that in these examples in Italian we have the accent on the suffix (see above 2.3). Was then the columnar principle temporarily disrupted in Classical Latin and then it – apparently for the sake of analogy – moved back to its original place? Or was the accent in these examples in the nom. sg. on the suffix even in Classical Latin and it escaped the attention of Latin grammarians?
- Dat. and abl. pl. of the nouns, where the suffix *-ibus* is preceded by a short syllable (here col. 3, 6 and 7). That is the case of the forms of the type *familia*, e.g. the forms with both short penultima and short antepenultima. Besides, the *-i-* here is secondary, epenthetic; therefore we can speculate that in fact columnarity was not upset, while the forms were accented rather as follows: *gēneribus*, *fācilibus*, *magnitūdinibus*.
- Nom., gen. and acc. of neuters in *-ia*, *-ium* with the short preceding syllable – here again we are referring to the forms of the type *familia*.

Mobile paradigms became static again; vowels in the roots became uniform within paradigms. In the original hysterdynamic stems the accent moved forward from the ultima (the accent in fact could not well stabilize on the suffix, which was unsyllabic, *pa-tr-is*; thus it seems only natural that the accent in oblique cases retracted from the ending to the root and as such eventually prevailed in the whole paradigm).

3.1.4 The fourth declension

Latin 4th declension consists of the original *-eu-* and *-teu-* stems. In the 1st column there is a disyllabic noun, in the 2nd column a multisyllabic noun with the short penultima, in the 3rd column a multisyllabic noun with the long penultima:

mánus	exércitus	advéntus
mánūs	exércitūs	advéntūs
mánuī / córnu	exercítuī / exércitū	advéntuī
mánum	exércitum	advéntum
mánū	exércitū	advéntū
mánūs / córnuā	exércitūs	advéntūs
mánuum	exercítuum	advéntuum
mánibus	exercítibus	advéntibus
mánūs / córnuā	exércitūs	advéntūs
mánibus	exercítibus	advéntibus

The original *-eu-* and *-teu-* stems have proterodynamic paradigm; this fact is very well reflected also in Latin endings, except for dat. sg. and gen., dat. and abl. pl., where the shortening of suffixal vowel must have taken place. From the synchronic point of view the accent inside paradigms is columnar again; the only exceptions are the nouns of the type *exercitus* in the 2nd column, where the columnarity is upset – suppose we strictly apply the (ante-)penultima law – in dat. sg. and in gen., dat. and abl. pl. These, however, are again the forms of the type *familia*; therefore we can reconsider the accent on the quartultima, i.e. the accent columnar throughout the whole paradigm.

As has been already mentioned, the paradigms were presumably originally proterodynamic. Then, what first took place was the transformation of the mobile paradigm into the static one; to be specific, the suffixal accent in oblique cases retracted to the root. After the accent had shifted, the shortening of the vowel in inner postaccented syllables followed (*-uī, -uum, -ubus*; however, the shortening in the first two instances could be regarded as *vocalis ante vocalem*), which was a very natural consequence of the accent loss.

3.1.5 The fifth declension

rēs	dīēs	spéciēs
rēī	dīēī	speciēī
rēī	dīēī	speciēī
rém	dīem	spéciēs
rē	dīē	spéciē
rēs	dīēs	
rērum	dīērum	
rēbus	dīēbus	
rēs	dīēs	
rēbus	dīēbus	

Latin 5th declension comprises two primary nouns, *rēs* and *dīēs*, and the derivations of the type *spéciēs*, which do not form plural. Both the subst. *rēs* and *dīēs* are inherited nouns with the originally hysterodynamic flexion.³⁰ As follows from the preceding declensions and as it is common also in other languages than Latin, the paradigms changed from mobile into static ones. Concerning the subst. *rēs*, the accent necessarily falls on the first syllable, in which the root and the (accented) suffix merge. That corresponds with the situation in Classical Latin: we have the columnar accent in the whole paradigm there. Regarding the subst. *dīēs*, the situation is more complicated. For the first time here, we can witness fundamentally non-columnar accent, given that we strictly observe the (ante-)penultima law of Classical Latin. It is natural to presume that the accent in the originally hysterodynamic paradigm stabilized on the suffix. However, in the nom., acc. and abl. sg. and in the nom. and acc. pl. such accent would fall on the ultima. There are two ways how to read the situation: either the accent in these forms actually remained on the suffix, i.e. on the ultima, also in Classical Latin. It is true that these

