



UDC 811.124+81-119

Verg. *Aen.* 9. 427: A linguist's perspective*

Elena V. Zheltova

St. Petersburg State University,
7–9, Universitetskaya nab., St. Petersburg, 199034, Russian Federation;
e.zheltova@spbu.ru, elena.zheltova@mail.ru

For citation: Zheltova E. V. Verg. *Aen.* 9. 427: A linguist's perspective. *Philologia Classica* 2023, 18 (1), 139–148. <https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu20.2023.112>

This article offers a linguistic commentary on the verse Verg. *Aen.* 9. 427 *me, me, adsum qui feci, in me conuertite ferrum*, in which the personal pronoun in the accusative needs interpretation. Since the time of Servius and Donatus, the opinions of commentators have been divided. Servius and his followers believe that the pronoun in the accusative is a direct complement that depends on an implied (omitted) verb like *interficite, occidite, or petite*, and consider this place as a rhetorical figure of aposiopesis. Donatus, on the other hand, argues that the accusative *me, me* is independent, while discontinuous intonation with which the whole verse must be uttered emphasizes the extreme degree of despair of Nisus, who cannot prevent the death of his beloved friend Euryalus. A review of the commentaries on the *Aeneid* shows that there are slightly more supporters of Donatus' hypothesis than that of Servius', but all of their reasoning is intuitive and does not explain why it is the syntactically independent accusative that gives the agitated sounding to Nisus' last words. The author of the article applies the pragmatic approach to the interpretation of this place, analyzing similar examples of “non-syntactic” use of the accusative and considering both traditional and modern views on this phenomenon. As a result, the author comes to the conclusion that the verse under consideration corresponds to what in modern linguistics is called “cleft construction”. Such constructions exist in different languages and serve to express the focus of contrast. At the end of the study, the author attempts to answer the question of why Latin employs the accusative as a tool to express intense emotions.

Keywords: Virgil, *Aeneid*, Latin, pragmatics, accusative, contrastive focus, cleft constructions.

* The study was conducted as part of the collective research project “Grammar of covert categories in Latin and Ancient Greek” supported by the Russian Science Foundation (project no. 22-28-00531). I am indebted to Tatiana V. Kostyleva for the careful proofreading of the article.

The daring night raid of the young friends Nisus and Euryalus in the ninth book of the *Aeneid* is one of the most dramatic episodes in Virgil's poem. After having slaughtered several Rutulians, both friends die heroically — unwilling to leave his beloved friend alone on his dangerous mission and volunteering to accompany him, Euryalus falls into the hands of the enemy, while Nisus, already out of danger, is killed at the moment he returns to rescue Euryalus. In the climax scene, when the Rutulians are about to massacre Euryalus, Nisus, feeling guilty for engaging his friend in the adventure, rushes from his shelter shouting out his final words of sadness and despair:

- (1) ... *tum uero exterritus, amens,
conclamat Nisus nec se celare tenebris
amplius aut tantum potuit perferre dolorem:
'me, me, adsum qui feci, in me conuertite ferrum,
o Rutuli! mea fraus omnis, nihil iste nec ausus
nec potuit; caelum hoc et conscia sidera testor;
tantum infelicem nimium dilexit amicum.'* (Verg. *Aen.* 9. 424–430)

‘... Loud shrieked Nisus, of reason reft, who could not bear such horror, nor in sheltering gloom of night longer abide: “T is I, ‘t is I!” he said. look on the man who slew them! Draw on me your swords, Rutulians! The whole stratagem was mine, mine only, and the lad ye slay dared not, and could not. O, by Heaven above and by the all-beholding stars I swear, he did but love his hapless friend too well.” (Transl. by Th. C. Williams)

These tragic words attracted the attention of Servius and Donatus, who both focused on the emotionally reduplicated personal pronoun in the accusative (9. 427), but treated it quite differently. Servius regards “*me, me*” as direct complement depending on the verb like *interficite* ‘to kill’, which is not expressed overtly but implied by the author:

- (2) *me me subaudis ‘interficite’: et est interrupta elocutio dolore turbati.* (Serv. *Aen.* 9. 427).
‘**Me, me** implies *interficite*, and this is a broken utterance of a man disturbed by grief.’

