I, Claudian: the syntactical and metrical alignment of ego in Claudian and his epic predecessors

Article

Published Version

Kruschwitz, P. and Coombe, C. (2016) I, Claudian: the syntactical and metrical alignment of ego in Claudian and his epic predecessors. Journal of Latin Linguistics, 15 (1). pp. 73-115. ISSN 2194-8747 doi: 10.1515/joll-2016-0003 Available at https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/27573/

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See Guidance on citing.

To link to this article DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/joll-2016-0003

Publisher: De Gruyter

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

Peter Kruschwitz* and Clare Coombe

I, Claudian: the syntactical and metrical alignment of *ego* in Claudian and his epic predecessors

Abstract: This article provides an analysis of the syntactical and metrical alignment of the subject pronoun of the first person singular in Latin epic. Based on the observation that, due to its prosody, *ego* may only feature in a certain number of *sedes* within the dactylic hexameter line, a quantitative and qualitative argument is made for a careful distinction between emphatic and unstressed uses in relation to consistent patterns of metrical and syntactical collocation.

Keywords: clitics, Wackernagel's law, *ego*, epic poetry, syntax

1 Introduction

In the *praefatio* to his panegyric on the consulship of Mallius Theodorus, Claudian concludes his invocation of the Muses with a personal praise of his audience:

(1)   (Claud. 16.17–20)
       princeps non aquilis terras cognoscere curat;
       certius in uobis aestimat imperium.
       <u>*hoc ego concilio*</u> *collectum metior orbem;*
       hoc uideo coetu quidquid ubique micat.
       'Our Emperor needs no eagles to teach him the magnitude of his domains;
       yourselves are preceptors more convincing. 'Tis this assembly that gives to
       me the measure of the universe; here I see gathered all the brilliance of the
       world.'[1]

---

[1] All Latin passages are following the format of J. B. Hall's *Teubneriana*; the translations of Claudian are taken from M. Platnauer's Loeb edition (modified as necessary). On Claudian more generally, see e. g. Ehlers et al. (2004), Christiansen and Christiansen (2009), Guipponi-Gineste (2010), and Ware (2012).

*Corresponding author: Peter Kruschwitz, University of Reading, Reading, UK,
E-mail: p.kruschwitz@reading.ac.uk
Clare Coombe, University of Reading, Reading, UK; St. Albans Cathedral Study Centre,
St Albans, Hertfordshire, UK, E-mail: clare.coombe@stalbanscathedral.org

While it is clear that Claudian moves from a third-person subject to a first-person subject in line 19, there is something peculiar about the position of *ego* in the sentence. Latin, as is well-known, is a pro-drop language, i. e. "the subject can be omitted in finite clauses when the inflection of the verb is sufficient to establish intended reference."[2] In the above example, both *metior* and *uideo* make it unambiguously clear that the person speaking at this point is a first-person subject, i. e. the literary persona of Claudian.

If in the Latin language a subject pronoun is not required to mark the person, it is reasonable to ask why it has subject pronouns to begin with. The common view on this matter as regards the use and position of *ego* in the Latin language is that *ego* is used for two main purposes: (i) to put (antithetical) emphasis on the subject ('I̲ do this, whereas you̲ do something else'), and (ii) – loosely related to the former – to mark a change of subject (as one might suspect in the above case, *princeps... ego*).[3] Both usages require *ego* to be an emphatic device – and emphatic devices in the Latin sentence tend to be placed in the left-most position of the Latin sentence.

This, however, clearly is not what has happened in the case of line 19 of the *praefatio*, above: instead *ego* finds itself placed in the middle of a split adverbial phrase *hoc... concilio*. How can this be accounted for? An obvious response to this remark would be a reference to the necessities arising from the metrical design of this passage, i. e. the *Verszwang* of the Latin hexameter line.[4] In Classical Latin, *ego* is to be understood as a bisyllabic unit consisting of two short syllables.[5] Let us consider the structure and constraints of the Latin hexameter line:

$$- \underline{\cup\cup} \mid - \underline{\cup\cup} \mid - \underline{\cup\cup} \mid - \underline{\cup\cup} \mid - \underline{\cup\cup} \mid - \times \parallel.$$

All odd elements of this sequence, consisting of twelve elements altogether which structurally are paired up to six *metra*, require filling with a single long syllable, and therefore *ego* cannot be used for this.[6] This leaves a mere two

---

2 Thus classified e. g. by Vincent (1988: 59). The definition is quoted from Jones (1988: 334). See also Lücht (2011).

3 Felgentreu (1999: 97) argues that "[d]as emphatische 'ego' in v. 19 greift 'nobis' wieder auf und unterstreicht noch einmal die Bedeutung des Panegyrikers als Instrument in der Hand des Kaisers." An emphatic nature of *ego* is simply taken for granted here, without supporting evidence (and perversely, as will be shown below).

4 For a recent study of Claudian's metre, see Ceccarelli (2004).

5 There is reliable evidence for the prosody $\cup$ – in other circumstances; for the present study, however, this is of no consequence.

6 One may wish to note the intellectual dilemma that a word which by default should be able to occupy the first position of a Latin sentence cannot ever occupy the first position in a Latin

different ways in which *ego*, a unit that represents two short syllables in Classical Latin, can be incorporated: either the *e-* of *ego* falls on the first *mora* of any of the even elements 2, 4, 6, 8, or 10 (∪∪), or the *e-* falls on the second *mora* of the same. In the latter case, however, the final *-o* would have to be either elided or lengthened by position. For the remainder of this paper, the positions will be indicated by a numbering system according to the following grid:

	I	II	III	IV	V
	– ∪∪	– ∪∪	– ∪∪	– ∪∪	– ∪∪
A	– *ego*	– *ego*	– *ego*	– *ego*	– *ego*
B	– ∪ *eg(o)*	– ∪ *eg(o)*	– ∪ *eg(o)*	– ∪ *eg(o)*	– ∪ *eg(o)*

Following these structural considerations, one may indeed feel tempted to argue that it was indeed metrical constraints which were responsible for Claudian's decision to formulate the line in the way he did.

There is but one problem with this view: considering the content of the line, the emphasis is not at all on the first person! In fact, as the very structure of the final distich shows, the emphasis is on the locale and the audience: *hoc... concilio*, *hoc... coetu*, with the demonstrative placed in a line-initial and phrase-initial position in each case, ''Tis this assembly that gives to me the measure of the universe; here I see gathered all the brilliance of the world'. In fact, even though the subject changes, the main emphasis of this sentence is not at all Claudian's 'I'.

This, of course, reminds one of an observation that was made by Jim Adams in an article on the position of subject pronouns in the Latin sentence, presenting a strong case for a potentially quasi-clitic use:[7] could it be the case that *ego* has in fact been attached to *hoc* (with a split of the host phrase, as frequently seen in the oblique cases of the subject pronouns), to mark the main emphasis of the sentence?[8]

A more general study of the Latin subject pronoun will demonstrate that *ego* (like *tu*, *nos*, and *uos*) does indeed generally function as a quasi-clitic argument-marking device in the Latin sentence, as an element of the Latin language,

---

hexameter line. This gave rise to workarounds such as *ast ego* vel sim. that feature frequently in the Latin poets.

7 Adams (1999); cf. also the frequently overlooked passage in the relevant entry of the *ThLL*, s. v. *ego*, 263.24 ff. A similar case has recently been made for the Greek language by Dik (2003).
8 For this use of the oblique cases of the personal pronouns in classical Latin, see Adams (1994: esp. 122–124); for documentary evidence from the material of *CIL* I², cf. Kruschwitz (2004: 85–88).

regardless of genre, time, space, or in fact any other contextual aspects.[9] For the purposes of the present article it will suffice to consider the following two questions: (i) how does Claudian use and place *ego* in his hexametric poetry, and (ii) how does this compare to earlier Latin epic poetry. In particular, it will be interesting to see (a) in which *sedes* of the hexameter line *ego* has been used, (b) how frequently it features as a stressed or unstressed unit, and (c) to which host phrases it has been attached in the case of its unstressed use. For this we will expand and assess the evidence for *ego* in Claudian in full.

2 Claudian's *ego*

A first interesting observation as regards the textual corpus of Claudian is the generally infrequent use of *ego*: there are a mere twenty attestations (in addition to item [1], above). The question to consider here is a twofold one: (a) where in the hexameter line is *ego* placed within the textual corpus of Claudian, and (b) what placement patterns emerge in relation to a potential quasi-clitic use? The following two subsections will scrutinise this question.

2.1 Metrical aspects

As regards the metrical aspects of the insertion of *ego* in Claudian's hexameters, there is surprisingly little variation: Claudian allows *ego* in a mere three positions (out of potentially ten, see above), all of which are located in either the first or the second metrum of the hexameter line. This is remarkable given that he could have chosen a total of ten different positions.

2.1.1 Pattern I A

Item (1), above, represents by far the most common type of metrical placement of *ego* in Claudian's hexameter line: in 19 out of altogether 21 cases (i. e. just over 90 %), *ego* fills the second element of the first metrum. An element of minor variation to this placement type is provided in the following two examples, where the first syllable of *ego* elides the final syllable of a preceding phrase (as indicated by parenthesis):

---

9 This will be demonstrated in a more substantial study by Kruschwitz (forthcoming).

(2)   (Claud. 26.31)[10]
     ann(e) ego terrigenas potius mirabor in ipsis

(3)   (Claud. *rapt. Pros.* 2.280)[11]
     ill(e) ego Saturni proles, cui machina rerum

Only two lines in all of Claudian, as far as *ego* is concerned, do not follow the pattern of this type.

2.1.2 Pattern I B

The first alternative solution to Claudian's default solution, as established by the previous pattern, sees *ego* shifting further to the right by one syllable:

(4)   (Claud. 26.154)[12]
     sed quid eg(o) Hannibalem contra Pyrrhumque tot annis

As stated above, the rhythm of the hexameter line can accommodate this type of placement, but only if the second syllable of *ego* is affected by the subsequent phrase, rendering it as a long. Here *-o* is elided by the opening syllable of *Hannibalem* (again as indicated by parenthesis). This item is the sole example for this placement type in all of Claudian.

2.1.3 Pattern II A

The second exception to Claudian's default, as established in Section 2.1.1, above, sees *ego* shifting even further to the right within the hexameter line, placing it in the second element of a trisyllabic second metrum:

(5)   (Claud. *rapt. Pros.* 3.419–422)
     (…) cur autem adscribimus illum
     his lacrimis? ego te, fateor, crudelis ademi,
     quae te deserui solamque instantibus ultro
     hostibus exposui. (…)

---

10 See also below, item (16).
11 See also below, item (17).
12 See also below, item (15).

> 'Yet why make Jove answerable for my tears? 'Twas I who so cruelly undid thee, I confess it, for I deserted thee and heedlessly exposed thee to threatening foes.'

This case then is not only remarkable for its integration of *ego* outside the first metrum of the hexameter line, but also for its being the only case which shows *ego* in a sentence-initial position in all of Claudian's poetry, with clear emphasis on the first-person subject. This token features in the third book of the *De Raptu Proserpinae* in a speech by Ceres to herself as she sets out by night to begin her long search for Proserpina. The first part of the speech laments the fact that she will never see her daughter married; with her gone, Ceres describes herself as outcast, blaming this upon the will of Jupiter. This line then begins a new section of the speech with a sudden turn-around, taking the blame away from Jupiter and moving the focus on to Ceres who will lament her own behaviour for eight lines.