³⁰ Cf. e.g. ROBERT S. P. BEEKES, *The Origins of the Indo-European Nominal Inflection*, pp. 80ff.; MICHAEL MEIER-BRÜGGER, *Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft*, pp. 197f.

forms in the verses by Plautus and Terence are usually accented on the suffix, but this would be also true in the purely quantitative verses with no relation between ictus and accent, so this argument is not really valid. However, we could see already in the case of the 3rd declension that in certain instances the accent on the ultima is not impossible. The other possibility is that Latin, on the contrary, and in accord with the findings of the grammarians, really avoided the accent on the ultima, and this was why the need to shift the accent arose. The substantives of the type *speciēs* have the accented suffix *-eh_i-* and follow exactly the same rules as the subst. *diēs*. The accent in Romance languages (It. *fàccia*, *spècie*, Fr. *espèce*, Esp. *día*) provides evidence rather in favour of the latter option, namely the shift of the accent from the ultima.

3.1.6 Summary – nouns

Concerning the noun declension, it can be generally said: With the exception of the 5th declension there is to be found quite clearly columnar accent in Latin nouns. This is not to say that the accent stays throughout the paradigm still on the syllable of the same place in a word, but that it remains still on the same morpheme, either root, or suffixal. The columnarity is upset, out of the whole system of Latin nouns, only in the following instances:

- in the noun *diēs* and the type *speciēs*;
- in the gen. pl. in *-ārum* and *-ōrum*, which, however, are not original (the forms with the original *-um* do retain columnar accent);
- in the nom. sg. of the nouns of the 3rd declension with the long word-formative suffix (of the type *dolor*, *novitās*); what is interesting in this respect is that Italian stresses the relevant forms on the suffix (which would correspond to columnar accent);
- if we strictly follow the (ante-)penultima law, then in some forms with short penultima and antepenultima in the 3rd and 4th declensions (e.g. *genéribus*, *facílibus*, *magnitūdínibus*, *exercítibus*). However, concerning the words with short penultima and antepenultima the possibility has long been discussed of quartultimate accent – and that would fall within columnar system in the given examples.

Latin nouns thus well correspond with the tendency formulated by M. Meier-Brügger (quoted above in 2.1) – throughout the whole paradigm, the root becomes uniform (in favour of oblique cases) and the ac-

cent is fixed either on the suffix or on the root. Latin, contrary to the general opinion, is not any more innovative concerning the nouns than other languages; compared to Greek, which has been regarded as one of the languages most authentically retaining Proto-Indo-European accentuation, Latin in fact differs only in the accentuation of root words, which preserve mobile accent in Greek. The only real innovation in the accentuation of Latin nouns is probably the shift of the accent from the ultima, which must have taken place in the originally suffixally stressed *ā*- and *o*-stems, the original hysterodynamic stems of the 3rd declension, the noun *diēs* and the type *speciēs*. In this respect we could also deem it more probable that also in the nom. sg. of the nouns of the type *dolor* and *novitās* the accent shifted from the ultima. Regarding the forms of the type *generibus*, the accentuation can be considered disputable: I am far from declaring that all Latin words with both short penultima and short antepenultima had the accent on the quartultima; the question, however, remains whether in all the forms where it probably was originally positioned on the quartultima (judging from its place in other forms of the paradigm), the accent had to shift necessarily to the antepenultima. The answer to this question may arise from a new analysis of the verses by Plautus and Terence (suppose we accept the thesis on the tendency to harmonize ictus and accent in their verses) relating to those particular forms; that however is not within the scope of this article.

3.2 Analysis of the place of accent in Latin verbs

PIE accent in verbs cannot be described by simple rules. Various types of primary stems (LIV 2001 lists twenty present stems + three aorist stems + one perfect stem) are accentuated differently; moreover, often the place of the accent alternates even throughout the paradigm between the singular and the plural. Beside that, as was already said above (2.1), the verbs in main clauses were accentuated differently than the ones in subordinate clauses. It is quite evident that extensive analogical leveling similar to that in nouns, took place throughout the paradigms of Latin verbs: except for irregular verbs we do not have evidence of any ablaut alternations throughout paradigms.

