Secondary stress in Latin?

1. Some annotated bibliography

Secondary stress has been posited for Latin (of some period or variety) in many different ways, on the basis of many kinds of evidence. These include:

- **early Latin word-initial stress vs. classical Latin stress**—i.e. in various guises, the idea that both of these coexisted, and that what changed was which counted as primary:
  e.g. Lindsay (1894: 159); Stolz (1894–5: 99); Ahlberg (1905: 8); Drexler (1932: 347–8). For a history and discussion of this idea, see Nishimura (2008: 207–11).

  Jacobs (2003, especially p. 242) explicitly argues against the idea that secondary stress was quantity-insensitive in classical Latin, although he sees this as compatible with a degree of continuity with the early Latin system of initial stress (compare Allen 1973: 188–190; Sen 2012: 211). Probert (2024, especially pp. 323–4) suggests on different grounds that secondary stress existed in classical Latin, but not always on the initial syllable.

- **iambic shortening**
  e.g. Allen (1973: 181, 182); Jacobs (2003).

  Fortson (2008: 184–5) offers counterarguments to theories which see iambic shortening as motivated by the position of the accent, and specifically as motivated by the supposed unnaturalness of a sequence ◡ – ; see further section 2 below.

- **Romance reflexes of Latin forms**
  e.g. Meyer-Lübke (1890: 273, 501); Lindsay (1894: 159–60); Exon (1912); Pope (1952: 101, 107–11); Allen (1973: 90 n. 4); Mazzola (1999).

  But for at least some of the developments in question, it is debated whether secondary stress is the correct explanation (see Bourciez and Bourciez 1967: 42 with Mester 1994: 6 n. 8).

- **Saturnian verse**
  e.g. Lindsay (1894: 159); Mercado (2019: 111–12)

  Opposition comes (at least implicitly) from scholars who do not see the Saturnian as a stress-based verse form in the first place (for a survey of both quantitative and stress-based approaches, see Mercado 2012: 40-53). More explicitly, de Melo (2014: 57–8) argues that the patterns of accentuation Mercado takes to be possible for each quarter verse "follow naturally and unavoidably from the rules of Latin accentuation, especially if one accepts a secondary accent along Mercado's lines".

- **versification in 'normal' metres, in antiquity**
  e.g. Exon (1907; 1912); Fraenkel (1928: 350–2); Drexler (1932: 348); Liénard (1969: 559); Allen (1973: 154, 168, 190–1); Smith (1982: 133–5)

  Opposition (at least implicit) comes mainly from those scholars who reject the idea that the position of the word accent played any role in Latin versification in antiquity (at least in 'normal' metres). See, for example, Soubiran (1988: 319–31). This debate has tended to conflate two questions which should be kept distinct: (a) did the location of stressed syllables play a role in versification?, and (b) were strong metrical positions given any special realisation when verse was performed? For this point, see Fortson (2011: 99–103) and in detail Zeleny (2008).

- **medieval versification**
- **statements by medieval metrical theorists**
- **plain chant**
  All these are adduced by Valois (1881: 177), apparently in support of the idea that Latin had secondary stresses on every other syllable preceding the main stress.

  In part, Valois misunderstands his sources (especially Thurot 1870: 265, whose interpretation of medieval metrical theorists involves polysyllabic words being *given* additional stresses for the purposes of the poetry). In part, he perhaps relies on observations from his sources but draws different conclusions of his own. Thus, Mantin (1846: 22–3) doesn't appear to suggest that plain chant reveals positions of secondary stresses in Latin, but that specific syllables are lengthened *for the purposes of plain chant*. (Note, though, that I have seen the relevant comments of Mantin's only in the quotation at Petit 1855: 75; I am also not sure if Valois had access to Mantin's treatise itself or only to Petit's work, which he also cites.) I take Valois to be wrong here, but for reasons which are of some interest methodologically: if we posit secondary stress on long words to account for their use e.g. in Saturnians, can we be sure we are not wrong in the same way?

- **classical prose clausulae**
  e.g. Fraenkel (1928: 351–2): without a secondary accent, words like *persolūtas* or *māchināris* wouldn't be so often used as ditrochaic clausulae.