    This turn-around and shift of focus is indicated by the use of *ego*, a new subject for the act of desertion to replace the rejected object *illum* (Jupiter) of the previous line. The line containing *ego* bears great significance to its structure. The second part of the line, from *ego* to *ademi*, contains the full confession, explaining the first part: this is the reason for *his lacrimis*. The metre places the *ego* within the same foot as the *-mis* of *lacrimis*, the *ego* thus providing a bit of a link, as Ceres will now confess, with the tears themselves. However, there is also a strong sense of division, as *ego* follows a strong, syntactically marked trithemimeres caesura (which later on in the line is mirrored, as often in Latin poetry, by a corresponding hephthemimeres caesura following *fateor*).

    Emphatic sentence-initial *ego* is highlighted even further by the contrastive, yet unstressed and clitic personal pronoun *te*, which syntactically echoes the attachment that should have existed between mother and daughter (contrasted by the revelation of subsequent *fateor* that the cruel mother – *crudelis* agreeing with *ego* – deserted Proserpina). This, however, brings us to a closer examination of the syntactical and semantical aspects of Claudian's use of *ego*.

2.2 Syntactical aspects

Having considered the metrical technicalities of the placement of *ego* in Claudian's hexameter line, it is now important to consider its syntax. The examples discussed above all fall into a mere two categories: either *ego* appears in a sentence-initial position, or it appears to be attached to one of the typical host phrases for Latin personal pronouns if used in their oblique, unstressed (i. e. clitical) variety.

The clearest case of a sentence-initial position of *ego* has already been discussed above, item (5), and it was clear that in this case there is actual emphasis placed on *ego* within the context of this token. In addition to this, there are a number of further attestations for *ego* which show *ego* in a quasi-sentence-initial position: these cases include such instances in which *ego* had to yield to a lexical item which syntactically has to go first by default. There are four relevant attestations of *ego* in Claudian for this, three of which are united by their use of the cadence *ast ego*.[13]

In the *In Gildonem*, a withered and pitiful Roma comes to Jupiter to seek aid to feed Rome, since their grain supply was being affected by Gildo. These lines introduce the final part of the speech, which fills about one hundred lines, in which she beseeches the gods for help, at least to change the nature of the punishment she endures to anything rather than starving:

(6)   (Claud. 15.113–115)
       nunc quid agam? Libyam Gildo tenet, altera Nilum.
       <u>*ast ego*</u>, *quae terras umeris pontumque subegi,*
       deseror: emeritae iam praemia nulla senectae.
       'What am I to do now? Gildo holds Libya, another Egypt. While <u>I</u>, who subdued land and sea with my strong arm, am left to perish. Veteran of so many wars, can I claim no reward in mine old age?'

This passage shows in a rather cunning fashion how Claudian gives perspective to his narrative. Opening this segment with a cry of dispair, *nunc quid agam*, 'now what will I do', he shifts gradually away from the focus on the time (*nunc*) to focus on the persona of the speaker: Libya is in the possession of Gildo, and someone else is in charge of Egypt. Here the *tertium comparationis*, the regions, are introduced in the accusative case, arranged in a chiasm. Roma herself, the *ego* of the subsequent clause, then stands in contrast to this, and this contrast is brought out even more strongly by sentence-initial *ast*, immediately followed by emphatic *ego* that compares Roma's situation to that of Libya and Egypt. The *ego* that Roma was in the past is made clear by the subsequent relative clause, concluding with the word *subegi* to parallel with the *ego*: once Roma was a conquerer, now she is overcome by hunger. The current state of the goddess then bears the emphasis of the next line, in which the first foot, in an enjambement,

---

13 On the placement of *ast,* see Hofmann and Szantyr (1965: 489). Pomp. *gramm.* V 269.13 K and others state that *ast* always comes first in the sentence (cf., too, *ThLL* s. v. *at*, 992.67 ff.), but there are notable exceptions to this rule in imperial poetic language; cf. *ThLL* s. v. *ast*, 944.16 ff. for a collection of relevant passages, the earliest one from Valerius Flaccus.

contains the single word *deseror* which describes the current state of the figure defined by the *ast ego* in the corresponding place in the previous line.

The second passage that must be discussed here stems from the *Panegyricus dictus Honorio Augusto sextum consuli*. The passage appears in a speech of Roma to Honorius in which she brings the complaints of her citizens to him in the hope that he will return to Rome. Specifically here she refers to a triumph which has previously been denied her, although she made all the preparations for the event, even preparing a chariot for the emperor:

(7)   (Claud. 28.369–373)
       ast ego frenabam geminos, quibus altior ires,
       electi candoris equos et numinis arcum
       iam molita tui, per quem radiante decorus
       ingrederere toga, pugnae monumenta dicabam
       defensam titulo Libyam testata perenni.
       'Yet did I harness for thee two steeds whiter than snow to draw the chariot
       wherein thou shouldst ride; already had I built in thy name a triumphal
       arch through the which thou shouldst pass clad in the garb of victory, and
       I was dedicating it as a memorial of the war with an inscription to be the
       undying witness of the salvation of Libya.'

Given that the whole speech so far has been concerned with Roma and the hurt Honorius has done her by not returning to her, it is clear that Claudian designs the opening to this passage in a way that generates a strong sense of antithesis. He does so not only by the use of emphatic *ast*, but also by an emphatic, antithetical use of *ego* in a quasi-sentence-initial position – a move that makes excellent sense, given that the previous sentence describes the mocking she, Roma, endured from Africa with hopes of the emperor's coming. The use of *ego* can thus be seen to return the attention, which Roma believes is lacking, to her as she describes the triumph that might have been.

The third passage to be discussed under this perspective is from the first book of the *De Raptu Proserpinae*. Here Dis sends a message of complaint to Jupiter by means of the messenger god Mercury, angered at the fact that he has never been granted a wife or child and therefore threatening war on heaven:

(8)   (Claud. *rapt. Pros.* 1.109–110)
       ast ego deserta maerens inglorius aula
       implacidas nullo solabor pignore curas.
       'And shall I in this empty palace, sans joy, sans fame, know no child's love
       to still instant care?'

The *ast ego* uses the conjunction to link to the previous lines in which Jupiter's contrasting situation – with his many women and children – has been described, the personal pronoun opposing Dis to his brother who has been referred to with *tibi* and *te* in lines 107–108:

(8a)   (…) *tibi tanta creandi*
          copia; te felix natorum turba coronat.

The line beginning *ast ego* thus creates a very different picture for the lonely and childless god of the underworld, serving to describe the *ego* with the adjectival *maerens ingloriosus* literally enclosed within the *deserta aula*.

   The fourth and final passage that shows *ego* in emphatic use is from the *Panegyricus dictus Honorio Augusto sextum consuli*:

(9)   (Claud. 28.277–280)
          en ego, qui toto sublimior orbe ferebar
          ante tuum felix aditum, ceu legibus exul
          addictusque reus flatu propiore sequentum
          terga premor. (…)
          'Behold me, once lord of the world, the friend of fortune till I invaded thee;
          now like an exile or an adjudged criminal, I feel upon my back the nearer
          breath of my pursuers.'

This is from a speech of Alaric, addressing the Ausonian sky, lamenting his defeat by Stilicho and seeking compassion at last from the land he has invaded. The sentence before this addresses the *regio funesta Getis*, drawing attention to those who have already died. *En ego* form an emphatic pair, turning the attention from the other soldiers and the Getae more generally to Alaric in particular, the act of beholding implied by *en* also drawing audience focus on to him; *ego* is considerably divided from the verb and thus becomes almost an object of attention before it becomes the subject of the passive *premor*. The relative clause supports this, describing the time when Alaric was the point of focus above the whole world, *toto sublimior orbe*, his new position recalled with the first words of the next line: *ante tuum*, the effect of the land of Italy emphasised with *tuum*.

   All remaining instances of *ego* in Claudian show *ego* aligned to a mere handful of host phrases that, typologically, are known as hosts for the place-ment of clitical personal pronouns in Latin. We shall arrange the complete evidence in the accustomed fashion.

2.2.1 Negative + ego

The first pattern that must be considered here is the alignment of *ego* to a negative (typically, but not necessarily exclusively, *non*).[14] There are four instances for this pattern in Claudian. The first item is to be found in Claudian's *Panegyricus dictus Olybrio et Probino consulibus*, the earliest of Claudian's major Latin works, where it features in a passage of direct speech:

(10) (Claud. 1.130–133)
  (...) *dic, maxima rerum!*
  <u>*non ego*</u> *uel Libycos cessem tolerare uapores*
  Sarmaticosue pati medio sub frigore Coros,
  si tu, Roma, uelis; (...)
  'Say, queen of the world. Were it thy wish I would <u>not</u> shrink from enduring the Libyan heat nor from the cold winds of a Russian midwinter.'

Ego here refers to Theodosius. The goddess Roma appears to Theodosius, who is resting after battle, to plead that the consulship be granted to the Anicii brothers, Probinus and Olybrius; when she appears the emperor is first to speak, asking her why she has come to him, as reiterated in line 130 in which Roma is addressed as *maxima rerum* with the imperative *dic*.

  The sentence-initial *non* clearly emphasises that which Theodosius would <u>not</u> do if the goddess insisted: he would <u>not</u> cease to tolerate labours nor to suffer. Verse-initial, and sentence-initial, *non* is the clear focus of the overall message in this sentence, and it forms a pair with the lines which follow in which Theodosius emphasises those things which he <u>would</u> do at Rome's behest: just as he would not shrink from the Libyan heat, he <u>will</u> hazard Meroë in summer, and not shrinking from Russian midwinter, he <u>will</u> hazard the Danube in winter:

(10a) (Claud. 1.133–135)
  (...) *pro te quascumque per oras*
  ibimus et nulla sub tempestate timentes
  solstitio Meroën, bruma temptabimus Histrum.

One might, at first glance, be inclined to argue that *ego* also potentially provides an element of antithesis to *tu* (in line 133), manifesting a balanced relationship

---

14 Adams (1999: 103) deals with this type, but sees the pattern mainly as a result of *non* taking precedence over *ego* in the competition for the left-most position in the Latin sentence. This is not entirely accurate, as this paper and subsequent publications will demonstrate.

between emperor and goddess. This, however, would miss a most crucial point: just like *ego*, *tu* can also be employed as an argument marker.[15] Seeing *tu* attached to the conditional conjunction *si* in a sentence that itself does not require any additional emphasis on the subject (as *Roma* herself is addressed in a vocative), allows the balance of meaning in this phrase to be teased out even more clearly: I would <u>not</u> cease to bear..., <u>if</u> you, Roma, so wish. It is thus clear why Claudian chose to add further emphasis to *non* as the focused constituent of item (10) by attaching quasi-clitic *ego* as an argument-marking device to *non*.

The next passage is from the *Epithalamium dictum Honorio Augusto et Mariae*. Here, the character of the young emperor Honorius, tormented by love for Maria, Stilicho's daughter, speaks to himself and laments the fact that his guardian has not yet granted his wish to marry his betrothed. His complaints are justified by a series of examples as to why he has behaved in an exemplary manner as a suitor, opposed to the practices of other young men:

(11) (Claud. 10.23–27)
  <u>non ego</u> *luxuriem regum moremque secutus*
  quaesiui uultum tabulis, ut nuntia formae
  lena per innumeros iret pictura penates;
  nec uariis dubium thalamis lecturus amorem
  ardua commisi falsae conubia cerae.
  'I follow <u>not</u> the example of luxurious princes in seeking the beauties of a pictured countenance, whereby the pander canvass may pass from house to house to make known the charms demanded; nor yet have I sought to choose the uncertain object of my love from this house or from that, and thus entrusted to deceptive wax the difficult selection of a bride.'

