

**ON THE ACCENTUATION OF THE LATIN WORDS
WITH ENCLITICS**

LUCIE PULTROVÁ

Contemporary normative and historical Latin grammar books¹ teach us that one of the exceptions from the penultima law in Latin are the words with enclitics. A full word and an enclitic constitute one accent unit that, however, does not behave as a “common” word, because of the rule stating that it is the next syllable to the enclitic that bears the accent (e.g. *virúmque, Musáque*). In the case of monosyllabic enclitics it is then the short penultima that is accentuated in some types of forms (*Musáque*). This rule is based on the testimony of ancient grammarians (for more detail see below). From the perspective of today’s grammar books it thus seems that the discussion has basically been forgotten, even though being sometimes briefly mentioned, that was held over that topic. It is most explicitly articulated in the article by Tucker (1965) and in the book by Allen (1973: 158sq.), but an opinion different from the one that is generally accepted nowadays we can occasionally find already in the older grammar books and studies.²

On the whole it can be said that the “other than general contemporary view” sees the evidence of grammarians as at best controversial, and suggests not to follow it. Opinions vary regarding the particular way of accentuation of the words with enclitics; we can, nevertheless, distinguish two basic views: first, a word and an enclitic constitute an accent unit that is accentuated consistently according to the penultima law (i.e. *virúmque*, but *Músaque*; thus e.g. Allen and his predecessors³); second, enclitics, in contrast, do not influence accentuation in any way: a full word is accentuated as if the enclitic was absolutely independent (i.e. *virumque, Músaque*; thus e.g. Tucker).

The testimony of ancient grammarians is at first sight unquestionable. For all,⁴ let us mention e.g. Servius’s formulation (*Aen.* 12, 668): ... *minores particulae, ut que, ve, ne, ce, quotiens iunguntur aliis partibus, ante se accentum faciunt, qualislibet sit syllaba, quae*

¹ For example Weiss (2009: 111), Baldi (2002: 268), Panhuis (2009: 8), Leumann (1977: 240) and others. Similarly, in more detail, also e.g. Bernardi Perini (1967: 38sq.) in the synthetic publication on Latin accent.

² For the outline see Tucker (1965: 449). Relatively recent article by H. Jacobs (1997), while considering the fact that accent in Latin falls on the syllable preceding enclitic to be a self-evident truth, it subsequently deals with the analysis of Latin stress and its consequences for metrical theory – and is thus irrelevant for the purpose of this study.

³ Throughout the following text I use the name of W. S. Allen as an abbreviation for the whole conception, even though Allen is by far not its only (nor the first) advocate – see Tucker (1965: 449).

⁴ For the complete list of evidence concerning the given problem see Schoell (1876: 135sq.). Cf. also Bernardi Perini (1967: 39sq.), Nardoni (1988: 75) and others.

praecedit, sive brevis sive longa; ut Musáque, huiúsve, illúcce, tantóne... Tucker (1965: 451sq.), however, objects that the testimony of ancient grammarians in fact cannot be interpreted that unambiguously: first (as is the case in the quoted passage from Servius) it is limited to some enclitics only (it does not speak e.g. about *-met*, *-cum*, polysyllabic enclitics such as *-cumque*, *-quidem*, etc.); further, some pieces of evidence bring slightly differing information after all (Diomedes, *gramm.* I 433, 19sq. [see Schoell 1876: 136] talks about accentuating the syllable long by position⁵, not every syllable preceding an enclitic; Priscianus, *gramm.* III 488, 21sq. [see Schoell 1876: 138] says in turn that the rule about the shift of the accent does not concern prepositions, e.g. *própterque illum*); and finally, the formulation by a number of Latin grammarians (Tucker cites Diomedes and Priscianus) implies that they regard this shift as inappropriate. Allen (1973: 159) and others then rightly argue reminding of the notorious fact that the Latin grammar books are at places almost slavish translations of Greek patterns – in as much that they take over the whole grammar phenomena or complete grammar categories that are proper to Greek but not to Latin.⁶ This is why their testimony cannot be considered quite without doubts in this case where they describe the phenomenon typical for Greek (or, more specifically Attic; e.g. Μοῦσά τε, χρήματά τε).

The fact that the matter is disputable is, in my opinion, clear. The question remains, though, whether to assume an unambiguous stance on this issue is at all possible. What, apart from the testimonies of the grammarians, could bring relevant information about this problem? Beside the reflections based on the comparison with other languages (that yields arguments in favour of both sides) it could be – and it is what the authors of alternative theories tend to lean on – metrical structure of Latin verses. That, however, is true only when we acknowledge that at least in some Latin verses there is a coincidence, or a meaningful tendency to a coincidence of ictus and word accent. This in itself is disputable. What may, on the other hand, be considered as a generally acceptable claim is that if we are to search for such coincidence of ictus and word accent anywhere in pre-classical and classical Latin poetry, then it is most likely in the dialogic passages of ancient playwrights.

