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Summary. A use of the nominative personal pronouns ego and tu is discussed. Ego and tu are not necessarily 'emphatic' or contrastive, but may be attached to emphatic, focused or 'preferential' terms which stand at the head of a clause. The function of the pronoun in such cases seems to be much the same as that of certain patterns of intonation in English. The pronoun highlights the emphatic term on which it hangs. Given its function, the usage certainly belonged to 'speech', which in this paper means 'educated speech'. The distribution of certain patterns (e.g. verb + ego: credo ego etc.) is discussed in republican and Augustan poetry. It is shown that Catullus (in hendecasyllables and elegiac verse) readily admits patterns which there is reason to believe were commonplace in speech, whereas the practice of Augustan poetry is more variable. Ovid in particular goes far beyond the norms of speech, both in displacing the unit focused term + ego/tu from initial position, and in developing complex forms of hyperbaton around the pronoun.

I. INTRODUCTION

This chapter will be about the use of the nominative personal pronouns ego and tu, but particularly ego. I will identify and discuss one of the factors determining the use of nominative pronouns in classical Latin,
prose as well as verse. A specific aim will be to explain the motivation and placement of *ego* in Catullus 16.1 ('pedicabo ego uos'), but I will be dealing not only with Catullus but also with Augustan poetry (elegy, Horace and Virgil). The use of nominative pronouns which will be identified here is not peculiar to poetry, or indeed to 'colloquial' Latin. It had a place in speech. I use the term 'speech' in a general sense in reference to educated speech of different degrees of formality; the term is intended to embrace in particular dialogue in the plays of Plautus and the oratory of Cicero. The chapter will examine the manner of the transfer to poetry of certain patterns of speech, and what that transfer has to tell us about the nature of poetic language in republican and Augustan Latin. The question arises to what extent these patterns were admitted, avoided, modified or extended by different poets.

The view is not uncommonly stated or implied that the nominative personal pronouns *ego* and *tu* are 'emphatic', or if used without emphasis are 'colloquial' or substandard in some way. Fordyce (1961: 149), for example, commenting on *legas tu* in (1),

(1) Catull. 22.9 haec cum legas tu, bellus ille et urbanus
Suffenus unus caprimulgus aut fossor
rursus uidetur

suggested that *tu* may be no more than a 'metrical stopgap', i.e. it is apparently 'unemphatic', and must therefore lack proper motivation. Goold (1983) was moved to change *tu* to *tum* (*tum g: tu V*). Kroll too (1922) was bothered by nominative pronouns in Catullus which seem to be without emphasis. On Catull. 6.14, for example, he notes that an example of *tu* is unemphatic, 'wie oft in der Umgangssprache'.

A common type of emphasis expressed by *ego* and *tu* might be called 'contrastive emphasis', as in (2)–(3), where *ego* and *tu*, at the head of their cola, are in antithesis:

(2) Cic. Brut. 151 de Seruio autem et *tu* probe dicis et *ego* dicam
quod sentio


But in any classical text, and I do not refer only to 'colloquial' texts, it is easy to find examples of *ego* and *tu* which do not participate in obvious contrasts of this type. I mention here a few other conditions which seem to have been influential, up to a point, in motivating the use of *ego* in Cicero and Plautus. I do not claim to be exhaustive.

First, 'subjective' verbs, that is verbs signifying feelings, belief, sense

---

perception etc. (e.g. existimo, uolo, nolo, scio, credo) are often used in association with ego, and ego does not necessarily have ‘contrastive emphasis’. There are however variations in the frequency of the pronoun from verb to verb which are difficult to account for. Existimo, for example, is frequently accompanied by ego, but credo less commonly so (see below). And it is often difficult or impossible to see why ego is used with a particular verb in one passage but not in another. Presumably the strength or personal character of the feelings etc. which a speaker wishes to express is particularly sensitive to the context, and for that reason one and the same verb may sometimes have ego, sometimes not.

Secondly, threats, promises, statements of intent and the like, utterances which again have a subjectivity about them, often seem to generate the use of ego. The verb is in the future tense (4)–(6):

(4) Plaut. Amph. 348 ego tibi istam hodie, scelestae, comprimam linguam
(5) Plaut. Amph. 556 iam quidem hercle ego tibi istam / scelestam, scelus, linguam apscidam
(6) Ter. Heaut. 730 ego pol istos commouebo.

In some of these passages ego is also juxtaposed with tibi or a demonstrative; ego is often alongside an oblique-case form of tu (see below, p. 108). The focus is on the future-tense verbs, and ego has no real contrastive emphasis of the type seen in (2)–(3), but collocations such as ego tibi may be reflections of the contrastive potential of ego and tu.

Thirdly, it has been plausibly suggested that a distinction should be made between conversational texts and narrative texts: ‘in conversations ego (nos) and tu (uos) are either used to identify the speaker or addressee or to carry some form of “focal” . . . information . . . In narrative texts, however, the nominative forms of the first person pronoun are used to indicate a change of “Topic”’ (Pinkster (1987: 369)).

The factors motivating the use of the nominative pronoun tu will often have differed from those motivating the use of ego. Ego may occur in the statement of feelings, beliefs etc. held personally by the speaker, but tu implicates a person other than the speaker in the discourse. Whereas ego is found (e.g.) in threats, tu is often used when an order is given. A full account of the uses of the nominative personal pronouns would have to treat the functions of ego and tu separately. I am not attempting such a comprehensive account in this chapter.

A good deal of this chapter will be concerned with standard patterns.

It will be suggested that there are structures which determine the use of *ego* and *tu*, regardless of their emphasis or pragmatic function.

**II. STRUCTURES CONTAINING EGO**

In subjective statements of the type defined above, or in contexts in which *ego* is motivated in some way by its pragmatic role, it may be placed at the start of its clause, as in (7):

(7) Cic. *Pis.* 79 *ego* C. Caesarem non eadem de re publica sensisse quae me *scio*; sed tamen . . .

It seems to be true of classical prose that if *ego* is expressed for some reason its normal tendency is to go to the head of its clause; it does not, for example, have a special liaison with the verb. One expects to find collocations of the type *ego scio* mainly in contexts in which *ego* is at the start of the clause.

But *ego* is often excluded from first place by what might be called 'preferential' terms of one sort or another, that is terms which characteristically occupy the first place in their clause. If there is a preferential term at the start of the clause, *ego* may be placed second, immediately after that preferential term. I list some categories of words which often precede *ego* (or *tu*) at the start of a clause:

(i) Relatives, including the connective use of the relative, e.g.

(8) Cic. *Q.fr.* 1.2.16 *quibus* *ego* ita *credo* ut nihil de mea comparatione deminuam.

The use of the nominative pronoun here may, superficially at least, be explained from the subjective character of the verb *credo*, or perhaps even from an element of contrastive emphasis, but that may not be the whole story (see below). *Ego* has been debarred from the first position by *quibus*, which almost inevitably comes first. A comparison of (7) with (8) shows that it would not do to see in (8) the operation of Wackernagel's law, according to which pronouns and certain other clitics are said to occupy the second position in their clause. There is no general rule of second-position placement at work in the two examples; it is the presence of a preferential term, *quibus*, which causes *ego* to be later than first in (8).

If the (connective) relative is adjectival, it may be split by *ego* from the noun in agreement:

3 I take the term from Dover (1968: 20). Latin like Greek had a set of words which more often than not are at the head of the clause.

4 See Wackernagel (1892); also Adams (1994a).
The verbs in four of these examples express feelings and the like, and that might have been at least one of the determinants of the use of *ego*. (10), on the other hand, is a threat. Note the formulaic character of at least some of the examples (those with *quem ego hominem*).

It is of some interest that the incomplete utterance of Neptune at Virg. *Aen.* 1.135 takes the form *quos ego* —!

(ii) Another constituent which often precedes *ego* is the demonstrative *hic*, which of course is interchangeable with the connective relative. In (15),

> (15) Cic. *Fam.* 11.20.1 *hoc ego* Labeonem *credo* illi rettulisse aut finxisse dictum

the verb (*credo*) is again subjective, and again, in (16)–(20), we see the tendency for *ego* to split the demonstrative from a noun:

> (16) Cic. *S. Rosc.* 47 nihil intersit utrum *hunc ego* comicum *adulescentem* an aliquem ex agro Veienti nominem

> (17) Cic. *Diu. Caec.* 25 *huic ego* *hominem* iam ante denuntio

> (18) Cic. *Verr. a. pr.* 2 *huic ego* *causae*, iudices, cum summa voluntate et exspectatione populi Romani actor accessi

> (19) Cic. *Cat.* 3.17 *hunc ego* *hominem* tam acrem, tam audacem, tam paratum . . . nisi . . . compulissem


*Hunc ego hominem* in (19) should be compared with *quem ego hominem*. In (20) *feci* in the first sentence is without *ego*, whereas *faciam* in the second has an accompanying subject pronoun, and it is only in the second that a demonstrative is present. Or could it be that the future tense (expressing intent) is the determinant of *ego*? It is not immediately obvious in some of the other examples what has motivated *ego*. Is it possible that the pattern *hic ego* had formulaic status such that the semantic content of the verb or of *ego* itself was not necessarily a determinant of its use?
 ego often follows interrogative words, particularly quis, e.g.

(21) Cic. Verr 1.75 quid ego nunc in altera actione Cn. Dolabellae spiritus, quid huius lacrimas et concursationes proferam . . .?

The examples in (22) have a formulaic structure which recurs over a long period.⁵

(22) a Ennius, Ann. 314 Skutsch sed quid ego haec memoro?
     b Lucil. 1000 sed quid ego haec animo trepidanti dicta profundo?
     c Cic. Mil. 18 sed quid ego illa commemoro?
     d Catull. 64.164 sed quid ego ignaris nequiquam conquerrar auris?
     e Ovid, Her. 9.143 sed quid ego haec refero?
     f Livy 8.32.5 sed quid ego haec interrogo?
     g Livy 38.48.6 sed quid ego haec ita argumentor?

