

THE IMPERATIVE IN *-TO* IN PLAUTUS AND TERENCE

1. INTRODUCTION

Latin is one of the best documented and most extensively studied of any language: nearly every area has been subject to continued and intense scrutiny, with ideas from recent subfields of linguistics providing a fresh look at some old topics.¹ The Latin future (or *-to*) imperative, the form that conveys commands for non-immediate execution, constitutes precisely such a topic in Latin linguistics: from the Roman Imperial period on, students have demarcated the usages, syntax and context-specific features associated with this form; more recently, scholars have applied ideas from various linguistic subfields to achieve new insights.² Given that the *-to* imperative is so well understood, it might come as a surprise to find that some matters pertaining to it are still debated. This paper will address four such contested areas: first, its register (is it colloquial—that is, a feature of everyday speech—or elevated?); second, the form's politeness (is the *-to* imperative 'softer' than the present imperative?); third, the temporal scope of the *-to* imperative (can it ever *really* pertain to orders for immediate execution, and thus overlap with the present imperative?); and fourth, the sensitivity of the form to social factors, that is, to the identity of the speaker and the addressee. (Did slaves avoid using the form with superiors? Did women, held to be more polite than men, refrain from it? By contrast, was the speech of citizen males characterized by a high frequency of the *-to* imperative?)

In what follows, I first survey the state of the question for each of these topics, then attempt to address each by applying ideas from linguistics and some simple statistical

¹ For instance, pragmatics, functional grammar and sociolinguistics. For holistic perspectives on Latin that take into account the former two fields, students have recourse to H. Pinkster, *Latin Syntax and Semantics* (London, 1990) and now to H. Pinkster, *Oxford Latin Syntax* (Oxford, 2015). For the last-named field, sociolinguistics, readers may consult most recently J.N. Adams, *Social Variation in the Latin Language* (Cambridge, 2013), or, for an introduction, J. Clackson 'The social dialects of Latin', in J. Clackson (ed.), *A Companion to the Latin Language* (Malden, MA, 2011), 505–26.

² For dates and further information on the Latin grammarians cited throughout this article on the *-to* imperative, see the prosopography with bibliographical references in R. Kaster, *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, CA, 1988), 233–440. The first stop in attempting to understand the *-to* imperative is, of course, at the standard grammars, H.–Sz. 340–1, and K.–St. 1.196; see also Pinkster (n. 1 [1990]), 220. Numerous specialized studies also exist. E. Loch, *Zum Gebrauch des Imperativus bei Plautus* (Memel, 1871) offers a collection of material, as does C. Bennett, *Syntax of Early Latin*, vol. 1: *The Verb* (Hildesheim, 1966), 354–61. O. Riemann, 'La question de l'impératif latin en *-to*', *RPh* 10 (1886), 161–87 and H. Vairel-Carron, *Exclamation, Ordre, et Défense* (Paris, 1975) deal with issues that will be taken up below, as does R. Risselada's work, *The Imperative and Other Directive Expressions in Latin: A Study in the Pragmatics of a Dead Language* (Amsterdam, 1993), which deals with the Latin directive, including the *-to* imperative, with the help of speech-act theory, politeness and discourse analysis.

tests to the analysis of a relatively large corpus of linguistic data.³ For us, this corpus consists of all tokens of the future (or *-to*) imperative.⁴ Table 1 summarizes this data by categorizing all the tokens in Roman comedy, according to the constructions in which they appear.

Table 1: Syntactical forms featuring *-to* imperative, distribution in Plautus and Terence.

<i>The -to imperative is ...</i>	Plautus	Terence
alone. ⁵	213 (57.7%)	38 (58.5%)
coordinated with pr. imper. ⁶	38 (10.3%)	6 (9.2%)
+ subordinate clause with future verb. ⁷	83 (22.5%)	19 (29.2%)
+ subordinate clause with pr. indic. or subj.; or perf. indic. ⁸	10 (2.7%)	2 (3.1%)
+ future verb in asyndeton. ⁹	25 (6.8%)	0 (0.0%)
TOTAL	369	65

With this complete data, and the application of simple statistical tests, to be explained when relevant, we will be in a position to address the problems posed above.

First, however, a brief review of some well-known features of the *-to* imperative will set the stage. According to the common view, this form originates from verb-stem plus archaic ablative of a demonstrative, **tod* (hence **age tod*, meaning ‘from that point on, drive’), and the *-to* imperative conveys commands intended for non-immediate realization. That is, such commands look to execution at some future time, or at any time

³ This approach was identified as ‘21st-century philology’ by D. Goldstein, ‘Review of A. Mercado, *Italic Verse: A Study of the Poetic Remains of Old Latin, Faliscan, and Sabellic* (Innsbruck, 2012)’, *Gnomon* 87 (2015), 695–703, at 695 with n. 1.