The grammarian also suggests that “*me, me*” should be considered an aposiopesis similar to the famous *quos ego!* uttered by Neptune in *Aen.* 1. 135,¹ which does not seem convincing because “*me, me*” has continuation in subsequent “*adsum qui feci*”, unlike “*quos ego*” pronounced without syntactic connection to any constituent in the line.

In contrast to Servius, Donatus emphasizes the emotional tension and the discontinuous nature of Nisus’ agitated speech. As for the repeated “*me, me*”, Donatus argues that its accusative form does not depend on the implied *interficite*, but rather functions as the subject of an incomplete clause:

- (3) *Nisus contra ait ‘me me adsum qui feci, in me convertite ferrum, o Rutuli!’ deficientis vox fuit per nimium dolorem. Denique quod animus tenebat non potuit semel effundere. Ait ergo ‘me’ et, cum deesset continuatio verborum sequentium, ait iterum ‘me’, tertio, ubi coepit paulatim sese colligere, adiunxit ‘adsum qui feci’, quarto ‘in me convertite ferrum’. Cum igitur haec pronuntiantur, separanda sunt, ne coniuncta minuant intellectum ma-*

¹ “*Quos ego* deficit hoc loco sermo; et congrue, quasi irati et turbatae mentis, ut alibi “*me me, adsum*” <...> *Quos ego* subauditur ‘*ulciscar*’. ergo ἀποσιώπησις est, hoc est, ut ad alium sensum transeat, ideo abruptum et pendentem reliquit.” (Serv. *Aen.* 1. 135).

gna subtilitate dispositum. Quod autem duplicatum est me, infra conpletum est adiectione facta verborum quae inter initia secuta non fuerant. (Claud. Donat. *Verg.* 9, 427).

‘And Nisus, in turn, says: “Me, me, it’s me, who have done this, turn your weapon on me, Rutulians!” — this was the voice of the man who was losing his vigour because of the excessive sorrow. He could not pour out in one go all that his soul embraced. Therefore, he says “me” and as he is unable to utter words that he is intending to speak next, he says “me” again, and the third time, when he begins to gather his thoughts little by little, he adds “me, who have done”, and the fourth time — “turn your weapon on me”. While being pronounced, these parts should be pronounced separately because if you merge them together, you will distort the meaning arranged with great elegance. As for the double “me”, it is further supplemented by the addition of the words that were not spoken next to what was said in the beginning.’

Since Servius’ and Donatus’ time, two lines of interpretation of this accusative have emerged, which are also supported by 19th- and 20th-century commentators. I will try to decide, from the standpoint of modern linguistics, which one is more valid.

Frieze (1862, 564), Aubertin (455), Chase (1884, 384), and many other scholars suggest supplying *interficite*, *occidite* or *petite* as implicit governing verbs for “*me, me*”, and thus follow Servius’ interpretation. Sidgwick (1890, 395) argues that “the verb is obvious and needless”, because Vergil “supplies the place later with a new structure, *in me convertite ferrum*”. Frieze and Sidgwick join Servius’ view on “*me, me*” as aposiopesis with the omitted verb like *convertite* but do not take into account that in this case, the pronoun must have a preposition with it.

