

Programm standen. Man kann noch einwenden, das Adjektiv *διπλοῦς* sei hier doch einigermaßen merkwürdig, zumal der Ausdruck *διπλᾶ ὀνόματα* seit Aristoteles (Po. 1457a32ff.) für etwas anderes, nämlich für zusammengesetzte Wörter, gebräuchlich war. Indessen ist zu bedenken, daß die Kinder ja gleichsam additiv lernten (Buchstaben, Silben, zwei-, dreisilbige Wörter usw.) und daß sie mehrsilbige Wörter zunächst gewöhnlich nach Silben getrennt schreiben mußten. Wer aber gewohnt ist, nach Silben zu zählen, mag zweisilbige Wörter zunächst einmal als eine Art Doppelung empfinden.

Accusativus Graecus

By O. SKUTSCH, London

Concerning the accusative of respect in Latin scholars are on the whole agreed¹⁾ that in the early period it is used only with middle verbs of dressing and undressing, and that in these circumstances it should not be described as an accusative of respect at all. The object accusative of the clothing seems to have started the construction, followed soon by the accusative of the part of the body. Only when, from the past participle, with which to begin with it is used almost exclusively — the absence of finite forms may, however, be accidental —, the accusative is transferred to adjectives (type *nuda pedem*) should we speak of an accusative of respect, which is a Grecism pure and simple. Such examples of the Greek accusative as are adduced from early Latin are generally discounted: Enn. ann. 400 *succincti corda machaeris* and Cato orig. 18 *togae parte caput uelati* could be considered legitimate extensions of the dressing construction; but Ennius is 'wohl gräzisierung' and Cato is supposed not to be quoted literally but to be paraphrased by Servius.

Ennius ann. 311 *perculsi pectora Poeni* must detain us a little longer. The fragment is poorly attested and generally held to be spurious. Silius Italicus may have imitated it with his *instincti*

¹⁾ Best survey of the fairly extensive literature: E. A. Hahn, TAPA 91. 1960. 221—238.

pectora Poeni (8. 242), but it has also been suggested that a forger started from those words and made them more Ennian by extending the alliteration²). Scevola Mariotti has recently³) identified the Fabius from Aquinum who sent the fragment to the editor of Ennius, Columna, having found it, as he says, in an old Statius commentary in his possession. Mariotti is inclined to accept that statement as made in good faith. But so as not to inflict an accusative of respect on Ennius he proposes, though with due hesitation, to take *perculsi* in a middle sense as 'beating their breasts', comparing Virgil's *percussae pectora matres* (Aen. 11. 877) rather than Lucretius' *perculsi corda tua vi* (1. 13). I see no reason to question the good faith of Fabius, though, like so many others, he may have been imposed upon by the unspeakable Quattromani, a contemporary fellow-citizen at Cosenza; cf. my *Studia Enniana*, p. 43. But I see no reason either to reject the obvious interpretation of *perculsi* as a passive⁴). With his customary balanced judgement Seb. Timpanaro, *SIFC* 22. 1947. 189⁵), argues that the absence of the Greek accusative from Plautus and Terence may mean no more than that the grecizing feature was restricted to the elevated style of epic and tragedy, the scant remains of which could hardly be expected to exhibit another example; if the construction was found in Lucretius and Catullus it could have been used by Ennius. Perhaps we could even go a little farther and say that, if it occurs in Catullus and Lucretius, the use of the Greek accusative is more likely than not to have been pioneered by Ennius.

However that may be, and whatever the authorship of *perculsi pectora Poeni*, there is a piece of evidence which seems never to have been adduced in the discussion of this construction. Varro *LL* 7. 100 says: *apud Ennium: 'decretum est stare corpora telis'. hoc uerbum Ennii dictum a fodiendo; a quo fossa*. Sense and metre require the insertion of *et fossari* (Bergk), *et fodicari* (Spengel) or *atque fodari* (K. O. Mueller, adopted by Goetz-Schoell). Whichever supplement

²) Somewhat illogically Hofmann's 'trotz der scheinbaren Nachahmung des Sil. 8. 242 unecht' (Schmalz-Hofmann p. 379) has become 'trotz offensichtlicher Nachahmung des Sil. 8. 242 unecht' in Szantyr's revision, p. 37.

³) Studi in onore di Vittorio de Falco, Naples 1971. 277 ff.

⁴) Mariotti, l.c. 282 n. 28, comparing Enn. scen. 37f. *V. mentis metu perculsus*, suggests that *metu* may have belonged to the context. True, but *metu* would support a passive rather than a middle.

⁵) In *Maia* 3. 1950. 28, however, discussing Grecisms in Ennius, Timpanaro considers the line spurious.

is chosen⁶), the construction, *prima facie*, is that of a passive proper with an accusative of respect.