A sentence-initial position puts the main emphasis of this sentence on the negative *non* (which incidentally is widely separated from the verb it modifies). The emphasis on *non* is further highlighted by the alignment of quasi-clitical *ego*: Claudian thus makes the speaker declare that what follows is <u>not</u> what Honorius has done (even though he could have). This emphasis on the negative is picked up by *nec* in line 26, thus rendering *non* the first element of a *de facto* enumeration.[16]

In Claudian's *De Raptu Proserpinae*, Proserpina, as she is seized by Dis, manages to undertake a twenty-two line speech of anger against Jupiter and pity at her own situation. The first ten lines of this are formed of a series of questions

---

15 This will be discussed in more detail in Kruschwitz (forthcoming).
16 A similar use of *ego*, in alignment to the first marker of an enumerative structure, can be seen below in n. 70.

to Jupiter, her father, one of which – asking what deed she has done to stir such anger in him – is supported by this sentence opening, in the first foot of the line, with *non ego*:

(12) (Claud. *rapt. Pros.* 2.254–257)
      (...) *tantas quo crimine mouimus iras?*
      <u>*non ego*</u>, *cum rapido saeuiret Phlegra tumultu,*
      signa deis aduersa tuli; non robore nostro
      Ossa pruinosum uexit glacialis Olympum.
      'When Phlegra rages with war's madness I bore <u>no</u> standard against the gods; 'twas through no strength of mine that ice-bound Ossa supported frozen Olympus.'

The speech has moved between a number of different subjects, beginning with a second person address to Jupiter: *cur non torsisti...* (250), moving to the impersonal *placuit depellere mundo* (252), the third person verbs *flectit* and *inest* (253–254) until finally the concerns come to those of Proserpina herself: *tantas quo crimine mouimus iras?* (254). It is in this line that the subject shifts from the second to the first person, and it must be noted that this is achieved without any personal pronoun. When in the subsequent line a first-person subject pronoun is used, it therefore cannot be used to introduce (much less: introduce emphatically) the new subject. Much rather, *ego* has been used for a functional purpose, as it focuses its host phrase *non* through its quasi-clitical alignment. The pronoun's pairing with *non* thus amplifies the injustice of Proserpina's treatment, separating her from those who indeed <u>did</u> commit the crimes which follow.

Unlike the majority of the examples of *ego* in Claudian, the following *ego* – from the first book of the *De Consulatu Stilichonis* – does indeed refer to the poetic 'I' as Claudian makes his own comment upon the situation of the increased numbers in Gaul, in spite of previous attempts in war. It comes from a long first-person address to the poem's dedicatee, Stilicho, in which Claudian lists the many inspiring deeds of his patron on which he might write: *quid primum, Stilicho, mirer?* (291). The passage reads thus:

(13) (Claud. 21.318–320)
      <u>*non ego*</u> *dilectu, Tyrii sed uomere Cadmi*
      tam subitas acies concepto dente draconis
      exiluisse reor. (...)
      'Methinks 'tis no levy but the ploughshare of the Phoenician Cadmus that has raised up thus suddenly a host sprung from the sowing of the dragon's teeth.'

Claudian is recreating the Gallic recruits as the Theban soldiers sprung from the dragon's teeth sown by Cadmus, answering three questions he has asked about their equipment and forces with his own insight (*reor* 320). The introduction of the personal pronoun to inform what he does <u>not</u> believe, preceding the first-person verb which concludes what he thinks is in fact the case, emphasises the poet's voice as an authoritative force, taking the first-person passages that have already been used in this section one step further into this revelation about these soldiers.

2.2.2 Interrogative + ego

The next cluster of attestations in the textual corpus of Claudian can be sum-marised as 'interrogative + *ego*'.[17] There are three variants of this pattern in Claudian, one containing *cur*, one *quid*, and one *anne* as interrogative pronoun, respectively.

The first example comes from the second book of the *De consulatu Stilichonis*, more precisely from a speech of Roma to Stilicho in which she begs him to take on the consulship. Here she comments on the downfall of Eutropius, eunuch consul in the East, and the silence which has deliberately followed on the subject of his shameful consulship. Her question is clearly rhetorical and there is no speech in response from Stilicho:

(14)   (Claud. 22.309–311)
   <u>*cur ego*</u>, *quem numquam didici sensiue creatum,*
   gratuler exemptum? delicti paenitet illos:
   nos nec credidimus. (...)
   'Why should I applaud the downfall of one whose elevation I never heard nor knew? 'Tis for the guilty to repent; we have never even believed.'

The point of the question is *cur*: <u>why</u> – or perhaps even more emphatically: <u>just why</u> – should Roma applaud that Rufinus has been removed from power (*exemptum*), when she never knew of said power in the first place. These lines are the culminating point of this section of the speech, which confines Eutropius' consulship to the shame of the East, classing it as a scandal which never profaned Italian ears. Therefore, although Roma describes the context of the situation, she never even reveals Eutropius' name. The context is the

---

17 For this pattern, cf. Adams (1999: 115–116).

summary of her argument that she had not heard about the disgrace, and, within this, the *ego* as a reference to the first-person subject is clearly not of any emphatic value.

This particular *ego* precedes two further pronouns: *illos* in 310 and *nos* in 311. However, it is *nos* and *illos*, distinct from *ego*, which stand in antithesis to each other. The train of thought of this passage is this: (i) Just why should I be sad, I never even heard of this man; (ii) those people (from the East) should be ashamed of their disgrace; (iii) we (*nos*, in emphatic use and position)[18] have never even believed in this story (and thus no reason to be ashamed and to repent). It is the contrast between (ii) and (iii) that stands out – *illos* versus *nos*, and this is supported not only by the syntax, but also by the chiastic arrangement of these phrases. This chiasm is prepared by the preceding line, feigning to be altogether uninvolved, thus stressing the *cur* as the actual focal point of this sentence.

The two remaining instances are to be found in the *Bellum Geticum*. We shall start with what chronologically is the latter of the two tokens, as it closely relates to item (14): here, too, we have a *qu-* interrogative with *ego* attached. The line in question has already been mentioned above, as token (4), due to its unusual placement within the hexameter line (unusual by the standards of Claudian, that is):

(15) (Claud. 26.154–159)
> sed quid ego Hannibalem contra Pyrrhumque tot annis
> certatum memorem, uilis cum Spartacus omne
> per latus Italiae ferro bacchatus et igni
> consulibusque palam totiens congressus inertes
> exuerit castris dominos et strage pudenda
> fuderit imbelles aquilas seruilibus armis?
>
> 'Why should I make mention of the wars waged all those weary years against Hannibal and Pyrrhus when that vile gladiator Spartacus, ravaging all the countryside with fire and sword, oft engaged the consuls in open war and, driving out its feeble masters from the Roman camp, put to rout the unwarlike eagles defeated with shameful carnage by a band of slaves?'

Like the earlier use of *ego* with an interrogative, the question is being asked by Claudian's poetic voice, making a comment upon his own choice of content for the poem which may explain the presence of *ego*, a reminder of the poet-creator. Simultaneously, he sets himself up as interpreter of past struggles against

---

18 The plural could indicate that Roma remembers that she speaks *pro cunctis* (line 270).

Hannibal, Pyrrhus, and Spartacus. The emphasis again lies not on the *ego* but upon the *sed quid,* which both engages with the preceding parallel between Stilicho's campaign and past wars for Rome, and moves the poem on in order to develop the comparison and prove that Stilicho's task is greater. The emphasis on (*sed) quid* is then further underlined by the attachment of quasi-clitical *ego*.[19]

The *ego* in this sentence does, however, prefigure the *nos* which begins the sentence answering the question (160). The focus here moves from Claudian's poetic question in the removed world of the poem, to the reality of hardship which he and his audience share, thus engaging his literary comparison with the reality of the war – and it is here where one then finds a first-person subject pronoun, *nos*, in a sentence-initial and verse-initial position that can clearly be identified as emphatic.

The third and final passage that must be considered here uses a different type of interrogative, namely *anne*. The first line of this item had already been discussed as item (2), above, as it shows a minor variation to the placement of *ego* insofar as it shows the first syllable of *ego* eliding the final syllable of a bisyllabic preceding item. With some further context, the passage in question reads thus:

(16) (Claud. 26.31–35)
      <u>*anne ego*</u> *terrigenas potius mirabor in ipsis*
      procubuisse satis, uitae quibus attulit idem
      principium finemque dies, quam caesa Getarum
      agmina, quos tantis aluit Bellona tropaeis
      totaque sub galeis Mauortia canuit aetas.
      'Am I to look with more admiration upon those earth-born warriors struck down in the very furrows from which they sprang, born and dying in a single day, than upon the slaughtered ranks of Getae whom the goddess of war reared on so many spoils and whose martial life came to grey hairs, passed over beneath helmets?'

An and *anne*, frequently used to introduce the second half of disjunctive questions, are commonly used to disapprove of a (putative) opposing opinion of an interlocutor in an argumentative dialogue.[20] Here, too, Claudian's *anne* thus aims to trigger a negative answer first and foremost to the question raised

---

19 Cf. also below, n. 27.
20 Cf. Kühner and Stegmann (1992 [1914]: II.2, 518–519).

subsequently: should the poetic 'I', i. e. Claudian, be looking more favourably upon the deeds of some mythic folk than upon the exploits of Stilicho?

What is remarkable here, as in the previous passage (15) is, of course, that *ego* refers to the very poet himself – but does this mean that he introduces himself here in an emphatic way? Claudian's question here forms part of a more extended proemic comparison between the deeds of Stilicho and those of Tiphys and the Argonauts, in which Claudian draws attention to the ability of the poet to exaggerate and deceive his audience (*licet omnia uates / in maius celebrata ferant*, lines 14 and 15). The text of item (16) is preceded by a first (rhetorical) question. This first question, however, is not in the first person but uses the impersonal *scilicet* to ask: 'is it a nobler title to fame' to have driven off Harpies or Getae. The second question quite technically then changes subject to the first person with *ego* ('am I to look with more admiration...') – but it quite obviously does not shift the emphasis to the first person: this clearly is not about any implied or even explicit comparison to competitor poets and their subject choices! Instead, the *ego* as a quasi-clitic argument marker adds emphasis to the host phrase, *anne*, and one would thus be justified to bring this out even stronger in the translation: 'am I <u>seriously</u> to look with more admiration... '.

The shift from an impersonal to a first-person subject is nevertheless cunning in the grander scheme of things: the subsequent paragraph in the poem then introduces a second-person agent: *per te namque unum*, 'thou and thou alone... '. This perspective is well-prepared by, but not the main point of, the introduction of *ego* in line 31 – the point is and remains its function as an argument-marking device.

2.2.3 Demonstrative + ego

The third cluster of attestations that must be discussed here follows the pattern "demonstrative + *ego*," and in fact already item (1), above, was evidence for this.[21] With five tokens that fall under this rubric in addition to item (1), it is by far the best attested category, accounting for almost one-third of all instances of *ego* in Claudian.

The majority of the evidence shows *ego* attached to a form of *hic*, *haec*, *hoc*, but there is a single attestation for *ego* being attached to a form of *ille* (which has briefly been mentioned before as item [3] for its metrical design):

---

21 For this pattern, see Adams (1999: 113–114).

(17)   (Claud. *rapt. Pros.* 2.280–281)
    <u>*ille ego*</u> *Saturni proles, cui machina rerum*
    seruit et immensum tendit per inane potestas.
    'I am that scion of Saturn whose will the framework of the world obeys,
    whose power stretches through the limitless void.'