Henry (1889, 895), in his turn, compares the passage under discussion with Lucan 2. 315 *me solum invadite* and concludes that the explicit governing verb in Lucan’s verse makes it “as unlike the dramatic action of our text as anything could possibly be”.² Therefore, Henry is closer to Donatus than to Servius. In the same vein, Page (1914, 277) claims that “to supply a verb to govern the accusative would spoil the living passion of the line”. Hardie (1994, 149) underlines that “the repeated *me, me* is given greater emphasis through having no grammatical dependence within the sentence”. In Hardie’s opinion, the passion is lost in the case of grammatical dependence, like in Seneca’s imitation in *Phaedra* 1159–1161: *me, me, profundi saeue dominator freti, inuade et in me monstra caerulei maris emitte*. Hardie also insists that in mouth of Euryalus’ mother (*Aen.* 9. 493–494 — the episode following the death of the two heros) “the challenge to the enemy’s weapons becomes mere emotional rhetoric: *figite me, si qua est pietas, in me omnia tela conicite, o Rutuli, me primam absumite ferro*” (Hardie 1994, 149). Actually, there are quite a few occurrences of reduplicated *me, me* in late Latin poetry, closely reminding of and probably modelled on the Vergilian line, e. g., Sen. *Tr.* 680 *me me sternite hic ferro prius*; Sen. *Herc.* 110 *me me sorores, mente deiectam mea, versate primam*; see also Sil. *Pun.* 4. 798; Stat. *Theb.* 1. 651.³ In all these examples, the constituents in the accusative are mere direct objects of the explicit verbs, which seems to reduce the expressiveness of these passages compared to *Aen.* 9. 427.

² “Lucan is always the rhetorician, never the poet; a commentator on the action, never the actor” (Henry 1889, 895).

³ I am grateful to Michael Pozdnev for these parallels as well as for the careful reading of the first version of this paper and for helpful and valuable advice.

Evidently, both Servius and Donatus have enough followers, with Donatus' opinion having a slight preponderance over that of Servius. But unfortunately, none explains why "having no grammatical dependence within the sentence" gives greater emphasis and "living passion" to the line, while adding the governing verb kills all this.

In attempt to answer this question, I will address some other examples of syntactically independent uses of the accusative case. They are not abundant but still occur in Latin, more frequently in the language of the Roman comedy (4–6) but not restricted to it (7–9):

- (4) *Sed istum, quem quaeris, ego sum.* (Plaut. *Curc.* 419)
'But **the one** you are seeking is me.'
- (5) *Naucratem, quem convenire volui, in navi non erat.* (Plaut. *Amph.* 1009)
'**Naurates** whom I wanted to come — he was not in the ship.'
- (6) *Eunuchum, quem dedisti nobis, quas turbas dedit!* (Ter. *Eun.* 653)
'(As for the) **eunuch** whom you have given us — how much turmoil he has made!'
- (7) *Agrum quem uir habet tollitur.* (Cato. *Orat.* 114)
'The **field** which a man owns is taken away.'
- (8) *Urbem, quam statuo, vestra est.* (Verg. *Aen.* 1. 573)
'And the **city** that I build, it is yours.'
- (9) *Hunc adolescentem, quem vides, malo astro natus est.* (Petron. 134. 8)
'But the **young man** you see, he was born under the unhappy star.'

In traditional grammars, such cases are either not explained at all (Bennett 1908; 1914; Stolz, Schmalz 1910; Kühner, Stegmann 1912; Woodcock 1959; Menge 2009) or referred to as *Attractio casus* (Ernout, Thomas 1953, 24; Hofman, Szantyr 1972, 29), which hardly seems sufficient to answer our question, why independent accusative imparts greater emphasis than the dependent one.

In modern literature on Latin linguistics, the problem is addressed and treated in different ways. Thus, Olga Álvarez Huerta (2005) equates the syntactic function of such accusatives as in ex. (4–9) with that of the nominatives which are traditionally coined as *Nominativus pendens*, cf. (10):

- (10) *Nunc adeo tu, qui meus es, iam edico tibi...* (Plaut. *Pseud.* 855)
'And now, **you**, who belongs to me, to you I say!'

