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 Pultrova, *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.
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