This token, from the second book of the *De Raptu Proserpinae*, is the only instance of *ille* preceding *ego* in Claudian. The *ego* comes within a four-word phrase in which *sum* is logically to be supplied, so in this sense *ego* partly fulfils an identifying role that is normally supplied by the verb. Moreover, *ego* is particularly important within the context of the poem: this passage comes from the speech of Dis to Proserpina as he snatches her away and marks the revelation of his identity to her. Given that the rest of the poem is concerned with the hiding of the identity of the rapist from Ceres and her attempt to discover that identity, this point of revelation to Proserpina is integral, as the reminder of *ego* may be understood to demonstrate.

    However, does this mean that *ego* is actually carrying any major emphasis here? Does the sentence suggest a nuance along the lines of '<u>I</u> am that scion of Saturn,... ' (as opposed to someone else)? Hardly. In keeping with the reluctance to reveal the identity, Dis does not put any emphasis on the first person, and in fact even within a phrase that introduces a first-person perspective, the gist remains remarkably non-personal. It much rather seems to be the case that, despite of the subject pronoun, the emphasis is on *ille*: 'I am <u>that very</u> scion of Saturn, whose will the famework of the world obeys,... '.

    This interpretation, of course, would confirm the argument-marking nature of the quasi-clitic subject pronoun in combination with demonstratives – an observation that was already suggested by item (1), above. Can this view be further supported by the remaining evidence for demonstratives + *ego* in Claudian?

    The evidence for *hic*, *haec*, *hoc* + *ego* itself can again be subdivided into two groups: instances in which the demonstrative features as a noun, and instances in which the demonstrative operates as an adjective (like in item [1]). We shall start our discussion with the evidence for the former. The first instance to consider comes from the *Panegyricus dictus Olybrio et Probino consulibus*:

(18)   (Claud. 1.147–149)
    <u>*his ego*</u> *nec Decios pulchros fortesue Metellos*
    praetulerim, non, qui Poenum domuere ferocem,
    Scipiadas Gallisque genus fatale Camillos.
    'To <u>these</u> I would not prefer the noble Decii nor the brave Metelli, no, nor

the Scipios who overcame the warlike Carthaginians nor the Camilli, that family fraught with ruin for the Gauls.'

This passage comes from Roma's reply to Theodosius in which she tells him her purpose in coming to him, and begins to tell him about the Anicii brothers to whom she desires him to give the consulship. It is these very brothers, Probinus and Olybrius, to whom she is referring with the demonstrative *his*, having first named them five lines previously as *fratres / pignora cara Probi*, and it is they, not her *ego*, which form the focus of this sentence in the comparison between them and the great former families of Rome. It is worth noting that although this is the first use of *ego* in the speech, uses of the first person have been accumulating since line 140, with emphasis given to Roma's role in their upbringing by means of *ipsa* in lines 144: *ipsa meo foui gremio*, and 145: *cunabula paruis / ipsa dedi*. The sentence containing *ego* begins, in fact, to move away from Roma's role towards several lines which present the virtues of the brothers to Theodosius and in which they become the centre of attention.

The final passage to be considered here under the rubric of '*hic*, *haec*, *hoc* as a noun + *ego*' is a passage from the first book of the *In Rufinum*:

(19)   (Claud. 3.112–113)

   hunc ego, si uestrae res est accommoda turbae,
   regalem ad summi producam principis aulam.

   'Him I will introduce, if the plan commend itself to you, to the kingly palace of the emperor of the world.'

The line comes from the speech of Megaera to the infernal council, an inversion of the epic *concilium deorum*, which opens the narrative of the *In Rufinum*. Here the Fury proposes that rather than attempt to throw the cosmos into disorder with a war upon the gods, it is more appropriate that she set loose her monster, Rufinus, upon the Roman world.

Given the role of Megaera as a driving force behind the chaos which permeates the poem, the use of *ego* in this line might seem justified as a means to emphasise just that. Megaera seems to be constructing herself in opposition to the underworld rabble, they an unruly force who wish to inflict chaos without the knowledge or means for success, she a true personification of evil who has brought up her tool for chaos since he was a child in her lap, shaped by her snakes (lines 93–100), with the intention of releasing him upon an unsuspecting world of harmony. The presence of *ego* therefore would be paired with the personal adjective *uestrae* to separate Megaera from the *turba* she addresses. However, the pair that is of rather greater importance here is

obviously formed between *hunc* and *ego*, the monster and the Fury sharing the role of evil force as they will throughout the poem.

Does this mean that there is actual emphasis on the *ego* here, to such an extent that it would require expressing this through a subject pronoun? Considering the actual context, it is clear that this cannot be the case: Megaera was the first-person subject before, so there is no need to highlight a subject change. The notion of the 'I' does not stand out in this sentence – it does not suggest that Megaera will do something (as opposed to everyone else). It is beyond doubt that the single most emphatic unit in this context is the demonstrative pronoun *hunc* which carries the force of the sentence as its very focus. In keeping with the observations made about *ego* as a merely functional marker of the argument, one can thus claim more confidently that *ego* has been used to shed further emphasis on *hunc*, rendering a meaning along the lines of 'this very man I will introduce... ', specifying the *hunc* rather clearer than it would have been achieved with a 'mere' *hunc*.

This brings us to the evidence for *hic, haec, hoc + ego* in an adjectival use of the demonstrative. There are two instances of this pattern, and they both show a similar syntax: the demonstrative and the related noun are separated by a considerable hyperbaton, the demonstrative features in a sentence- and verse-initial position, and *ego* is directly aligned to the demonstrative in immediate juxtaposition. The first token is to be found in the *Bellum Geticum* where it features in a speech of defiance by Alaric:

(20) (Claud. 26. 530–531)
       hanc ego uel uictor regno uel morte tenebo
       uictus humum. (...)
       'This land shall be mine whether I hold it in fee as conqueror or in death as
       conquered.'

This comes from a speech of defiance by Alaric in the *De Bello Gothico* in which he responds to the doubts raised by one of the Getic leaders about the war. He opens his speech with a long sequence of first-person rhetorical questions, essentially all suggesting that he is poised to attack Italy and Rome herself. A first highpoint of this outburst is the above passage, in which Alaric makes it absolutely clear that it is this very land which he will occupy, dead or alive. It is this slightly modified meaning of the demonstrative that is brought out by the attachment of *ego*, which otherwise would be superfluous in this sentence just as much as it was in all the preceding first-person clauses that did not show the subject pronoun despite the stress of the first-person subject.

The second and final item for this category comes from the *Panegyricus dictus Honorio Augusto sextum consuli*, but – ironically – links to item (20)

insofar as it relates to the same historical context. This passage, too, is spoken by Alaric – now in despair, addressing the Ausonian sky:

(21)   (Claud. 28.291–293)

     <u>haec ego</u> continuum si per <u>iuga</u> tendere cursum,
     ut prior iratae fuerat sententia menti,
     iam desperata uoluissem luce, quid ultra?
     'If I had pursued the plan that anger first dictated to me and had in my desperation continued my march along <u>its crest</u>, what lay beyond?'

Here Alaric asks whether a different course might at least have won him a worthier death. The line forms part of a speech which principally uses first-person verbs, and focuses on Alaric's own situation, but there is no particular emphasis in this sentence upon the _ego_. Instead, Alaric, as the _ego_, is being located topographically, the geography of his journey forming the main point of lines 286–295. The _ego_ juxtaposed to the _haec_ places Alaric where he desires to have gone, the _haec_ describing the _iuga_ he wishes he had traversed. This placing of the subject within his longed for landscape helps to lead up to his ultimate desire: that from there he would at least have been able to see Rome with his dying eyes:

(21a)   (Claud. 28.295)

     et certe moriens propius te, Roma, uiderem,...
     'Ay, and my dying eyes had beheld thee, Rome, from not so far away.'

The use of _te_ with the vocative _Roma_ in this culminating sentiment thus forms a parallel with the _ego_ before it, the subject able only in the imaginary sphere of his wishes to see his desired object, Rome.[22]

2.2.4 Adverbs and adjectives indicating time, space, and extent

This final category for Claudian only at first glance presents itself as a bit of a mixed bag: in fact, it is a contraction of a broader spectrum of host phrases to which _ego_ typically is attached in Latin.[23] It comprises the final three instances for _ego_ in Claudian.

---

22 For the clitic use of the oblique forms of the Latin personal pronoun, see e. g. Wanner (1987: 132), Adams (1994), and Kruschwitz (2004), to mention but a few.

23 For an initial assessment, cf. Adams (1999: _passim_). This will be significantly expanded and fine-tuned in Kruschwitz (forthcoming).

The first item is a passage from the second book of the *De consulatu Stilichonis*. Here it features in a speech of Roma to Stilicho at the point at which she is presenting him with the consular cloak on which the prophecy of his future family is embroidered:

(22)   (Claud. 22.336–337)
  hic ego promissam subolem sperataque mundo
  pignora praelusi. (...)
  'See here I have prefigured thy destined progeny, those thy children for whom the world prays.'

Hic is clearly deictic, meaning that it refers to a physical act of pointing to the embroidery on the cloak, and in this vivid visual presentation of Roma the *ego* seems somewhat unnecessary, since it is the cloak and not the goddess which is the object of focus: 'It is here that I have prefigured... '. The sentence does, however, fall within a series of acts of construction which have made up the creation of the prophetic cloak: firstly, Minerva and Roma together dipped the thread in purple dye and wove the cloth, interwoven with gold (lines 330–334), whereas it was Lachesis whose gold thread it was, with which she also wove the golden centuries which Rome will have under Stilicho (line 335). However, the change of subject to *ego* here does seem to give a particular role to Roma in the prefiguring of Stilicho's family, a theme which is continued both in the fact that Minerva will be credited with the other embroidery (lines 340–341) and that Roma claims that for her specific work of weaving Stilicho's destined children she will be called a true prophet, the personal role picked up with *me* and *nostrae*:

(22a)   (Claud. 22.337–339)
  (...) *ueram mox ipse probabis*
  me uatem nostraeque fidem uenientia telae
  fata dabunt. (...)

Whereas in item (22) thus some small doubts may remain over the quasi-clitic nature of *ego*, the case is absolutely clear-cut in the following item which is from the *Panegyricus dictus Honorio Augusto quartum consuli*. Here Claudian looks back upon Honorius' childhood and portrays Theodosius addressing his son, the emperor looks forward to his own death and his sons' respective rules of the eastern and western empires:

(23)   (Claud. 8.394–395)
  tunc ego securus fati laetusque laborum

discedam, uobis utrumque regentibus axem.
'Then, careless of doom and rejoicing in my labours, I shall quit this mortal life, while you, my sons, rule either hemisphere.'

It is the first word *tunc*, referring to that future time (and thus the time contemporary to this poem's performance in 398 AD), which clearly bears all the emphasis: 'It is at that very time that I shall quit... ', and it is obvious that the first-person subject is not the main point of the introduction of *ego*.[24]

The very final item to be considered here bears some resemblance to items (20) and (21), as it shows *ego* in a split noun phrase attached to the adjectival element of that phrase. The attestation stems from the third book of the *De Raptu Proserpinae*:

(24)   (Claud. *rapt. Pros.* 3.228–230)
quos ego nequidquam planctus, quas inrita fudi
ore preces! ruit illa tamen confisa sororum
praesidio; famulae longo post ordine Nymphae.
'What tears did I not shed to no purpose, what vain entreaties did my lips not utter! Away she flew, trusting to her sisters' protection; the scattered company of attendant nymphs followed after her.'

This *ego* refers to Electra, nurse of Proserpina, in her speech explaining the story of Proserpina's disappearance to Ceres. It follows an eight-line passage in which Electra is describing the guile of Venus and the way in which she undertook to persuade Proserpina to go out to gather flowers on Aetna, with Venus the subject throughout. Following the *ego* phrase, *ruit illa* of line 229 then changes the subject to Proserpina who, against Electra's will, rushes away. The change of subject, however, is of less importance than the contrast between *quos... planctus* and *nequidquam*, especially the contrast between the *quos = quales/quantos* and the fact that this happened in vain. The particular emphasis placed on this contrast and particularly the significance of the adjective *quos* is, following the established rule, further highlighted by the alignment of quasi-clitical *ego*.