Álvarez Huerta has proposed a new term *Accusativus pendens* for these and some other instances of the accusative case. She believes that *Accusativus pendens* is a kind of "left-dislocation" (or, to put it another way, "New Topic"), which conveys a piece of new information and, thus, performs the pragmatic function of focus (Álvarez Huerta 2005, 435).⁴

Grounded in the traditional idea of attraction, Anna Pompei (2011, 468) came up with the idea that instances like (7) and (8) are nothing but *Attractio inversa*, or regressive attraction. This means that "a (pro)nominal head is not in the case required by its function within the matrix clause, but rather in the same case as the relative pronoun. In all

⁴ Álvarez Huerta considers these and some other examples including *Aen.* 9. 427 as *Acc. pendens*.

instances of this phenomenon, the lexical head is immediately before the relative pronoun, and as a rule the relative clause precedes the matrix clause". Pompei does not analyze specifically the cases with pronominal head in the accusative but only mentions them, and, therefore, does not help us solving the problem.

The phenomenon of left-dislocation and regressive attraction in the context of historical development of the Latin language has been analyzed in detail by Hilla Halla-Aho (2016, 384). She discussed the question of whether the regressive attraction in the accusative was characteristic of either archaic or spoken language and to what extent the historically changing status of the accusative could affect this phenomenon. Halla-Aho argues that the regressive attraction is "at no period a mechanical process but certain conditions have to be met for the attraction to happen". Insufficient data, however, have not so far allowed us to single out such conditions (Halla-Aho 2016, 386).

It is to be stressed that *Aen.* 9. 427, albeit somewhat similar to examples analyzed by Anna Pompei and Hilla Halla-Aho, cannot be treated as regressive attraction because the relative pronoun (*qui*) is in the nominative while the pronominal head (*me, me*) is in the accusative.

It is clear that neither traditional nor modern works answer our question. Meanwhile, instances like 4–9 as well as *Aen.* 9. 427 can be regarded within the framework of the pragmatic function that is wide-spread cross-linguistically and has been studied quite sufficiently. As one can see, all these examples demonstrate a more or less similar syntactic structure which consists of a main clause with the first argument in the accusative (marked in bold in the examples analyzed) and a subordinate relative clause that modifies the accusative subject of the main clause. Such structure corresponds perfectly well to what is referred to as cleft construction or cleft sentence.

Actually, there are different opinions concerning cleft constructions in Latin. For example, Gualtiero Calboli believes that for Latin, in contrast to the Romance languages which developed from it, cleft constructions are not specific and used very rarely: "In Latin it was impossible to give special emphasis ("Hervorhebung") to some words through the 'cleft' because of the language's greater freedom of word order compared with that of the Romance languages" (Calboli 1996, 431; 2005, 238). On the contrary, Olga Spevak (2010, 55), Eugenio Gorla (2013), Roland Hoffmann (2016), Harm Pinkster (2020, 644) among others, hold the view that cleft constructions are pretty common in Latin. Hoffmann even proposed a detailed synchronic and diachronic classification of cleft sentences. But the vast majority of the examples in Hoffmann's article as well as in the other works contain the first argument in the nominative rather than in the accusative and only one may be compared to ours.⁵

Taking into account the paucity of examples, let us address the classical description of cleft constructions to check, if *Aen.* 9. 427 is really a relevant case.

On the example of the English sentence "It was John's watch, that Peter found in the garden", Simon Dik (1997, 293–294) proposed the following description of the prototypical Cleft: "It is an identifying construction, in which some entity, described by means of expressions such as the thing that Peter found in the garden is identified as being nothing else than another entity, described by such expressions as John's watch. The identifying ex-

⁵ *Epidicum quis est qui revocat?* (Plaut. *Epid.* 201). 'And who exactly is calling Epidicus?' (Gorla 2013, 154, ex. 15; Hoffmann 2016, 206, ex. 29). To my mind, this is not a cleft construction proper, but rather the example of *Accusativus prolepticus* which will be discussed below.

pression (John's watch) constitutes the Focus of the Cleft predication; the other term (what Peter found in the garden) is the Given Topic of the construction. The Given Topic presents an entity presupposed to be available to the Addressee; the Focus presents the most salient information, usually that which is supposed to be new to the Addressee. Thus, in the prototypical case, the pragmatic import of the Cleft construction can be represented as follows: I assume you already know that Peter found something in the garden. Well, I can now inform you that the something was nothing else than John's watch."

