

XVI. The Origin of the Greek Accusative in Latin

E. ADELAIDE HAHN

HUNTER COLLEGE

The type¹ of accusative² which is also so common in Greek as to merit its appellation of "accusativus Graecus" is apparently not a native construction in Latin. Only four examples of it have

¹ Bibliographical references are to be interpreted as follows. **AJP**=*American Journal of Philology*. **ALL**=*Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik*. **Baehrens**, **PLM**=*Poetae Latini minores*, ed. by Aemilius Baehrens, 5 vols. (Leipzig 1879-83). **Bennett**=Charles E. Bennett, *Syntax of Early Latin*, 2 vols. (Boston 1910-14). **Buck**=Carl Darling Buck, *A Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian* (Boston 1904). **Duff**=J. Wight Duff, *A Literary History of Rome from the Origins to the Close of the Golden Age* (London 1910). **Friedrich**=*Catulli Veronensis Liber*, ed. by Gustav Friedrich (Leipzig 1908). **Frobenius**=Rudolf Frobenius, *Die Syntax des Ennius* (Nördlingen 1910). **Haase**=Friedrich Haase, *Vorlesungen über lateinische Sprachwissenschaft*, 2 vols., vol. 1 ed. by Friedr. Aug. Eckstein and vol. 2 by Hermann Peter (Leipzig 1874-80). **Hofmann**=Manu Leumann and Joh. Bapt. Hofmann, *Stolz-Schmalz: Lateinische Grammatik*⁵ (Munich 1928). **IF**=*Indogermanische Forschungen*. **Jordan**=*M. Catonis praeter Librum de re rustica quae extant*, ed. by Henricus Iordan (Leipzig 1860). **Kritz**=*C. Sallusti Crispi Historiarum fragmenta*, ed. by Fridericus Kritz (Leipzig 1853). **Kroll, Stud.**=Wilhelm Kroll, *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur* (Stuttgart 1924). **Kroll, Wiss. Synt.**=Wilhelm Kroll, *Die wissenschaftliche Syntax im lateinischen Unterricht*³ (Berlin 1925). **Lachmann** (on **Catullus**)=*Q. Valerii Catulli Veronensis Liber*³, ed. by Carolus Lachmann (Berlin 1874). **Lachmann** (on **Lucretius**)=*T. Lucreti Cari De rerum natura libri sex*³, ed. by Carolus Lachmann (Berlin 1860). **Lindsay**=W. M. Lindsay, *Syntax of Plautus* (Oxford 1907). **Löfstedt, Late Lat.**=Einar Löfstedt, *Late Latin* (Oslo 1959). **Löfstedt, Synt.**=Einar Löfstedt, *Syntactica*, 2 parts (Lund 1928-33). **Mackail**=J. W. Mackail, *Latin Literature* (New York 1895). **Merrill**=*T. Lucreti Cari De rerum natura libri sex*, ed. by William Augustus Merrill (New York 1907). **Müller**=C. F. W. Müller, *Syntax des Nominativs und Akkusativs im Lateinischen* (Leipzig 1908). **Munro**=*T. Lucreti Cari De rerum natura libri sex*⁴, ed. and tr. by H. A. J. Munro, 3 vols. (Cambridge 1886). **Mus. Helv.**=*Museum Helveticum*. **Norberg**=Dag Norberg, *Syntaktische Forschungen* (Uppsala 1943). **Norden**=*P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis Buch VI*, ed. by Eduard Norden (Leipzig 1903). **Norden, Enn. u. Verg.**=Eduard Norden, *Ennius und Vergilius* (Leipzig 1915). **Planta**=Robert von Planta, *Grammatik der oskisch-umbrischen Dialekte*, 2 vols. (Strassburg 1892-97). **Poultney**=James Wilson Poultney, *The Bronze Tables of Iguvium* (Baltimore 1959). **Ribbeck, Com.**=*Comicorum Romanorum fragmenta*³, ed. by Otto Ribbeck (Leipzig 1898). **Riese, AL**=*Anthologia Latina, carmina in codicibus scripta*², ed. by Alexander Riese, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1894-1906). **Steuart**=*The Annals of Quintus Ennius*, ed. by Ethel Mary Steuart (Cambridge 1925). **TAPA**=*Transactions of the American Philological Association*. **Teuffel-Schwabe**=Ludwig Schwabe, *Teuffel's History of Roman Literature*⁵, revised and enlarged, tr. by George C. W. Warr, 2 vols.

For note 2 see p. 222.

been cited from early Latin³: Ennius, *Ann.* 311, *perculsi pectora Poeni*; *Ann.* 400, *succincti corda machaeris*; Plautus, *Pseud.* 785, *si quispiam det qui manus gravior siet*; Cato, *Orig.* 1.18, *togae parte caput velati*.

The supposed example from Plautus we may certainly reject;⁴ *manus* is indubitably not an accusative plural but a nominative singular, subject of *siet* (*qui* is not the subject; it is not a nominative but an ablative).

The other passages arouse some misgivings.

The first example from Ennius certainly lacks satisfactory attestation. Columna reports that he got it from Fabius of Aquinum, and that the latter got it from a very ancient interpreter of Statius whose name was lost. Vahlen accepts the fragment, listing it (55) as *Ann.* 311, but is reproached bitterly by Norden (*Enn. u. Verg.* 78, note 2) for his "Mut" in actually assigning to a specific book (the ninth) so obscurely attested a passage.⁵ Two other editors of Ennius, Steuart (92) and Warmington (1.448), both class it under "Spuria": the former declares (236) that "there is no trace elsewhere of any body of *scholia* on Statius different from that preserved under the name of Lactantius; and Colonna's unsupported testimony does not warrant a belief in its existence"; and the latter (1.448, note a) lays down the general principle that "where

(London 1900). **Vahlen**=*Ennianae poesis reliquiae*², ed. by Iohannes Vahlen (Leipzig 1903). **Warmington**=*Remains of Old Latin*, ed. and tr. by E. H. Warmington, 4 vols. (Cambridge 1935-40). Citations from Ennius are in accordance with Vahlen's numbering. Citations from Vergil without specific designation as to the work are from the *Aeneid*. Quotations are not always in complete form; when they are not, there is usually no indication of omitted words.