It might perhaps be argued that the construction changes from an infinitive to an accusative with infinitive and that *corpora* is the subject of *fossari*; but the chances of such a change appear slight. A combination of infinitive and accusative with infinitive construction is not unheard of. I give a list of instances known to me, omitting authors after Tacitus, and marking with an asterisk examples where the accusative with infinitive follows the infinitive⁷) Plaut. *Most. 180; *Poen. 337; (Rhet. Her. *2.2.2; *3.3.5: *sequi* probably a passive in both instances); Cic. inv. 2.36; 117; Brut. 196; de or. 2.177; *S. Rosc. 26; Lig. 14; Phil. 5.39; leg. 1.56; off. 2.82; fat. 23; 46; fin. 2.21; Caes. gall. *7.60.1; *7.73.1; civ. 3.25; *Bell. Alex. 56.2; Sall. Cat. *8.5⁸); 37.10; ep. ad Caes. 2.1.4; Livy 9.15.5; 28.25.9; 31.10.7; *33.31.8; 34.49.3, al.; Virg. Aen. *5.773; Ov. her. 11.91; Colum. arb. 5.4; 28.2; Sen. prov. 1.1; *2.5; nat. *3.28.7; Tac. ann. *3.12.7; *13.7.1. Where the accusative

⁶) Spengel's *fodicari* is too common a verb to justify Varro's *hoc uerbum Ennii*. Mueller's *fodari* is recommended by Paul. Fest. 74 L. *fodare*: *fodere*, and by the fact that in Enn. ann. 504 *Illyrii restant sicis sibunisque fodentes* there is a fair chance that *fodentes* should be replaced by *fodantes* (but see O. Szemerényi, Syncope in Greek and Indoeuropean, p. 371 n. 6 and add. p. 410). However, would Varro say *fodare dictum a fodiendo*? Any child would know that *fodare* was a variant of *fodere*. Moreover, disyllabic *atque* is slightly suspect: Ennius shares the reluctance of some later poets to scan the word so. In the scenica he elides the final *e* 27 times and retains it twice only. In the hexameter, where the short open final should be welcome, especially in the first and in the fifth foot, he nevertheless elides it 12 times and keeps it intact three times only, once in the first foot (569), once in the fifth (79), and once, probably, in the fourth (3). Inserting it in the third foot, thereby creating a very unusual caesura, seems rather bold. Bergk's *fossari* therefore has the strongest claim. The verb is attested elsewhere only in the substantivized participle *fossatum* used in military and agricultural language and occasionally elsewhere, though hardly before the fourth century (ThLL 6. 1214). Isolation of the verb, however, is demanded by Varro's *hoc uerbum Ennii*. If a *quo fossa* referred to the verb to be supplied it would have to be *fossari*; but even if, as seems more probable, it refers to a *fodiendo* the mention of *fossa* supports that form. For why should Varro mention it unless the *-ss-* linked the two together?

⁷) I am indebted to Professor Åke Fridh for a list of these. See also B. Elmar, *Stud. z. d. Epist. ad Caes. senem*, Lund 1931, 81f.; 90.

⁸) The asterisk should here perhaps be omitted since the accusative with infinitive is more closely connected with the following infinitive than with the preceding one.

with infinitive follows it is normal for the accusative to precede the verb, as in Cic. S. Rosc. 26 *ut mori mallet quam de his Sullam doceri* and Caes. gall. 7.60.1 *naves . . . progredi ibique se expectari* (var. *-re*) *iubet*; although Virg. Aen. 5.773 says *agnam caedere deinde iubet soluique ex ordine funem*. In the Ennian line the improbability of a change of construction is heightened by the fact that, differently from e.g. Cic. S. Rosc. 26 (above) and Sall. Cat. 37.10 *conturbari rem publicam quam minus ualere ipsi malebant*, the logical subject remains the same and a change is therefore unnecessary; the idea that the bodies could be those of e.g. elephants, the possessive genitive following in the next line, could be entertained only if the fragment were quoted by Festus, who is indifferent to the sentence as a whole; as it is quoted by Varro the sentence must be considered complete or at least not mutilated.

To sum up: a grecizing construction found in Catullus and Lucretius (Cic. carm. 7.6 M. *satiata animos* is not perhaps a valid example) is likely to have been introduced by Ennius, and the natural interpretation of the Ennian fragment is that it offers an example of the Greek accusative. There is no absolute certainty that he used it; but the contention that the accusative of respect is not found in early Latin will have to be modified: it does seem to be attested in the fragments of Ennius.

Zur Lachmannschen Regel

Von KLAUS E. BOHNENKAMP, Tübingen

I. In neueren Lehrbüchern der lateinischen Metrik wird die ehemals lebhaft diskutierte Lachmannsche Regel nicht mehr ausdrücklich erwähnt¹⁾. Nur die „Römische Metrik“ von Crusius-Rubensbauer bildet eine Ausnahme, die aber um so schwerer wiegt, als gerade dieser Leitfaden sich auch heute noch in der Hand der meisten Schüler und Studenten befindet²⁾. Hier, wie an anderen

¹⁾ Vgl. etwa James W. Halporn-Martin Ostwald, *Lateinische Metrik*, Göttingen 1962 (Studienhefte zur Altertumswissenschaft Heft 8); Hans Drexler, *Einführung in die römische Metrik*, Darmstadt 1967. Auch im *Kleinen Pauly* fehlt — im Gegensatz zum *Lexikon der Alten Welt* — ein diesbezügliches Lemma.

²⁾ F. Crusius, *Römische Metrik. Eine Einführung*, neu bearbeitet von H. Rubensbauer, 8. Aufl., München 1967.