  Opposition (at least implicit) comes from scholars who reject the idea that the position of the accent played any role in the clausulae of classical prose: see e.g. Nicolau (1930: 8–9, 18–19, 83–91).

- **medieval prose cursus**
  e.g. Valois (1881: 177–9); more clearly Lindholm (1963: 27–8).

  For a cautious approach compare Janson (1975: 31): '…Lindholm discusses the possibility of secondary accent in long words, and so do some medieval theorists. In practice, however, no author until Bernhard of Meung [12th century] seems to favor long final words…'

- **synchronic and diachronic phonological analyses of the Latin prosodic system as a whole**
  e.g. Mazzola (1999); Jacobs (2003); Sen (2012, especially p. 209). Current work to improve this type of account includes Sen (2025).

- **typological comparisons**
  e.g. Corssen (1870: 826) on secondary stress in German compounds; Lindsay (1894: 158–9) on secondary stresses in English.

  Typological comparisons can help to demonstrate possibilities, but have sometimes been adduced as if they are equivalent to obvious common sense: "A long word like *săpientia, tempestatĭbus* must have had at all periods a secondary as well as a main accent; it could hardly be pronounced otherwise, as we can see from our own pronunciation of such words as 'chàracterístical'…" (Lindsay 1894: 158–9)

- **metalinguistic statements**
  Convincing examples of metalinguistic statements bearing on this question are very hard to find, and this point is noteworthy in itself. We shall return to such passages as might be relevant in sections 3 and 4.

2. Need 'secondary stress' be audible?

Two examples:

• Iambic shortening

Iambic shortening forms part of an argument for secondary stress in at least two quite different ways:

For Allen (1973: 179–5), iambic shortening normally takes place after a stressed syllable: e.g. *égō > égo, cítō > cíto, módō > modo, *bénē > bene*. A secondary stress is posited to account for e.g. *àmīcítiam > àmicítiam, uèrēbā́mini > uèrebā́mini*.

For Jacobs (2003), iambic shortening provides part of the evidence for an Optimality Theoretic analysis of the Latin prosodic system (in three diachronic stages). The head syllable of every foot is taken to assign a primary or secondary stress, but stress plays a less central role. A fragment of Jacobs' analysis, aiming to account for iambic shortening in the second syllable of *uoluptā́tem* but not of *domesticā́tim* (I have adapted Jacobs' notation):

FɪɴMoɴ = a final syllable is monomoraic WSP = heavy syllables are stressed
Max-μ = an underlying mora must be parsed WBP = coda consonants are moraic
Cʟᴀsʜ = foot heads are not adjacent W/L = a prosodic word starts with a foot

(i) uo.lup.tā.tem	FɪɴMoɴ	Max-μ	Cʟᴀsʜ	WSP	WBP	W/L
(uò.lup).(tā́).te\<m>				*!		
uo.(lùp).(tā́).te\<m>			*!			*
☛ (uò.lu\<p>).(tā́).te\<m>					*	
(ii) do.mes.ti.cā.tim	FɪɴMoɴ	Max-μ	Cʟᴀsʜ	WSP	WBP	W/L
(dò.me\<s>).ti.(cá).ti\<m>					*!	
do.(mè\<s>.ti).(cá).ti\<m>					*!	*
☛ do.(mès).ti.(cá).ti\<m>						*
(dò.mes).ti.(cá).ti\<m>				*!		

Fortson (2008: 184–5) argues against theories which see iambic shortening as motivated by the position of the accent, and specifically by the supposed unnaturalness of a sequence ‿ –. Most importantly, he points out following Devine and Stephens (1980: 148) that the words which were actually lexicalised with iambic shortening tend to be unstressed words. Fortson (2008: 176–258) further argues in detail that in Plautus, iambic shortening typically affects words sitting in an acoustic trough. All this makes it difficult to see how iambic shortening can be motivated by the presence of an audible stress as such.

On the other hand, if iambic shortening is taken to be a strategy to optimise conformity to constraints governing the rhythmic structure of the language, it is less clear that these need to refer to audible stress rather than to the head position in a foot, whether or not this entails audible secondary stress in a given context, or at all.