The verb is one of saying or the like, and the answer expected is that the speaker should not be saying what he is saying, or that it is being said in vain. Sed precedes quid, and ego is usually followed by a neuter demonstrative. Since this type of question implies a personal view on the part of the speaker which he attempts to impose on the hearer, the presence of ego may originally have been explicable from the subjectivity of the utterance. But it had surely become a mere manner of speaking, with the use of ego triggered as much by the interrogative quid and the collocation of words as by the semantic contribution which the pronoun might have to make.

If the interrogative is adjectival, it may in the usual way be separated from its noun by ego:

(23) Plaut. Bacch. 357 quas ego hic turbas dabo! (the exclamatory use of quis)
(24) Cic. Att. 1.16.1 quas ego pugnas et quantas strages edidi! (note the contextual similarity of this to the previous example)
(25) Cic. Att. 2.15.3 quos ego homines effugi cum in hos incidi?

In (24) it might be said that the boastful nature of the claim determines the use of ego; (23) is a threat.

For tu used in the same structure, see:

(26) Plaut. Pseud. 1195 quem tu Pseudolom, quas tu mihi praedicas fabulas?
(27) Cic. Cat. 1.13 cui tu adulescentulo . . . non aut ad audaciam ferrum aut ad libidinem facem praetulisti?

(iv) A strongly focused term, whether e.g. a word in antithesis, or

participating in a rhetorical anaphora, will often be placed at the head of a clause. If *ego* is expressed for some reason, it will be prevented from adopting first position by the focused term. In (28) *ego*, as often, is expressed as subject of *uidi* (see below, pp. 123–4), but the first position goes to *alios*, which is part of an extended anaphora; *ego* is attached to it:

(28) Cic. Pis. 21 *alios ego uidi uentos, alias prospexi animo procellas,*
  *alis impendentibus tempestatibus non cessi.*

In (29)

(29) Cic. Cat. 3.26 *in animis ego uestrís* omnis triumphos meos,
  omnia ornamenta honoris, monumenta gloriae, laudis
  insignia condi et conlocari *uolo*

Cicero has said that he wants no *concrete* memorial. It is enough for him to be retained in the citizens' *minds*. *Animis* is part of a loose contrast. The verb (*uolo*) is subjective. *Ego* has moved towards the start of the sentence, attaching itself to the antithetical term *animis* and separating thereby *animis* from *uestrís*.

See further:


Here the verb (*odi*) is a subjective one which elsewhere has *ego* expressed as its subject (see below, (97)–(99); *ego* is placed after one of a pair of overtly (alliterative) antithetical terms.

(v) Negatives are frequently at the head of a clause. *Ego*, motivated by one of the factors identified earlier, may move towards but be prevented from adopting first place: e.g.

(31) Plaut. Pers. 533 *numquam ego te tam esse matulam credidi*

(32) Cic. Marc. 8 *non ego eum cum summis uiris comparo, sed*
  *simillimum deo iudico*

(33) Cic. Att. 1.12.1 *nihil ego illa impudentius, astutius, lentius uidi.*

I summarize. *Ego*, if expressed, is often placed at the head of its clause. But it may be prevented from adopting that position if one of a variety of preferential terms normally placed first is present in the sentence: for example a relative, *hic*, an interrogative, a focused or rhetorical or antithetical term, a negative. In such sentences *ego* is constantly found attached to the preferential term. It is probably true to say that in prose if *ego* is not in first place in the clause, it will usually follow a preferential term. Many of the examples so far quoted show quasi-formulaic structures of one sort or another, e.g. *hunc ego hominem, sed quid ego haec*. The question arises whether in such cases *ego* is motivated only by its own
'emphatic' or 'subjective' or 'focal' character. Is it possible that certain types of preferential terms placed at the head of a sentence in effect attracted *ego*, or even generated its use if the verb was first person?

I ask this question partly because in some of the examples quoted so far it is difficult to see any other reason why *ego* should have been expressed, but particularly because there is evidence in Latin that certain preferential and focused terms attracted enclitics of other kinds.\(^6\) Consider first (34):

(34) Cic. Fam. 13.73.2 sed mihi ita persuadeo (potest fieri ut fallar) // eam rem *laudi tibi* // potius quam *uituperationi* fore.

The double lines mark off colon division. *Tibi*, the unemphatic enclitic oblique case pronoun, ought, by Wackernagel's law, to be in second position in its colon. Instead it is right at the end of the colon, attached to the antithetical term *laudi*, which stands in a contrast with *uituperationi*. *Tibi* has been attracted to the right by the antithetical term, and this is a common process in classical Latin. The antithetical or focused term exercises an attracting power over enclitics. Take again (35):

(35) Caes. Gall. 6.40.7 quorum non nulli *ex inferioribus* ordinibus reliquarum legionum // uirtutis causa // *in superiores erant* ordines huius legionis *traducti*.

Here a transfer from lower ranks (*ex inferioribus ordinibus*) to higher (*in superiores ordinis*) is described. *Inferioribus* and *superiores* are antithetical. The auxiliary *erant*, which would usually follow *traducti*, has moved to the left and attached itself to one of the antithetical terms.

I would suggest that *ego* often behaves in a similar way to oblique case pronouns, and the copula or auxiliary, in that it seeks out focused or preferential terms and links itself to them, even in contexts in which it appears to have no particular emphasis itself and is apparently redundant. Consider (36)–(39):

(36) Plaut. Aul. 322 *coquom ego*, *non furem* rogo
(37) Plaut. Aul. 457 *coctum ego*, *non uapulatum*, dudum conductus fui
(39) Cic. Verr. 5.130 itaque ad me, iudices, hanc querimoniam praeter ceteras Sicilia detulit; *lacrimis ego* huc, *non gloria* inductus accessi.

In each case *ego* has moved towards the start of the sentence, but instead of reaching first position has been attached to antithetical terms, which stand in an 'A non B' structure. *Ego* seems usually to be semantically redundant. In (38), for example, the first sentence contains a contrast between Atticus, the subject of *defendis*, and Cicero, who refers to himself by means of the contrastive use of *ego*. But in the third sentence the primary contrast is between *rerum* and *hominum*. The main motivation of *ego* seems to be its tendency to occur as enclitic on certain categories of focused terms.

I wish to consider further the possibility that the use of *ego* may sometimes be determined not by its own emphatic or contrastive potential, but by its mechanical place in certain structures, in attachment to a limited range of focused or preferential terms. Two pieces of evidence are offered (*ego* used as subject of *credo*, and of *accuso*).

I take first *ego* used in conjunction with the verb *credo* (in the present tense, indicative). *Credo* might seem to be the archetypal subjective verb which would often be accompanied by *ego*. However, in Cicero, *credo* occurs 337 times, and *ego* is expressed with it only 6 times. The 6 examples are set out at (40):

(40) a  *S. Rosc.* 1 *credo ego* uos, iudices, mirari quid sit quod . . .
    b  *Dom.* 134 *quem ego* tamen credo
    c  *Nat.* 3.14 *quibus ego* credo
    d  *Att.* 1.16.12 *quod ego* non credo
    e  *Q. fr.* 1.2.16 *quibus ego* ita credo
    f  *Fam.* 11.20.1 *hoc ego* Labeonem credo illi rettulisse aut finxisse dictum.

There is evidence here that the use of *ego* is structurally determined. In four places (b — e) *ego* follows a connective relative, and in a fifth (f) it follows *hoc*. It seems to be the presence of the preferential term which generates the use of *ego*, in attachment to it.

Of particular note is (40a), which is the opening of the *Pro Roscio Amerino*. The same expression opens the *Stichus* of Plautus —

(41) *Plaut. Stich.* 1 *credo ego* miseram
    fuisses Penelopam

— and is found elsewhere in speeches:

(42) *C. Sempronius Gracchus* frg. 34, p. 184 Malcovati *credo ego*
    inimicos meos hoc dicturum

(43) *Livy* 21.21.3 *credo ego* uos, inquit, socii . . .

(44) *Livy* 24.38.1 *credo ego* uos audisse, milites . . .

I take it that the emphasis of (40a) is 'I IMAGINE, gentlemen, that you
are surprised'. The focus is on credo. Ego is neither genuinely contrastive nor emphatic, but appears to be attached to a focal initial verb. It could not be argued that the order ego credo has been reversed to throw the verb into relief, because, as we have seen, ego is not necessarily expressed in combination with credo in Cicero. It would seem to be more accurate to say that the use of ego has been motivated by the presence of a focused term at the start of the sentence which Cicero wishes to highlight. Speeches of Cicero often have a first-person verb in the first sentence, but usually it is unaccompanied by ego or nos; it would not do therefore to suggest that the orator had a habit of expressing ego as a mannered speech opening to stress (e.g.) his personal involvement in or commitment to the case. At S. Rosc. 1 then it is both the presence of ego, and its placement, which have to be explained. Positioned thus, the pronoun virtually has a focusing role.

I move on to my second piece of evidence. At (45) Cicero poses a number of rhetorical questions, each introduced by quis:

(45) Cic. Verr. 4.104 pro di immortales! quem ego hominem accuso? quem legibus aut iudiciali iure persequor? de quo uos sententiam per tabellam feretis?

Ego does not seem to have any special emphasis. Could it be that its use has been determined by the verb accuso? There are 15 examples of accuso (first-person present indicative) in Cicero. Only four times is ego expressed with it. There is a second case of the pronoun attached to an interrogative:

(46) Cic. Verr. 3.137 pro deum hominumque fidem, quem ego accuso?

The context is virtually identical to that of (45), and in both passages the emphasis seems to be on the interrogative: 'what sort of man is this that I am accusing'.

In a third example ego begins a sentence, and may be intended to be emphatic (Att. 13.22.3). It is also subject of another, coordinated, verb (libero). Finally, at Sull. 48 ego is contrastive:


There are then no grounds for thinking that the presence of ego is related to the nature of the verb accuso; in two places it is the interrogative quis which must surely have determined its use. Whereas the two questions of the form quem . . . accuso? both have ego attached to quem, in none of

7 S. Rosc. 94, Verr. 3.16, 3.17, 3.187, 4.104, 5.166, Planc. 17, Sull. 48, Att. 3.15.4, 3.15.7, 4.16.1, 10.5.3, 13.22.3, 13.22.5, Q.fr. 2.2.1.
the places where *accusō* occurs *without* *ego* is it preceded by the interrogative.