Latin verbal system is, unlike the nominal one, very innovative compared with the Proto-Indo-European and it must be said that the origin of the secondary suffixes (distinguishing the categories of tense and mood)

remains to a great extent a mystery for the researchers, or better, the scholars do not agree at all in the interpretation thereof. Out of the whole system of finite verbal forms, only the present indicative and imperatives can be considered really inherited forms (at the level of tenses and moods, not at the level of individual words).³¹ Another group includes the formations that could perhaps be considered the successors of certain PIE forms, but with the function other than original (it is in the interpretation of these forms that the researchers most disagree). Among those we can class the future I of the 3rd and 4th conjugation (possibly the original PIE conjunctive in *-e-*) and the present conjunctive, which could be the successor of the PIE present conjunctive as well,³² but e.g. according to Baldi³³ the present conjunctive of the 1st conjugation is the successor of the original optative while the 2nd -4th conjugation developed a secondary suffix *-ā-*. All the other active verbal forms are clearly secondary: ind. impf. and fut. I of the 1st and 2nd conjugation are Proto-Italic, or Latino-Faliscan neologisms (in the instance of the future in *-b-* we perhaps deal only with the analogical forms to the forms of the impf. in *-bā-*). The origin of the conj. impf. is, according to Baldi (pp. 402f.), uncertain; according to Meiser (p. 202), the *-s-* (> *-r-*) is a relic of the original Italic *s*-future, the long *-ē-* is then the result of the contraction of the thematic vowel and the conjunctive *-e-*. Also all the forms in the perfect system are secondary: in the perfect indicatives (with the exception of the original reduplicated perfects) the original aorist stems or the new Italic stems (the perfects in *-v-*) take the original perfect endings (which themselves, however, are quite distant from the original PIE state, see the note 31). Other forms of the perfect system (ind. plupf., ind. fut. II, conj. pf. and conj. plupf.) are apparently synthetic, the researchers, however, again disagree as to the interpretation of the individual elements. But it is not our aim to try to interpret the individual formations now; I present this perhaps rather superfluous outline merely because I want to clarify that in most verb forms, in contrast with the nouns, there does

³¹ One would like to add also the perfect indicative yielded by original perfects, e.g. *meminī*, but the perfect endings in Latin are analogical to such an extent (the paradigm is infiltrated by the features of active endings; that is yet another manifestation of the syncretism of aorist and perfect) and so distant from the original PIE endings, that we can regard no type of perfect to be really inherited.

³² Cf. GERHARD MEISER, *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*, Darmstadt 1998, pp. 200ff.

not exist any direct line from the Proto-Indo-European forms, and therefore we can hardly deal with the question of preserving or shifting the original accent there. Concerning the Italic or directly Latin neologisms, which constitute, as follows from the discussion above, the absolute majority of verb forms, the question of continuity of the accent is quite irrelevant.

It must be said that even Greek, undoubtedly considered to be one of the languages best preserving the Proto-Indo-European state of affairs, is quite innovative considering the accentuation of verbal forms: the accent therein is, as we know, recessive; it is positioned as far as possible from the end of a word while following some other rules (= the accent does not fall further than on the antepenultima, so, practically, it is – with the exception of irregular verbs and some contracted forms – always either on the penultima or the antepenultima, depending on the quantity of the ultima). I am not familiar with any study which would compare the place of accent in Greek and PIE verbal forms directly; the latest monograph on the subject of Greek accent³⁴ only quotes Wackernagel's theory³⁵ of the origin of recessive accent in some verbal forms in Greek.³⁶ I am therefore not able to determine the real scope of innovativeness compared with the original state. (Apparently, in many cases the accent remains in fact on the same place it originally had, e.g.: φέρω, φέρεις, φέρει, φέρομεν, φέρετε, φέρουσι < *b^hérō, *b^héresi, *b^héreti, *b^hérome-, *b^hérete-, *b^héronti.)

The (ante-)penultimate accent in Latin – and the following actually corresponds with the way Latin grammarians saw it – is also nothing else than recessive accent with the limitation on the last three syllables; the only difference between Latin and Greek is that the decision whether

³³ PHILIP BALDI, *The Foundations of Latin*, Berlin – New York 2002, pp. 402f.