(For the possibility that language has evidence for iterative foot structure without also having audible secondary stress, see e.g. Mester 1994: 6—making the case that Latin could be a language of this type—; McCarthy 2003: 111–4; Sandell 2023: 103 n. 17, 139, 104 n. 18.)

Given that the same word form (e.g. *uoluptātam*) may be scanned with and without iambic shortening in Plautus, Jacobs (2003: 242) appeals to free constraint ranking of various constraints (FɪɴMoɴ vs Max-μ, and WSP vs WBP). If combined with this idea, Fortson's case that iambic shortening occurs in acoustic troughs could be understood as providing the conditions under which different constraint rankings occur: specifically, Max-μ and WBP (both militating against the light treatment of a syllable with enough underlying material to be treated as heavy) are ranked lower in the context of an acoustic trough than in the context of an acoustic peak.

• Saturnian verse

Stress-based accounts of Saturnian verse posit secondary stress in ways that vary depending on the exact account of the verse form. Mercado (2012) finds that fifteen secure Saturnians have too few main stresses for his scheme, but will fit if a secondary stress is posited in accordance with Allen's view of secondary stress, viz 'the portion of a word preceding the main accent was treated as a word for purposes of secondary stress (unless it consisted of a single syllable)' (Allen 1973: 190; see Mercado 2012: 111). For example:

hemistich	variant type	reference
# ònerári- ᴵᵃᵉ onústae II	x́xx́x | xx́x II	Naev. 48
# mágna(m) sàpi- ᴵ éntiam II	x́xx́x | xx́x II	*CIL* I² 11.1
# ìmmolábat | áuream II	x́xx́x | x́xx II	Naev. 25.3
# dédet Tèmpes- ᴵ tátebus II	x́xx́x | x́xx II	*CIL* I² 9.6

On this view, secondary stresses sometimes fall on syllables where they are not taken into account by the verse. E.g.:

hemistich	variant type	reference
# fléntēs ámbᵃᵉ a- ᴵ beúntēs II	x́xx́x | xx́x II	Naev. 5.3
# (ini)mícus | sī̆ ᵉs comméntus II	⏑⏑x́x | x́xx́x II	App. 2.2
# úrit (popu)látur | uástat II	x́x⏑x́x | x́x II	Naev. 37.2
# sénex frḗtus | (pie)tátei II	x́xx́x | ⏑⏑x́x II	Naev. 9.1
# símul (áli)us | (ali)únde II	x́x⏑̀x | ⏑⏑x́x II	Naev. 54

For Mercado (2012: 113–15), the key thing is how the relative stresses within a word map onto the relative stresses in the metrical pattern.

However, stress-based verse forms may allow unstressed syllables to be "promoted" to stressed positions under specific circumstances (see e.g. Attridge (2014 [1982]: 164–8) on English poetry; Hayes (1995: 166) on Hindi poetry). In this light, at *CIL* I² 9.6 (for example) the first syllable of *Tempestatebus* could be a syllable eligible for promotion rather than one normally heard with secondary stress. It would not necessarily follow that this syllable was pronounced in a special way when the Saturnian was performed. Compare Attridge on English poetry:

> "It is worth emphasising that promoted and demoted syllables do not demand special pronunciation; rhythm is a matter of perception, and it is possible to perceive a syllable as both light and yet playing the part of a beat, or heavy and yet functioning as an offbeat." (Attridge 2014 [1982]: 171)

A further question is whether the rhythmic structure of the language plays a role in determining which syllables are eligible for promotion. Hayes suggests this for Hindi poetry:

> "…the first choice for the metrical placement of a word is determined by its main stress. There is only one second choice available, namely, the syllable that would have borne main stress if foot extrametricality had not applied. A reasonable surmise is that in the dialect of Hindi spoken by the poets, foot extrametricality was optional but preferred… More generally, this account correctly predicts that syllables that are not foot heads can never occur in strong metrical position." (Hayes 1995: 166)

Contrast Attridge on English:

> "The promotion of nonstresses to the role of a metrical beat seems to be a phenomenon very little affected by the linguistic structures in which it occurs, which is not surprising in this, the least marked of metrical deviations. We can accept any three nonstresses as realising a sequence of offbeat, beat, offbeat…" (Attridge 2014 [1982]: 248–9)