Further evidence could be cited suggesting that *ego* is often expressed because the structural conditions are right to motivate it, but the two cases discussed above are enough for our purposes.

I summarize. The infrequency with which *ego* is expressed as subject of (e.g.) *credo* shows that the subjectivity of the verb was not sufficient cause in itself to determine the use of the pronoun. *Ego* seems to be motivated by the presence of a restricted range of preferential terms—that is, terms which habitually come at the head of their clause and to which it might attach. I refer, in the case of *credo*, to the emphatic deictic demonstrative *hic*, to the connective relative *qui* which is interchangeable with *hic*, and to the miscellaneous category of focused initial terms placed at the head of the clause, represented by initial *credo* at *S. Rosc*. 1. The tendency which *ego* shows of linking itself to such preferential terms has a parallel in the tendency which oblique case pronouns, and the copula *esse*, also show of seeking out preferential terms as their host. What is different about the nominative pronoun *ego*, as compared for example with an oblique case form such as *mihi*, is that logically it is redundant. If its use is related to the presence of a preferential term in the clause, then one would have to say that the preferential term not only attracts it, but in many cases even causes it to be expressed.

III. CATULLUS: VERB + *EGO/TU*

I turn now to Catullus. I will be arguing that Catullus falls constantly into the patterns of speech, with a minimum of adaptation or innovation. I begin with one type of attachment of *ego/tu* to preferential terms, that is their attachment to emphatic or antithetical verbs, as in Cicero's expression *credo ego*. The nature of the phenomenon may be even more clearly illustrated from (48)--(50):

(48) Cic. Caec. 38 *reieci ego* te armatis hominibus, *non deieci*

(49) Cic. Scaur. frg. (f) *non enim tantum* *admiratus sum ego* illum uirum, sicut omnes, sed etiam praecipue *dilexi*

---

8 There are 20+ examples of *ego* placed immediately behind a first-person verb in Cicero, and 30+ examples of *tu* after a second-person verb. The structure is not particularly common, but it was clearly available as a functional form of placement. Many of the examples of both *ego* and *tu* so placed fit the pattern discussed here (e.g. in (48)--(50)), but the use of *tu* in particular in a comprehensive account of pronoun placement would require a detailed treatment.
In (48) the argument turns on the question whether Caecina was ‘ejected’ (deicere) from a farm, or excluded, i.e. prevented from entering it. Here Cicero’s opponent is imagined as making the defence ‘I rejected you, I did not eject you’. There is an explicit antithesis between the two verbs, or rather between their two prefixes, as Cicero in effect goes on to observe: ‘ut tantum facinus non in aequitate defensionis, sed in una littera latuisse uideatur’. The structure is again ‘A non B’ (cf. (36)–(39)). Neither ego nor te carries any discernible emphasis. The pronouns are, it is true, in the familiar first-person/second-person pattern, but that is not sufficient to cause ego to be used here; te is often subject of a first-person verb without a juxtaposed ego.9

In (49) two verbs are again in antithesis, with the second a deliberate intensification of the first. There is a secondary contrast between ego and omnes, but the main focus lies undoubtedly on the two verbs. In (50) there is contrast of complete opposites, with tu attached to the second of the pair. The presence of tu here can only be explained as a manifestation of a usage whereby a nominative pronoun follows an antithetical or focused verb at the start of its clause, and thereby, one assumes, sharpens the focused character of that verb, much as if the emphasizing particle quidem had been tacked on instead. Even if one were to maintain that in, say, (49), ego is required because of contextual factors other than its focusing function, it would still have to be allowed that its position is significant, behind a markedly antithetical term.10 Regular positioning of this kind in

9 In reference to the collocation ego te a referee comments: ‘the very regular way in which [ego] is followed (or embraced) by an accusative (phrase) might suggest that what comes after [it] may be just as relevant as what comes before. And the same could be true of datives too.’ I have collected every example of first-person verbs in the first 20 letters to Atticus (as published in Shackleton Bailey’s edition) which are accompanied either by the direct object te or the indirect object tibi. In 21 cases ego is not expressed at all. Four times where ego (or nos) is expressed, it is separated from te/tibi. And only once is ego followed immediately by the second-person pronoun (tibi). These figures do not support the possibility that the use of ego could be determined by the presence of a second-person pronoun object. Where ego and te/tibi occur in juxtaposition, it must be assumed that ego is independently motivated. The figures given here from Cicero do not include those cases in which te/tibi is in an embedded clause, and ego would have been in the matrix clause, had it been expressed. If such cases had been included, the argument of this footnote would have been further strengthened.

10 Pinkster (1987) does not distinguish between those pronouns which precede the verb and those which are placed after it. He quotes (1987: 372), for example, Petron. 74.15 ‘ego... accipere potui. scis tu me non mentiri’, with the comment: ‘Fortunata is called as a witness for the truth of Trimalchio’s statements: “others may not know this, but you know it damned well”.’ But what is the significance of the placement of tu? It is at least as likely that the
passages in which *ego* might have been motivated as well by the context opened the way for the pronoun to be given a focusing role in its own right.

At Catull. 22.9 (cited above (1)) *tu* can without difficulty be interpreted as linked to a focused verb. In the previous lines (5–8) the splendid, even luxurious, *appearance* of Suffenus' book of poems is described. But, says Catullus, when you READ them, the truth is revealed.\(^{11}\) The contrast between superficial appearances and reality is implicitly rather than starkly expressed as in some of the examples discussed earlier.

The focusing usage of *ego* can be clearly seen in Catull. 14.4:

(51) Catull. 14.4 *nam quid* **fecl ego** *quidue* **sum locutus, cur me to6 male perderes poetis?*

'What have I *done* or what have I *said* that you should want to destroy me with so many poet?' Here there is a hackneyed antithesis between doing and saying, and *ego*, without real contrastive function itself, follows the first of the antithetical pair. For a comparable use of *ego*, cf.:

(52) Plaut. Capt. 414 *fecl ego* ita ut commemoras, et te meminisse id gratum est mihi

'I DID do as you say' (expressing agreement with the previous speaker).\(^{12}\)

\(^{11}\) focus is on *scis*: 'you KNOW that I am telling the truth'. See Marouzeau (1907: 27) on the difference between *ego scio* and *scio ego* in comedy; e.g. Plaut. Pers. 616–7 'quanquam ego serua sum, / scio ego officium meum' ('although I am a slave, I am WELL AWARE of my duty'), alongside Ter. Hec. 849–50 'X. nescio. Y. at ego scio' ('I don't know.' 'But I do'). Note too Plaut. Bacc. 202 'uide quaeso ne quis tractet illum indiligens; / scis tu ut confringi uas cito Samium solet', 'you KNOW how readily Samian ware breaks'. Similarly I cannot accept that at Petron. 111.12 ('uis tu reuiuiscere? uis discusso muliebri errore... lucis commodis frui') the emphasis is on *tu*, as in Pinkster's paraphrase (1987: 372), 'Do you want to begin life afresh? In that case the body itself... of your dead husband ought to persuade you.' In fact *uis tu* is a well-established idiom, expressing a strong exhortation = 'WONT you, CAN'T you', with the emphasis most definitely on the modal nuance of the verb, not on *tu*. Cf. Livy 25.6.22 'uis tu mari, uis terra, uis acie, uis urbibus oppugnandis experiri uirtutem?', Hor. Sat. 2.6.92 'uis tu homines urbemque feris praeponere siluis?', Sen. Dial. 10.19.2 'uis tu relicto solo mente ad ista respicere'. The idiom was explained, with numerous other examples, by Bentley (1711: 327 on Hor. Sat. 2.6.92): note his remark, 'In illis omnibus *tu* VIS non interrogantis modo est ut VIN; sed orantis, hortantis, flagitantis, iubentis'. The Livian example above is particularly telling, as the repetition of *uis* shows that it is this, not *tu*, which is emphatic.

\(^{12}\) Roland Mayer draws my attention to Tac. Dial. 3.3 *leges tu*, where *tu* may have a similar function. It has caused editors some problems.

\(^{11}\) Often in Plautus a verb preceding *ego* is emphatic (see e.g. the examples cited in n. 10, with Marouzeau (1907)), but his usage is somewhat variable, perhaps partly because of the pressures applied by the metrical form of the text. With (52), compare Bacch. 410 'fecl ego istae idem in adolescencia', where it is *ego* which is strongly emphatic. For some factors favouring this placement of emphatic *ego*, see below (116)–(120).
Perhaps the most interesting example of *ego* in this function is at Catull. 16.1, 14:

(53) Catull. 16.1, 14 pedicabo *ego* uos et irrumabo.

The word order adopted by Catullus is not haphazard. The structure is of a type which belonged to speech, but its determinants are complex. *Ego*, as often, is juxtaposed with a second-person pronoun, but that is not the main reason for its use. The utterance is a threat, and in threats, as we saw ((4)–(6)), *ego* is constantly expressed. *Ego* may go to or towards the start of the threatening utterance, but there can be no doubt that the real weight of any future-tense threat lies on the verb itself, or in this case on the pair of verbs, which are of increasing intensity. If translated into spoken English the line will inevitably have a falling intonation on the verbs, a sure sign of focus in the sense in which I use that term, and there will be little or no stress on the pronouns. Because of the inherently focused character of threatening verbs, there is a tendency for the verb to be placed at the head of the clause with *ego* following. The structure occurs repeatedly in Plautus, and is also found in Terence:

(54) a Plaut. *Amph.* 295 timet homo: *deludam ego* illum  
b Plaut. *Bacch.* 571 si pergis paruom mihi fidem arbitrarier, *tollam ego* ted in collum atque intro hinc auferam  
c Plaut. *Bacch.* 766 *uorsabo ego* illunc hodie, si uiuo, probe  
d Plaut. *Cist.* 367 *ludam ego* hunc  
e Plaut. *Most.* 1168 *interimam hercle ego* <te> si uiuo  
f Plaut. *Pseud.* 382 *exossabo ego* illum  
g Ter. *Eun.* 803 *diminuam ego* caput tuum hodie, nisi abis.