³⁴ PHILOMEN PROBERT, *Ancient Greek Accentuation*, Oxford 2006.

³⁵ JACOB WACKERNAGEL, *Der griechische Verbalaccent*, in: *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete des Deutschen, Griechischen und Lateinischen* 23 (= NS 3), 1877, pp. 457–470.

³⁶ First, already in the pre-dialectal period, Greek introduced as an innovation the law of limitation (very briefly: the accent could fall only on one of the last three syllables, circumflex as far as the penultima, acute as far as the antepenultima, but only if the ultima was short); enclitic verbs in main clauses then formed, with respect to the new law of limitation, an impermissible cluster of unaccented syllables at the end of a word, and therefore adopted a new, recessive type of accentuation, which subsequently spread on the finite verbal forms in all syntactic positions (cf. PHILOMEN PROBERT, *Ancient Greek Accentuation*, p. 87).

the accent falls on the penultima or the antepenultima depends in Latin on the quantity of the penultima, while in Greek on the quantity of the ultima. The principle, however, is the same. With respect to the fact that almost the entire Latin verbal system is an innovation compared to the PIE state, it is only natural that the language should adopt a new system of accentuation. If we look at least at the formations which could be considered inherited, can we, as we could with nouns, trace a system concerning the positioning of the accent on the individual morphemes?

Present Indicative:

	1 st conj.	2 nd conj.	3 rd conj.	4 th conj.
active	láudō	móneō	légō / cápiō	áudiō
	láudās	mónēs	légis / cápis	áudīs
	láudat	mónet	légit / cápit	áudit
	laudá mus	moné mus	lég imus / cá pimus	audí mus
	laudá tis	moné tis	lég itis / cá pitis	audí tis
	láudant	mónent	légunt / cápiunt	áudiunt
passive	láudor	móneor	légor / cápior	áudior
	laudá ris	moné ris	léger is / cáper is	audí ris
	láudá tur	moné tur	légit ur / cápit ur	audí tur
	laudá mur	moné mur	lég imur / cá pimur	audí mur
	laudá minī	moné minī	leg iminī / cap iminī	audí minī
	laudá ntur	moné ntur	leg úntur / capi úntur	audi úntur

In the 1st, 2nd and 4th conjugation, that is where the endings are preceded by a long suffix, we can see the alteration of the stress on the root in the sg. act., the 3rd pers. pl. act. and the 1st pers. sg. pas., and on the suffix in the 1st and 2nd pers. pl. act. and in all the remaining persons of passive. The following scenario seems to be most likely: The accent was originally in all persons and numbers on the suffix (which should indeed apply to denominatives, which constitute the overwhelming majority of the 1st conjugation and a big part of the 4th conjugation, as well as for

statives – a large group of verbs of the 2nd conjugation). After the original ending *-i* had dropped in the 2nd and 3rd pers. sg. and the 3rd pers. pl. act. (I leave aside the 1st sg. as an absolutely exceptional form), the accent moved to the ultima, wherefrom it then shifted towards the beginning of a word according to the new rules of accentuation.

In the verbs of the 3rd (a and b) conjugation, which includes chiefly primary verbs,³⁷ we can see the columnar accent on the root, with the exception of the 2nd and 3rd pers. pl. pas. However, in the 2nd pers. pl. pas. we deal with the forms of the type *familia*, i.e. with the short penultima and antepenultima – the accent then perhaps could have been on the root also in this form.

Thus, certain logic and some traces of the original accentuation can be possibly found even there. But we must add that Latin system is compared to the original greatly simplified and that the individual Latin conjugations “combine” various types of PIE verbs, primary and derived; e.g. primary *arō* and many others, according to *LIV* (2001: 272) with originally stressed suffix, are among other deverbative, suffixally stressed verbs in the 1st conjugation; then e.g. the very verb *capiō* is reconstructed with the stressed suffix (*LIV* 2001: 344) etc. Naturally, the new type of accentuation is already dealt with also here – we merely want to show that the “choice” of the new accentuation had certain logic, as it probably was not far from how the majority, or at least a great part of verbal forms were originally accentuated. After all, the same most likely applies also to Greek (cf. the example cited above: φέρω).