3. Metalinguistic statements by ancient authors

Arguably, metalinguistic statements by ancient authors are of particular interest if we want to know whether Latin had secondary stresses with some directly audible phonetic correlates. Clear examples are very difficult to find, and this point is noteworthy in itself, but the following passages have been brought into the discussion (I discuss the first two in more detail in Probert 2024):

- **Ps.-Sergius, *In Donati Artem maiorem*, GL iv 529.1–532.28** (≈ Varro fr. 84 Goetz-Schoell ≈ Varro fr. 282 Funaioli ≈ Tyrannio fr. 59 Haas). This is a long and rambling discussion of the doctrine of the so-called 'middle accent', in a late antique text which claims to be drawing on Varro. In Probert (2024), I suggested that Varro might have gone *looking* in Latin for some counterpart to the 'middle accent' known to him from Greek sources (cf. the phrase *ibique quam quaerimus prosodiam* 'and there we have the accent we are looking for'); for a history of the question, with bibliography, see Probert (2024: 318–22).

- **Aulus Gellius, *NA* 18.12.8 ≈ Varro fr. 85 Goetz-Schoell ≈ Varro fr. 45 Funaioli**

  (1) *Varro libris, quos ad Marcellum de lingua Latina fecit: 'in priore uerbo graues prosodiae, quae fuerunt, manent, reliquae mutant'; '<mutant>' inquit elegantissime pro 'mutantur'. potest etiam id quoque ab eodem Varrone in septimo diuinarum similiter dictum uideri: 'inter duas filias regum quid mutet, inter Antigonam et Tulliam, est animaduertere'.*

  "In the books On the Latin language which he wrote for Marcellus, Varro (saying) '<u>in the first word the accents which had been grave remain, and the others change (*mutant*)</u>' very elegantly said <*mutant*> for *mutantur*. And this can be seen to have been said in the same way by the same Varro in the seventh book of the *Res diuinae*: 'One can observe what is different (*mutet*) between two daughters of kings by observing the difference between Antigone and Tullia'."

  With inspiration from a different suggestion of Schoell's (1876: 45–6), in Probert (2024) I suggested that Varro had in mind two words being put together to form a compound, as follows:

uérsus, péllis	→	*uěrsipéllis*	'skin-changer'
supérbus, loquéntia	→	*supěrbiloquéntia*	'proud talk'

  And supposing first members which already contained a secondary stress (here positioned *exempli gratia*):

cǒnfīdéntis, lóquor	→	*cōnfīděntilóquius*	'more confidently speaking'
pǐetâtis, cúltrīx	→	*pietǎticúltrīx*	'practising maternal care'

  (Why should the downgrading of accents result in e.g. *supěrbiloquéntia*, *cōnfīděntilóquius* and not *superbiloquéntia*, *cōnfīdentilóquius*? Because if we envisage a system in which secondary stress played a role, such as in hypothetical *cǒnfīdéntis*, it is unlikely that there was no secondary stress at all on a long word like *superbiloquéntia* or *cōnfīdentilóquius*.)

- **Martianus Capella, *De nuptiis* III 273**

  (2) *acutus accentus notatur uirgula a sinistra parte in dexteram ascendente, grauis autem a sinistra parte ad dexteram descendens, inflexi signum est sigma super ipsas litteras deuexum. accentus partim fastigia uocamus, quod litterarum capitibus apponantur, partim cacumina, tonos uel sonos, Graeci prosodias. sciendum etiam uni uocabulo accidere omnes tres accentus posse, ut est 'Argiletum'.*

  'The acute accent is marked with a stroke ascending from the left side to the right, the grave with a stroke] descending from the left side to the right, and the sign of the circumflex is a [lunate] sigma reclining above the letters themselves. We sometimes call accents *fastigia*, because they are placed on the tops of letters, and sometimes *cacumina*, *toni* or *soni*, while the Greeks call them *prosodiae*. And one should know that all three accents can occur on one word, as in the case of *Argiletum*.'

  In context, the "three accents" which can occur on one word are the acute, grave, and circumflex. The idea that all three can occur on one word is surprising: Latin grammarians otherwise insist that a single word has a single accent, either an acute or a circumflex (e.g. Servius, *Comm. in Donatum*, GL iv. 426.15; Diomedes, *Ars*, GL ii 433.30 = Donatus, *Ars Maior* 610.8-9 Holtz; cf. Martinus Capella, *De nuptiis* III 269).