² In some passages it is classed as the object of a verb in the middle voice, and in some as an accusative of specification; the latter is of course the only possibility when the accusative is combined with a passive or intransitive verb or with an adjective. But in general the two types are formally indistinguishable, and I think it is not worth while to try to distinguish them. Both I believe have a common origin, the substantive denoting the part in the *schēma kath' holon kai meros*; my reasons for so believing I have given in *TAPA* 85 (1954) 239-89. We may note in this connection that the *schēma* is extremely common in Homer, while the accusative of specification which I believe is derived from it is much less common in Homer than in later Greek.

³ See Landgraf, *ALL* 10 (1898) 209-24, especially 209, 216, and 218.

⁴ Landgraf, who had classed *manus* as an accusative of specification (*ALL* 10 [1898] 209), later himself retracted this (*ibid.* 376). Cf. Müller 112.

⁵ See the quotation in Vahlen (55): "Columna p. 239: 'hoc fragmentum mihi e Cosentia Fabius Aquinas misit: quod a quodam suo vetustissimo Statii interprete M. S. excerptis: cuius nomen, cum in illius libri principio et fine multae desiderentur paginae, prorsus ignoratur. constat tamen ex collatione non esse Lactantium.'" Vahlen himself adds: "mihi non aliunde innotuit fragmentum."

Colonna, Barth, or anyone else claims to follow the authority of some literary work which has otherwise not been known, there we are justified in rejecting the alleged fragment." The passage is also deemed "unecht," and therefore useless as evidence concerning the accusative, by Haase (2.64, note 1), Müller (128), and Hofmann (379); and similarly Löfstedt (*Synt.* 2.421) deems the passage so poorly attested that we can hardly dare operate with it. It is true that we have some parallels in later Latin literature: three in Lucretius, 1.13, *perculsae corda tua vi*, 1.261, *lacte mero mentes perculsa novellas*, and 5.1223, *percussi membra timore*; and one in Silius, 8.242, *instincti pectora Poeni*. These look as if they might stem from the alleged Ennius passage; on the other hand a fraudulent inventor might have deliberately worked backward from the later passages in concocting the pretended Ennian fragment *percussi pectora Poeni*, which indeed looks like a *contaminatio* of the Lucretian *perculsae corda tua vi* and the Silian *instincti pectora Poeni*.

The second example from Ennius has also been questioned as evidence for the Greek accusative on the ground that it is too fragmentary to serve as such evidence.⁶ However, we have a reasonably dependable witness in Servius, who quoted it as a possible model for *armati ferro* in *Aen.* 9.678:⁷ "ferrea corda habentes, id est dura et cruenta cogitantes, ut Ennium sit secutus qui ait *succincti corda machaeris*."

The Cato passage also rests on a note in Servius, but is more dubious. It is deduced from Servius' comment on *Aen.* 5.755: "quem Cato in originibus dicit morem fuisse. conditores enim civitatis taurum in dextram, vaccam intrinsecus iungebant et incincti ritu Gabino, id est togae parte caput velati parte succincti, tenebant stivam incurvam, ut glebae omnes intrinsecus caderent." Jordan (7) quotes this note in full without committing himself as to how great a part of it, if any, represents Cato's exact words; but his scepticism is indicated by his marking the passage with an asterisk, and by his italicizing a phrase from it, *Gabinus ritus*, in his index (122), where he uses italics to mark words that are not Cato's own but those of writers citing him (115). Similarly

⁶ Haase (2.64, note 1), quoted with approval by Müller (128), calls the passage "keinesfalls in dieser fragmentarischen Ueberlieferung . . . beweisend."

⁷ In Servius the line is numbered 9.675—which Vahlen (73) and Warmington (1.184) retain.

Hofmann (379) discounts the Servian passage as merely a paraphrase. The phrase *caput velati* occurs in a portion of the note that seems particularly unlikely to be Cato's own, namely, *id est togae parte caput velati parte succincti*. As Müller says (128), Cato would hardly have deemed it necessary to give a description of the *cinctus Gabinus*. Livy tells of its being worn in the fourth century, by C. Fabius Dorsuo (5.46.2) and by P. Decius (8.9.9), and it was doubtless still familiar in Cato's time.

Hence, of the four examples from early Latin cited as illustrating the Greek accusative, only one, *Ann.* 400, seems to me to provide reasonably valid evidence. However, in view of the fact that *Ann.* 311 is accepted by so eminent an authority on Ennius as Vahlen, and that we cannot actually prove Servius' use of *caput velati* to be an interpolation of his own rather than an actual quotation from Cato, I think we must not categorically decline to include these passages in a discussion as to whether the so-called Greek accusative is actually a native Latin construction. Therefore I shall now, despite my grave doubts about the authenticity of two of them, study all three passages as evidence *pro et contra*. The usage in Ennius, whether illustrated twice or only once, may certainly be dismissed as a borrowing from Greek⁸; but the passage from Cato, if authentic, must give us pause.

Possibly the use of *velati*—and this of course might apply to *perculsi* and *succincti* as well—might be viewed as a remnant of the time when the past participle, originally simply an adjective in *-to-*, was still voiceless.⁹ More probably *velati*, as well as *succincti*, could be thought to be influenced by the construction with verbs of donning. The regular usage in early Latin is that the word designating the article of clothing or equipment which is put on,

⁸ Cf. Geisau's statement (*IF* 36 [1916] 79) that in Ennius, who did many violence to the Latin language, a Grecism is not surprising. See further Kroll (*Stud.* 249) on Ennius' use of Grecisms. Lindsay (30) and Bennett (261–62) pronounce *Ann.* 311 (which they evidently accept as genuine) a Grecism, and Löfstedt (*Synt.* 2.421) admits the existence of Greek influence in *Ann.* 400. Frobenius' attempt (25) to disprove Lindsay's statement about *Ann.* 311 is so woefully lacking in linguistic understanding that it is not worth refuting. Bennett's characterization (2.261) of this attempt as "arbitrary," and Kroll's characterization (*Stud.* 249) of his endeavors in general as "nicht geglückt" and "unbegreiflich," are moderate.