---

24 This, of course, does not mean that the first-person subject is irrelevant altogether – it is just not the main point (which means that the justification for the introduction of *ego* is a functional, not a semantic one): this is the first use of the first person in this section of the speech which has largely referred to Theodosius' actions by means of third-person verbs, with the resulting future actions of Honorius addressed in the second person. However, the change of person only becomes significant within the context of the idea expressed. It is not emphasising a change of subject but it does for the first time distance Theodosius (*ego*) from his sons (*uobis*) upon the event of his departing this life and thus being divided from them (*discedam*).

3 Establishing a control group

Following the close examination of Claudian's practice for the placement of *ego* in his hexametric poetry, both in terms of the metrical and syntactical aspects, it is now appropriate to compare and contrast the findings as regards the metrical and syntactical inclusion of *ego* in Claudian to a sizeable corpus of other hexametric poets. The corpus chosen for this exercise therefore includes a handful of landmark Latin epic poets, from Ennius to Silius Italicus, who may or may not have served as a model for Claudian.[25] With the exception of Ennius (who as the "founding father" of Latin hexametric poetry deserves a more detailed observation), treatment of these authors will be data based and largely refrain from extended interpretation.

3.1 Ennius

The earliest evidence for *ego* in hexametric poetry, unsurprisingly, stems from Quintus Ennius' *Annales*. In the fragments of the *Annales*, there are altogether four attestations, only one of which seems to show *ego* in emphatic use:

(25) (Enn. *ann.* 201 Sk)
      (...) *sed ego hic animo lamentor.*
      'But I feel grief in my heart here.'

Here *ego* appears in the leftmost position of the phrase, but not in a sentence-initial position which has been reserved for *sed*. It seems conceivable that *ego* constituted an antithesis of some sort in the (now lost) context of this passage. However, there is some discussion about the constitution of the text, however, with a *uaria lectio* that reads thus:[26]

(25a) (...) *sed quid ego hic animo lamentor.*
       'But why do I feel grief in my heart here?'

This would render *ego* unemphatic, and it would be in line with the wording of one of two non-emphatic tokens in Ennius that show *ego* attached to an

---

25 An element of variation is provided by the inclusion of Vergil's *Eclogues* and *Georgica* as well as Lucretius' didactic poetry. Satirical hexameters, however, have been excluded from this study altogether, as one may expect a certain amount of deliberate variation between these genres that should not simply be conflated.
26 Cf. O. Skutsch, *The Annals of Q. Ennius*, Oxford [2](1985: 363).

interrogative (below), and in fact *sed quid ego* is a frequent occurrence in Latin hexametric poetry.[27] Be that as it may, metrically *ego* obviously was used in element 6 of the hexameter line, with the *e-* placed on the second of the two *morae* that form this element; the *-o* of the second syllable is elided by the following *hic*; this constitutes a case of placement pattern III B according to the grid of Section 1, above – a pattern not even once attested in Claudian.

Moving on to the undisputedly unstressed instances of *ego* in Ennius' *Annales* there are two instances of 'interrogative + *ego*', both parallels to item (25a), if this in fact ought to be the accurate reading of the passage in question. The first instance, showing *ego* in placement pattern I B, reads thus:

(26) (Enn. *ann.* 314 Sk)
      <u>*sed quid ego*</u> *haec memoro? dictum factumque facit frux.*
      'But <u>just why</u> am I saying this? Said, done: that's how a smart man acts.'

The second item, with *ego* collocated according to pattern II B, is even more interesting:

(27) (Enn. *ann.* 337–339 Sk)
      O Tite, <u>*si quid ego*</u> *adiuuero curamue leuasso*
      quae nunc te coquit et uersat in pectore fixa,
      ecquid erat praemi?
      'O Titus, <u>if somehow</u> I manage to help or to lessen a concern that eats you up right now and that keeps turning, permanently in your chest, just what would be the reward?'

This passage, spoken by a shepherd sent to the Romans by the Epirotans, makes it clear that the speaker is trying to negotiate: <u>if</u> he managed to achieve something for the Romans, <u>what</u> would be the reward? *Ego* in this case is attached to *si quid*, which must be interpreted as a single word (and, of course, this word is frequently written as a single unit, *siquid*). With the alignment of *ego* to this unit, it evolves into the emphatic focus of this phrase, and thus corresponds nicely with *ecquid* of the main question. In turn, there is next to no (if any) emphasis on the first person – it neither highlights a contrast nor makes emphatic reference to a first-person subject.[28]

---

27 A number of examples have been listed in this paper; see items (4), (15) (with n. 19), and cf. below, nn. 50 and 101.

28 It seems unlikely that such a contrast should have existed in the context of this passage.

The final item from Ennius' *Annales* to be considered here shows the pattern 'demonstrative + *ego*' in position I A:

(28)   (Enn. *ann.* 180–182 Sk)
       (...) *qui antehac*
       inuicti fuere uiri, pater optume Olympi,
       <u>*hos ego*</u> *ui pugna uici uictusque sum ab isdem.*
       'Men who were previously unbeaten, best father of the Olymp, <u>those very men</u> I beat by force in battle... I and I was beaten by them in turn.'

Again it seems that *ego* does not carry any semantic value of its own, but functions as a device to put further emphasis on *hos*, thus clarifying its reference within the sentence at large.

In conclusion, one must note that Ennius, while adhering to the same syntactic principles in the placement of *ego* as Claudian (at the far end of the Roman epic tradition), even in the few remaining fragments seems to show a much more sophisticated range of metrical placement patterns than Claudian.

3.2 Lucretius

The next author to be considered here is Lucretius, who provides us with the first extensive corpus of epic (didactic) hexametric poetry in Latin. There are altogether seven instances for *ego* in Lucretius. Six of them show the metrical pattern I A, one follows the pattern I B (Table 1).

From a syntactical perspective, Lucretius without exception uses the unstressed form of *ego*, aligned to typical host phrases as a quasi-clitic.

Table 1: Placement patterns of *ego* in Lucretius.

Pattern	Instances	Relative frequency
I A	6	85.71 %
I B	1	14.29 %
II A	0	–
II B	0	–
III A	0	–
III B	0	–
IV A	0	–
IV B	0	–
V A	0	–
V B	0	–

Instances cover the alignment of *ego* to negatives,[29] relatives,[30] demonstratives,[31] and temporal adverbials.[32] All in all, the evidence of Lucretius is much in line with Claudian's practice and divergent from Ennius' line; however, the small amount of relevant tokens for both Ennius and Lucretius renders the comparison problematic: this will be remedied by the subsequent authors whose works survive more or less in full and yield significantly more examples of *ego*.

3.3 Vergil

Discounting the spurious opening of the "extended" prooemium of the *Aeneid* (*ille ego qui* eqs.), there are 84 instances of *ego* in the three major textual corpora that can be attributed to Vergil with certainty, *viz.* the *Eclogues*, the *Georgica*, and the *Aeneid*.[33] These spread anything but evenly across the ten established patterns for the position of *ego* in the Latin hexameter line (Table 2).

A much more detailed picture emerges, however, when looking at the individual poems of Vergil.

Table 2: Placement patterns of *ego* in Vergil.

Pattern	Instances	Relative frequency
I A	45	53.57 %
I B	10	11.90 %
II A	4	4.76 %
II B	6	7.14 %
III A	1	1.19 %
III B	2	2.38 %
IV A	7	8.33 %
IV B	0	–
V A	9	10.71 %
V B	0	–

29 Servius claims that Verg. *georg.* 2.42 (*non ego cuncta meis amplecti uersibus opto*) was borrowed from Lucretius. Not all editors of Lucretius have inserted this line (or given it as a fragment).
30 Lucr. 1.25, 3.316, 5.55 (the sole instance of pattern I B *cuius ego ingressus* eqs.).
31 Lucr. 1.943 = 4.18 (*sic ego nunc* eqs.).
32 Lucr. 5.337 (*nunc ego sum* eqs.).
33 These figures are based on R. A. B. Mynor's OCT edition.

3.3.1 *Eclogues*

Vergil's *Eclogues* contain a total of 21 attestations for *ego*. These are distributed over six out of ten possible metrical patterns (Table 3).

Table 3: Placement patterns of *ego* in Vergil's *Eclogues*.

Pattern	Instances	Relative frequency
I A	7	33.33 %
I B	2	9.52 %
II A	0	–
II B	2	9.52 %
III A	0	–
III B	2	9.52 %
IV A	4	19.04 %
IV B	0	–
V A	4	19.04 %
V B	0	–

Remarkably, the spread of instances across these patterns is rather different from anything that has been seen before (and it will prove to be different from subsequent forms as well). Pattern I A still is the most common one in Vergil's *Eclogues*, but it accounts for only one-third of all cases. Even in conjunction with pattern I B, relevant instances do not make up more than 45 %. The spread of all remaining cases among II B, III B, IV A, and V B is roughly even – with either two or four instances. What is noteworthy, though, is how these figures relate to those instances that show *ego* in clearly emphatic or antithetical use. Syntactically, a mere six out of the twenty-one instances for *ego* in Vergil's *Eclogues* are to be regarded as stressed, as they occur in a sentence/colon-initial position.[34] However, each and every one of these instances occurs in one of the less common patterns;[35] in particular, all instances for III B fall under the emphatic use of *ego* – a metrical pattern that allows for the use of the *kata ton triton trochaion* incision before *ego*.

All attestations of unstressed *ego* in Vergil's *Eclogues* syntactically fall into the well-established patterns, with a majority of instances for the patterns 'negative + *ego*',[36] 'demonstrative + *ego*',[37] and 'temporal adverbial + *ego*'.[38]

---

34 Verg. *ecl.* 3.29, 3.75, 5.2, 7.7, 8.83, 9.65.
35 II B: Verg. *ecl.* 3.29. III B: Verg. *ecl.* 8.83. 9.65. IV A: Verg. *ecl.* 3.75. 5.2. V A: Verg. *ecl.* 7.7.
36 Verg. *ecl.* 1.75, 2.26, 3.17, 7.14, 9.34.
37 Verg. *ecl.* 2.51, 8.97 (with split host phrase <u>his ego</u>... siluis), 8.102.
38 Verg. *ecl.* 6.6, 8.92, 9.51.

A mere four instances are not covered by the aforementioned category. Yet they all show unstressed *ego* as an argument-marking device. Two of them show *ego* aligned to a typical host phrase within this framework – a personal name and an interjection;[39] the other two cases show *ego* attached to uncategorised host phrases that coincide with the narrative focus of the respective sentence:

(29) (Verg. *ecl.* 6.19–20)
      Vrbem quam dicunt Romam, Meliboee, putaui
      <u>*stultus ego*</u> *huic nostrae similem,...*
      'The city they call Rome, Meliboeus, I regarded – <u>foolish</u> me – to be similar to our city here...'

(30) (Verg. *ecl.* 8.37–38)
      saepibus in nostris paruam te roscida mala
      (<u>dux ego</u> uester eram) uidi cum matre legentem.
      'In our garden I saw you (I was your <u>guide</u>), a little girl, picking up dewy apples, with your mother.'

In both cases there cannot be any reasonable doubt that *ego* has been employed for functional purposes only, for there is no noticable emphasis placed on the subject pronoun itself.

3.3.2 *Georgica*

Vergil's *Georgica* contain a total of six attestations for *ego*. These are distributed over three out of ten possible metrical patterns (Table 4).