The object of the verb is usually a pronoun, but it need not be second-person. If the object pronoun is third- rather than first-person, then the utterance is strictly a statement of intention—rather than a threat, but the intention is threatening. There is clearly a pattern of speech exemplified here. It is moreover in contexts of this type that the focusing use of *ego* might have developed. In this case *ego* is not motivated solely by its habit of following an antithetical or focused verb. It has its own motivation, in that a person making a threat may graphically refer to himself as the one who will carry the action out. But *ego* tends, in its attempt to reach the start of the utterance, to be blocked by the strong future-tense verb in the focal initial position. The next stage in the development of *ego* might have been the mechanical attachment of the pronoun to a focused term at the head of a clause, even when it was not independently motivated.

The practice of Plautus (see further above, (4)–(6)) suggests that a person making such a threat had the choice of either placing the pronoun in initial (or peninitial) position, or of giving priority to the verb. If we leave aside the possible influence of metrical factors in Plautus, we might suggest that the pattern chosen would depend on the speaker's subjective judgement whether in a particular context the focus of the threat should be placed on his personal participation in the act, or on the nature of the act itself.

IV. CATULLUS: (CONNECTIVE) RELATIVE + EGO/TU

It was seen earlier that a common pattern in prose is relative (including the connective use) + ego/tu, with the relative often separated from an associated term. The use of the pronoun may again originally have been inspired by its own emphasis or by the subjective nature of the verb, but it was suggested that the pattern became a mechanical one, with the preferential term itself causing the pronoun to be expressed. I begin with Catull. 23.22:

(55) Catull. 23.21–3 atque id durius est faba et lapillus;
quod tu si manibus teras fricesque,
non umquam digitum inquinare posses.

Kroll (1922: 45) correctly describes tu as unemphatic, and he adds a cross-reference to his note on 6.14, where another instance of unemphatic tu, as we saw (see p. 98), is accounted for as a colloquialism. That is far from satisfactory as an explanation of the use of the pronoun. Fordyce’s note (1961: 154) is equally uninformative: ‘for the rare addition of the unemphatic pronoun to a subjunctive of the indefinite second person, cf. . . .’ But tu is not an addition to teras; it is rather an attachment to the relative quod. Not only that, but there are structural parallels between this sentence and various sentences in Cicero. Note first (56):

(56) Cic. Rab. perd. 25 quod tu si audisses aut si per aetatem scire potuisse, numquam profecto istam imaginem . . . in rostra atque in contionem attulisses.

The connective relative has attracted tu, which in this context may be loosely contrastive, and there is then a conditional clause (with si following tu as in Catullus), followed by a main clause introduced by numquam, which may be compared with Catullus’ non umquam. Catullus’ use of tu reflects a mechanical attachment of tu to the connective relative originating
from structures of the type seen in (56), where tu is perhaps independently motivated.

Similar again is (57), where again a si-clause follows connective relative + tu:

(57) Cic. Q. Rosc. 42 quem tu si ex censu spectas, eques Romanus est, si ex uita, homo clarissimus est, si ex fide, iudicem sumpsisti, si ex ueritate, id quod scire potuit et debuit dixit.

Here tu seems to be without emphasis: the emphasis lies on a series of contrasted terms which follow (ex censu, ex uita, etc.), and partly also on quem, in that various persons are contrasted in the passage. Quod tu si is found nowhere in Augustan poetry; Ovid, Am. 2.14.20 is not structurally parallel.

Another 'unemphatic' instance of tu in Catullus (as noted by Kroll (1922: 30)) is in (58):

(58) Catull. 13.13 quod tu cum olfacies, deos rogabis, totum ut te faciant, Fabulle, nasum.

For the structure here, cf. the following Ciceronian example:

(59) Cic. Flacc. 51 quem tu cum ephebum Temni cognosses, . . .
    semper nudum esse voluisti.

With the examples of tu from Catullus quoted so far in this section also belong those at 15.11 and 30.5.

I move on to a different pattern in Catullus, but one which again displays ego linked to a connective relative. It was noted earlier that in Cicero ego so placed may separate the relative from an associated term. This pattern is found in (60):

(60) Catull. 66.37 quis ego pro factis caelesti reddit caetu
    pristina uota nouo munere dissoluo.

The preposition on which quis factis depends (pro) follows ego. For this structure in Cicero, see (61):

(61) a Verr. 1.103 quibus ego in rebus
    b Verr. 5.72 quorum ego de acerbissima morte
    c Cluent. 106 quorum ego de sententia
    d Sull. 62 cuius ego de uirtute
    e Dom. 144 quorum ego a templis
    f Har. resp. 2 cuius ego de ecfrenato . . . furore.

I note in passing that ego in (61a) is undoubtedly emphatic. It must be stressed again that ego (or tu) in the structures which I am identifying is not necessarily unemphatic. I am suggesting rather that its original motiv-
ation was the carrying of some sort of emphasis or pragmatic function, and that it then became formulaic in certain structures, its emphasis no longer a necessary determinant of its use.

Also of note is the disjunction in the following example:

(62) Catull. 68.25 **cuius** ego **interitu** tota de mente fugauí / haec studia.

Here a genitive form of the relative is separated from the noun on which it depends, as in some of the Ciceronian examples in (61), and those in (63):

(63) a Cluent. 194 **cuius** ego **furorem**
    b Cael. 14 **cuius** ego **facinora**
    c Red. Sen. 20 **cuius** ego **clientibus**.

**Cuius** ego is not found in elegy, Horace or Virgil, but note the following examples:

(64) Plaut. Amph. 141 **quolius** ego fero **hanc imaginem**
(65) Lucr. 5.55 **cuius** ego ingressus **uestigia**.

The patterns discussed in this section cannot be dismissed as colloquial, even in those cases where *ego* and *tu* are manifestly unemphatic. Moreover the parallelism between Catullus and Cicero sometimes goes beyond the mere attachment of *ego/tu* to a (connective) relative; there is sometimes a more extensive structural similarity. Catullus has employed in verse some structures of speech.

I discuss in the next section the attachment of *ego/tu* to the demonstrative *hic*, particularly in the pattern *hunc* ego *hominem*.

**V. CATULLUS: DEMONSTRATIVE + EGO/TU**

In (66) *haec* is separated from *commoda* by *tu*, and again *tu* is noted by Kroll (1922: 45 on line 22) as unemphatic:

(66) Catull. 23.24 **haec** tu **commoda** tam beata, Furi, / noli spernere.

*Haec tu commoda tam beata* is followed by a vocative, a structure which can be seen in Cicero in the examples at (67):

(67) a Phil. 8.28 **haec** tu **mandata**, L. Piso, et tu, L. Philippe...
    b Mur. 34 **hunc** tu **hostem**, Cato, **contemnis**
    c Verr. 3.97 **hunc** tu in hac causa **testem**, Verres, habebis.

Catullus has again fallen into a pattern of wording which is rooted in the spoken language. Note also the similarity of the verb phrase in (66) with
that in Cicero in (67b). In (67a) *tu* is contrastive, but it has lost that function in (66).

A clear-cut instance of a demonstrative, which is focused (antithetical), separated from the word in agreement is found in (68), where *haec* (*singula*) is antithetical with (*totum*) *illud*:

(68)  
Catull. 86.2  
*haec* ego sic *singula* confiteor.  
totum illud 'formosa' nego.

Compare the contrastive use of *hunc* (*ego*) in Cicero in (16). In (68) *ego* is unemphatic. In the previous line Catullus contrasts himself with others (*multis/mihi*), but in line 2 *ego* is no longer antithetical. (68) might be compared with the Plautine passage (69), which contains the same verb:

(69)  
Plaut. Capt. 296 *haec* tu *eadem* si confiteri uis.

In (69), however, *tu* is contrastive. I stress again the fact that *ego* and *tu* recur in our various patterns whether or not they are themselves 'emphatic'.

I quote in (70)–(71) two further examples from Catullus where the nominative pronoun, apparently unemphatic, hangs on the demonstrative, which in these cases is not separated from a noun:

(70)  
Catull. 56.6  
deprendi modo pupulum puellae  
*trusantem*; *hunc ego*, si placet Dionae,  
protelo rigida mea cecidi

(71)  
Catull. 24.9  
*hoc tu* quam lubet abice.

Note the position of the *si*-clause in (70). A clause is often inserted after an enclitic, thereby isolating the emphatic host term (in this case *hunc*) and its dependent enclitic. For *hunc ego* in a similar context in Plautus (where a form of punishment is at issue), note:

(72)  
Plaut. Pseud. 447  
*hic mihi corrumpit filium, scelerum caput;*  
hic dux, hic illist paedagogus, *hunc ego*  
cupio excruciari.

The combining of the demonstrative *hic* with *ego* or *tu* is common in elegy and Augustan poetry in general, but there are some subtle differences between the way in which Catullus uses the pattern and the way it is used by other poets, particularly Ovid. Catullan usage is directly relatable to that of Cicero. I return to Augustan poetry later.

---

14 See Adams (1994b: 37 on (190)).
VI. CATULLUS: INTERROGATIVES + EGO/TU

It was pointed out earlier (see (21)–(27)) that interrogatives, particularly quis, often have ego or tu following. In this section I concentrate by way of illustration on just one interrogative, the old instrumental qui, which often means ‘how?’. In (73) Catullus uses qui with tu following:

(73) Catull. 67.37 qui tu istaec, ianua, nosti...?