We can now apply this description to *Aen.* 9. 427. In the sentence *me, me, adsum qui feci, in me conuertite ferrum*, the relative clause *qui feci* is typical Given Topic, since the enemies who captured Euryalus are already aware of the slaughter of their fellows, while *me, me* is Focus of the Cleft predication. Certainly, one may notice small deviations from the prototypical cleft construction, such as the absence of the expletive pronoun like *It* in English, which brings about the verb (i. e. *adsum*) in the 1st instead of the 3rd person. But deviations from the prototypical construction are not uncommon and have been sufficiently described in literature (Dik 1997, 291–330; Lambrecht 2001), and besides, the absence of cleft pronoun in languages such as Latin is considered the norm (Hoffmann 2016, 208). Concerning the verb *adsum*, it's no matter that it does not perfectly fit in the definition of copula verb. As Goría points out (2013, 150), "the elements working as copulae or subordinators in one language are not necessarily of the same nature as their equivalent in another language", therefore I suppose that in *Aen.* 9. 427, *adsum* is likely to function as both a copula and a meaningful verb signifying "it's me who did it, and here I am".⁶

Importantly, cleft constructions are only one morphosyntactic means to convey focus, and to be more precise, the *contrastive* focus which introduces opposition between the two elements, one of them being expressed explicitly or implicitly. Personal pronouns, in particular, are often contrastive (Spevak 2010, 45–46), and this is the case of "*me, me*" shouted out by Nisus: it implies that Nisus is opposed to Euryalus as the true culprit of the incident.

As regards the question, why the subject with focus function takes the accusative case instead of the nominative, I dare to suppose that the reason is that the accusative cross-linguistically marks constituents with focus function, including that of contrastive focus (see Calboli 1996, 434; 2005, 238; Álvarez Huerta 2005, 438; Zheltov, Zheltova 2008, 139, among many others).

Let us consider several examples from Ancient Greek and some modern languages.

In ex. (11) from "Odyssey", Athena first tells Telemachus about the suitors and then switches to the new topic — his mother. Noteworthy, the constituent μητέρα is in the accusative which is syntactically independent, but from the pragmatic point of view, it is in the position of left-dislocation, i. e. performs the focus function. The adversative connector δ' highlights the contrast and gives the considerable emphasis to μητέρα:

- (11) μνηστῆρας μὲν ἐπὶ σφέτερα σκίδνασθαι ἄνωχθι,
μητέρα δ', εἴ οἱ θυμὸς ἐφορμᾶται γαμέεσθαι,
 ἄψ ἴτω ἐς μέγαρον πατρὸς μέγα δυναμένοιο. (Hom. *Od.* 1. 274–276)

'Let the suitors go to their homes, but as for the mother, if she has a heart for marriage, let her go to the home of her powerful father.'

⁶ Cf. Goría 2013, 157.

In ex. (12) from Sophocles, Λαῖον is in the so called proleptic accusative (*Accusativus prolepticus*)⁷ which performs the function of focus by taking the fronting position in the main clause rather than in the subordinate one.

- (12) Ὅστις ποθ' ὑμῶν Λαῖον τὸν Λαβδάκου κάτοιιδεν ἀνδρὸς ἐκ τίνος διώλετο...
(Soph. OT 224–225)

‘Whoever among you knows **Laius**, the son of Labdacus, by whom he was slain...’

In the next example from Sophocles (13), Creon interrogates Antigone as to whether or not she has committed the ritual burial of Polinicus:

- (13) Σὲ δὴ, σὲ τὴν νεύουσαν εἰς πέδον κάρᾳ,
φής, ἢ καταρνῆ μὴ δεδρακέναι τάδε; (Soph. Ant. 441–442)

‘But you, you, bowed head, do you say or refute that you did it?’

The accusative Σὲ δὴ, σὲ, though formally the subject of AcI, is separated from the infinitive δεδρακέναι by the embedded clause (τὴν νεύουσαν εἰς πέδον κάρᾳ)⁸ and the governing verbs (φής, ἢ καταρνῆ) and thus acquires a greater emphasis. In my opinion, this example is very close to the Latin one observed above and can also be considered left-dislocation with focus function. In addition, the highly emotional sounding of this line is complemented by the expressive reduplication.