From a syntactical perspective, the material provided by the *Georgica* does not have anything new to offer: instances cover the types 'negative + *ego*',[40] 'demonstrative + *ego*',[41] and 'temporal adverbial + *ego*'.[42] There are two instances for *ego* as argument marker, aligned to uncategorised host phrases that clearly carry the emphasis of their respective phrases – incidentally these

---

39 Verg. *ecl.* 5.42 (<u>*Daphnis ego*</u> *in siluis, hinc usque ad sidera notus*, the first line of a fictive epitaph), 7.41 (<u>*Immo ego*</u> *Sardoniis uidear tibi amarior herbis*).
40 Verg. *georg.* 2.42, 2.101.
41 Verg. *georg.* 3.401.
42 Verg. *georg.* 1.316.

Table 4: Placement patterns of *ego* in Vergil's *Georgica*.

Pattern	Instances	Relative frequency
I A	4	66.67 %
I B	1	16.67 %
II A	0	–
II B	1	16.67 %
III A	0	–
III B	0	–
IV A	0	–
IV B	0	–
V A	0	–
V B	0	–

two instances coincide with the sole attestations for the patterns I B and II B.[43] There are no attestations for *ego* as an emphatic unit in Vergil's *Georgica*.

3.3.3 *Aeneid*

Vergil's *Aeneid* contains a total of 57 attestations for *ego*. These are distributed over eight out of ten possible metrical patterns, thus providing by far the most complex picture of all authors and œuvres covered so far (see Table 5 for the figures).

Table 5: Placement patterns of *ego* in Vergil's *Aeneid*.

Pattern	Instances	Relative frequency
I A	34	59.64 %
I B	7	12.28 %
II A	4	7.02 %
II B	3	5.26 %
III A	1	1.75 %
III B	0	–
IV A	3	5.26 %
IV B	0	–
V A	5	8.77 %
V B	0	–

---

43 Verg. *georg*. 3.10 (*primus ego in patriam*..., with repetition of focused *primus* in 3.12), 3.17 (*illi uictor ego*...).

Patterns I A, I B, and II A alone, i. e. those patterns used by Claudian, account for almost 80 % of the instances of *ego* in Vergil's *Aeneid*. On the other hand, this means that about one-fifth of the attestations for *ego* in the *Aeneid* follows a different pattern, and it is worth considering these cases in somewhat greater detail. As already seen in the *Eclogues*, Vergil tends to use a wide spread, but outside the "common" patterns I A, I B, and to a lesser extent II A, the evidence is spread rather thinly.

Already for the *Eclogues* it was possible to demonstrate that a large number of the uncommon patterns was indeed reserved for emphatic usages of the subject pronoun. This observation can be partly confirmed, partly adjusted through the evidence of the *Aeneid*. Nine instances show *ego* in emphatic use, either in a sentence-initial position or shifting to the right in the sentence due to the insertion of a word of higher priority as regards the occupation of the initial position.[44] Considering their placement within the hexameter line, Vergil follows two basic strategies: either they go first in the line following the syntax *ast ego* or *aut ego* (according to pattern I A), or they appear in one of the less common patterns: emphatic usages of *ego* in the *Aeneid* thus account for the sole instance for *ego* following the pattern III A (at the beginning of a direct speech, commencing at the penthemimeres caesura),[45] two (out of four) instances of the pattern II A (utilising the trithemimeres caesura),[46] two (out of three) instances of the pattern IV A (utilising the hephthemimeres caesura),[47] and one (out of five) instances of the pattern V A (*aut ego*, thus utilising the bucolic caesura).[48]

Moving on to the syntactical spread of attestations for the unstressed, quasi-clitical use of *ego* in Vergil's *Aeneid*, there is practically no variation to what has been observed before. All remaining instances show an unstressed use of *ego*: in these cases *ego* is seen to attach itself to the typical range of host phrases. There is substantial evidence for the patterns 'negative + *ego*',[49] 'interrogative + *ego*',[50] 'relative + *ego*',[51] 'demonstrative + *ego*' (frequently

---

44 Verg. *Aen.* 1.46 (*ast ego*), 4.333, 7.308 (*ast ego*), 7.559, 8.62, 8.533, 10.93 (*aut ego*), 10.630 (*aut ego*), 12.316. For the pattern *ast ego* cf. also above, n. 13.

45 Verg. *Aen.* 4.333.

46 Verg. *Aen.* 7.559, 8.62.

47 Verg. *Aen.* 8.533, 12.316.

48 Verg. *Aen.* 10.630.

49 Verg. *Aen.* 2.785, 4.337, 4.425, 8.568, 9.88, 12.189.

50 Verg. *Aen.* 2.101 (*sed quid ego*, on which pattern cf. above, n. 27).

51 Verg. *Aen.* 1.135 (Vergil's famous aposiopesis *quos ego*, on which cf. Adams 1999: 101), 4.536 (with a wide hyperbaton as regards a related predicative noun *quos ego... maritos*, 'the very people whom I have have eqs.').

with split host phrase).[52] Further instances cover the categories of 'personal name + *ego*'[53] and 'emphatic interjection + *ego*',[54] two patterns that had come up for the *Eclogues* already.[55] Equally well established, of course, are uses of *ego* aligned to adverbs indicating time[56] or size.[57]

Finally, there is a sizable group of instances in which *ego* is used as an argument-marking device, attached to that very word of a clause that carries the main emphasis (in a true Wackernagel position).[58] This may be illustrated through a couple of interesting cases that at the same time illustrate some of the less common placement patterns. Two instances for IV A were already mentioned above; the third and final one is a particularly interesting case:

(31) (Verg. *Aen.* 3.250–252)
      accipite ergo animis atque haec mea figite dicta,
      quae Phoebo pater omnipotens, mihi Phoebus Apollo
      praedixit, uobis Furiarum ego maxima pando.
      'Receive thus in your hearts my words and keep them there, what the almighty father told Phoebus, and Phoebus Apollo told me, and what I reveal to you, the eldest of the Furies.'

Here, in a reported speech of the ill-boding seer Celaeno, the tradition of bad news is reported, and it is clear that the cascading tricolon means that the news get worse and worse as they get passed on from Jupiter to Apollon to the Furies.

---

52 Verg. *Aen.* 1.278, 1.680, 3.492, 4.120, 4.419, 4.702, 5.51, 5.414, 5.846, 6.72, 6.110, 8.57, 8.496, 9.287, 9.323, 9.481, 10.185, 10.851, 12.56.
53 Verg. *Aen.* 3.45 (*nam Polydorus ego. eqs.* – one of three instances for the pattern II B), 11.441 (*Turnus ego,...*).
54 Verg. *Aen.* 5.672 (*en ego uester / Ascanius*), 7.452 (another instance of *en ego*), 9.257 (*immo ego uos eqs.*), 11.169 (*quin ego eqs.*) – a special case under this rubric is one instance which shows an oath introduced by *per* + accusative, in which *per* and the prepositional complement are split by the insertion of *ego*: Verg. *Aen.* 4.314 (*per ego has lacrimas dextramque tuam te*). Clearly this solution is intended to shift further emphasis to the very oath. Another case of this phenomenon is mentioned below, nn. 61, 78, 85, 93, 103 Cf., too, Adams (1999: 122). A more in-depth study of all relevant instances in Latin literature will be presented in Kruschwitz (forthcoming).
55 Cf. above, n. 39.
56 Verg. *Aen.* 5.808, 11.593.
57 Verg. *Aen.* 6.692 (technically an interrogative).
58 Verg. *Aen.* 3.252 (see below, item [31]), 5.236, 10.442, 10.449, 11.160, 11.364 (with an inherent antithesis, but no clear opposition of *ego... tu*), 11.392, 12.159, 12.882. An interesting case is *Aen.* 8.475 where *ego* follows *sed tibi* – it would appear that *tibi* in fact carries the emphasis in this case due to the alignment of the subject pronoun.

No emphasis lies on *ego*, all the emphasis lies on the defining genitive *Furiarum* (which in turn is separated from the preceding sentence by a penthemimeres caesura).[59]

A second example to be mentioned here is illustrative of the infrequent pattern II B;[60] the passage is from Iuturna's speech to Turnus near the end of the *Aeneid*:

(32) (Verg. *Aen.* 12.882–883)
      <u>*immortalis ego*</u>? *aut quicquam mihi dulce meorum*
      te sine, frater, erit? (…)
      'I, <u>immortal</u>? Will anything be sweet to me without you, my brother?'

Obviously, here there is a potential antithesis between *ego* and *te*. The latter is clearly emphatic due to its placement and the inversion of the preposition (*te sine* instead of *sine te*). However, this case is not as straightforward as it may seem – in fact, quite the contrary: Iuturna is deploring her fate (as she envisions it), querying divine justice: *haec pro uirginitate reponit* (sc. *Jupiter*)? / *quo uitam dedit aeternam?* eqs. (Verg. *Aen.* 4.878–879). All this is emphatically summarised in *immortalis*, further highlighted by the alignment of quasi-clitic *ego*, and only then a contrast to *te* is created – before that there is no emphasis on the first person of the speaker at all.

3.4 Ovid, *Metamorphoses*

The next substantial body of hexametric poetry to be considered here are Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. They contain 106 instances of *ego* altogether, spread over seven of ten possible patterns (Table 6).

This constitutes an interesting development away from (or more likely: as a logical consequence of) Vergil's practice. Patterns I A, I B, and II A account for less than two-thirds of all instances. In turn, there is a considerable increase of the pattern IV A which warrants further investigation. It is also noteworthy that, like in Vergil, patterns IV B and V B remain unattested. Unlike in Vergil, however, pattern II B remains unattested in Ovid, too. In terms of relative and

---

59 One may be tempted to see this as a subcase of the pattern 'personal name + *ego*', cf. above, n. 53.

60 The other two attestations are Verg. *Aen.* 3.45 (see above, n. 53) and 5.236 (with emphasis on *laetus*, as *laetus* here indicates the mood in which a *uotum* is paid).

Table 6: Placement patterns of *ego* in Ovid's
Metamorphoses.

Pattern	Instances	Relative frequency
I A	57	53.77 %
I B	2	1.89 %
II A	6	5.66 %
II B	0	–
III A	8	7.55 %
III B	1	0.94 %
IV A	36	33.96 %
IV B	0	–
V A	6	5.66 %
V B	0	–

absolute frequency, one must furthermore note that patterns III B (like in Vergil) and I B (unlike in Vergil) remain very poorly attested.[61]

About one-third of all instances of *ego* in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* are clearly emphatic or antithetical in nature: this affects 35 (possibly 36) out of 106 cases. Interestingly enough, these do not altogether follow the general spread of instances across the placement patterns, as the overview in Table 7 proves.

One must note that Ovid clearly preferred patterns III A (at the penthemimeres; exclusively used for emphatic *ego*) and IV A (at the hephthemimeres) for the placement of stressed *ego* in favour of the otherwise generally preferred pattern I A (with significantly fewer attestations in this material).

As regards syntactic matters, non-emphatic usages of *ego* in Ovid include all previously attested types of host phrases with *ego* aligned. Instances provide ample evidence for the patterns 'negative + *ego*'[62] and, in particular, 'demonstrative + *ego*' (frequently with split host phrase).[63] Further instances cover the

---

61 The sole instance for III B is Ov. *met.* 10.29, incidentally another instance of the highly peculiar formula *per ego* + accusative, for which cf. above, n. 54. The two attestations for the pattern I B both show *ego* (i) attached to a clearly emphatic oblique form of the personal pronoun *tu* (Ov. *met.* 1.658 *at tibi ego* eqs.) and (ii) as final element in a sequence of clitics (Ov. *met.* 3.557).