Fraenkel, the author of a fundamental work concerning the relation of verse ictus and word accent, begins his famous monograph (1928) with the words: “Die Frage nach dem Verhältnis von Iktus und Wortakzent im lateinischen Sprechverse ist so alt wie die wissenschaftliche Behandlung der griechisch-römischen Metrik.” In Fraenkel’s time the question had really been discussed over and over again for 200 years.⁷ Fraenkel clearly proceeds from the thesis claiming that in the Old Latin “Sprechvers” ictus coincides with word accent. If the ictus should in spite of that fall on another syllable than the one accented in the isolated word, then, according to Fraenkel, this fact is to be ascribed to various syntactic connections that may modify the accent during the speech. Similarly

⁵ This, at any rate, is Tucker’s (1965: 451, note 14) understanding of the formulation *verbi antecedentis longius positum acumen* (in Keil *cacumen*).

⁶ For example the aorist, optative etc. We do not have to, however, search for an example that far away: when dealing with Latin accent, Latin grammar books generally address the issue, quite irrelevant in fact, of the position of the acute and circumflex in Latin.

⁷ Clear and concise history of the research in this problem up to the time of publishing his work is brought by Král (1913: 137qq.).

Drexler (1932) speaks directly of the identity of ictus and accent, with the presumption in Plautus's time not of a word accent, but a "Gruppenakzent" (or "Kolonakzent", "Satzakzent"),⁸ which is to a great extent variable (indeed in the exact sense of Quintilian's saying *evenit, ut metri quoque condicio mutet accentum*⁹).

On the other hand, the author of the latest monograph on Plautus and Terence's metrics Questa (2007) stands on the quite the opposite end of the opinion spectrum: he asserts uncompromisingly (p. 10) that Latin verses had been at least until approximately the 2nd cent. A.D. based exclusively on the quantity of the syllable.¹⁰ In other metrical handbooks¹¹ we mostly meet with less radical stance (explicit or not), holding that we deal with quantitative verse, albeit with the strong tendency towards the coincidence of ictus and word accent.

The matter is immensely complicated, with the arguments in favour and against many times repeated, and this short study cannot, nor it has an ambition to, bring any fundamentally new issues to the discussion. Nevertheless, I allow myself to at least express my opinion that the reader who approaches reading Plautus's comedies intuitively,¹² without having been burdened with professional literature, cannot have any doubts about at least a "strong tendency" towards maintaining the coincidence of ictus and accent. I even believe that sooner or later everyone will ask himself a question as to whether these verses are indeed quantitative, and not accented. The prevailing opinion throughout the whole history of solving the problem, i.e. that the verses are quantitative, is with regard to the Greek patterns undoubtedly well-grounded.¹³ Despite that I consider the Pulgram's (1975: 227) statement that "attempts to read Latin dramatic lines in an accentual meter lead to rhythms so complex and recondite that the hearer has difficulty in perceiving them at all" to be rather exaggerated. Even quantitative reading implies countless and many times described exceptions (various non-standard shortenings, lengthenings, elementa ancipitia, indifferentia etc.). Accentual reading does not seem that complicated; only we must not approach it as if we were expecting an ictus on every word accent, but rather that ictus, if possible, should not go against word accent (i.e. not each accented

⁸ Cf. e.g. Drexler (1932: 346): "Das Charakteristikum des Lateins plautinischer Zeit ist vielmehr die einheitliche Betonung der Gruppen und Sprechakte, innerhalb deren das einzelne Wort seine Betonungselbständigkeit verliert." After all, Sturtevant recommended turning the attention towards a sentence accent already somewhat earlier in his fundamental study on this topic (1919), providing a statistical assessment of the coincidence of ictus and accent in Plautus and Terence. While his statistical tables are not absolutely persuasive concerning the harmony of ictus and accent in the relevant verses, Sturtevant has no doubts about it, deducing that (p. 243sq.): "On the basis of this material we find a strong and nearly consistent effort to place the verse ictus upon accented syllables. But it has been demonstrated that the ictus fell upon syllable which had the sentence accent in many places where it seems to conflict with the traditional word accent."

⁹ Quint. *inst.* 1, 5, 28 (I owe the quotation to Okál 1990: 14; Quintilian, however, supports the statement with the example of measuring the syllable containing the group *muta cum liquida*, which is a specific case).

¹⁰ Questa, same as e.g. the author of an outline work on Latin metrics Boldrini (1999: 21sq.), absolutely denies the existence of ictus and presume that the Romans read verses as prose.

¹¹ E.g. Crusius (1992: 66).

¹² Naturally, what is of great consequence is the mother tongue of the reader and its "natural" verse system.