No less interesting is ex. (14) from Demosthenes, in which the syntactically independent extraclausal element⁹ in the accusative τὸν δὲ Μάνην is in the position of left-dislocation and clearly functions as contrastive focus:

- (14) Τὸν δὲ Μάνην, δανείσας ἀργύριον Ἀρχεπόλιδι τῷ Πειραιεῖ, ἐπειδὴ οὐχ οἶός τ' ἦν αὐτῷ ἀποδοῦναι ὁ Ἀρχεπόλις οὔτε τὸν τόκον οὔτε τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἅπαν, ἐναπετίμησεν αὐτῷ.
(Dem. 53, 20)

‘As for **Manes**, who lent money to Archepolis... since Archepolis was unable to pay him either interest or principal, he paid him off differently...’

In some modern languages, the pronouns in the accusative with untypical syntactic functions can also be given the additional emphasis and thus perform the pragmatic function of focus. In English, for instance, one can answer the question “Who is the winner?” as follows (15):

- (15) *The winner is me.*

The syntactically independent extraclausal elements like in (16) are also marked in the accusative:

- (16) *Us, the Browns, we never do such things.*

⁷ About *Accusativus prolepticus* as focus see, in particular, Álvarez Huerta (2005, 439).

⁸ It is worth noticing that the attributive construction consisting of the participle τὴν νεύουσαν with its dependents is functionally similar to relative clauses in cleft sentences.

⁹ In modern literature, such extraclausal elements are referred to as “Theme”, see more in Pinkster 2020, 647.

And finally, the focal pronouns in cleft constructions are commonly marked in the accusative in English (17) and French (18):¹⁰

(17) *It is **me** who did it.*

(18) *C'est **moi**, qui l'a fait.*

It is to be underlined again that such accusatives are syntactically independent, which was spotted by Donatus and some later commentators on Verg. *Aen.* 9. 427. This brings us back to our principal question: why “the repeated *me*, *me* is given greater emphasis through having no grammatical dependence within the sentence” (Hardie 1994, 149) while “supplying a verb to govern the accusative would spoil the living passion of the line” (Page 1914, 277).

To solve this issue, let us address another construction in which the syntactically independent noun phrases (NP) in the accusative is used, that is *Accusativus exclamatio-nis*. It is employed to express a whole array of emotional connotations (joy, indignation, despair, unbelief, surprise *etc.*), as, for example, in (19):

(19) *O **hominem lepidum!*** (Plaut. *Pseud.* 931)

‘Oh, what a nice man!’

There is an extensive literature on the question how to explain the use of the accusative in exclamations, and Harm Pinkster (2015, 367) points out that “proposals to explain it as a normal object with a verb of saying or a verb to be supplied from the context are unconvincing”.¹¹ What seems to me really convincing, is the attempt to compare the exclamative accusatives with other focus-marking constructions (including those discussed above) and to show that they share some crucial syntactic and pragmatic properties (see García 2018). This way of focus marking may indicate the presence of different emotions and affectations, in particular, of non-fulfilled speaker expectations and concomitant surprise, which belongs to the domain of mirativity (see Zheltova 2018, 230–232).¹² One can hardly deny that the emotional potential of the accusative, be it part of an exclamative construction or a cleft sentence, may also encompass fear for the beloved friend and despair in the face of the imminent demise.

In sum, I would suggest that the common syntactic behaviour and the ability to convey vivid emotions bring together the exclamative accusatives and other focus-marking constructions in the accusative, to which the cleft sentence “*me, me adsum qui feci*” belongs, too. What makes the enigmatic Vergil’s verse truly unique is the rare combination of several focus strategies in a single line, i. e. the combination of left-dislocation, cleft construction with pronominal subject in the accusative, and expressive reduplication. With

¹⁰ The similarity of cleft sentences in French and English as possible result of the supposed pragmatic borrowing is discussed in literature, cf. Trips, Stein 2018.