62 Ov. *met.* 1.182, 1.513, 6.352, 9.779, 13.917 (aligned to the first negative in a sequence of *non... nec*).

63 Ov. *met.* 1.757, 2.521, 2.817 (*hinc ego* eqs., i. e. this item can be explained as a local adverb as well), 3.463, 3.568, 4.226, 4.697, 5.604, 6.496, 6.693, 6.697, 7.32, 7.596, 8.70, 8.502, 8.592, 8.771, 9.73, 9.254, 9.475, 11.668, 12.383, 13.85, 13.87, 13.755, 13.960, 14.235, 14.727, 15.500.

Table 7: Placement patterns of clearly emphatic *ego* in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*.

Pattern	Instances	Relative frequency	Comments
I A	11[a]	31.4 %	On average far less frequently attested for emphatic cases
I B	0	–	Only two attestations overall
II A	2[b]	5.7 %	Relative frequency approximately the same
II B	0	–	–
III A	7 (8?)[c]	20 %	Frequency significantly higher; in fact, (almost?) *all* attestations are emphatic cases
III B	0	–	Only one attestation overall
IV A	13[d]	37.1 %	Relative frequency approximately the same
IV B	0	–	–
V A	2[e]	5.7 %	Relative frequency approximately the same
V B	0	–	–

[a]Ov. *met.* 1.361, 1.608, 3.458, 7.51, 9.513, 12.439, 13.21, 13.93, 13.859, 13.878, 15.160.
[b]Ov. *met.* 4.328, 9.545.
[c]Ov. *met.* 2.743, 4.110, 9.199, 10.199, 11.328, 11.781, 13.300. It is tempting to include 6.613, although this case is less clear-cut.
[d]Ov. *met.* 1.230, 5.583, 5.610, 6.190, 6.328, 7.707, 7.735, 13.171, 13.187, 13.930, 13.951, 14.136, 15.518.
[e]Ov. *met.* 1.607, 7.172.

categories of 'interrogative + *ego*',[64] 'relative + *ego*',[65] 'personal name + *ego*',[66] 'emphatic interjection + *ego*',[67] and *ego* in alignment to adjectives and adverbs indicating time[68] or size/dimension.[69] All remaining instances of unstressed *ego* in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* show *ego* as argument marker aligned to individual focused host phrases.[70] An interesting illustration for the latter, especially in

---

64 Ov. *met.* 13.11 (*quantum ego... tantum* eqs.; can be explained as adjective indicating size as well; clearly the emphasis is on the pair *quantum... tantum* here).
65 Ov. *met.* 7.59, 9.757, 13.8.
66 Ov. *met.* 3.230 (<u>Actaeon ego</u> sum eqs.).
67 The case of *per ego* eqs. has already been mentioned above, n. 54. In addition to that, cf. Ov. *met.* 2.520 (*o ego quantum egi*), 6.206, 8.51 (one might argue that this is actually an emphatic manifestation of *ego*), 9.487, 14.33.
68 Ov. *met.* 3.592, 12.445.
69 Ov. *met.* 9.44 (with split host phrase <u>toto ego</u> pectore), 9.292 (numeral and split host phrase: <u>septem ego</u> per noctes), 13.368, 15.588.
70 Ov. *met.* 1.658 (on which see above, n. 61), 5.577, 5.639, 6.537, 6.614 (aligned to *aut* as the first element of an enumeration of the type *aut... aut*; for a similar case cf. above, n. 16), 8.90, 8.99, 9.16, 9.182 (a very remarkable case with *ego* in alignment with *ergo*: however, *ergo* is clearly the main focus in this passage), 10.606, 13.165, 13.284 (again a highly peculiar case: *his*

contrast with item (31), above, is the following passage with a wide hyperbaton splitting the host phrase *pars... una*:

(33)   (Ov. *met.* 5.577–579)
      '*pars ego nympharum, quae sunt in Achaide,' dixit*
      '*una fui, nec me studiosius altera saltus*
      legit nec posuit studiosius altera casses.'
      "'I was <u>one</u> of the nymphs who live in Achaia", she said, "and no other was more eager than me in choosing the woodlands, nor was anyone more eager in putting out the hunting nets."'

Whereas in token (31) the emphasis was on the partitive genitive *Furiarum* (with *ego* aligned), here the emphasis is on the fact that the speaker used to be *pars una* (with *ego* aligned to the main aspect *pars* and *una* in a line-initial position). This shows just how nuanced an expression can be when considering the attachment of unstressed *ego*. A subset of this particular use of *ego* as argument-marking device, not previously encountered in the texts discussed here,[71] can be seen in those items where *ego* immediately follows a host phrase consisting of a finite verb in the first-person singular: here it must be argued that the emphasis is on the semantic value of the verb (rather than any element expressed through the verbal ending).[72]

3.5 Lucan

Vergil's and, to an even higher degree, Ovid's complex practice in the placement of *ego* is not paralleled in the next substantial body of epic poetry, *viz.* in Lucan's *Pharsalia*. This may, to some extent, be explained with the scarce use of ego in this epic poem, as only fifteen attestations can be detected. These attestations spread across the potential placement patterns as seen in Table 8.

   The statistics show very clearly that Lucan largely restricts himself to pattern I A. Moreover, it is clear that he avoids any pattern of the "B" variety. Like in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, pattern III A is exclusively attested for stressed forms of

---

umeris, his inquam, umeris ego corpus Achillis /... tuli, placing emphasis on both *his*, through an anadiplosis, and *umeris* through the placement of *ego*, in a highly stylised manner of speech), 13.786, 13.840.

71 It is a very common occurrence otherwise, however. This will be discussed in greater detail in Kruschwitz (forthcoming).

72 Ov. *met.* 2.570 (*fueramque ego regia uirgo*), 7.38 (*prodamne ego regna parentis*), 12.327 (*uidi ego Petraeum conantem tollere terra / glandiferam quercum*), 15.262 (*uidi ego* eqs.). For an in-depth treatment of this matter see eventually Kruschwitz (forthcoming).

Table 8: Placement patterns of *ego* in Lucan.

Pattern	Instances	Relative frequency
I A	10	66.67 %
I B	0	–
II A	0	–
II B	0	–
III A	2	13.33 %
III B	0	–
IV A	2	13.33 %
IV B	0	–
V A	1	6.67 %
V B	0	–

ego.[73] Syntactically, the picture emerging for Lucan is equally unspectacular: five out of fifteen instances of *ego* are examples of *ego* in emphatic use;[74] all remaining forms can be attributed to standard types of 'host phrase + unstressed *ego*',[75] including two instances of 'finite verb in first-person singular + *ego*'.[76]

3.6 Statius

The next body of evidence to be considered here are the two large-scale epic poems of Statius, *viz.* his *Thebaid* and his *Achilleid*. These two poems provide 84 instances of *ego* altogether. The overall picture, as regards the spread of instances according to the available placement patterns, is seen in Table 9.

These figures prove Statius to be the most "daring" of all Latin epic poets included here in terms of variety regarding the placement of *ego* in his hexameter line.

3.6.1 *Thebaid*

In the *Thebaid*, a substantial 77 instances of *ego* are to be found. Their spread across the possible placement patterns is seen in Table 10.

---

73 Lucan. 7.299, 8.639.
74 Lucan. 7.299, 8.279, 8.639, 10.197, 10.262.
75 'Negative + *ego*': 8.647, 9.153; 'demonstrative + *ego*': 1.685, 7.266, 9.598; 'adjective indicating size/dimension + *ego*': 2.310. *Ego* as argument-marking device in individual solutions occurs in Lucan. 6.594, 6.732.
76 Lucan. 6.795, 9.133 (both instances have *uidi ego*).

Table 9: Placement patterns of *ego* in Statius.

Pattern	Instances	Relative frequency
I A	35	41.67 %
I B	8	9.52 %
II A	3	3.57 %
II B	6	7.14 %
III A	7	8.33 %
III B	4	4.76 %
IV A	15	17.86 %
IV B	1	1.19 %
V A	5	5.95 %
V B	0	–

Table 10: Placement patterns of *ego* in Statius' *Thebaid*.

Pattern	Instances	Relative frequency
I A	33	42.86 %
I B	8	10.39 %
II A	3	3.90 %
II B	4	5.19 %
III A	6	7.79 %
III B	4	5.19 %
IV A	13	16.88 %
IV B	1	1.30 %
V A	5	6.49 %
V B	0	–

This renders the *Thebaid* the sole work covered by this study in which eleven (out of twelve) patterns are attested – a figure unparalleled by any of the previous authors. It is noteworthy, too, that instances attested for placement of *ego* in the first foot of the hexameter line amount to just over 50 % – a number that follows the trend that was set by Ovid in his *Metamorphoses*.[77] Particularly interesting is the single instance of pattern IV B, a placement type that is unattested in any other author covered by this study. Interestingly enough, this instance is generated by one of the three attestations of the assertive swearing formula '*per ego* + accusative' in the *Thebaid*:[78]

---

77 See above, Section 3.5.
78 On this formula cf. above, n. 54.

(34)   (Stat. *Theb*. 10.694–696)
> (...) <u>*per ego*</u> *oro tuosque,*
> *nate, meosque annos miseraeque per ubera matris,*
> *ne uati, ne crede, puer!* (...)
> 'I beseech you, my son, by both your and my age and by your wretched mother's breasts, do not, do not believe the seer, my boy!'

Here, the formula is even more awkward than usual as the request formula *oro* intervenes, and this may well be the justification for this peculiar arrangement in this line. As it was possible before to show that the Latin epic poets derived semantic meaning from consideration of these patterns and their use, it comes as little surprise that the two remaining instances of *per ego* in Statius' *Thebaid* are found in scarcely attested positions: both remaining instances follow placement pattern III B which, again, is one of the very rarely attested patterns for the arrangement of *ego* in Latin epic poetry.[79] (Note that it only features four times in Statius' *Thebaid*.)

Syntactically speaking, there are twenty clearly stressed instances of *ego* in Statius' *Thebaid* with a relatively flat spread over most of the placement patterns used in this work (but not in II B, III B, and IV B).[80] All remaining cases can be attributed to typical functional patterns as established for the authors that were analysed previously. There is evidence for 'negative + *ego*',[81] 'interrogative + *ego*',[82] 'relative + *ego*',[83] 'demonstrative + *ego*',[84] 'exclamative interjection + *ego*',[85] 'temporal adverbial + *ego*',[86] and of course for *ego* as an argument-marking device.[87] The latter group can be supplemented by a group of three

---

79 Stat. *Theb*. 6.171, 10.360.

80 Statius has a habit to use *ego* in a sentence-final position that makes it not always easy to determine if *ego* is supposed to be emphatic or attached to one of the typical host phrases immediately preceding it. The following overview contains all those cases in which we prefer an interpretation of *ego* as emphatic/antithetical in those relevant cases. I A: 6.167, 7.215, 8.61, 11.467, 11.703; I B: 10.429, 11.728; II A: 11.90, 12.397; III A: 1.645, 10.430, 7.164; IV A: 4.205, 4.693 (?), 9.558, 10.586, 10.732, 12.458; V A: 3.212, 12.458 (second instance).

81 Stat. *Theb*. 5.218, 7.370, 7.377, 10.796, 11.344, 11.621, 12.797.

82 Stat. *Theb*. 1.461, 4.777, 4.781, 6.142, 6.149, 8.65.

83 Stat. *Theb*. 10.805.

84 Stat. *Theb*. 1.225, 2.448, 2.732 (unless an interpretation as local adverb is to be preferred), 3.151 (with split host phrase), 3.277, 3.362, 3.379 (opens an anaphora), 5.34 (ditto), 5.623, 6.819, 8.666, 9.60, 9.434, 9.516, 10.338 (with split host phrase), 11.84, 11.165, 12.322, 12.591.