¹³ Nevertheless, even the derivation from Greek patterns need not be regarded as unquestionable argument: there is an analogical case the translation by Livius Andronicus of the *Odyssey* in the Saturnine verse. M. Vaníková in the preceding issue of this journal (2010) persuasively showed that this may be understood as an accentual substitute of quantitative hexameter. After all, quantitative poetry has been translated exactly this way into Czech and other modern languages.

syllable has to be necessarily under ictus, in other words, some words can stand in the verse with no ictus at all, and, on the contrary, some other, three- and polysyllabic, can have, or better, often have two ictus¹⁴).

According to Fraenkel (and my own excerpt) the places where ictus and accent most often do not coincide (or more exactly, following Fraenkel and Drexler, “where the shift of accent occurs most often”), are the first foot of iambic senar and trochaic septenar, then the third thesis from the end and the end of the verse.¹⁵ For now, I shall leave it to the more competent to explain why ictus and accent often do not match in these particular feet. I simply state it as a fact, as it will play a certain role in the further text. But let us now go back to the original question and my own contribution to the discussion on the place of accent in the words with enclitics (namely *-que*, *-ne*, *-ve*).

The material corpus for the analysis contains only a fragment of relevant texts, namely Plautus’s comedy *Miles gloriosus*,¹⁶ more specifically the iambic and trochaic verses, of which there are 1354 in this play (trochaic septenar: 723 verses, iambic senar: 417 verses, iambic septenar: 214 verses; the anapestic verses 1011–1093 were excluded from excerpt), and the results thus will naturally have to be further tested on other texts; nevertheless, even this limited material allowed certain conclusion. It is good to repeat explicitly that in the following analysis we proceed from the presumption that ictus does not go against word accent (while we are aware of that this rule does not apply absolutely). Discussion standpoints whose validity we want to test are two:

- 1) Does the word with enclitic behave as one accent unit (= ancient grammarians; Allen), or is the full word accented individually and the enclitic has no influence on the place of the accent (= Tucker)?
- 2) If it is true that the word with enclitic constitutes an accent unit, is it a classical (ante-) penultimate accent (= Allen), or does the accent always fall on the last syllable before the enclitic (= ancient grammarians)?

¹⁴ Traditionally, we speak about a “secondary accent” in such cases; I deliberately avoid using this term as the concept of secondary accent is being questioned today. Two ictus in one longer word is an absolutely common phenomenon also in the Czech folk and artistic – accentual – verses, e.g. *pojedeme* in *Prší, prší, jen se leje, kam koničky pojedeme* etc. (the ictus on *koničky*, which does not coincide with the accent on the first syllable *koničky*, seems to bear witness to the presumption that the discord between ictus and accent in the verse that otherwise functions well in this respect, does not in any way disturb the rhythmical whole). The example of the word with no ictus that is accented in normal speech is e.g. the word *byl* in the verse *Byl pozdní večer, první máj*.

¹⁵ See Fraenkel (1928: 27sq., 91sq., 244sq.). It may seem from such a brief outline that there is practically left little space for coincidence of ictus and accent in the verse. In reality, however, the coincidence of ictus and accent is always “broken” only in some place in the verse, not in all these “critical” places. The “breaches” in the third, second and first foot from the end then have their own rules and logic (in maximum brevity: in masculine verses there is often a two-syllable word in the last foot – the ictus thus falls on the unaccented syllable; in these cases, that is if there is the second syllable of a disyllabic word under the last ictus, then the second ictus from the end falls as well on the last syllable of a word, which could again be disyllabic – e.g. *Mil. 9: propter virum*, or tri- or polysyllabic with a long penultima – e.g. *Mil. 3: cónsertá manú*; in this last case then also the third ictus from the end falls on the unaccented syllable; the third ictus from the end falls on the unaccented syllable also in the case that the last two feet are filled by a four-syllabic word – e.g. *Most. 1: ex(i) é culína sis forás, mastígiá*); “the breach” in the first foot may as well be understood as a deviation from the standard meter, not accentuation (see the dactyl beginning in the Czech *hrdliččin zval ku lásce hlas...*).

¹⁶ The edition used: T. Maccius Plautus, *Miles gloriosus*. Mit deutschem Kommentar von J. Brix, M. Niemeyer, O. Köhler. Leipzig, Teubner 1964.