  Schoell (1876: 7, 46–7) suggests that Martianus Capella in passage (2) is drawing on Varro, noting that in the previous paragraph he has used the phrase *mutant accentus* 'accents change', with the rare intransitive use of *mutant* that Gellius attributes to Varro in passage (1). Schoell further notes that according to Ps.-Sergius, Varro considered the middle accent to be a sort of acute more than a sort of grave, while later grammarians subsumed the middle under the grave. On this basis, Schoell suggests that Martianus Capella's comment *sciendum etiam uni uocabulo accidere omnes tres accentus posse, ut est 'Argiletum'* derives from a discussion in which Varro had in mind a middle accent on the first vowel: *Ărgilêtum*.

Misteli (1877: 51–2) gave Schoell's analysis short shrift, as purely speculative—but Schoell at least offers a way to make sense of passage (2), and is it difficult to see what a good alternative would be. *Argiletum* could have had all three accents in the 'ordinary' sense if pronounced as two words, *Árgī lêtum*. But *Argiletum* is an old and well-known street name: surely it was *not* pronounced as two words, even if it was etymologised as 'death of Argus' (as per the first of two etymologies offered by Varro, *De lingua latina* V 157).

4. Diomedes on prose rhythm: possibly relevant, or not?

In his discussion of prose rhythm, the late antique grammarian Diomedes claims that he will take account only of the 'natural' quantity of a syllable, not of quantity 'by position':

(3) *sed meminerimus ita nos de longis et breuibus temporibus locuturos ut natura tantum, non etiam positione, longas aut breues syllabas iudicemus. neque enim de metro quaeritur, ut necessitas naturam cogatur imitari, sed de prosa oratione tractatur, quae tam soluta || et libera est tamque omnibus dicendi opibus instructa ut non seruire uerbis sed imperare uideatur. hoc adeo uerum est ut in structura similiter currat 'iusta reprehensio' et 'iusta uideatur', quamuis 'reprehensio' primam syllabam positione longam habeat propter duas consonantes quae secuntur, 'uideatur' autem primas duas syllabas breues habeat. item 'omnia locuturus' et 'omnia propinauit' simili structura feruntur, quia natura paria sunt, quamuis sint positione diuersa.* (Diomedes, *Ars, GL* i.468.25–469.2)

'But let us mention that we shall speak of long and short quantities in such a way that we will judge syllables long or short only by nature, not by position. For our investigation does not concern metre, in which case necessity is forced to imitate nature, but prose, which is so relaxed and free and so fitted out with all the resources of speech that it appears not to serve words but to give orders to them. And this is true to such an extent that in a clausula, *iusta reprehensio* and *iusta uideatur* run similarly, even though *reprehensio* has its first syllable long by position because of the two consonants that follow, while *uideatur* has its first two syllables short. Likewise *omnia locuturus* and *omnia propinauit* are carried along with a similar cadence, because they are alike by nature, although they are different by position.'

Passage (4) suggests that the single words *archipirata* and *parricidarum* in some sense make a clausula like *impetus fecit*, but a 'softer' one. Similarly, *facilitatis*, *agilitatis*, and *temeritatis* in some sense make a clausula like *refero causam* and *facite uota*, but again a 'softer' one:

(4) *trochaeus quoque in clausula bene ponitur, maxime si se ipse praecedat, ut 'acta res est' et 'iusta causa', et pyrrichius, 'cape uota', et creticus, 'proditis rebus', et amphibrachys, 'uenite me cum', nisi quod haec clausula in rythmum cadit, et anapaestus, 'impetus fecit'.sane quotiens una pars orationis anapaestum et trochaeum receperit, mollem et quasi lubricam structuram dabit, ut 'archipirata' et 'parricidarum'. quamuis enim idem pedes eademque sint tempora, tamen ubi duae sunt partes orationis nescio quo modo in utriusque confinio retentus spiritus ac restitutus adfert quandam conpositioni firmitatem; at in una parte orationis properare uerba et continua spiritus celeritate labi uidentur. sic fit ut trochaeum quoque tamet<si> bene tribrachys antecedit, ut 'refero causam' 'facite uota', tamen in una parte orationis quae totidem pedum totidemque sit temporum mollior ac fluxior structura ducatur, ut 'facilitatis' 'agilitatis' 'temeritatis'.* (Diomedes, *Ars, GL* i 469.15–24)