⁹ Note the active use at all periods of *cenatus* and *iuratus*. Cf. too the occasional active use of the gerundive in early Latin, as in Plautus, *Ep.* 74, *puppis pereunda est*; *Trin.* 1159, *si illa tibi placet, placenda dos quoque est*. (I discussed the essential voicelessness of participles, including gerundives, in *TAPA* 74 [1943] 276–78.)

or a neuter pronoun representing it,¹⁰ is in the accusative with a middle form of the verb.¹¹ All the examples cited from early Latin involve the past participle, and this has been thought to be significant,¹² but this limitation, as Hofmann says (378), may be mere chance. The participle usually indicates the result of action rather than the process; it is to all intents and purposes an adjective meaning "dressed in, wearing," rather than a true participle meaning "having donned." This is true whether it is used (a) attributively with a substantive, as in Plautus, *Men.* 511-12, non te indutum exire vidi pallam?, or (b) predicatively with the copula, as in *ibid.* 515, tun med indutum fuisse pallam praedicas? In other words, *med indutum fuisse pallam* means not "that I had put on a mantle" (which of course would demand rather *indutum esse*), but "that I was wearing a mantle." We may quote further to exemplify type *a* Turpilius 73-74 (Ribbeck, *Com.*), aspexit virginem stantem indutam riculam, and to exemplify type *b* Plautus, *Ep.* 223, quid erat induta, 225, utin impluvium induta fuerit, *Rud.* 207, hoc quod induta sum, and Terence, *Eun.* 1015-16, vestem vidit illam esse eum indutum. But in *Eun.* 707-8, tuam vestem detraxit tibi et eamst indutus?, the combination of *indutus* with the present tense of the copula is quite different from what it is in *Rud.* 207, where the meaning is "what I have on"; here *est indutus* is a genuine periphrastic form of the verb *induo*, a true perfect just as is *detraxit*, and the meaning is "did he put it on?" If we can have *est indutus* meaning "he donned," I see no reason why we could not have *induitur* meaning "he dons."¹³ At all events we do find an accusative with a present medio-passive form (third person imperative) in Umbrian, *Tab. Ig.* vi B 49, perca arsmatiam anouihimu, translated by Planta (2.579) "uirgam imperatoriam induimino," by Buck (277) "uirgam

¹⁰ For the shift from the neuter pronoun to the noun, we may note Plautus, *Ep.* 223, quid erat induta?, and 225, utin impluvium induta fuerit?, both cited again below.

¹¹ Plautus has one example with the active, *Cas.* 695, lorica induam.

¹² Cf. e.g. Kroll (*Wiss. Synt.* 47-48): "immer überwiegt der Gebrauch des Partizips mit diesem Akkusativus . . . und das Altlatein kennt nur diesen."

¹³ Perhaps it is chance again that the only example from early Latin of an instance meaning "he dons" (present) is in the active voice, *Cas.* 695, lorica induam (already quoted in note 11, above). To be sure, it is possible that at this stage of the language the verb was a semi-deponent, *induo*, *induere*, *indutus sum*. It certainly was not such at a later date; Vergil apparently uses the present active and present middle interchangeably, e.g. 9.365-66, galeam induit, and 2.392-93, galeam induitur (to this I shall revert later, note 47, below).

ritualem induitor," and by Poultney (270) "he shall hold a ritual wand."¹⁴ This example certainly proves that the usage as seen in early Latin is Italic and therefore not a borrowing from Greek¹⁵; the accusative is direct object of the verb, active or deponent, and definitely not an accusative of specification. But with certain other verbs akin in meaning to *induo* the article of armament or apparel goes into the ablative: thus Ennius has *succincti gladiis* (*Ann.* 505) and *succincta stola* (*Sc.* 387), with which we may compare his *succincti machaeris* and Cato's *togae parte velati*. Could the odd use of the accusative for a part of the body in both these instances, *corda* with *succincti* and *caput* with *velati*, be a sort of distorted reflection of the use of the accusative for an article of clothing with *indutus*? This may have been facilitated by the fact that the object of *induo* is not always a term for the article worn; we have the accusative of the person affected (and the whole person can easily interchange with a part of his body¹⁶) in Plautus, *Cas.* 113, *tu te in laqueum induas*. This is of course quite different; but still the fact that in the active we can say either *loricam induis* (as in *Cas.* 695, *loricam induam*) or *te induis* (as here) reveals the possession by *induo* of various shades of meaning and consequent various types of constructions, which might have led to comparable variations in more or less synonymous verbs.¹⁷ At all events I think it significant that the two passages most likely to exemplify the *accusativus Graecus* in early Latin, namely the very probable *Ann.* 400 and the not utterly impossible *Orig.* 1.18, have participles of like meaning to *induti*, the accusative

¹⁴ The medio-passive imperative *anouihimu* (on the voice see especially Planta 2.311) is from a verb etymologically allied to Latin *induo* (Planta 2.251, Buck 15 and 164). Because of this, *perca* has sometimes been taken as a kind of toga, but its own etymology favors the meaning "staff, rod, wand"; it is undoubtedly allied to Oscan *perek(ais)* and Latin *pertica*, both denoting a measure of length, presumably a rod, since *pertica* also means "pole, rod." Poultney (239) says that it would not have been difficult for *anouihimu* to extend its meaning from "put on (clothing)" to "take up, equip oneself with (articles held in the hand, etc.)."

¹⁵ Cf. Planta, who on the basis of the Italic evidence expressly states (2.410) that the construction is not to be viewed as a Grecism. So too Löfstedt (*Synt.* 2.421 and *Late Late.* 94), and Norberg (120) and, on the basis of the Old Latin evidence, Geisau (*IF* 36.78).

¹⁶ Cf. the frequent use of the *schēma* referred to in note 2 above. Partitive apposition is particularly common in early forms of the language; it abounds in Hittite (see my article on the subject in *TAPA* 84 [1953] especially 93-95).

¹⁷ Then we have a sort of hypallage of the type that later became so common in Vergil. Cf. below, note 53.

with which, while unlike most Latin accusatives, is certainly not an *accusativus Graecus*.

When the accusative of specification¹⁸ finally came into Latin in the Ciceronian Age, it was surely, I believe, not as an inheritance from early Latin but as a borrowing from Greek. The same is doubtless true of the double accusative construction (whole and part) from which I believe the Greek accusative was derived (cf. above, note 2). The *schéma kath' holon kai meros* is certainly native to Latin as well as to Greek, being undoubtedly an inheritance from Indo-European; but its use in Latin with the accusative was far too rare, both in the early period and in the Golden Age, to generate the accusative of specification in Latin as I believe it did in Greek (again cf. above, note 2). The double accusative is found in Plautus,¹⁹ but then (unlike the double dative²⁰) it disappears without a trace, and when it reappears in Vergil,²¹ it is undoubtedly as an imitation of Homer.²² Certainly therefore, if I am right in my view as to the genesis of the accusative of specification, the rise of this construction in Latin cannot be an independent native development.