The excerpted material provides relatively unambiguous answer to the first question: enclitics definitely play a role in accentuation, and the words they are attached to are not stressed in a “standard way”.¹⁷ The answer to the second question is more complicated – first, because in many cases (indeed in most cases) the “accent according to the penultima law” and “accent on the last syllable before enclitic” mean the same (the type *virúmque*), and second, because the excerpted examples include a considerable number that do not correspond to either type (e.g. *pugnándoque* etc.). The situation, however, totally changes when we proceed not from the written record of the verses but their presumed spoken realization: then the probability shifts significantly towards Allen’s approach. As the excerpted material quite persuasively shows, the words with enclitics *-que*, *-ne*, *-ve*, in position before the word beginning in a vowel (or *h-*) where the final *-e* undergoes elision are measured without the last, i.e. enclitic (elided) syllable: e.g. ... *pugnándoqu(e) hóminem* ... – what is penultimate is not the syllable *-do-*, but *-nand-*. With this modification having taken place the Allen’s rule gains more predominance:¹⁸

A) *-que*, *-ve*, *-ne* in hiatus, i.e. with elision of final *-e*¹⁹

- *1) *rogitábant*: „**hícin(e)** Achilles ést?“ *inquit mihí* (61)
 *2) *séd Philocómasi(um) hícin(e) étiam núnc est?* – *Qu(om) exhib(am) híc erát* (181)
 3) *eárumqu(e) árt(em) et disciplín(am) optíneat cólere*. – *Qu(em) ád modúm?* (186)
 4) *quá cibátus cómmeátusqu(e) ád t(e) et légionés tuás* (224)
 5) *rés parátast, ví pugnándoqu(e) hóminem cáperest cérta rés* (267)
 6) *máxum(um) ín malum crúciátumqu(e) ínsuliámus*. – *Tú salí* (279)
 7) *nís(i) oculós orátiónemqu(e) áliam cómmutás tibi* (327)
 8) *grátisqu(e)*²⁰ *ag(am) éiqu(e) ut Árabicó fumífic(em) odór(e) amoéne* (412)
 9) *ita mé ludíficant. méamn(e) híc ín vi(a) hóspítám* (488)
 10) *orátiónemqu(e)*. – *Égone sí post húnc diém* (565)
 *11) *mihiqu(e) amánt(i) ir(e) ópitulát(um) atqu(e) éa te fácere fácinorá* (621)
 *12) *hánčin(e) aétat(em) éxercére <méi> amóris grátíá* (626)
 13) *ét eg(o) amóris áliquant(um) hábe(o) umórisqu(e) éti(am) ín córpore* (639–640)
 14) *Véner(em), amór(em) amoénitátemqu(e) áccubáns exérceó* (656)
 15) *ópust(e) erít tib(i) ádvocáto trist(i), irácund(o)? écce mé* (663)
 16) *nímis boná ratióne nímiuqu(e) ád t(e) et túam vitám vidés* (716)
 17) *céns(er)em) émorí; cecidísetv(e) ébrius aút d(e) equ(o) úspiám* (721)
 18) *qu(i) ét rem sérvat ét se bén(e) habet súisqu(e) amícis úsuíst* (724)
 19) *ó lepidúm capút. ita mé di déaequ(e) amént, aequóm fuit* (725)
 20) *hóspes, nón qui m(i) ímperárent quíbusv(e) eg(o) éss(em) obnóxiús* (746)
 *21) *ítaqu(e) omnís s(e) ultró sectár(i) ín Épheso mémorat mülrierés* (778)

¹⁷ The following list of examples contains a number that bear witness against Tucker: 35–43, 51, 52, 54, 55, 57, 61, 65, 66 (e.g. *capítique, templisque* etc.).

¹⁸ In the lists, I have not included the cases when the word preceding enclitic is monosyllabic and thus naturally accented (e.g. *meque* etc.), and then the cases when the whole word with enclitic stands in the verse with no ictus, e.g. v. 932: *a tú(a) uxóre mihí dat(um) éss(e) eamqu(e) illum déperire*.

¹⁹ Marked by one asterisk are the verses in the list with the relevant words of the structure *qu/v/ne* (e.g. *ítaque*), where the shift of accent cannot take place even after the elision of the last syllable (in contrast with the examples not marked by an asterisk, e.g. *eárumqu(e) × earúmque*).

²⁰ See below no. 41.

- *22) **ítaqu(e)** e(am) húc ornát(am) addúcas, éx matrónarúm modó (791)
 23) cápite cómpito, crínis **víttasqu(e)** hábeat, ádsimulétque²¹ sé (792)
 *24) **quásiqu(e)** hunc anulúm faveae suae déderit, éa porró mihí (797)
 25) ben(e) **ópportúnequ(e)** óbvi(am) és, Palaéstri(o). ém tib(i) ádsunt (898)
 *26) **quásiqu(e)** istíus cáus(a) amóris éx hoc mátrimónio (1164)
 *27) **quásiqu(e)** eiús opuléntitátem révereáris, ét simúl (1171)
 28) Venerí pol hábeo gráti(am), **eándemqu(e)** ét oró et quaéso (1228)²²
 29) **benígnusqu(e)** érge mé siét, quod cúpiam né gravétur (1230)
 30) *Phílocomásíum*, salv(e). – Ét tu sálve. – **Máterqu(e)** ét sorór (1315)
 31) cónservi **consérvaequ(e)** ómnes, béne valét(e) et vívité (1340)
 32) **métuoqu(e)** ét timeó, n(e) hoc tándem própalám fiát, nimís (1348)
 *33) **ítaqu(e)** ancilla, cónciliátrix quae érat, dicebát mihí (1410)
 34) quód eg(o) hic hódie vápularím, **iúrequ(e)** id fáct(um) árbitrór (1415)