The emphasis probably lies on tu, but perhaps on istaec as well. Qui ego and qui tu are particularly common in comedy. They presumably lingered on in speech, their fading currency in the literary language determined not by the disappearance of ego/tu from questions, but by the obsolescence of instrumental qui. But the instrumental use of qui lasted somewhat longer in the colloquial language than in literature, as a recent attestation in a letter at Vindolanda shows (Tab. Vind. II.234). In this case Catullus’ usage can with justification be classified as colloquial.

Various observations may be made about (73). First, qui tu is followed by the demonstrative form istaec, with its deictic particle -ce. For qui ego in Plautus followed by the same demonstrative term, note the following:

(74) a Plaut. Men. 786 qui ego istuc, mi pater, cauere possum?
   b Plaut. Merc. 627 qui ego istuc credam tibi?

There is a distinct possibility that the whole sequence qui ego/tu istuc/istaec was a formulaic way of opening a question in colloquial speech. The augmented demonstratives illidistic/istic had a colloquial character. Ego is often associated with istic in Plautus, and not only in the structure which we see here:

(75) a Plaut. Amph. 925 ego istaec feci uerba
   b Plaut. Men. 265 ego istuc cauebo
   c Plaut. Merc. 477 omnia ego istaec auscultaui.

Secondly, istaec in (73) is followed by a vocative. For the identical structure in Plautus, see (74a).

Thirdly, the verb in Catullus is a verb of knowing. Again the idiom can be paralleled in Plautus:

(76) a Plaut. Capt. 629 qui tu scis?
   b Plaut. Pers. 716 qui ego nunc scio...?

It should now be clear that Mynors’s text (1958) of Catull. 67.37 ((73) above) is incorrect: ‘quid? tu istaec, ianua...’ (quid V: qui Aldina).

In this section we have identified in Catullus a highly stereotyped pattern of phraseology, a pattern which can be paralleled in this case in
Plautus rather than in Cicero. As such it probably belonged to that colloquial register which is extensively represented in Latin comedy, but which leaves its mark in Catullus as well. This is not the only structural parallel that we have found between Plautus and Catullus; there was also the form of the threat pedicabo ego uos.

This is not the only example in Catullus, as we will see in the next section, of a nominative pronoun associated with an interrogative. I refer finally in this section to (77), which has a formulaic structure already noted in (22):

(77) Catull. 64.164 sed quid ego ignaris nequiquam conquerar auris?

(77) should be compared with the Ciceronian example (78), where the verb is much the same:

(78) Cic. Imp. Pomp. 33 nam quid ego Ostiense incommodum atque illam labem atque ignominiam rei publicae querar?

Nam quid ego in (78) is, like sed quid ego, a formulaic opening. For nam quid ego, see:

(79) a Plaut. Amph. 41 nam quid ego memorem...
    b Cic. Verr. 1.129 nam quid ego de cotidiano sermone querimoniaque populi Romani loquar?

VII. CATULLUS: QUIN + EGO/TU

I next consider another type of expression showing nominative pronouns in association with an interrogative. Quin is the negated form of the instrumental qui, and it too may be followed by ego/tu.

In the self-address in Catullus 76 tu is unemphatic, as Kroll (1922: 14) noted (on 6.14):

(80) Catull. 76.11 quin tu animo offermas atque istinc teque reducis?

Tu is metrically unnecessary, and indeed is omitted by Ovid in his imitation of the line:

(81) Ovid Met. 9.745 quin animum firmas teque ipsa recolligis...?

Quin tu undoubtedly belonged to speech. It occurs 70 times in Plautus: e.g.

(82) a Asin. 659 quin tu labore liberas te...?
    b Curc. 240 quin tu aliquot dies / perdura
    c Merc. 942 quin tu istas omittis nugas...?
In this case the expression was admitted also by Cicero (8 times, scattered across all genres). Its rather stereotyped character may be illustrated by (83a) alongside (83b):

(83)  a  Plaut. Curc. 611 quin tu is in malam crucem . . .?
       b  Cic. Phil. 13.48 quin tu abis in malam pestem malumque cruciatum?

Note is/abis immediately after tu, and then the prepositional expression. There is only one example of quin tu in Augustan poetry:

(84)  Virg. Ecl. 2.71 quin tu aliquid saltem potius, quorum indiget usus,
       uiminibus mollique paras detexere iunco?

It may have been obsolete by the first century AD. It is not found in Petronius or Martial, and there is only one example in Apuleius (Apol. 79).

VIII. CATULLUS: NUMQUAM + EGO

Negatives, as noted earlier (see (31)–(33)), are often placed at the head of their clause in Latin. Sometimes the negative seems to cause ego or tu to be expressed after it; that is, an unemphatic, redundant nominative pronoun follows the negative almost as a focusing particle.

At Catull. 65.10 numquam is loosely antithetical with semper in the next clause. Two clitics (ego, te) follow numquam, but only te is necessary to the sense:

(85)  Catull. 65.10  numquam ego te, uita frater amabilior,
       aspiciam posthac? at certe semper amabo.

For numquam ego, see above (31).16

The combination numquam ego is not found in Propertius, Horace, Tibullus or Virgil. There is one example in Ovid:

(86)  Ovid, AA 3.519 numquam ego te, Andromache, . . . rogarem.

---

15 Rosc. Com. 25, Sull. 25, Pis. 61, Phil. 13.48, Rep. 1.61, 6.14, Fam. 7.8.2, Att. 4.19.1.
16 Cf. e.g. Plaut. Cist. 44, 53, Mil. 1202, Most. 214, Cic. Cat. 2.15, Pis. 99, Lael. 18. Note too Petron. 134.9 'numquam tu hominem tam infelicem uidisti' (quoted by Pinkster (1987: 372) with the comment 'the personal experience of Oenothea is compared with the dreadful reality'). But it is numquam which is emphatic.
IX. CATULLUS: SOME CONCLUSIONS

Some uses of *ego* and *tu* in Catullus can be readily related to uses of nominative pronouns on the one hand in Plautus and on the other in Cicero. Sometimes the pronoun might be classed as 'emphatic' by a speaker of a modern language, sometimes as 'unemphatic', and I have referred to the views of Kroll and Fordyce on individual cases. But Kroll and Fordyce considered *ego* and *tu* in isolation, without reference to the preferential terms, which, in the data considered here, commonly preceded them. These preferential terms are one of the determinants of the use of *ego* and *tu*. Those examples of *ego* and *tu* which, while following preferential terms, themselves appear to be 'emphatic', might partly at least have been motivated by their own emphatic potential. But pronouns which do not seem to be emphatic might have been determined by the formulaic place which they had acquired in attachment to certain preferential terms.

It is a mistake, with Kroll, to classify allegedly 'unemphatic' nominative pronouns as colloquial, because equally 'unemphatic' pronouns can be found readily in Cicero following the same categories of preferential terms. I have been able to identify certain colloquialisms in Catullus (the structure of *pedicabo ego uos, qui + ego/tu*), but not on the grounds that the pronoun in question was unemphatic. Certain collocations of words or structural patterns in which a nominative pronoun is embedded can be paralleled in Plautus but not Cicero, and these probably belonged to the colloquial registers of the language. Other patterns on the other hand can be paralleled in Cicero (or in Cicero as well as Plautus), and these may reflect the spoken language in a wider sense. The patterns of speech, both colloquial and more formal, are definitely to be detected in Catullus.

The question arises to what extent these speech patterns are found in elegy and other Augustan poetry. I make no attempt here to go through all of the categories of uses of *ego* and *tu* discussed earlier. I restrict myself to two phenomena (a) the attachment of *ego* to a focused verb, and (b) patterns showing *ego/tu* after the demonstrative *hic*.

X. AUGUSTAN POETRY: VERBS + *EGO*

The only Augustan poet who falls into line, up to a point, with Catullus and Cicero in the attachment of *ego* to verbs is Propertius. On the one hand Propertius sometimes makes what might be called a debased use of the pattern, in that *ego* may follow a verb which is not focused or emphatic or at the head of its clause. On the other hand there is an element of the mundane about Propertius' exploitation of the pattern. *Ego* tends to follow
verbs with which it is associated also in prose and earlier Latin, particularly certain subjective or modal verbs, and verbs in the future tense. There are 23 cases of verbs followed by *ego* in Propertius, of which I discuss a selection.

I begin with (87):

(87) Prop. 2.25.36  at si saecla forent antiquis grata puellis,  
essem ego quod nunc tu: tempore uincor ego.

*Ego* early in the line is obviously contrastive with *tu* (on the structure, see below (116)–(117)). I have stressed throughout that, while *ego* may be unemphatic in this position and tacked on to a verb merely as a means of focusing the verb, there is no theoretical reason why it should not acquire from the context its full contrastive function. In the second half of the line in (87) *ego* is ‘given’ in the context, and not conspicuously emphatic. The focus would seem to be on *tempore* rather than *uincor*. *Ego* is displaced by the norms of prose, in that it does not follow a term which is either focal or in initial position, but is mechanically positioned after a verb which is in second position in the colon. This example seems to represent a loosening of the connection between speech patterns and poetic discourse which we were able to demonstrate for Catullus.

But this example must be contrasted with (88):

(88) Prop. 2.8.5 *possum* ego in alterius positam spectare lacerto?

*Possum* ego begins a question, the expected answer to which is ‘no’. I would interpret the force as ‘how CAN I look at her in another’s arms’, or ‘CAN I look at her’, but certainly not ‘can I look at her . . .’. (89) is similar:

(89) Prop. 2.20.28  cum te tam multi peterent, tu me una petisti:  
*possum* ego naturae non meminisse tuae?

‘How CAN I not remember your (kind) nature? [It is impossible].’