'A trochee too is well placed in a clausula, especially if it precedes itself, as in *acta res est* and *iusta causa*, and if a pyrrhic precedes, as in *cape uota*, and a cretic, as in *proditis rebus*, and an amphibrach, as in *uenite me cum*—except that this clausula falls into poetic rhythm—and an anapaest, as in *impetus fecit*. But whenever a single word takes in an anapaest and a trochee, it will give a soft and as it were smooth clausula, like *archipirata* and *parricidarum*. For even though the feet and the quantities are the same, nevertheless when there are two words then in some way the breath retained within the confines of each and restored brings some firmness to the arrangement; but in a single word the words seem to rush, and to slip with the constant quickness of the breath. In this way it happens that although a tribrach well precedes a trochee too, as in *refero causam* and *facite uota*, nevertheless in a single word which comprises as many feet and as many quantities, a softer and more flowing clausula is drawn out, as in *facilitatis, agilitatis, temeritatis*.'

Diomedes is writing at an early stage in the development of stress-based clausulae (see Nicolau 1930). Could a secondary stress enable *archipirata* and *parricidarum* to sound similar to *impetus fecit* but 'softer', and *facilitatis*, *agilitatis*, and *temeritatis* to sound similar to *refero causam* but 'softer'?

Possibly not, because Diomedes' discussion stands in some relationship to the following passages of Quintilian, who was writing at a time when clausulae followed the classical quantitative system (see Nicolau 1930: 88):

6

(5) *nam quo fit ut cum Demosthenis seuera uideatur compositio* τοῖς θεοῖς εὔχομαι πᾶσι καὶ πάσαις, *et illa quae ab uno, quod sciam, Bruto minus probatur, ceteris placet* κἂν μήπω βάλλῃ μηδὲ τοξεύῃ, *Ciceronem carpant in his 'familiaris coeperat esse balneatori' et 'non nimis dura archipiratae'? Nam 'balneatori' et 'archipiratae' idem finis est qui* πᾶσι καὶ πάσαις *et qui* μηδὲ τοξεύῃ, *sed priora sunt seueriora. Est in eo quoque nonnihil, quod hic singulis uerbis bini pedes continentur, quod etiam in carminibus est praemolle, nec solum ubi quinae, ut in his, syllabae nectuntur, 'fortissima Tyndaridarum', sed etiam quaternae, cum uersus cluditur 'Appennino' et 'armamentis' et 'Orione'. quare hic quoque uitandum est ne plurium syllabarum uerbis utamur in fine.* (Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.4.63–65)

'For how else does it happen that Demosthenes' τοῖς θεοῖς εὔχομαι πᾶσι καὶ πάσαις and κἂν μήπω βάλλῃ μηδὲ τοξεύῃ (which only Brutus disapproves of, so far as I know, everyone else approving) are thought to illustrate "austere" Composition, while Cicero is criticized for *familiaris esse coeperat balneatori* and *non nimis dura archipiratae*? For *balneatori* and *archipiratae* make the same ending as πᾶσι καὶ πάσαις and μηδὲ τοξεύῃ, but the first examples are the more "austere." There is something too in the point that here two feet are contained within a single word, which even in poetry gives a very soft effect, not only when a five-syllable word is concerned (as in *fortissima Tyndaridarum*) but also when the line ends with a quadrisyllable like *Appennino*, *armamentis* or *Orione*. We must therefore avoid using polysyllabic words at the end in oratory also.' (transl. Russell 2001)