The counter-examples are to be found only in the feet where ictus and accent do not coincide most frequently (see above the note 15 and the corresponding text):

a) In the last three feet (see above the note 15):

- 35) *glaućum(am)* ob óculos óbiciémus **eúmqu(e)**²³ itá (148)
 36) s(i) ínvenió qui vídit, ád eum víneás **pluteósqu(e)** agám (266)
 37) *licétn(e)?* – At íta me dí **deaéqu(e)** omnis amént (501)
 38) *éius huc gémina vénit Éphes(um)* et máter, **áccersúntqu(e)** eám (975)
 39) *vid(i) híc sorór(em)* ess(e) *éius*. – **Cónvénítn(e)** eám (1105)

b) In the beginning of iambic verses:

- 40) **curámqu(e)** adhibér(e), ut praéolat míhi quod tú velís (41)
 41) **grátisqu(e)** ag(am) *éiqu(e)* ut *Árubicó fumífic(em)* odór(e) amoéne (412)
 42) *licétn(e)?* – At íta me dí *deaéque* omnis amént (501)
 43) **magisqu(e)** eánd(em), ut póte quae nón sit éadem, nón reór (529–530)

The following are only seeming counter-examples: the ictus on the pronounced ultima (= preceding elided enclitic) is already the second ictus in the word here, while the first ictus coincides with the accent on the antepenultima according to the penultima law:

- 44) *longúm* **diútínúmqu(e)**, a máne ad vésperúm (503)
 45) **líquidiúsculúsqu(e)** eró quam véntus ést favóniús (665)
 46) *málac(um)* et *cálidum cónficiátur* **túnicaéqu(e)** hibernaé bonaé (688)

More problematic, however, are the following examples:

- 47) *vin(o)*, *órnaméntis* **ópiparisqu(e)** opsóniís (107)
 48) *nosqu(e)* *ópera* **cónsilióqu(e)** *adhórtatúr*, iuvát (137)
 49) *árrip(e)* *op(em)* **aúxiliúmqu(e)** *ad hánc rem: próper(e) hoc, nón placidé decét* (220)
 50) **íngenuámn(e)** *an líbertín(am)?* – *Aequ(i)* *ístuc fácio, dúm modó* (783)

²¹ See below no. 63.

²² In the Harvard edition, with the positions of all the ictus marked, this verse is measured in a different way: *Venerí pol hábeo grátiam, éándémqu(e) et ór(o) et quaéso* (i.e. without the elision in the hiatus *gratiam eandem*). However, the ictus falling on *éand-* is absolutely non-standard; I therefore consider the solution suggested above (e.g. without the elision in the hiatus *oro et*) to be more fitting.

²³ Here, the word can also be measured *eúmqu(e)*.

Even though this also concerns longer words where the ictus falling on the syllable preceding enclitic is the second ictus in the given word, the situation is complicated by the fact that the first ictus in the word falls on the syllable that would not have been stressed according to the classical penultima law. All the mentioned examples are the words with short penultima and ultima (in professional literature they are sometimes described in short as “the words of the type *facilius*”²⁴). The theory is notorious, first articulated by R. Bentley (1726: 183, note 30), according to which the words with this syllabic structure had accent not on the antepenultima, but as far as on the quartultima. This theory has not become a general opinion, nevertheless it usually is mentioned in standard grammar books and special works on Latin accent, even though with certain uncertainty. It is true that the exception – if the theory is thus formulated – does not bring totally convincing results; but it is also true, on the other hand, that the number of the words with the given syllabic structure where ictus falls on the quartultima instead of the expected antepenultima are statistically significant. In most probability, we must interpret this accentuation as the remains of an older accentuation in Latin, the view that is not uncommon.²⁵ The author, however, does not agree with the theory of initial accent in Latin,²⁶ but presumes a direct transition from the PIE accent, where the place of accent constituted a characteristic of the word-formative type, to the classical Latin accent on the (ante-)penultima. It is possible that in Plautus’s time the (ante-)penultima law had not been yet fully constituted and in some word-formative types²⁷ and grammar forms²⁸ the older accent remained. A systematic analysis of individual word-formative types is totally beyond the scope of this article; however, at least the following may be outlined:

- Adj. *opiparus* (incl. adv. *opipare*) is to be found in Plautus’s texts four more times apart from in this place (*Bacch.* 373, *Capt.* 769, *Persa* 549, *Poen.* 132), in all the instances with the ictus falling on the first and the last syllables. The accentuation of this word-formative type in the proto-language is not absolutely clear, but at any case the accent falling on the morpheme corresponding to Latin antepenultima (-i-) is totally out of the question.
- Subst. *consilium* appears quite frequently in Plautus’s texts, with 18 times in *Mil.*, with the ratio of 2 : 1 in favour of the ictus falling on the first syllable. This, however, in itself does not testify to anything, we would have to examine the ways of placing ictus in the whole relevant (highly productive) word-formative type, which exceeds the possibilities of this article. In the protolanguage the root morpheme of these abstracts (corresponding to the Latin antepenultimate syllable) was certainly unaccented, as implied by the ablaut grade. It also must be added that the whole verse 137, as far as the coincidence of ictus and accent is concerned, deviates totally from the norm (the only ictus and accent match: *ópera*).

²⁴ Cf. e.g. the explanation by A. Thierfelder in Fraenkel (1928: 357sqq.).

²⁵ Cf. e.g. Leumann (1977: 251).

²⁶ Cf. e.g. Pultrová (2010).

²⁷ Typically in those, where there is in Latin an epenthetic (non-etymological) vowel between the root and the suffix, e.g. *fac-i-lius*, *fam-i-lia*, but not *videritis* etc.

²⁸ The accent of Latin nouns and adjectives is – apart from infrequent exceptions – columnar (which corresponds to the late Proto-Indo-European state). Majority of the exceptions are represented by the forms with short penultima and antepenultima that would fall in the columnar system if they were accentuated on the quartultima; e.g. *magnitúdo* – **magnitúdinibus*, *fácilis* – **fácilium* and others. Cf. Pultrová (2010).

- Subst. *auxilium* appears 31 times in the iambs and trochees in dialogic passages in Plautus,²⁹ with the ratio of 21 : 10 in favour of the ictus falling on the first syllable (these are, however, only “rough” figures, disregarding which feet in the verse the words appear in). The vowel *-i-* constituting the Latin antepenultima is only epenthetic (non-etymological).
- Adj. *ingenuus* appears 15 times in the iambs and trochees in dialogic passages in Plautus, with the ratio of 7 (*inge-*) : 8 (*ingé-*) (again in rough figures) – the exception thus does not imply anything at all; this case has no value of evidence, also because it concerns the initial syllable of the verse, where ictus does not necessarily have to testify of the place of accent (see above the note 15).

B) **-que, -ve, -ne** preceding consonant, i.e. retaining the final **-e**³⁰

- | | |
|--|--------|
| 51) <i>víden hostís tīb(i) adésse tuóque térg(o) obsídium? cónsulé</i> | (219) |
| 52) <i>túis nunc crúribús capítique fráudem cápital(em) hinc creás</i> | (294) |
| **53) <i>édepol fácinus fécit áudax. hócine sí milés sciát</i> | (309) |
| 54) <i>quom m(e) ín locís Neptúniís templisque túrbuléntis</i> (413) | |
| 55) <i>n(am) haec níl respóndet. – T(e) ádloquór, víti probríque pléna</i> | (423) |
| **56) <i>orátiónemqu(e). – Égone³¹ sí post húnc diém</i> | (565) |
| 57) <i>méumque³² cór corpúsque crúciat. – Quíd id est quód cruciát? cedó</i> | (617) |
| **58) <i>quíd ais t(u)? ítane tīb(i) ego vídeor óppid(o) Ácherúnticús</i> | (627) |
| **59) <i>tíbique, quibus nunc m(e) éss(e) expérior súmmae sóllicitúdiní</i> | (671) |
| 60) <i>quí deorúm consília cúlpet, stúltus íncitúsque sít</i> (736) | |
| 61) <i>út hic e(am) ábducát habeátque. – Dár(i) istanc rátioném voló</i> | (770) |
| 62) <i>cúí facétiárum cór pectúsque sít plen(um) ét dolí</i> (783) | |
| 63) <i>cápíte cómpito, crínis víttasqu(e) hábeat, ádsimulétque sé</i> | (792) |
| 64) <i>domi démonstráv(i) in órđin(e). hánc fabricám falláciásque</i> | (875) |
| 65) <i>síbi potéstatémque fácias. – Cúpi(o) hercl(e) équidem, s(i) illa vólt</i> | (972) |
| 66) <i>dicásque témpus máxume ésse, ut eát domúm</i> | (1101) |

The counter-examples are of two types:

- a) the first feet of trochaic verse (again, in the place where ictus and accent often do not coincide – see Fraenkel 1928: 91sq.), i.e. on the antepenultima, even though penultima is long by position:

- | | |
|--|--------|
| 67) <i>méumque cór corpúsque crúciat. – Quíd id est quód cruciát? cedó</i> | (617) |
| 68) <i>ópusne léni? léniórem díces quám mutúmst maré</i> | (664) |
| 69) <i>príusne qu(am) íll(am) oculis túis? – Videón id quód credó tíbí</i> | (1005) |

- b) two specific cases of parallelism:

- | | |
|--|--------|
| 70) <i>t(um) aut(em) illa ípsast <u>nímiūm lépida</u> nímisque <u>nítida</u> féminá</i> | (1003) |
| 71) <i>héia véro. – <u>Nímis</u> <u>facéte</u> nímisque <u>fácundé</u> malás</i> | (1141) |

²⁹ Excerpted from the database of *Bibliotheca Teubneriana Latina* – 3.

³⁰ Two asterisks in the following list mark the cases where the ictus is not on the last syllable before the enclitic, thus bearing witness against the traditional conception of the accent preceding the enclitic.

³¹ Iambic shortening is testified to by the fourfold appearance of the nonictic *egone* in *Mil.*

³² See below no. 67.

Let us sum up in conclusion: The above presented lists may offer a probable answer to the questions asked in the beginning of this article (p. 68). As has already been said it is apparent that enclitics really play a role in accentuation of words they are attached to (Tucker, therefore, is wrong). They constitute an accent unit. The accent, however, does not fall, contrary to the assertion of Latin grammarians, on the last syllable preceding enclitic, but on the penultima or antepenultima according to the penultima law. The conception represented by Allen is thus the correct one. But it must be specified that what is understood as penultima, resp. antepenultima is the second, resp. the third syllable from the end of the pronounced word in the particular verse: it does matter whether the vowel of the enclitic undergoes elision because of the hiatus, or whether the enclitic stands before the initial consonant, and is therefore fully syllabic.

Besides the answers to the stated questions we can gather some information this way concerning firstly the nature of accent in Plautus's time and secondly the form of elision. The given rule bears witness to the fact that Latin accent was already in Plautus's time placed mechanically on penultima or antepenultima depending on the quantity of the penultima; this assertion thus contradicts the above mentioned theory of the existence of traces of an older accentuation in archaic Latin and we cannot but state that the whole issue of placing ictus/accents in polysyllabic words will have to be submitted to a new analysis. Concerning the nature of the elision in verse, it is usually considered as incomplete,³³ i.e. with at least partial pronunciation of both vowels.³⁴ The modification of Allen's rule that has issued from our excerption, however – quite in discord with the common sense – shows the complete elision of the vowel, and that even at the seam between the speeches given by two acting figures (cf. e.g. *Mil.* 565 – above no. 10). That elision could bring forth the shift of accent was proposed by several scholars in the past.³⁵ Nevertheless, it is by no means a generally valid rule: e.g. in *Mil.*, if we proceed from the beginning of the text, having excluded the instances appearing in “critical places” in the verse (1st foot, ending of the verse), we will gradually find e.g. the phrase *fortunat(um) et* (v. 10), *elephant(o)* in (v. 25), *enarrand(um) hoc* (v. 81) etc. No shift of accent takes place following the elision there. Nevertheless, in the case of the words with enclitics, the shift of accent indeed appears to be a rule. Questa (2007) wittily quotes as a motto of his book Lindsay's statement that “in studying these niceties of early Latin speech one must remember the virtue *aliqua nescire* and take the facts as he finds them, without trying to give reasons of everything”. I believe that the specific nature of elision in the words with enclitics belongs among such cases.

³³ Cf. also Quint. *inst.* 9, 4, 40: *Atqui eadem illa littera (sc. M), quotiens ultima est et vocalem verbi sequentis ita contingit, ut in eam transire possit, etiamsi scribitur, tamen parum exprimitur, ut Multum ille et Quantum erat; adeo ut paene cuiusdam novae litterae sonum reddat. Neque enim eximitur, sed obscuratur, et tantum aliqua inter duas vocales velut nota est, ne ipsae coeant.* (I owe the knowledge of this quote to E. Kutáková.)

³⁴ Read with complete elision, the verses such as e.g. *Mil.* 412 (see above no. 8) or 621 (no. 11) etc. could be understood only with difficulty.

³⁵ E.g. Drexler (1932: 14): “Bei Synalöphe ist die Verlagerung des Akzents immer gestattet.” Cf. Allen (1973: 159sq.), who considers this theory invalid.