¹⁸ It goes without saying that in the Latin imitation as in the Greek original (on which see note 2, above), this accusative when combined with a medio-passive form, either finite or participial, of a transitive verb may be called a direct object with the middle voice instead of an accusative of specification. Here too it seems to me neither desirable nor feasible to try to make the distinction; and when commentators do, they frequently disagree. Thus I am in disagreement with Landgraf, who holds (*ALL* 10 [1898] 219) that the two constructions were originally distinct but eventually coalesced. If one thinks, e.g., of Vergil, *Aen.* 6.470, *nec vultum movetur*, as equivalent to *nec se vultum movet*, we may view *vultum* with the reflexive *se movet* as in essence an accusative in partitive apposition with *se*, and it does not matter whether we view this same accusative when used with the medio-passive *movetur* as eventually becoming an object with the middle voice or an accusative of specification. I am not implying that a development of this sort actually took place in Latin; but I think it did in Greek, from which Latin borrowed the end-product (once more, see note 2 above). This is an additional reason for tracing to Greek Latin phrases such as 6.470 in which the accusative denotes a part of the body, but not such phrases as *vestem induor*, in which it denotes a garment.

¹⁹ In *Men.* 858–59, *hunc senem dedolabo viscera*, and a few less certain instances; I discuss these in *TAPA* 84 (1953) 102–3. Landgraf (*ALL* 10 [1898] 215), in commenting—correctly—on the contrast between Greek and Latin as to the relative chronology of the accusative in partitive apposition and the accusative of specification, says that Vergil was the first to use the *schéma*, but this is incorrect.

²⁰ I discuss this construction in *TAPA* 84 (1953) 105–11.

²¹ I know of only two instances: 10.698–99, *Latagum occupat os faciemque*, and 12.273–76, *horum unum, egregium iuvenem, transadigit costas*.

²² E.g. *Il.* 7.14–16 and 16.586–87. For numerous examples, see my discussion, *TAPA* 85 (1954) 219–33.

The view that the Latin use of this accusative is a borrowing from Greek and not an inheritance is held by most scholars,²³ but it has been disputed by a few, notably Brugmann. He maintains (*IF* 5 [1895] 113 and 131) that not only *induor vestem* and *cingor ferrum* but *velor caput* are "echt italisch" and not "Gräzismus." He sees in both types Latin inheritances of the Indo-European middle voice, which, however, ultimately spread as a result of coalescence with the Greek accusative (113). The construction was, according to him, used by the poets at all periods but in prose first by Sallust (5.113).²⁴ This dictum would seem to indicate that he is not including Cato's *caput velati* in his evidence for the construction *velor caput* in early Latin²⁵; that leaves only *succincti corda*, which certainly need not be held to be "echt italisch." Furthermore, the restriction of the construction to poetry as opposed to prose, and the rarity of its appearance even in poetry, seem to me odd if it is really a genuinely Latin one.

Brugmann later (*IF* 27 [1910]) reiterated his view in slightly different terms, declaring (132) that the Latin use of the *accusativus Graecus* has its root "in echt lateinischem volkstümlichen Akkusativgebrauch," and that only its "starke Kultivierung," starting at the time when the language of the Romans, particularly the poets, came under the influence of Greek, constitutes a Grecism. Here again (133) he pronounces as "echt lateinisch" not only *vestem induo* or *induor* but also *corpus induo* or *induor*, and not only *vestem indutus* but also, conceivably, *corpus indutus* and *caput velati*.

Brugmann wholly fails to differentiate between the certainly native and natural *vestem induor* (equivalent to *vestem induo*) and the rarer and later *corpus induor*.²⁶ To me they seem quite distinct.²⁷ Furthermore, it is only in Vergil that expressions corresponding

²³ See particularly Landgraf (*ALL* 10 [1898] 218), Müller (111 and 127), and Geisau (*IF* 36 [1916] 79), all of whom have made a detailed study of the use.

²⁴ Cf. below, note 35.

²⁵ Perhaps Brugmann here is limiting himself to the construction with finite verbs; but in that case he has no examples from early Latin at all! On the other hand, where does he get his specific phrase *velor caput* if not from Cato?

²⁶ See his list of examples, *IF* 5 (1895) 131.

²⁷ I suggested above (note 17) that the use of the accusative of the body-part instead of the accusative of the garment with verbs of donning may be due to a sort of hypallage, but that does not mean that the two accusatives are essentially parallel. The accusative of nouns denoting garments or armaments, used with *induor* and similar verbs, is quite different from the Greek accusative, since it does *not* denote a part of the body. That the Greek accusative regularly does so is in line with what I believe to have been its origin, as the part in apposition with the whole (see above, note 2).

to the type *corpus induor* become fairly common, and there I think they are to be traced to Homer rather than to Cato.²⁸

Kroll too (*Wiss. Synt.* 47) fails to distinguish between the accusative of the garment and that of the body-part; for, after declaring (correctly as I believe) that Brugmann had rightly attacked the view that we have a Greek accusative in *exuvias indutus*, he goes on to mention *velor caput* and *induor vestem* in the same breath (as both middles). Yet later (48) he declares that Ennius' two examples, *perculsi pectora* ("freilich schlecht bezeugt") and *succincti corda*, are quite different from Horace's famous *suspensi loculos* (*Serm.* 1.6.74), which he derives from the construction with *indutus*; the Ennius passages, "wo der Körperteil das Objekt bildet," are "schwerlich ohne griechischen Einfluss." How then can he separate them from his hypothetical *velor caput* and combine the latter with *induor vestem*? The accident that *velor* is a finite verb and not a participle is surely irrelevant—especially as the only basis for *velor caput* is Cato's supposed *caput velati*!

Löfstedt's views are more or less in line with Brugmann's. He states (*Synt.* 2.421) that the accusative of the garment with *induor* and *indutus* brought in its train ("zog . . . nach sich") the accusative of the body-part, as in *Ann.* 400. However, he recognizes Greek influence in the occurrence of the construction in this passage (cf. above, note 8), as well as its later spread; and he admits that it is almost non-existent in early Latin. In returning to the subject over a quarter-century later (*Late Lat.* 93–94), he repeats his original views to some extent, though with some new (and very interesting) material as well. Once more he maintains that the accusative of the garment was extended into that of the body-part, yet recognizes in regard to the latter that "the native element in this construction is very limited indeed; in fact it is almost entirely lacking in Early Latin" (94). He sums up what he thinks happened as follows (93): "Often the origin of a construction lies in some old and genuinely Latin linguistic tendency, which becomes more widely operative under the stimulus of a parallel Greek model." A construction thus developed he would now call a "partial Graecism" (93 and 94) in contrast with such a "pure Graecism" (95) as Horace's *regnavit populorum* (*Carm.* 3.30.12), which has "no possible basis in the history of Latin syntax" (93).