It is metrically convenient to have a disyllabic word (ending in -m or -o) at the start of a line followed by *ego*. But the collocation is no mere metrical convenience. It is good idiomatic Latin for *possum* when focused to be followed by unemphatic *ego*. The pattern is found in Cicero. Note e.g. (90), where Cicero deals with a problem of translation:

(90) Cic. *Fin.* 3.35 quas Graeci παθη appellant — *poteram* ego  
uerbum ipsum interpretans morbos appellare, sed non  
conueniret ad omnia

17 1.10.15, 1.12.11, 1.13.14–15 (twice), 2.8.5, 2.18b.37, 2.20.28, 2.24c.41, 2.24c.42, 2.25.36 (twice), 2.28.44, 3.8.27, 3.17.21, 3.21.24, 3.25.7, 4.2.53, 4.5.61, 4.5.67, 4.7.36, 4.7.51, 4.7.70, 4.8.81.
'I COULD [translating literally] have called them *morbi*, but that term would not be suitable.' The contrast is between what is possible, and what is appropriate, with the nuance 'possibility' rather than the person of the subject focused. Cicero uses another tense of *possum* with *ego* in (91):

(91)  Cic. *Verr.* 5.179 **potero** silere . . . **potero** dissimulare . . . **potero** ego hoc onus tantum aut in hoc iudicio deponere aut tacitus sustinere?

*Potero* is used three times. There must be an emphasis of sorts on the series of infinitives dependent on *potero*, but all Cicero is stressing the *impossibility* of silence, etc. The force of the rhetoric might best be rendered into English: 'how CAN I be silent, etc.', or, in the third clause, 'will it be POSSIBLE for me either to lay aside this responsibility, or to support it while saying nothing?'

Example (92) is again a question, with the same answer implied as in (88), (89) and (91):


It is comparable in all respects to the Propertian examples (88) and (89). Propertius then has used an established idiom which happens to fit well into the first foot of the line.18

**Possum ego** also begins a line in (93):

(93)  Prop. 1.10.15 **possum** ego diuersos iterum coniungere amantes
      et dominae tardas **possum** aperire fores;
      et **possum** alterius curas sanare recentis.

The presence of *ego* is not required by the metre, though it does produce a dactyl at the start of the line. There is a rhetorically insistent repetition of *possum*, which arguably might have been sufficient motivation for the use of *ego*. In this case though there is a personal claim carried by *ego*, which has a certain emphasis. It might have been expected to precede *possum*, but metrical convenience has triumphed over pragmatically determined word order.

Note finally (94):

(94)  Tib. 1.6.70 laudare nec ullam **possim** ego, quin oculos appetat illa meos.

Tibullus places *ego* after a verb only twice, and in this case we seem to have a mechanical, metrically convenient placement which cannot be

18 For *possum* + *ego*, cf. also Pacuvius 236, Ter. *Eun.* 712.
attributed to the emphasis of *possim*. The emphasis seems to lie on *ullam* or *laudare*.

*Credo ego*, I pointed out earlier, was a collocation found in Plautus (cf. *Cas.* 234, *Epid.* 535) and sometimes in oratory. It may have been a hackneyed sentence or speech opening. It never occurs in Virgil, Horace, Ovid or Tibullus, but note first the following Propertian passage:

(95) Prop. 2.24c.41–2 *credo ego* non paucos ista perisse figura,
*credo ego* sed multos non habuisse fidem.

This order seems to be adopted when a firm opinion is expressed, without any contrastive emphasis on the pronoun: ‘I am SURE that, I IMAGINE that, I TRUST that’. In (96) the emphasis is clearly on *credam*:

(96) Prop. 2.18b.37 *credam ego* narranti, noli committere, famae

— ‘I will believe rumour’. Again Propertius has used an established idiom with its expected implication.

Another subjective verb which not unexpectedly sometimes has *ego* as its subject is *odi*. Propertius has the expression *odi ego* in (97) in a context in which *odi* is obviously the focus, though *ego* may be independently motivated:

(97) Prop. 3.8.27 *odi ego* quos nunquam pungunt suspiria somnos:
semper in irata pallidus esse uelim

‘I HATE sleep which sighs never punctuate. I would always prefer to be pale in the presence of an angry woman.’

Again the expression may have been a commonplace one. Note (98):

(98) Plaut. *Capt.*325 *non ego* omnino lucrum omne esse utile
homini existumo:
*scio ego*, multos iam lucrum lutulentos
homines reddidit;
est etiam ubi profecto damnum praestet
facere quam lucrum.
*odi ego* aurum.

I have quoted the passage at length because it illustrates particularly well the function of *ego* which I have been discussing. The three verbs *existumo*, *scio* and *odi* are all verbs of the type which I have called ‘subjective’. If the presence of *ego* is in part determined by that feature, it is nevertheless true that it is attached in each of the three lines to a focused preferential

---

19 It may be significant that Cicero employed the collocation in one of his earliest speeches, and never thereafter; it is possible that it had become banal in oratory. See further Landgraf (1914: 14) *ad loc.*

20 Cf. Marouzeau (1907: 28).
term: ‘I do NOT think . . .’, ‘I am WELL AWARE’, ‘I HATE gold’. Odi ego is also found in Pacuvius:

(99) Pacuvius 348 odi ego homines ignaua opera et philosopha sententia.

Verbs of asserting or revealing often have ego as subject, in Propertius and in the language in general. I offer a few observations on the motivation of the pronoun before turning to Propertius.

The legal formula quoted by Gaius (100) displays the formulaic hunc ego hominem, but ego is not determined only by its place in the collocation of words:

(100) Gaius Inst. 4.16 hunc ego hominem ex iure Quiritium meum esse aio.

A strong assertion may reflect the personal conviction of the speaker, or an undertaking to which he is personally willing to be held, or new information which he is prepared to stand by, or is claiming as his own, etc. The marked personal commitment to the assertion inspires the use of ego. This can be seen from an example such as (101), where the speaker’s claim is underlined by his invocation of the gods.

(101) Plaut. Men. 990 per ego uobis deos atque homines dico.

To describe a pattern such as this as manifesting ‘Wackernagel’s law’ would be to miss the point entirely. Ego is not unemphatic, as second-position pronouns are supposed to be according to the conventional understanding of Wackernagel’s law. It is not in second position qua second position, but has rather been blocked from first position by per, which in such old formulae began its clause for some reason. If a writer chooses not to give per the initial position, then that place is freed for ego: e.g.

(102) Plaut. Amph. 436 at ego per Mercurium iuro tibi . . .

If there is no preferential term to debar it from first position, ego, as subject of a verb of asserting sim., often begins its clause:

(103) Ter. Andr. 375 X. quor simulat? Y. ego dicam tibi
(104) Ter. Phorm. 837 ego me ire senibus Sunium / dicam ad mercatum.

A future-tense form, expressing intent, may act as an additional trigger to the use of the pronoun here.

But in an assertion or revelation containing ego the focus may readily be interpreted as being on the verb, and such an interpretation may entail
initial placement of the verb. Thus (105) and (106), in both of which the verb expresses a revelation ('I TELL you', 'I shall TELL you'):

(105) Plaut. Epid. 668 *dico ego* tibi iam, ut scias
(106) Mart. 10.41.4 quid, rogo, quid factum est? subiti quae causa doloris?
   nil mihi respondes? *dicam ego*, praetor erat.

Into this class falls the following Propertian example:

(107) Prop. 3.17.21 *dicam ego* maternos Actaeo fulmine partus.

In this case the revelation is to take the form of poetic composition, but this is merely a contextually determined nuance. *Ego* is as often metrically unnecessary. Another verb of asserting in initial position is at (108):

(108) Prop. 4.7.51 iuro ego Fatorum nulli reuolubile carmen / . . . si fallo

'I SWEAR by the song of the Fates which cannot be unravelled by anyone (that I was loyal) . . . If I LIE . . . ' There is a contrast between asserting the truth on oath, and lying, and *iuro* is accordingly emphatic.

Not unlike (107) is a case of *scribam*:

(109) Prop. 2.28.44 pro quibus optatis sacro me carmine damno:
    *scribam ego* 'per magnum est salua puella Iouem'.

In return for the survival of Cynthia Propertius undertakes to Jupiter to write a poem.

Another hackneyed collocation is *uidi ego*.21 The fairly frequent use of *ego* as subject of *uidi*, whether placed before or after the verb, no doubt derives in part from the speaker's/writer's desire to stress that his own personal observation was involved. Sometimes indeed the appeal to the evidence of one's own senses is made even more explicit, as e.g. in (110), where the -*met* form of the pronoun occurs:

(110) a Ter. Ad. 329 *hisce oculis egomet uidi*
    b Hor. Sat. 1.8.23 *uidi egomet*.

The order *uidi ego* originally must have conveyed a particular nuance, e.g. 'I DID see', 'such and such did not go UNNOTICED', as in (111):

(111) Cic. Planc. 76 et mihi lacrimulam Cispiani iudici obiectas. sic enim dixisti: *uidi ego* tuam lacrimulam'

---

21 For *uideo* (*uidi* etc.) + *ego* (or *tu*), see e.g. Plaut. Cas. 349, Accius 647, Titinius 18, Ter. Heaut. 563, Cic. Sull. 41, Flacc. 53, Fam. 1.9.22, Livy 1.39.3, 6.29.1, 7.34.4 etc.
'I SAW your little tear, it did not ESCAPE me.' This same type of nuance is readily identifiable in Propertius:

(112) Prop. 1.13.13-15 haec non rumore malo, non augure doctus;
uidi ego: me quaesio teste negare potes?
uidi ego te toto uinctum languescere collo.

There is a contrast, the force of which is roughly: 'I did not HEAR about these things, for example from rumour: I SAW them. I SAW you in his embrace.'

But uidi ego seems to have become a banal expression, particularly in poetry, the force of which in any context may be difficult to discern. There are some problematical examples of the phrase in Propertius (4.2.53, 4.5.61, 4.5.67), and numerous ones in Ovid (see below).

Very similar to uidi ego (and particularly the example in Cicero at (111)) is the expression sensi ego in the following passage:

(113) Prop. 4.7.36 sensi ego, cum insidiis pallida uina bibi.

Cynthia's ghost is the speaker. When she drank the poisoned wine, it did not escape her notice: 'I NOTICED, I was well AWARE, when I drank the poison.' The emphasis clearly lies on sensi, though since the verb is one of perception, the pronoun may also have a secondary justification.