SOURCES

- T. Maccius Plautus, *Miles gloriosus*. Mit deutschem Kommentar von J. Brix, M. Niemeyer, O. Köhler. Leipzig, Teubner 1964.
- T. Maccius Plautus, *Miles gloriosus*. Edited with an introduction and notes by M. Hammond, A. M. Mack, W. Moskalew, revised by M. Hammond. Cambridge (Mass.)/London, Harvard University Press 1997.

REFERENCES

- Allen, W. S., 1973. *Accent & Rhythm*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Baldi, Ph., 2002. *The Foundations of Latin*. Berlin/New York, Walter de Gruyter.
- Bentley, R. (ed.), 1726. *Publii Terentii Afri Comediae*. Cambridge, Cornelius Crownfield.
- Bernardi Perini, G., ²1967. *L'accento latino*. Bologna, R. Pàtron.
- Fraedrini, S., 1999. *Prosodie und Metrik der Römer*. Stuttgart/Leipzig, Teubner.
- Crusius, F., ⁸1992. *Römische Metrik*. München, Max Hueber.
- Drexler, H., 1932. *Plautinische Akzentstudien*. Breslau, M. & H. Marcus.
- Fraenkel, E., 1928. *Iktus und Akzent im lateinischen Sprechvers*. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.
- Jacobs, H., 1997. Latin Enclitic Stress Revisited. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28, 648–661.
- Král, J., 1913. *Řecká a římská rhytmika a metrika II: Řecká a římská metrika*, III. Praha, Jednota českých filologů.
- Leumann, M., 1977. *Lateinische Grammatik, I: Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*. München, C. H. Beck.
- Nardoni, D., 1988. The Accent of the Latin Language. *Metalogicon* I, 71–90.
- Okál, M., 1990. *Antická metrika a prekladanie gréckej a latinskej poézie do slovenčiny*. Bratislava, Slovenský spisovateľ.
- Panhuis, D. 2009. *Latin Grammar*. Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press.
- Pulgram, E., 1974. *Latin-Romance Phonology: Prosodics and Metrics*. München, Wilhelm Fink Verlag.
- Pultrová, L., 2010. Constitution of the Classical Latin accent. In: P. Anreiter, M. Kienpointner (eds.), *Latin Linguistics Today: Akten des 15. Internationalen Kolloquiums zur Lateinischen Linguistik Innsbruck, 4.–9. April 2009* [Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 137]. Innsbruck: s.n., 75–85.
- Questa, C., 2007. *La metrica di Plauto e di Terenzio*. Urbino, QuattroVenti.
- Schoell, F., 1876. *De accentu linguae latinae veterum grammaticorum testimonia* [Acta Societatis philologiae Lipsiensis, 6]. Leipzig: Societas philologiae Lipsiensis.
- Sturtevant, E. H., 1919. The Coincidence of Accent and Ictus in Plautus and Terence. *Classical Philology* 14, 234–244.
- Tucker, R. W., 1965. Enclitics in Latin. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 96, 449–461.
- Vaníková, M., 2010. Comparison of the Saturnian Verse and Czech Translation Verse of Classical Quantitative Hexameters. *Graecolatina Pragensia* 23, 107–128.
- Weiss, M., 2009. *Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin*. Ann Arbor, Beech Stave Press.

ON THE ACCENTUATION OF THE LATIN WORDS WITH ENCLITICS

Summary

The article is a small contribution to the earlier held discussion on accentuating the words with enclitics. It agrees with the opinion of the scholars (e.g. Allen 1973) according to whom the words with enclitics are accentuated as a whole, but, contrary to the comments by ancient grammarians (and the way the rule is described in contemporary grammar books), not on the last syllable preceding the enclitic, but

consistently according to the penultima law. However, this conception is – based on the partial excerption of Plautus's iambic and trochaic verses, and thus presuming that these verses show the coincidence of ictus and accent – slightly modified in the sense that (here in contrast to Allen's opinion) the counting of penultima and antepenultima depends on whether the final vowel of the enclitic undergoes elision or not.

K AKCENTOVÁNÍ LATINSKÝCH SLOV S PŘÍKLONKAMI

Shrnutí

Článek je drobným příspěvkem k dříve vedené diskusi o akcentování slov s příklonkami. Dává za pravdu názoru badatelů (např. Allen 1973), podle nichž jsou slova s příklonkami akcentována jako jeden celek, ovšem v rozporu se zprávami latinských gramatiků (a s tím, jak je pravidlo tradováno v současných gramatikách) nikoli na poslední slabice před příklonkou, nýbrž konzistentně podle penultimového zákona. Tato koncepce je však – na základě dílčí excerptce Plautových jambických a trochejských veršů, a tedy na základě presumpce, že tyto verše vykazují shodu iktu a akcentu – drobně modifikována v tom smyslu, že (zde v kontrastu s Allenovým míněním) počítání penultimy a antepenultimy je odvislé od toho, zda je koncový vokál příklonky elidován, či nikoli.