²⁸ Cf. below, note 61.

Löfstedt's treatment is eminently sane and moderate; yet I must dissent from his conclusions. As we have just seen, he himself states (a) that in early Latin the accusative of the garment was common but the accusative of the body-part was almost non-existent, (b) that the later spread of the accusative of the body-part was due to the influence of the corresponding Greek construction. I cannot believe that the Latin use of the accusative of the body-part, which became common at times when, and in works where, Greek influence was strong, should be viewed as derived not from the parallel, and very common, Greek accusative of the body-part, but from the quite different, and non-Greek, accusative of the garment.

In contradistinction to Löfstedt, who follows the same path as Brugmann and gives reasonable explanations for so doing, Knight goes even further than Brugmann, and seems to me to err badly in so doing. She holds (*AJP* 39 [1918] 191) as he did that "the construction is not a Graecism but a very natural poetic development of an old Italian idiom"; and in addition she believes (189) that probably "the accusative of the part of the body in Latin was resumed on the analogy of the garment." To her (*ibid.*) "it was not a very great step, especially when the feeling of the middle had been lost," from *vestem succinctus* to *corpus cinctus*.

Her entire treatment is, to my mind, vitiated by her failure to grasp the force of the Greek middle, which she apparently approaches through the medium of English. She thinks the use of the middle, as *louomai*, is "natural enough" when there is no object; but when there is an object, as in *loessamenê terena chroa* (Hesiod, *Op.* 522), "the middle is unnecessary and doubtless due to the use without an object" (188). What she wholly fails to understand is that the presence or absence of an object is absolutely irrelevant; whether one "washes skin" or merely "washes," if one performs the action on oneself the verb is middle, and if one performs the action on some one else the verb is active.

Händel and Szantyr (*Mus. Helv.* 11 [1954] 43-46) agree with Brugmann that neither *indutus vestem* nor *indutus pedem* is a Greek accusative. I think they are right in regard to the first and wrong in regard to the second. They explain (44) that *indutus pedem* is equivalent to *qui se pedem induit*, with *se* and *pedem* constituting a *schêma kath' holon kai meros*. This is quite like the explanation which I gave (in *TAPA* 85 [1954] 284) for the "Greek accusative"

in *Greek*²⁹; but I do not think that it can be applied to the Greek accusative in *Latin*, where, as we have seen (above, note 19), partitive apposition in the accusative was very rare at an early date, and continued very rare in Vergil in whom the Greek accusative was so common. Furthermore, what the *schéma* produced in Greek *was* a Greek accusative, and that is what Händel and Szantyr declare *pedem* is not!

They then proceed to give what seems to me an utterly unrelated explanation for the spread of *indutus pedem*. They apparently think this was due to the difficulty of changing *induo aliquid* (garment) *alicui rei* (body-part) into the medio-passive. I myself see no difficulty, for a shift from active to middle need in no way affect any part of the clause except the verb.³⁰ In this connection they examine the various constructions in which the body-part may appear, (a) as a prepositional phrase and (b) as a dative or ablative, as a sign (45) "dass die Sprache Mühe hatte, im Medio-passiv die Angabe des Körperteils in der Konstruktion unterzubringen." But "die Sprache" had no "Mühe" at all! (Query: does a "Sprache" ever have "Mühe" in doing what it needs to do?) What the authors strangely fail to perceive is that it is the verb to which the participle belongs that determines the construction used, and the passages cited by them (44–45) include verbs other than *induo* and quite different from *induo*, e.g. Vergil, *Georg.* 4.337, *caesariem effusae per colla*, *Aen.* 2.273, *per pedes traiectus lora*. Of course *effusae* and *traiectus* cannot govern datives! They conclude (45) that the most convenient construction was the prepositional phrase. Sure instances of the dative (we cannot always tell whether we have a dative or an ablative) are rare; this case seems, according to the authors, "dem Sprachgefühl nicht zu entsprechen." In one instance (second *Carmen de mensibus* 41,³¹ *carbaceos artus indutus amictus*) we

²⁹ That they and I worked independently is proved by the fact that both articles appeared in 1954.

³⁰ Thus they fall into the same error as did Knight (above, 230).

³¹ *Tetrastichon authenticum de singulis mensibus*: published by Riese, *AL*, as No. 395 (1.309–11); by Baehrens, *PLM*, as No. 12 (1.206–9). Baehrens conjectures *atrox* for *artus*, which Händel and Szantyr seem right in pronouncing "zu phantasievoll" (*Mus. Helv.* 11 [1954] 45, note 28). The passage is of little help in tracing the history of the construction, since it cannot be dated: Teuffel-Schwabe (2.371) describes it as "in the style of Ausonius," and Riese (1.309) attributes it to this poet; on the other hand Baehrens (1.204) believes it goes back almost to the time of Augustus, because in it "tanta versuum elegantia tantusque dictionis nitor decorque eminet."

have a genuine *accusativus Graecus*, which shows, they say, that the other instances cannot exemplify this construction. Certainly I agree that *amictus* (like *vestem*) with *indutus* is not a Greek accusative; but if *artus* with *indutus* really is a Greek accusative, then why not (as I believe but Händel and Szantyr do not) *pedem*? They conclude (46) that the *vestem induor* type is much more complicated (*viel verwickelter*) than the far commoner *pedem induor* type, and is perhaps not truly alive (*wirklich lebendig*); and they end by saying that they cannot now enter into the question how large a part Greek influence played, apparently in the origin of *vestem induor*—which seems to me a begging of the question.

I myself am concerned not so much with the origin of *vestem induor* as with the development of *corpus induor*—which certainly, in my opinion, did not begin until the Ciceronian Age.

Doubtless there is significance in the fact that this form of expression is a feature of poetry, not of prose,³² and that among the prose-writers of the period the masters of Latinity, Caesar and Cicero, do not employ the construction at all. Sallust, noted for Grecisms,³³ has at least one example,³⁴ *Hist.* 3.91 (Kritzius 298), *dedecores inultique terga ab hostibus caedebantur*.³⁵ The anonymous author of the *Bell. Afr.*, who has a tendency to use poetic expressions³⁶ and whose style in other ways too is far removed from that of his hero Caesar,³⁷ has two examples: 78.10, *Pacideius*

³² Cf. Landgraf (*ALL* 10 [1898] 212): "Die Prosa hält sich dagegen in sehr engen Schranken."