(6) *Est et dochmius, qui fit ex bacchio et iambo vel iambo et cretico, stabilis in clausulis et severus. Spondius quoque, quo plurimum est Demosthenes usus, non eundem semper prae se habebit: optime praecedet eum creticus, ut in hoc: 'de qua ego nihil dicam nisi depellendi criminis causa.' Non nihil est, quod supra dixi multum referre, unone verbo sint duo pedes comprehensi an uterque liber. Sic enim fit forte 'criminis causa', molle 'archipiratae', mollius si tribrachys praecedat, 'facilitates', 'temeritates'. Est enim quoddam ipsa divisione verborum latens tempus, ut in pentametri medio spondio, qui nisi alterius verbi fine, alterius initio constat, versum non efficit.*

'The Dochmius also, consisting of Bacchius and Iambic or Iambus and Cretic, forms a stable and austere clausula. And the Spondee, which Demosthenes used a great deal, should not always be preceded by the same foot. It is best preceded by a Cretic, as in "I shall say nothing of this, except for the sake of refuting the charge (*crīmĭnīs cāūsā*)." It is of some importance (as I said above) whether the two feet are contained within a single word or are separate. *Criminis causa* is strong: *ārchĭpīrātāe* ("pirate chief") is effeminate, as, even more, are words where a Tribrach precedes: *făcĭlĭtātēs*, *tĕmĕrĭtātēs* ("capacities," "rashnesses"). This is because there is a time unit concealed in the actual division between the words, as in the Spondee in the middle of a pentameter, which does not produce a correct verse unless it consists of the final syllable of one word and the initial syllable of the next.' (Transl. Russell 2001)

Nevertheless, Diomedes (or a predecessor) has reworked the discussion. Thus, *criminis causa* and *archipiratae* scan identically for Quintilian, whereas for Diomedes the two-word clausula to be compared with *archipirata* is rather *impetus fecit*. If Diomedes' discussion was meant to make sense in his own time, should we conclude that *archipirata*, *parricidarum*, *facilitatis*, *agilitatis*, and *temeritatis* all had some audible stress on their initial syllables, albeit only a 'softer' secondary stress?

5. Conclusion

I suggest that our best candidates for metalinguistic statements giving evidence of audible secondary stress in Latin are passages (1) and (2), both plausibly deriving from Varro. (1) concerns a compound word unknown to us, and (2) concerns the word *Argiletum*, plausibly being taken to be a compound. If the connection with compound words is correct and is not coincidental, we should reckon with audible "cyclic" secondary stress as a component of the phonology of Latin in the classical period.

Acknowledgements

References

Ahlberg, A. W. 1905. *Studia de accentu Latino*. Lund.

Allen, W. S. 1973. *Accent and rhythm*. Cambridge.

Attridge, D. 2014 [1982]. *The rhythms of English poetry*. London/New York.

Bourciez, E. and Bourciez, J. 1967. *Phonétique française: Étude historique.* Paris

Corssen, W. 1870. *Über Aussprache, Vokalismus und Betonung der lateinischen Sprache*, ii, 2nd edn. Leipzig.

Devine, A. M. and Stephens, L. D. 1980. 'Latin prosody and meter: Brevis Brevians'. *Classical Philology* 75: 142–57.

Drexler, H. 1932. *Plautinische Akzentstudien*, ii. Wrocław.

Exon, C. 1907. 'The secondary accentuation of Latin words of the type of *consuluisti*'. *Classical Philology* 2: 341–4.

Exon, C. 1912. 'The accentuation of words of the type *commemorare*'. *Classical Philology* 7: 84–5.

Fortson, B. W., IV. 2008. *Language and Rhythm in Plautus*. Berlin/New York.

Fortson, B. W., IV. 2011. 'Latin prosody and metrics'. In J. Clackson (ed.), *A Companion to the Latin Language*. Oxford/Malden, MA, 92–104.

Fraenkel, E. 1928. *Iktus und Akzent im lateinischen Sprechvers*. Berlin.

Hayes, B. 1995. *Metrical Stress Theory: principles and case studies*. Chicago.

Jacobs, H. 2003. 'The emergence of quantity-sensitivity in Latin'. In D.E. Holt (ed.), *Optimality Theory and Language Change*. Dordrecht, 229–47.

Janson, T. 1975. *Prose rhythm in medieval Latin from the 9th to the 13th century*. Stockholm.

Liénard, E. 1969. 'Réflexions sur l'accent latin'. In J. Bibauw (ed.), *Hommages à Marcel Renard*, i. Brussels, 551–60.