I draw attention to one further example of a focused initial verb in Propertius:

(114) Prop. 3.21.24 scandan ego Theseae bracchia longa uiae.

Propertius is announcing a plan to go abroad to Athens. Various stages of the journey and its culmination are set out. Scandam expresses one of these, and is loosely focused as expressing an intention.

I have not considered all the evidence from Propertius, but it should be clear that the functional postponement of ego is fairly common in his work, that his use of the pronoun can be paralleled both in Catullus and Cicero, and that he has a habit of using ego in hackneyed collocations. Notable among these is credo ego, an expression which Cicero used in the Pro Roscio Amerino, but thereafter apparently rejected. We have also seen in Propertius a case of mechanical placement of ego behind a verb

22 See Marouzeau (1907: 29) on Plaut. Cas. 349. Note also Cic. Sull. 41 'uidi ego hoc, iudices, nisi... testatus essem, fore ut...', 'I REALIZED, gentlemen...'. Here the emphasis is on the fact of the realization, not on the person who made that realization.
23 So Rossberg (non N: [ego] non A).
(87) in a context in which the order is difficult to explain as functional. What I have called the ‘debased’ use of *ego* is also found in Tibullus (94).

I turn now to other Augustan poets. *Ego* never follows a verb in Virgil.\(^{25}\) In Tibullus and the *corpus Tibullianum* there are just two examples, one of which has been seen (94). Note also (115), where *ego* is contrastive (with *alias*):

(115) [Tib.] 4.5.5 uror ego ante alias.

*Ego* can have contrastive emphasis in this position in classical prose (see also above, n. 12), but it is relatively rare. Consider (116):


A double antithesis is developed here after the verb, between *ego* and *tu* on the one hand, and two prepositional expressions on the other. *Ego*, placed after the verb, may be the marked focus if a contrast is expressed with another pronoun. A pattern of this type seems to have been favoured if both pronouns were subject of the same verb. Cf.:

(117) Prop. 2.35.36 *esse* *ego* quod nunc *tu* (= (87) above).

Here a determinant of the initial placement of *esse* may have been the mood of the verb.\(^{26}\) Slightly different again is the following:

(118) Cic. *S. Rosc.* 60 adsedit; surrexi *ego*.

*Surrexi* stands in a contrast of opposites (with *adsedit*). But there is a secondary contrast, between the first- and second-person subjects of the two verbs, with *ego* marking the change of subject.\(^{27}\) A verb participating in such an antithesis may be followed by a pronoun which itself is contrastive. Cf.:

(119) Cic. *Verr.* 5.121 *laetaris* *tu* in *omnium gemitu*.

*Laetaris* is in contrast with *gemitu*, and *tu* with *omnium*. Similar to (118) is the following Propertian example:

(120) Prop. 4.8.81 indixit legem: respondi *ego* ‘legibus utar’.

\(^{25}\) It is a curiosity, as Professor Powell points out to me, that Virgil happily places *equidem* after a verb, but not *ego* (e.g. Aen. 4.12 *credo equidem*; cf. 2.704, 3.315, 4.382 etc.). Collocations of the type *credo ego* may have had some sort of nuance (such as a banal oratorical flavour) which made them less than acceptable in high epic.

\(^{26}\) See Adams (1994b: 60 (on (295)), 76).

Respondi contrasts with indixit, and ego with the subject of indixit.

In Horace there are six examples of verb + ego:

(121) a Sat. 2.1.74 quidquid sum ego quamuis / infra Lucili censum ingeniumque
   b Sat. 2.3.235 ut aprum / cenem ego? tu piscis hiberno ex aequore uerrris, / segnis ego
   c Sat. 2.7.80 nam / siue uiciarius est qui seruo paret, uti mos / uester ait, seu conserus, tibi quid sum ego?
   d Epist. 1.16.32 nempe / uir bonus et prudens dici delector ego ac tu
   e Epist. 1.17.19 scurror ego ipse mihi, populo tu
   f Odes 3.5.21 arma . . . / derepta uidi; uidi ego ciuium / retorta tergo bracchia libero.

Five of these are in the Satires and Epistles and only one in the Odes, but, contrary to what one might be tempted to conclude, this distribution cannot be used to argue that in the Satires and Epistles, but not the Odes, Horace was influenced by the usage of speech. In all five cases ego is itself contrastive, usually with tu. A use of ego which in prose in this position was rare, has become the norm in Horace; examples d and e are of the pattern seen in (116) and (117). Vidi ego (f) is, as we saw, a hackneyed collocation, and it is in the Odes.

I turn finally to Ovid. There are just 24 examples of the phenomenon in the whole of Ovid’s work, scattered across the various genres, and 13 of these consist of the expression uidi ego.\(^{28}\) It does not seem meaningful to attempt to analyse uidi ego in Ovid in terms of focus; it is a metrically useful line opening. Given that there are so few examples (11) outside this formula,\(^{29}\) it is obvious that Ovid has not exploited our enclitic pattern. Moreover it is not certain in any of these 11 examples that the verb is focused. In (122), for example, both quartus and ego are in antitheses with earlier terms:

(122) Ovid Her. 16.330 quartus in exemplis adnumerabor ego.

Ego can usually be interpreted as emphatic in some sense in the other cases.

In Catullus’ insubstantial corpus ego and tu do not often follow a verb, but when this placement does occur it is functional in the manner of prose and comedy. No poet of the Augustan period so faithfully represents this spoken usage. In Horace and Ovid ego tends to be emphatic when it

\(^{28}\) Am. 1.2.11, 2.2.47, 2.12.25, 3.4.13, AA 3.487, RA 101, Met. 12.327, 15.262, Trist. 2.143, 3.4.37, 3.5.11, 5.8.11, Pont. 1.1.51.

\(^{29}\) Am. 2.8.13, Trist. 3.11.25, Her. 3.90, 7.82, 16.330, 17.50, 17.122, 18.117, 21.54, Met. 2.570, 7.38.
comes after the verb. In Propertius and Tibullus we have what I describe as a debased postpositive use of ego. Propertius, however, admits a number of banal collocations verb + ego, and it is Propertius in this respect who is closest to Catullus.

**XI. SOME DISJUNCTIONS**

We saw in Section II some disjunctions, whereby a connective relative or hic was separated from a noun by ego, and such patterns were illustrated in Catullus. In the Catullan examples, with the minor exception of (123), the pronoun alone effects the separation:

(123) Catull. 86.2 haec ego sic singula confiteor.

In Augustan poetry the disjunction is often much longer, as for example in (124), where hunc ego begins the line, but dolorem does not come until the end of the line:

(124) Virg. Aen. 4.419 hunc ego si potui tantum sperare dolorem.

Since disjunctions and so-called 'enclosing' patterns of word-order are thought to be characteristic of Augustan poetry, I consider in this section the nature and distribution in poetry of those separations of which the first element comprises relative or demonstrative + ego (tu). Though there are obvious differences between (123) and (124), the enclosing order of (124) is clearly related to the tendency which we have discussed for ego to link itself to demonstratives. The question arises whether cases such as (124) represent a poetic development of an old pattern.

I repeat that in Catullus, with the exception of (123), the pronoun is the only word which separates the deictic from the noun. In this respect there is again a close similarity between Catullan and prose usage. I offer some statistics from Cicero. In the Verrine orations (including diu. Caec.) there are 24 cases of relative/demonstrative + ego followed by a noun. In 22 of the 24 cases the noun is located immediately after ego. The two exceptions show an adverb (maxime) and a subordinator (si) as additional separating constituents:

(125) a Verr. 2.183 quod ego maxime genus . . .

b Verr. 5.130 hunc ego si metum . . . deiecero.

But while such limited separations are the norm in Ciceronian prose, the

---

30 See Pearce (1966).
host of *ego* (i.e. the demonstrative or relative) from time to time is at a much greater remove from the associated noun. Consider first (126a):

(126) a Cic. *Tusc*. 5.64 *cuius ego* quaestor ignoratum ab Syracusanis, cum esse omnino negarent, saepturn undique et uestitum uepribus et dumetis *indagaui sepulchrum*
b *Sest*. 13 *cuius ego* nuper in Macedonia *uidi uestigia*
c *Flacc*. 106 eam *quam ego* patri suo quondam pro salute patriae *soponderim dignitatem*
d *Att*. 8.4.1 *cuius ego* cum satis cognossem *mores*
e *Att*. 13.33a.1 *horum ego uix attigi paenulam*
f *De orat*. 2.174 sic *has ego argumentorum notauui notas*
g Livy 2.2.7 *hunc tu... tua uolunate, L. Tarquini, remoue metum.*

Of note here (126a), apart from the length of the disjunction of *cuius* and *sepulchrum*, is the fact that *sepulchrum* is immediately after the verb, and that a second disjunction is embedded within the structure *cuius ego... sepulchrum*. I refer to the fact that the participial expression *saeptum... dumetis* is itself separated by the verb from *sepulchrum*. (126f) combines the same two features: *notauui* is in the penultimate position, and *argumentorum* is separated from *notas* by the verb. All of the examples in (126) have a verb in penultimate position. It is as if the verb announces the arrival of the noun which is to close the construction. That noun is usually focal.31

This is by no means the full extent of longer separations in Cicero. I have concentrated on a particular type. In Augustan poets when compared with Catullus there is a change in the balance between short and long separations. When *ego* takes part in a disjunction, it is more often hosted in poetry by *hic* than by *qui* (a reversal of the norm for prose), and the disjunction is long more often than short. Short disjunctions do of course occur, but I have noted only about 13 in Virgil, Horace and elegy.32 To what extent are longer separations in poetry artificial or distinctively ‘poetic’? Can they be related to prose usage?

I return to (124). It may be true that *hunc dolorem* frames the line, but in fact there is no great difference between this line and some of the

---

31 A participant at the Symposium suggested that in (126a) there is a correspondence between structure and meaning, in that the sentence describes the discovery of the tomb of Archimedes, and *sepulchrum* comes right at the end of the sentence. That may be so, but Cicero was able to achieve this correspondence because the appropriate structure existed already, to be exploited in this way.

separations which we have seen in Cicero. Note first that *dolorem* is object of a verb which immediately precedes it, as is the case in every one of the prose examples quoted in (126). Moreover the line opening *hunc ego si*, where *hunc* and *ego* syntactically belong within the *si*-clause, can be found in Cicero at (125b).