³³ Cf. Quintilian 9.3.17, *ex Graeco vero translata vel Sallustii plurima*, and Suetonius, *Gr.* 10, *vitet maxime . . . Sallustii . . . audaciam in translationibus*. (However, in the Suetonius passage, *translationibus* may well mean "figures of speech.")

³⁴ Landgraf (*ALL* 10 [1898] 212) cites another, *Hist.* 3.88, *facta consultaque eius quidem aemulus erat*; but he adds the caution that the reading is not certain. Kritzius (34, where the fragment appears as 3.6) has the reading *aemulatus*, which seems much more likely.

³⁵ Brugmann (*IF* 5 [1895] 113) calls Sallust's use of the construction the earliest in prose, but we can hardly differentiate in date his *Historiae* from the *Bell. Afr.* Kroll (*Wiss. Synt.* 48) calls it the earliest example of the construction with a finite verb, but this is surely an error, for Lucretius' instance, 3.489 (on which see note 42), must antedate it: Lucretius probably died in 55 B.C., surely not later than 51 (see Merrill's excellent discussion in his Introduction, 11–13), and it is generally agreed that Sallust did his writing after Caesar's death in 44 (see e.g. Teuffel-Schwabe 1.361, and Kritzius' Prolegomena 5).

³⁶ Cf. Landgraf (*ALL* 10 [1898] 217): ". . . der ja auch sonst zu dichterischer Ausdrucksweise hinneigt."

³⁷ Teuffel-Schwabe characterize his diction as "careless and sometimes vulgar" (1.341); Duff comments on the work's "faults of ignorant and hasty composition" (413) and contrasts it with contemporary "masterpieces of classical Latin" (29).

graviter pilo per cassidem caput ictus, and 85.7,³⁸ Pompeius Rufus brachium gladio percussus.

On the other hand it is the poets of the period, Catullus and Lucretius, who may be viewed as having really introduced the Greek accusative into Latin literature. Once more there seems to me to be significance in the fact that Catullus' examples are—so far as I am aware—confined to that one of his poems which is most markedly in the epic style, his double epyllion on the marriage of Peleus and Thetis and the tale of Theseus and Ariadne. The passages are 64.64, non contacta levi velatum pectus amictu³⁹; 65, non tereti strophio lactentis vincta papillas; 122, devinctam lumina somno⁴⁰; 207–8, caeca mentem caligine Theseus consitus; 296, restrictus membra catena. If the construction is, as Brugmann holds (*IF* 27 [1910] 132), “echt lateinisch” and even “volkstümlich,” it seems strange that Catullus does not use it in his much more familiar and colloquial lyrics and elegiacs. In Lucretius' epic, which naturally shows more Greek influence than Catullus' lyrics,⁴¹ the instances are scattered throughout the work. In one of them, 3.489, tremit artus, the accusative is used in combination with a finite verb⁴²; in another, the rather odd 2.734, alium quemvis quae sunt imbuta colorem,⁴³ with a periphrastic form of the verb. Several other passages, as usual with past participles, were listed above (223).

It is above all in the Augustan Age that the *accusativus Graecus* becomes common, at least in poetry; and it is Vergil who makes it so. His examples are legion.⁴⁴ However, he does not use this

³⁸ Landgraf (*ALL* 10 [1898] 217) and Müller (129) both give this reference wrongly as 85.8.

³⁹ The reading is not absolutely certain, but the general structure is clear. The combination of two participles strikes me as rather awkward.

⁴⁰ Here again (as also in the echoing passage, *Ciris* 206, devinctus lumina somno) the reading is not certain, but Lachmann's suppletion, defended by Friedrich (351) and generally accepted, seems highly plausible.

⁴¹ Especially, as is to be expected of an epic writer, the influence of Homer. Naturally, Homer is one of those listed by Munro in his great edition of Lucretius (2.9) as one of the five Greek writers “whom, to judge by his imitations of them, he most loved and admired.”

⁴² Landgraf (*ALL* 10 [1898] 214) and Müller (115) say this is the earliest instance of such use. Cf. above, note 35.

⁴³ This is the reading of one codex; two others have *colore*, and Lachmann emended to read *quo . . . imbuta colore*, which, in combination with *alium quemvis*, seems to me even more unnatural than *imbuta colorem*. Munro *ad loc.* (2.156) defends the accusative by various parallels.

⁴⁴ I hope to publish later a study of Vergil's use of the *accusativus Graecus* (a summary

construction with *induo* any more than the early writers did, though he does add to this verb's syntactic possibilities as exemplified in Plautus. Since the accusative with *induo* has, as we have seen, been thought by some to be the starting-point for the *accusativus Graecus* in Latin, it may be worth while to observe Vergil's manner of using this verb, which in my opinion lends no support to this theory.

Vergil employs three quite different constructions with *induo*. He, like Plautus, can choose between (1) *induo* (or *induo*) *vestem* and (2) *induo me in vestem* (or *in membrum*). Thus, corresponding to *Men.* 511–12 and 515, *indutum pallam*, he has the following: with a finite verb in the active,⁴⁵ 11.76–77, *harum* (= *vestium*) *unam iuveni induit*,⁴⁶ 9.180, *induit arma*, 11.439, *induat arma*, 9.365–66, *galeam induit*; with a finite verb in the middle,⁴⁷ 2.392–93, *galeam induitur*, 7.640, *loricam induitur*; with a middle participle, 11.487, *thoraca indutus*, 2.275, *exuvias indutus*, 7.666–68, *tegimen leonis indutus capiti*,⁴⁸ this last with an innovation⁴⁹ in the shape of the dative *capiti* for the part of the body.⁵⁰ On the other hand, corresponding to *Cas.* 113, *tu te in laqueum induas*, he has 7.19–20, *quos hominum ex facie induerat Circe in vultus ac terga ferarum*, and (still more like *Cas.* 113 because of the use of the reflexive) *Georg.* 1.187–88, *se nux induet in florem*.⁵¹ A Vergilian variant of the construction not met in Plautus, with *in* governing the ablative instead of the accusative, is *Georg.*

of which I presented before the American Philological Association in December 1959). Vergil employs the construction freely with the past participle of transitive verbs, which may be either middle or (less frequently) passive in force; with the present participle of intransitive verbs; and with non-verbal adjectives, which in some instances approach past participles in meaning. Examples with finite verbs occur also, but are rare (cf. below, note 62).

⁴⁵ The corresponding passive is also met: *Georg.* 3.363–64, *vestesque rigescunt indutae*.