Lindholm, G. 1963. *Studien zum mittellateinischen Prosarhythmus*. Stockholm.

Lindsay, W. M. 1893. 'The Saturnian metre: second paper.' *American Journal of Philology* 14: 305–34.

Lindsay, W. M. 1894. *The Latin Language*. Oxford.

Mantin, C. 1846. *Traité de psalmodie ou exposé des règles qui la concernent, suivant chaque mode et d'après les nombreuses variantes du psautier. Appliquable, en général, à toutes les églises, et, en particulier, au diocèse d'Orléans*. Orléans.

Mazzola, M. L. 1999. 'Tuscan geminates and trochaic feet'. In J. A. Franco, A. Landa, and J. Martín (eds), *Grammatical analyses in basque and romance linguistics*. Amsterdam, 151–64.

McCarthy, J. 2003. 'OT Constraints Are Categorical'. *Phonology* 20: 75–138.

de Melo, W. D. C. 2014. Review of Mercado 2012. *Kratylos* 59: 53–81.

Mercado, A. 2012. *Italic verse: a study of the poetic remains of Old Latin, Faliscan, and Sabellic*. Innsbruck.

Mester, R. A. 1994. 'The quantitative trochee in Latin'. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 12: 1–61.

Meyer-Lübke, W. 1890. *Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen*, i. Leipzig.

Misteli, F. 1877. *Erläuterungen zur allgemeinen Theorie der griechischen Betonung*. Paderborn.

Nicolau, M. G. 1930. *L'origine du «Cursus» rythmique et les débuts de l'accent d'intensité en latin*. Paris.

Nishimura, K. 2008. *Vowel reduction and deletion in Italic: effects of stress.* Ph.D. Dissertation, UCLA.

Norberg, D. 1958. *Introduction à l'étude de la versification latine médiévale.* Stockholm.

Petit, l'Abbé. 1855. *Dissertation sur la psalmodie et les autres parties du chant grégorien, dans leurs rapports avec l'accentuation latine.* Paris/Verdun.

Pope, M. 1952. *From Latin to modern French with especial consideration of Anglo-Norman: phonology and morphology*, 2nd edn. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Probert, P. 2024. "'Between uneducated and educated, or hot and cold, or bitter and sweet…there's a middle point': Varro and the Middle Accent". In J. F. Eska, O. Hackstein, R. I. Kim, and J.-F. Mondon (eds), *The method works: studies on language change in honor of Don Ringe.* Cham, 307–26.

Russell, D. A. 2001. *Quintilian: the orator's education*. Cambridge, MA.

Sandell, R. P. 2023. *Towards a Dynamics of Prosodic Change: Corpus-Based and Computational Studies in the Synchronic and Diachronic Prosodic Phonology of Indic, Greek, and Germanic*. Habilitationsschrift, Fakultät für Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaften Ludwig–Maximilians–Universität München. https://www.ryan-sandell.com/word-prosodic-systems

Schoell, F. 1876. 'De accentu linguae latinae veterum grammaticorum testimonia'. *Acta Societatis Philologae Lipsiensis* 6: 1–231.

Sen, R. 2012. 'Exon's Law and the Latin syncopes'. In P. Probert and A. Willi (eds), *Laws and Rules in Indo-European*. Oxford, 205–26.

Sen, R. 2025. 'Cinderella Syncope: stratal structure and the life cycle in centuries of Latin vowel deletion'. Presentation to the Manchester Phonology Meeting 2025.

Smith, P. L. 1982. 'Enclitic rhythms in the Vergilian hexameter'. *Phoenix* 36: 124–43.

Soubiran, J. 1988. *Essai sur la versification dramatique des romains: sénaire iambique et septenaire trochaïque*. Paris.

Stolz, F. 1894–5. *Historische Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*. Leipzig.

Thurot, C. 1870. 'Document relatif à l'histoire de la poésie latine au Moyen Âge.' *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 14: 258–69.

Valois, N. 1881. 'Étude sur le rythme des bulles pontificales'. *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes* 42: 161–98.

Zeleny, K. 2008. *Itali modi: Akzentrhythmen in der lateinischen Dichtung der augusteischen Zeit*. Vienna.

Philomen Probert, ECIEC 2025, Munich