If there is a difference between (124) and the Ciceronian examples, it may lie in the place of the focus. In the examples in (126) the final noun often seems to be emphatic, whereas in (124) the focus seems rather to be on *sperare*. But there can be no doubt that the pattern represented in (124) had its origin in the spoken language, rather than in a contrived form of poetic diction.

In (124), as we saw, *hunc ego si* is followed by a verb. For this structure in verse, cf.:

(127) Hor. Epist. 1.7.34 **hac ego si compellar imagine.**

I quote in (128) further examples from verse which have the opening *hic ego si*:

(128) a Ovid Her. 18.27 *his ego si* uidi . . . / noctibus
     b Pont. 4.12.15 *his ego si* uitiis ausim corrumpere nomen.

I return to the structure showing a verb in penultimate position. In the examples cited in (126) the enclosing expression is object of the penultimate verb. In (127) it is an instrumental. In the poetic examples quoted in (129) an accusative is to be seen in f, but poets seem to have been prepared to exploit a wider range of cases in this position:

(129) a Prop. 1.6.11 *his ego* non horam possum *durare querelis*
     b Ovid Pont. 3.6.9 *huic ego*, quam patior, nil possem *demere poenae*
     c Hor. Epist. 1.1.27 restat ut *his ego* me ipse *regam solerque elementis*
     d Ovid Her. 19.128 *hac ego laedor aqua*
     e Prop. 4.8.33 *his ego constitui noctem lenire uocatis*
     f Lucr. 3.316 *quorum ego nunc nequeo caecas exponere causas.*

I would draw particular attention to (129f). Here the initial constituent is a relative, as often in prose. It is in the genitive, as again is typical of prose (see e.g. (126b)). And within the wider disjunction *quorum . . . causas* there is a secondary disjunction *caecas . . . causas*, as in the Ciceronian example (126a).

The type of disjunction which we have been considering was clearly domiciled in both verse and prose, though poets may have extended the range of cases in which the enclosing noun phrase might stand. The verb
seems to have had a role in indicating that the construction was about to end. For this type of clause-ending in clauses which do not have *ego* in second position, see (130):

(130)  

| a | Cic. Brut. 6 *hunc* autem ... *sustineret dolorem* |
| b | Phil. 12.9 *omnis* aequo animo belli *pattitur iniurias.* |

(130b) recalls Lucretius (129g) and Cicero (126f), in that there is a secondary disjunction of *belli* from *iniurias.*

Long disjunctions, or ‘enclosing’ word orders, have been the subject of some discussion. In this section I have dealt with just one type, that in which a demonstrative or relative attracts *ego* and is detached from an associated noun. In its simplest form, which is the predominating type in Cicero, *ego* alone is the disjoining element. This simple structure is represented a number of times in Catullus in examples which have structural parallels in Cicero, and which, we have suggested, are grounded in the patterns of real speech. The simple type in Augustan poetry is outnumbered by more complex disjunctions. But despite the greater frequency of these longer disjunctions in Augustan poetry as compared with Cicero or Catullus, the poetic examples can constantly be paralleled in structure in Cicero. I conclude that, even if poets may have developed complicated patterns of their own, a topic to which I will return in the next section, the basic structure rel./*hic* + *ego* + disjoined noun had its origin in real speech, at least of a formal kind. It should not be seen as an artificial invention of poetry, or as something inspired from outside Latin, but rather as a native Latin phenomenon.

XII. POETIC DEVELOPMENTS

I turn now to the exploitation of the structure *hic* + *ego* ... noun by Augustan poets. I take in turns various developments discernible particularly in Ovid.

(i) Usually the pair *hic* *ego* belongs syntactically in the same clause: that is, *ego* is subject of a verb with which the deictic is also associated, as its object for example or instrumental satellite. But it is not unusual, even in prose, for *hic* and *ego* to belong in different clauses. Thus in (131) *ego* belongs in the main clause as subject of *confiteor*, whereas *hisce* belongs in the dependent clause, as object of *uti*:

(131)  

| Cic. Planc. 87 *hisce* ego auxiliis studentibus atque incitatis uti me ... potuisse confiteor (= (ego confiteor) (me *hisce auxiliis uti potuisse)). |
An extension of structures of this type can be seen in the Ovidian example (132):

(132) Ovid AA 3.178 crediderim nymphas hac ego ueste tegi (=
(ego crediderim) (nymphas hac ueste tegi)).

But here the main verb crediderim precedes the dependent clause. Ego comes after the verb of which it is subject, and is in the wrong clause. It has tracked hac away from the start of the sentence well into the dependent clause. The position of ego is determined by that of its favoured host. A striking analogy for this placement of ego can be found later in the same book:

(133) Ovid AA 3.522 credere uix uideor, cum cogar credere partu, /
uos ego cum uestris concubuisse uiris.

Here again the verb phrase credere... uideor precedes the dependent clause in the second line. Ego is even more clearly detached from the main verb and embedded in the dependent clause, because an intervening cum-clause separates the main verb from its dependent clause. Ego is not in this case attached to hic, but it has a preferential term before it, namely an instance of uos which is emphatic in the context. In a way (133) is less remarkable than (132). The dependent clause occupies the whole of the second line. If that whole line could be placed before credere, then we would have much the same structure as that of (131). The whole dependent clause, with ego in its characteristic second position behind a preferential term, has been postponed. In (132), on the other hand, ego is not second word in the dependent clause, but is well within that clause.

(ii) The examples (134)–(136) differ from (132)–(133) in that ego and hic are syntactically in the same clause.

(134) Ovid Met. 8.771 nympha sub hoc ego sum Cereri gratissima 
ligno
(135) Ovid Trist. 5.5.28 fieri quis posse putaret, / ut facerem in 
mediis haec ego sacra Getis
(136) Prop. 2.34.58 ut regnem mixtas inter conuiua puellas / hoc 
ego, quo tibi nunc cleuor, ingenio.

They resemble (e.g.) (132) in that hic ego is not at the start of the clause but well within it. What these examples show is the intimate connection between hic and the nominative pronoun, and Ovid's readiness to displace the pair. If one is postponed, so too is the other. (136) resembles (133) because the whole second line could in theory be moved en bloc to the initial position (after ut) and a normal position for hoc ego restored.

(iii) In (136) a relative clause stands between hoc ego and ingenio. For this pattern, which is characteristic of Ovid, see (137)–(138):
(137) Ovid Pont. 3.6.9 *hui e g o, quam p a t i o r*, nihil possem demere
*poenae*

(138) Ovid Pont. 4.10.19 *h o s e g o, qui patriae faciant obliuia, suc o s.*

(iv) Finally, in (139) we see as usual *hac ego* separated from a noun (*nocte*):

(139) Ovid AA 2.138 *hac ego* sum *captis nocte* reuectus *equis*.

But within this disjunction there stands *captis*, which is itself disjoined from *equis*. A double disjunction of this type is more complex than a prose example such as (126a).

**XIII. CONCLUSION**

Any attempt to account for the use of the nominative pronouns *ego* and *tu* exclusively in terms of an opposition ‘emphatic’ vs. ‘unemphatic’, with the ‘unemphatic’ use perhaps ‘colloquial’, is misguided. There is undoubtedly an emphatic use of both pronouns, which is most readily detectable when they are contrastive. But there are many cases of *ego* and *tu* in high literature which cannot be described as emphatic in this sense. I have suggested that certain structural conditions are among the determinants which may generate the use of a nominative pronoun, regardless of whether that pronoun in the context is emphatic or not. *Ego* and *tu* have a tendency to attach themselves to certain preferential terms, that is terms which habitually are placed at the head of a colon.

When a use of *ego* is independently motivated, as for example by its contrastive emphasis, it will seek out the head of its clause. But if there is a relative, an emphatic demonstrative, an interrogative, an antithetical term or a negative present in the clause, *ego* may be excluded by these preferential terms from the first position. It therefore goes to the second place, in attachment to the preferential term. The types of terms which most often precede *ego* are thus preferential terms. A relationship is accordingly formed between preferential terms and *ego/tu*, such that the pronoun may sometimes be generated merely by the presence of its preferential host. It is also possible that this attachment of *ego* (or *tu*) to preferential terms was influenced by or related to a larger phenomenon, whereby enclitics in general in Latin (e.g. the copula and oblique case pronouns) tended to gravitate to preferential or focused terms (see (34)–(35)).

Our nominative usage is represented in verse as well as prose. Various nominative pronouns in Catullus which have caused commentators some puzzlement and have even led to emendation can be explained as typical
manifestations of the phenomenon, and we have seen that Catullan usage is very close in some respects to Ciceronian.

Discussions of poetic language tend to concentrate on the one hand on high-style vocabulary avoided in prose, and on the other on the presence of colloquialisms in lower genres. The phenomena dealt with in this paper cannot be classified in these terms. Fraenkel demonstrated in his work on colon structure that verse often falls into the types of cola found in prose. We have seen that certain quite intricate forms of disjunction in poetry, whereby hic in particular, with ego attached, is separated from a noun in agreement, are not the inventions of poets but are based in the spoken, or rather, formal spoken language. This aspect of poetic discourse reflects the fact that verse was intended to be read aloud, and it could therefore not reject entirely the communicative processes of formal speech. The collocation hic ego readily triggers the expectation that a disjunction may follow, and a later verb in its turn creates the expectation that that disjunction is about to end. Some poets, notably Ovid of those considered here, were able to develop the complexity of such disjunctions beyond that normally found in prose, whereas Catullus adhered to the types of patterns which would readily have been heard in speech.

Note. I am grateful to Professors H. D. Jocelyn, R. G. M. Nisbet, J. G. F. Powell and M. Winterbottom for their very helpful comments on a version of this paper.
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