⁴⁶ Here *induit* is used of putting a garment on some one else (*iuveni*, the dead Pallas). Elsewhere, whether active or middle, the verb is used of putting something on oneself.

⁴⁷ There seems no significant distinction in meaning between active and middle. Cf. above, notes 13 and 46.

⁴⁸ Or *os indutus capiti* if we accept Ribbeck's plausible emendation, which obviates the necessity of combining *tegimen* with both *torquens* and *indutus*.

⁴⁹ I shall return to this just below.

⁵⁰ Cf. the use of the dative *iuveni* of the person in 11.76–77, quoted just above (see above, note 46).

⁵¹ Here the flowers correspond to an article of clothing, as they do to a part of the body in *Ecl.* 1.53–54, *saepes apibus florem depasta*.

4.142-43, in flore se arbos induerat. (3) In contradistinction to both these types, Vergil, though not Plautus, has still a third type, *induo vestem*; this is met only with the participle, 5.674, qua (= galea) indutus, and 12.947, spoliis indute.⁵² The variation between, e.g., 2.275, exuvias indutus (middle) and 12.947, spoliis indute (passive) constitutes a typical Vergilian hypallage.⁵³ But the next step Vergil does *not* take; his innovation seen in 7.666-68, tegimen leonis indutus capiti,⁵⁴ is *not* balanced by a similar innovation through the type of hypallage that we might have expected, namely, *tegimine leonis indutus caput.⁵⁵ In other words, Vergil says *vestem induo* and *vestem indutus* as Plautus had done, and also *vestem induor*, but he does *not* say *corpus induor* any more than Plautus did.

He does, however, take this step in his use of *cingo*: he has not only 2.510-11, ferrum cingitur, and, metaphorically, 4.493, magicas accingier artis (these corresponding to *galeam induitur*), as opposed to 2.520, cingi telis, 6.184, accingitur armis, and 7.640, accingitur ense (these corresponding to *galea induor* as implied by *galea indutus*)⁵⁶; but in addition he expands the second type to include a genuine Greek accusative, *Ecl.* 6.75, succinctam inguina monstris. The verb *circumdo* also can in the medio-passive govern an accusative denoting either a garment, as in 4.137, chlamydem

⁵² I have suggested elsewhere (*TAPA* 87 [1956] 157, note 24) that this variation with verbs of donning may have had its origin in the similar variation with verbs of doffing, best exemplified by (a) 9.303, umero exuit ensem, as opposed to (b) 4.518, exuta pedem vinclis; removing the sword from the shoulder, which is what literally happens, after all has the same ultimate result as removing the foot from the chains. In the same category as (a), which corresponds to 2.275, exuvias indutus, is 5.420, exue caestus; in the same category as (b), which corresponds to 12.947, spoliis indute, are 5.421-23, artus, ossa lacertosque exuit, 8.567, exuit armis, 11.395, exutos Arcades armis, 2.153, exutas vinclis palmas. On all these see *TAPA* 87 (1956) 156-57.

⁵³ I have discussed this distinctive feature of Vergil's style in *TAPA* 84 (1953) 98-99 and 87 (1956) 147-89.

⁵⁴ See above, note 49.

⁵⁵ However, with *induco*, which is sometimes used as a synonym for *induo*, he does employ this construction, in 8.457, tunicaque inducitur artus. (In the reverse construction, he uses only the active voice, 5.379, manibusque inducere caestus.)

⁵⁶ The double use seems due to the fact that there are two varieties of middle verbs, those which represent the actor as acting directly upon himself, and those which represent him as acting for himself, in his own interest. Thus *galeam induitur* and *ferrum cingitur* are equivalent to *galeam sibi induit* and *ferrum sibi cingit*, "he puts the helmet on himself," "girds the sword on himself"; *galea induitur* and *ferro cingitur* to *galea se induit* and *ferro se cingit*, "he arrays himself with the helmet," "girds himself with the sword."

circumdata,⁵⁷ or a part of the body, as in 2.218–19, collo squamea circum terga dati; both these passages seem harsh to me, but perhaps the one about the snakes is intentionally so.⁵⁸

The construction seen in *succinctam inguina monstribus*, while it is not used with *induo*, does occur with several verbs of somewhat similar meaning to *induo*, namely *necto* (and its compounds), *induco*,⁵⁹ *insterno*, and *velo*. The passages are as follows: 4.216–17, mentum mitra crinemque subnexus; 7.669, Herculeo umeros innexus amictu; 5.309, caput nectentur oliva; 8.457, tunica inducitur artus; 2.721–22, umeros insterno pelle leonis; *Georg.* 3.382–83, gens velatur corpora saetis; 3.405, purpureo velare⁶⁰ comas adopertus amictu; 3.545, capita Phrygio velamur amictu. All these eight passages, especially the first two because of their use of the participle, and the last three because of their choice of verb, are reminiscent of Cato's (if it is Cato's!) *togae parte caput velati*; but in the Vergilian passages, we probably need have no hesitation in recognizing a genuine Grecism⁶¹ of the sort that is so common in Vergil. However, it is rather odd that six of these eight passages have a finite verb, which is otherwise so rarely used by Vergil in combination with a Greek accusative.⁶² What the precise significance of this phenomenon may be, I am not certain; but it does seem to suggest that the construction with verbs of donning or the like (even the type corresponding to *corpus induo* rather than to *vestem induo*) is somehow distinct from the normal use of the Greek accusative.

With Vergil the Greek accusative becomes firmly established in Latin poetry. Horace, Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid exhibit

⁵⁷ Cf. in the active 2.509–10, arma circumdat umeris, and 12.88, circumdat lorica umeris.

⁵⁸ Does the position of the words *squamea terga* surrounding the preverb *circum* suggest the action of the snakes in coiling around their victim? Cf. the effect produced—in this case a lovely one—by the word order in 8.608, at Venus aetherios inter dea candida nimbos, and on this see Hahn, *Language* 30 (1954) 272, note 156.

⁵⁹ Cf. above, note 55.

⁶⁰ Medio-passive imperative.

⁶¹ Cf. for instance with Vergil's *umeros innexus amictu* (7.669) Homer's *σάκεσιν εἰλυμένοι ἄμους* (*Od.* 14.479).