¹¹ This view goes hand in hand with the idea that the accusatives in question depend on the omitted governing verb (Bennett 1914, 256; Ernout, Thomas 1953, 24; Hofman, Szantyr 1972, 290). Bennett, though mentions this *opinio communis*, is far from being sure about its plausibility: “The elliptical theory of origin, therefore, while sufficiently plausible in itself and probably worthy of provisional acceptance, cannot be regarded as proved by the extant literature” (Bennett 1914, 256).

¹² Interestingly, exclamative clauses usually have overtones of surprise and new and/or unexpected information and *vice versa*, miratives can be used as markers of rhetorical questions in some languages (Aikhenvald 2012, 474–475).

all these in mind, I propose to translate the line as follows: “It’s me, me, who did it, and here I am! Draw on me your swords, Rutulians!”

References

- Aikhenvald A. Y. The essence of mirativity. *Linguistic Typology* 2012, 16, 435–485.
- Álvarez Huerta O. ¿Accusativus pendens en latín? In: G. Calboli (ed.) *Latina Lingua! Proceedings of the Twelfth International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics (Bologna, 9–14 June 2003)*. [Papers on Grammar IX. — 2005]. Roma, Herder, 2005, 433–442.
- Aubertin Ch. (ed., comm.) *Publii Virgilio Maronis Opera*. Paris, Librairie Classique Eugène Belin, 1889.
- Bennett C. E. *A Latin Grammar*. Boston and Chicago, Allyn and Bacon, 1908.
- Bennett C. E. *Syntax of Early Latin*. Vol. II: The Cases. Boston, Allyn and Bacon, 1914.
- Calboli G. The accusative as a default case in Latin. In: H. Rosén (ed.) *Aspects of Latin. Papers from the Seventh International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics, Jerusalem, April 1993*. Innsbruck, 1996, 423–436.
- Calboli G. The accusative as a ‘default’ case in Latin subordinate clauses. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 2005, 110, 233–264.
- Chase Th. (ed., notes) *Aeneid of Vergil*. Philadelphia, Eldredge and Brothers, 1884.
- Dik S. C. *The Theory of Functional Grammar*. Vol. 2. 2nd ed., rev. by Kees Hengeveld. Berlin — New York, Mouton de Gruyter, 1997.
- Frieze H. S. (ed., notes) *Virgil’s Aeneid*. New York, D. Appleton and Co., 1862.
- García García M. NP exclamatives and focus. In: M. García García and M. Uth (eds) *Focus Realization in Romance and Beyond*. Amsterdam — Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 2018, 229–252.
- Goria E. Towards a taxonomy of Latin cleft sentences. *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 2013, 12(2), 147–172.
- Halla-Aho H. Left-detached constructions from early to late Latin (nominativus pendens and attractio inuversa). In: J. N. Adams, N. Vincent (eds) *Early and Late Latin: Continuity or change?* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2016, 367–389.
- Hardie Ph. (ed.) *Virgil. Aeneid*. Book IX. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Henry J. (ed.) *Aeneidea*, or critical, exegetical, and aesthetical remarks on the *Aeneis*, with a personal collation of all the first class mss., upwards of one hundred second class mss., and all the principal editions. Vol. 3. Dublin, Ponsonby and Weldrick, 1889.
- Hofmann J. B., Szantyr A. *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*. Teil 2. Bd. 2. München, C. H. Beck, 1972.
- Hoffmann R. Latin cleft constructions, synchronically, diachronically, and typologically reconsidered. *Études de linguistique latine I. — Pallas. Revue d’études antiques* 2016, 102, 201–210.
- Kühner R., Stegmann C. *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*. Zweite Teil: Satzlehre. Erster Band. Hannover, Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1912.
- Lambrecht K. A framework for the analysis of cleft constructions. *Linguistics* 2001, 39 (3), 463–516.
- Menge H. *Lehrbuch der lateinischen Syntax und Semantik*. Völlig neu bearbeitet von Thorsten Burkard und Markus Schauer. Darmstadt, WBG, 42009.
- Page T. E. (ed., introd., and notes) *The Aeneid of Vergil*. Books 7–12. London, Macmillan and Co., 1914.
- Pompei A. P. Relative clauses. In: P. Baldi, P. Cuzzolin (eds) *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax*. Vol. 4: *Complex Sentences, Grammaticalization, Typology*. Berlin — New York, Mouton de Gruyter, 2011, 427–548.
- Stolz F., Schmalz J. H. *Lateinische Grammatik. Laut- und Formenlehre, Syntax und Stylistik*. München, C. H. Beck, 31910.
- Sidgwick A. P. (ed., notes) *Virgilio Maronis opera*. Vol. 2. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1890.
- Spevak O. *Constituent order in classical Latin prose*. Amsterdam — Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 2010.
- Trips C., Stein A. Cleft sentences in the history of French and English. A case of pragmatic borrowing? In: M. García García and M. Uth (eds) *Focus Realization in Romance and Beyond*. Amsterdam — Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 2018, 287–310.
- Williams Th. C. (transl.) *Virgil. Aeneid*. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1910.
- Woodcock E. C. *A New Latin Syntax*. London, Bristol Classical Press, 1959.
- Zhelotov A. Y., Zheltova E. V. Classical Languages and the Typology of Role Marking. *Hyperboreus. Studia Classica* 2008, 14 (1), 118–140.