PIE imperatives of thematic verbs are stressed on the root, same as Latin imperatives of verbs of the 3rd conjugation. In the other conjugations, containing mostly secondary verbs, the accent is analogical to that of present indicative: in 2nd pers. pl. it is on the (long) suffix, in 2nd pers. sg. the suffixal accent would equal the accent on the ultima, where it is inadmissible according to the new rules of accentuation.

Concerning the present conjunctive and future I of the 3rd and 4th conjugation, it will suffice to say briefly that the accent behaves as it was described in present indicative of the 1st, 2nd, and 4th conjugation: in these forms there are long suffixes (somewhere secondarily shortened), which the accent remains on with the exception of the forms of sg. act.,

³⁷ The secondary verbs with the suffix *-scere*, another important group belonging to the 3rd conjugation, are accented columnarily on the long vowel preceding the group *-sc-*.

3rd pers. pl. act. and 1st pers. sg. pas.; in active forms there was originally the ending *-i*, after it had dropped, the accent got on the ultima and forced the shift.

In Latin verbal system, same as in Greek one, a completely new system of accentuation was founded, establishing recessive accent, which fell as far from the end as possible while respecting certain respective rules in either language. However, this new accent apparently fell in the majority of Latin verb forms on the same place, where it had previously been according to the earlier morphological accentuation.

4. Conclusion

In conclusion, let us once again briefly sum up what follows from the above presented analyses: The Latin accent in principle is actually not very different from the Greek one. In the verbal system, which is quite innovative in and of itself, a new type of accentuation was established, namely recessive accent, with the limitation on three last syllables (very similar to the situation in Greek). The formation of this new accent, however, did not bring about any revolution, because as we can read from the paradigms, in the inherited formations the “new” accent corresponded with the place of the original accent. Accordingly, we should rather talk about a “new perspective” on the accent – the original accent bound on a certain morpheme started to be regarded as the accent bound on the syllable of a certain place and as such it was transferred on other neologisms, which constitute an absolute majority of Latin verbal system.

Regarding Latin nominal system, it preserves quite closely late PIE state when the change took place of mobile paradigms into static ones (in Greek, in contrast, some mobile paradigms were preserved). In other words, the accent in Latin nouns is basically columnar, either on the root, or on the suffix. The only real Latin innovation³⁸ is the shift of accent from the ultima. The exceptions to the columnarity are very scarce. The instances of where this prehistoric, morphologically bound accent and the new accent bound on the syllable of a certain place in a word,

³⁸ In most probability the innovation will not be Latin, but older in development, perhaps Proto-Italic; nevertheless I shall leave this incorrect formulation as I do not dare to give any judgments as regarding the accent in other Italic languages.

namely the penultima and antepenultima, differ are so few that it is worth questioning whether the new accent was established as consistently in nouns (by no means so innovative) as in verbs. If this was the case, then the original accent in the forms of the type *generibus* would have shifted from the original quartultima forward to the antepenultima. The other possibility, which I beg to favour, is that the original accent was stronger and in these few examples it maintained its original place. In other words, nominal accent in Classical Latin would in such case actually preserve the state after the accent shift from the ultima, and, with this only license, otherwise remain morphological (columnar). This could be, incidentally, testified to also by some types of exceptions from the classical (ante-)penultima law, as mentioned above in the section 2.2.2).

This article, however, is mainly conceived as another argument in support of the refusal of the initial accent, for which there do not exist good arguments and which, should we assert its existence, would have illogically disturbed the smooth and easy transition from the PIE accent to the Classical Latin accent.

Summary

The article is concerned with the ways of establishing the (ante-)penultimate accent in Classical Latin. The author starts from the belief, formulated in her monograph (LUCIE PULTROVÁ, *The Vocalism of Latin Medial Syllables*, Praha 2006), that there never existed any initial accent in Archaic Latin, and therefore she attempts to describe the direct transition from the reconstructed Proto-Indo-European accent to the Classical Latin accent. She reaches a conclusion that such transition is surprisingly straight and uncomplicated one. At the same time she asks an almost heretical question whether we have enough evidence that the Classical accent was indeed consistently (ante-)penultimate.

Keywords: accent, Archaic Latin, Classical Latin

LUCIE PULTROVÁ, Ústav řeckých a latinských studií, Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Karlovy, nám. Jana Palacha 2, 116 38 Praha 1, Lucie.Pultrova@ff.cuni.cz.