⁶² Apart from these six passages, I know of only two other certain instances in Vergil, *Georg.* 3.84, *tremit artus*, an echo of Lucretius 3.489 (on which see above, notes 35 and 42), and 6.470, *vultum movetur*. To these we may add 5.720 if we read (with Servius) *in curas animum diducitur* (however, the usual lection, *animo*, seems to me to be preferable); and with these we may perhaps compare 1.713, *expleri mentem nequit*, and 8.265, *nequeunt expleri corda*, since the combination of a finite auxiliary and an infinitive is comparable to a single finite verb.

examples of the construction quite similar to Vergil's. In Ovid in particular, instances abound⁶³; he has been classed with Vergil as most addicted among the poets of the period to the use of the *accusativus Graecus*.⁶⁴ But my thesis that this accusative really is fundamentally *Graecus* and not *Latinus* seems to be borne out by the fact that it continues, in the age of Augustus as in that of Cicero, despite its widening use in poetry, to be very rare in prose. Livy, though his style in general is marked by poetic,⁶⁵ and especially Vergilian,⁶⁶ influence, has only a single instance⁶⁷ of this particular poetic construction, 21.7.10, femur tragula graviter ictus.

In the Silver Age the construction is still widely used by the poets, especially Silius and Statius,⁶⁸ who as writers of epic are strongly under Vergil's influence. Among the satirists, however, it is rare—understandably so, since their language is closer to prose: Persius has only two examples, 1.78, cor fulta,⁶⁹ and 5.86,

⁶³ According to Müller (129), he has a hundred examples with participles and a dozen with verbs.

⁶⁴ So Landgraf (*ALL* 10 [1898] 212), who says the construction is found in these two poets above all among the classical writers (by which he obviously means the writers of the Golden Age; cf. below, note 68). It is interesting to note in this connection that both these poets come to employ the construction more and more: Norden (on *Aen.* 6.281) says that Vergil's use increases from work to work, and, in the *Aeneid*, from book to book; and Geisau (*IF* 36 [1916] 87) makes a similar comment on Ovid's use in the *Metamorphoses*.

⁶⁵ Cf., e.g., Duff 659–60 and 661.

⁶⁶ Cf., e.g., Mackail 152–53, and Duff 660, note 3.

⁶⁷ So Hofmann 379. As a second example from Livy, 5.41.8, maiestatem similimos dis, has been cited, but the accusative *maiestatem* can hardly be justified by Vergil's use of the neuter *omnia* in 4.558 and 9.650, and the correct reading is almost certainly *maiestate*. Müller seems right in rejecting this instance (114), but wrong in including 27.37.12, indutae vestem (129), which belongs to the type in which I cannot recognize a Greek accusative.

⁶⁸ Landgraf (*ALL* 10 [1898] 212) says that they lead among "post-classical" writers. Cf. above, note 64.

⁶⁹ When I presented this paper orally before the American Philological Association (in Hartford, December 28, 1960), Professor Louis Alexander MacKay reminded me that there may be significance in the fact that Persius is apparently mimicking Pacuvius. His point seems excellently taken. The whole Persius passage (1.77–78) runs as follows:

sunt quos Pacuviusque et verrucosa moretur
Antiopa, aerumnis cor luctificabile fulta.

Persius appears to be ridiculing what Duff (225) characterizes as Pacuvius' "passion for strange compounds," and presumably at least *cor luctificabile* is actually a quotation from the early poet. The editors of Pacuvius accept it as such: Ribbeck (*Trag.* 89) says that these may certainly be regarded as Pacuvius' own words; and Warmington

aurem lotus; and Juvenal only one, 8.16, attritus lumbum.⁷⁰ In prose it is employed by the daring innovator Tacitus, but not by the more traditional stylists Pliny the Younger and Quintilian⁷¹; and indeed the Ciceronian Quintilian comments on, and apparently condemns, its common current use as a feature of journalistic style.⁷²

Among later writers, the *accusativus Graecus* comes into prose to a tremendous extent in Apuleius, who employed it "in reichlichstem Masse," according to Geisau (*IF* 36 [1916] 76). This scholar definitely classes Apuleius' use of the construction as a Grecism.⁷³ And so I believe it is, from start to finish of Latin literature.

(2.164-65) encloses *cor luctificabile* and his translation "dolorificable heart" in quotation marks, with the comment (165, note b) that "the phrase looks like a quotation from Pacuvius." Editors of Persius take the same position: Gildersleeve (92) says that "the words are doubtless taken from the play itself, of course in different order"; Ramsay (325), by using quotation marks in his translation "her dolorific heart buttressed up with woes," implies that *fulva* too belongs to Pacuvius; and similarly Némethy (92), after stating that these are "ipsa Pacuvii verba," comments specifically on *fulciri* as used in a sense that it had in the time of Pacuvius but not in that of Persius (which would doubtless be part of the joke). If *fulva* really does belong to the quotation from Pacuvius, then we have another example, apparently not listed heretofore, of the Greek accusative from early Latin. However, here again, as in the case of the one or two possible instances from Pacuvius' uncle and mentor Ennius, we may easily recognize a Grecism (as we may also in the "passion for strange compounds" already referred to). It is clear from the titles of his plays that Pacuvius, like Ennius, was strongly under Greek influence; the epithet *doctus* applied to him by both Horace (*Epis.* 2.1.56) and Quintilian (10.1.97) is explained by Duff (225 and 227, note 2) as a reference to his Hellenism. And it is also clear that Pacuvius, again like Ennius, is not a native speaker of Latin (he was born in Brundisium, and his name is Oscan: cf. Teuffel-Schwabe 1.155), and therefore his language cannot serve as evidence for native Latin constructions; indeed, Cicero, though he considers him Rome's greatest writer of tragedy (*De opt. gen. or.* 1), none the less calls his diction poor (*Brut.* 74.258), and his Latinity may well have merited the epithet "shaky" applied to it by Duff (226).

N.B. The works referred to in this note and not included in note 1 are as follows. **Gildersleeve** = *The Satires of A. Persius Flaccus*, ed. by Basil L. Gildersleeve (New York 1875). **Némethy** = *A. Persii Flacci Satirae*, ed. by Geyza Némethy (Budapest 1903). **Ramsay** = *Juvenal and Persius*, ed. and tr. by G. G. Ramsay (London 1928). **Ribbeck, Trag.** = *Tragicorum Romanorum fragmenta*³, ed. by Otto Ribbeck (Leipzig 1897).

⁷⁰ So Müller (129).

⁷¹ So Hofmann (379).

⁷² 9.3.17, et iam vulgatum actis quoque: *saucius pectus*.

⁷³ In his article entitled "Syntaktische Gräzismen bei Apulejus" (*IF* 36 [1916] 70-98), he devoted a considerable section (part 2, 76-87) to the *accusativus Graecus*.