Verg. Aen. 9. 427: взгляд лингвиста*

Елена Владимировна Желтова

Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет,
Российская Федерация, 199034, Санкт-Петербург, Университетская наб., 7–9;
e.zheltova@spbu.ru, elena.zheltova@mail.ru

Для цитирования: Zheltova E. V. Verg. Aen. 9. 427: A linguist’s perspective. *Philologia Classica* 2023, 18 (1), 139–148. <https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu20.2023.112>

В статье предлагается лингвистический комментарий к стиху Verg. Aen. 9. 427 *me, me, adsum qui feci, in te conuertite ferrum*, в котором личное местоимение в аккумулятиве нуждается в толковании. Со времен античных грамматиков Сервия и Доната мнения комментаторов разделились. Сервий и его последователи полагают, что местоимение в аккумулятиве является прямым дополнением, которое зависит от подразумеваемого (опущенного) глагола вроде *interficite, occidite* или *petite*, и что рассматриваемое место представляет собой риторическую фигуру апосиопезы. Донат, напротив, придерживается мнения о независимом характере аккумулятива и считает, что прерывистая интонация, с которой должен произноситься весь стих, подчеркивает крайнюю степень отчаяния Ниса, который не может предотвратить гибель любимого друга Эвриала. Анализ нескольких комментированных изданий «Энеиды» показывает, что сторонников гипотезы Доната несколько больше, чем Сервия, однако все их рассуждения носят интуитивный характер и не объясняют, почему именно синтаксически независимый аккумулятив придает взволнованный оттенок последним словам Ниса. Автор статьи применяет прагматический подход к толкованию данного места, анализирует аналогичные примеры «несинтаксического» использования аккумулятива и взгляды на данную проблему как авторов традиционных грамматик, так и современных лингвистов разных направлений. В результате автор приходит к выводу, что толкуемое место более всего соответствует тому, что в современной лингвистике называется клефт-конструкцией. Подобные конструкции существуют в разных языках и служат для выражения фокуса контраста. В конце исследования предлагается ответ на поставленный в статье вопрос, почему в качестве инструмента для выражения сильных эмоций латинский язык использует именно аккумулятив.

Ключевые слова. Вергилий, Энеида, латинский язык, прагматика, аккумулятив, фокус контраста, клефт-конструкции.

Received: January 18, 2023

Accepted: April 25, 2023

* Исследование проводилось в ходе работы над коллективным проектом «Грамматика скрытых категорий в латинском и древнегреческом языках» (грант РФФ № 22-28-00531).