85 Stat. *Theb*. 3.165, 3.367, 8.625. Add those cases of *per ego*, discussed above, n. 54.

86 Stat. *Theb*. 4.518, 4.622.

87 Stat. *Theb*. 1.79, 3.668, 4.627, 7.197, 9.52, 9.76, 9.445, 9.657, 10.793, 11.613, 12.209, 12.378. These cases, too, contain some instances of sentence-final *ego*; cf. above, n. 80.

instances in which *ego* is aligned to a verb in the first person.[88] It is worth considering these cases in slightly more detail. The first one is this:

(35) (Stat. *Theb.* 8.68)
       ede nefas, quod <u>mirer ego</u> inuideantque sorores.
       'Commit an abominable crime, for me to <u>admire</u>... and for your sisters to envy.'

Here, one may justifiably argue, *ego* highlights an antithesis between the speaker and the addressee's sisters. However, even in an antithesis – such as the above parallelism – there can be nuance, and we shall argue that here the nuance, due to the placement of *ego*, is as follows: 'for me to <u>admire</u>, and to envy for your <u>sisters</u>'. Can this view, based on the assumption that *ego* in its quasi-clitic form, when aligned to a verb in the first person, stresses the semantic aspect of the verb (rather than shifting emphasis on the first person) be supported by the remaining instances?

(36) (Stat. *Theb.* 10.436–437)
       (...) *'summumne hoc cladibus,' inquit*
       deerat ut afflictos <u>turparem ego</u> proditor Argos?'
       'He said: "Was this crown of all miseries alone missing, that I <u>soil</u>, as a traitor, Argos when it was already in trouble?"'

Here the context makes it very clear that all emphasis is on *turparem* – the speaker refuses to bring any further harm to the troubled city of Argos: everything else already has to be seen as *clades*, but an additional *turpare* is out of the question to him, and this semantic aspect of *turpare* is emphasised through the alignment of quasi-clitic *ego*. This function of the subject pronoun can be seen even more clearly in the third and last instance of this pattern in Statius:

(37) (Stat. *Theb.* 11.175–177)
       <u>uidi ego</u> me propter ruptos telluris hiatus,
       nec subii; uidi exanimum fecique nocentem
       Tydea; (...)
       I <u>saw</u> the gaps of the earth, gaping on my account, and I did not go in; I <u>saw</u> Tydeus lifeless and I rendered him guilty.

It is beyond any reasonable doubt here that *ego* does not fulfil any semantic purpose: there simply is no emphasis on the first person in the first clause. Much

---

88 On this phenomenon cf. already above, n. 72. Cf. also Adams (1999: 118–127).

rather the value of *ego* is entirely functional: it aligns itself to *uidi* (which stands in an anaphora here), and thus sheds emphasis on the semantic aspect of the verb: 'I <u>saw</u>..., but... <u>didn't</u>... '. As a group, these cases therefore can provide some preliminary proof for the assumption that *ego*, whenever attached to a finite verb in the first-person singular in Latin, achieves to shift emphasis to the verb's semantic value – a phenomenon not sufficiently recognised in Latin linguistics so far.[89]

3.6.2 *Achilleid*

In Statius' fragmentary *Achilleid*, a mere seven instances of *ego* survive. The spread of instances across the potential range of placement patterns is shown in Table 11.

Given the overall small amount of instances, no conclusive picture emerges. It is noteworthy, however, that only one out of those seven instances of *ego* in Statius' *Achilleid* is clearly emphatic.[90] In turn, the majority of attestations shows *ego* in quasi-clitical use, aligned to a negative,[91] a demonstrative,[92] an exclamative interjection,[93] or used as an argument-marking device in individual solutions.[94]

Table 11: Placement patterns of *ego* in Statius' *Achilleid*.

Pattern	Instances	Relative frequency
I A	2	28.57 %
I B	0	–
II A	0	–
II B	2	28.57 %
III A	1	14.29 %
III B	0	–
IV A	2	28.57 %
IV B	0	–
V A	0	–
V B	0	–

---

89 This matter will be dealt with in greater detail in Kruschwitz (forthcoming).
90 Stat. *Ach.* 1.634 (showing *ego* in pattern I A).
91 Stat. *Ach.* 1.652, 1.949.
92 Stat. *Ach.* 1.650.
93 Stat. *Ach.* 1.267 (another instance of *per ego* + accusative, for which cf. above, n. 54).
94 Stat. *Ach.* 1.253 (with a split host phrase), 1.733.

3.7 Silius Italicus

Finally, a look at the evidence from Silius Italicus, even though Pliny the Younger dismisses his work as written *maiore cura quam ingenio*.[95] In his *Punica*, a grand total of 36 instances of *ego* can be found. They spread across the range of placement patterns as shown in Table 12.

Table 12: Placement patterns of *ego* in Silius Italicus.

Pattern	Instances	Relative frequency
I A	23	63.89 %
I B	3	8.33 %
II A	0	–
II B	2	5.56 %
III A	0	–
III B	2	5.56 %
IV A	2	5.56 %
IV B	0	–
V A	4	11.11 %
V B	0	–

More than two-thirds of all instances of *ego* in Silius Italicus show the subject pronoun in the first foot of the hexameter line (patterns I A and I B). Strangely, there are no instances of II A or III A. Pattern V B, unattested in all previous epic writers, remains unattested in Silius Italicus, too. Note, however, a small number of instances for the otherwise rare patterns II B[96] and III B.[97]

Less than one-quarter of instances of *ego* in Silius Italicus can be regarded as emphatical in their syntactical use.[98] With two exceptions – Sil. 8.220 (I B) and 17.462 (IV A) – all instances of emphatic *ego* in Silius Italicus are arranged according to pattern I A. All unstressed instances of *ego* follow the well-established patterns of syntactical alignment to typical host phrases: the evidence comprises examples for 'negative + *ego*',[99] 'relative + *ego*',[100]

---

95 Plin. *epist.* 3.7.5.
96 Sil. 12.80, 15.205.
97 Sil. 2.678, 17.357.
98 Sil. 4.737, 4.826, 8.220, 8.229, 9.161, 9.530 (*ego* appears to be a metrically convenient, yet syntactically and functionally superfluous filler here), 16.204, 17.462.
99 Sil. 5.184, 6.447, 6.504, 7.38, 8.346, 17.357.
100 Sil. 5.110.

'interrogative + *ego*',[101] 'demonstrative + *ego*',[102] 'emphatic interjection/exclamation + *ego*',[103] and usages of *ego* as argument marker in individual cases, aligned to focused host phrases.[104]

4 Some preliminary conclusions

This article has, for the first time, presented a complex and detailed overview of the syntactical and metrical alignment of *ego* in hexametric poetry. Whereas the metrical alignment is partly due to the "mechanics" of the Latin hexameter line, it was possible to demonstrate that *ego*, unless used in its emphatic/antithetical manifestation, follows clear functional principles in its syntax. In particular, as regards the syntax of unemphatic *ego*, it was possible to show that – further to the findings of Jim Adams – the subject pronoun *ego* in Latin in fact does seem to appear in a quasi-clitical use, aligning itself to typical strong, focused host phrases.

As far as metrical structures were concerned, it was possible to demonstrate that individual poets managed to develop their individual signature solutions to the ways in which *ego* could be embedded into the hexameter line. It was particularly noteworthy that some of the poets seem to have reserved certain placement patterns exclusively to emphatic/non-emphatic forms of *ego*, depending on personal taste. Overall, there seems to have been a particularly noteworthy range of experimental solutions in Ovid and Statius. Claudian, on the other hand, restricted himself in rather peculiar manner in the ways in which he included *ego* into his hexameters.

Interestingly enough, the metrical inclusion of *ego*, regardless of the poet in question, was in all cases entirely independent from the syntactical solutions that were to be observed. Whether or not poets felt it to be possible to shift *ego* to the right within their hexameter lines, they consistently follow the same principles of syntactical and functional alignment of the first-person subject pronoun. It must also be highlighted that no noteworthy difference in that respect, depending on narrative or dialogical nature of the passages in question, could be detected. This must mean that, as far as the syntactical embedding of

---

101 Sil. 6.110 (*sed quid ego*, cf. above, n. 27).
102 Sil. 2.322, 3.573, 9.128, 10.289, 11.177, 11.180, 11.318, 15.59, 15.61, 16.687, 16.690.
103 Sil. 11.85, 12.80 (a case of *per ego* + accusative; cf. above n. 54).
104 Sil. 2.340 (attached to a verb in the first person, *uidi ego*), 2.678, 8.301, 11.561, 11.574, 15.204, 17.221.

ego is concerned, a general principle of Latin syntax (rather than a stylistic predilection) has been discovered and described.

References

Adams, J. N. 1994. Wackernagel's law and the position of unstressed personal pronouns in Classical Latin. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 92(2). 103–178.

Adams, J. N. 1999. Nominative personal pronouns and some patterns of speech in Republican and Augustan poetry. In J. N. Adams & R. G. Mayer (eds.), *Aspects of the language of Latin poetry* (Proceedings of the British Academy 93), 97–133. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ceccarelli, L. 2004. Osservazioni sull'esametro di Claudiano. In Ehlers et al., *Aetas Claudianea. Eine Tagung an der Freien Universität Berlin vom 28. bis 30. Juni 2002*, 104–141. Munich & Leipzig: Teubner.

Christiansen, P. G. & D. Christiansen. 2009. Claudian: The last great pagan poet. *L'Antiquité Classique* 78. 133–144.

Dik, H. 2003. On unemphatic "emphatic" pronouns in Greek: Nominative pronouns in Plato and Sophocles. *Mnemosyne Ser.* IV 56. 535–550.

Ehlers, W. W., F. Felgentreu & S. M. Wheeler (eds.). 2004. *Aetas Claudianea. Eine Tagung an der Freien Universität Berlin vom 28. bis 30. Juni 2002*. Munich & Leipzig: Teubner.

Felgentreu, F. 1999. *Claudians Praefationes. Bedingungen, Beschreibungen und Wirkungen einer poetischen Kleinform* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 130). Stuttgart & Leipzig: Teubner.

Guipponi-Gineste, M.-F. 2010. *Claudien: poète du monde à la cour d'Occident*. Paris: De Boccard.

Hofmann, J. B. & A. Szantyr. 1965. *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft II 2.2). Munich: C. H. Beck.

Jones, M. 1988. Sardinian. In M. Harris & N. Vincent (eds.), *The Romance languages*, 314–350. London & Sydney: Croom Helm.

Kruschwitz, P. 2004. *Römische Inschriften und Wackernagels Gesetz* (Schriften der Philosophisch-historischen Klasse der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften 31/04), Heidelberg: Winter.

Kruschwitz, P. Forthcoming. *Easy on the 'I'. A functional analysis of the unstressed Latin subject pronoun (Ego, Tu, Nos, Vos)*.

Kühner, R. & C. Stegmann. 1992 [1914[2]]. *Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*. Hanover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung. Reprint, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Lücht, W. 2011. Das Lateinische als pro-drop-Sprache: Der Gebrauch von Subjektpronomina in der römischen Komödie aus sprachtypologischer und empirischer Sicht. *Glotta* 87. 126–154.

Vincent, N. 1988. Latin. In M. Harris & N. Vincent (eds.), *The Romance languages*, 26–78. London & Sydney: Croom Helm.

Wanner, D. 1987. *The development of Romances clitic pronouns, from Latin to Old Romance*. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Ware, C. 2012. *Claudian and the Roman epic tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.