⁴ These were gathered by reading through the editions of Lindsay (1910, repr. with additions) for Plautus (with consultation when necessary of the other major reference editions: Ritschl et al. [1878–1902] and Leo [1895]) and the second edition of Kauer and Lindsay for Terence. Approaches to the Latin *-to* imperative similar to my own: Risselada (n. 2), who draws from Vairel-Carron’s (n. 2) data, in addition to data from Plaut. *Mostell.* and a selection from Cicero’s letters; R. Gibson, ‘Didactic poetry as “popular” form: a study of imperatival expressions in Latin didactic verse and prose’, in C. Atherton (ed.), *Form and Content in Didactic Poetry* (Bari, 1997), 67–98, who offers a fascinating essay taking into account Risselada’s work, while drawing on a different corpus (Latin prose and verse didactic treatises), and L. Unceta-Gómez, *La petición verbal en Latin: estudio léxico, semántico y pragmático* (Madrid, 2009), 43–4, who provides a brief account focussing on speech-act categories. Finally, P. Barrios-Lech, *Linguistic Interaction in Roman Comedy* (Cambridge, 2016), 59–62 provides a summary of some of the issues raised here. I take this opportunity to explain a discrepancy. In my book, I identify 354 *-to* imperatives in Plautus; in this article, 369. For this article, I add to the 354 *-to* imperatives identified in Barrios-Lech (this note) fifteen (15) more tokens: eleven greetings (*salueto*) or leave-takings (*ualeto*); three instances of *nolito* (*Cist.* 108, *Poen.* 872 and 1320), and one instance at *Persa* 667. These I excluded from my book for various reasons, but I see fit to include them here for the sake of presenting the complete data. See further n. 38 below. Henceforth, I will indicate in a footnote wherever this article discusses more fully an issue summarized in Barrios-Lech (this note).

⁵ Plaut. *Mostell.* 579: *redito huc circiter meridie*.

⁶ Plaut. *Asin.* 740: *Leonida, curre opsepro, patrem huc orato ut ueniat*. On this construction, see K.–St. II.1§50.3.c.

⁷ Plaut. *Stich.* 287 (a *seruus currens*, in a self-address): *si rex opstabit obuiam, regem ipsum priu’ peruortito*. The future verb may be a future indicative (as in this example), a future perfect or a future sigmatic verb. See K.–St. II.1§50.3.b.

⁸ Plaut. *Mostell.* 255: *ubi tu commoda es, capillum commodum esse credito*; here *ubi* has the sense ‘whenever’. See e.g. Vairel-Carron (n. 2), 236 n. 2.

⁹ Plaut. *Asin.* 240: *modo tecum una argentum adfero, facile patiar cetera*. See for this construction Loch (n. 2), 8–9. The future verb may be a future indicative (as in the previous example), a future perfect or a future sigmatic form.

appropriate for fulfilment.¹⁰ The grammarian Diomedes (fourth century C.E.) defines the *-to* imperative as follows:

1. (Diom. 339.13 K)

futurum uero tempus [*sc.* imperatiui modi] differt a ceteris futuris, quia non ut confestim fiat imperamus, sed in futurum fieri, ut perpetuum fiat, quasi ‘facito’, ‘legito’, id est ‘semper fac’, ‘semper lege’. iure ergo diceretur quasi futuri.

The future time [of the imperative mood] differs from the other futures, because we are commanding not in order that it is done immediately, but command it to be done in the future, in order that it be done as an abiding command, for instance, *facito*, *legito*: that is, ‘always do’, ‘always read’. Rightly then would [the latter] be assigned to the future time.¹¹

But by the time Diomedes was writing, the *-to* imperative, used to convey commands for non-immediate realization, had fallen out of use in the spoken language.¹² This is why Diomedes focusses on the type he was no doubt frequently exposed to: the kind of *-to* imperative that conveys a command or a piece of advice to be followed whenever circumstances require. Such a form was still used in laws, technical treatises and manuals.¹³ Indeed, as recent work has shown, for writers of manuals and technical treatises after Cato, the *-to* imperative became a ‘generic marker’ that situated the relevant work within the didactic tradition.¹⁴

With this context, we may first note the average frequency of use in both Plautus and Terence. Table 2 shows the raw number of occurrences of the imperative in *-to* in Plautus

Table 2: Imperative in *-to*: frequency and average frequency in Plautus and Terence.

	Plautus	Terence
Imperative in <i>-to</i> : second person	369	65
Average frequency in corpus (per 1,000 words)	2.3/1,000	1.3/1,000

¹⁰ The ablative **-tod* of the demonstrative **-to* paired with an order for immediate execution produced **agetod*, which would mean ‘from then on, lead/do/drive’; or ‘en s’éloignant de maintenant’, as Vairel-Carron (n. 2) translates; ‘von da an’: H.–Sz. II.§188. For further details, see L.–H.–S. I.§423, Vairel-Carron (n. 2), 257–9 and G. Meiser, *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache* (Darmstadt, 1998), 41 and 220–1. I will not discuss here the well-known ambiguity of person present in the *-to* imperative form, between the second and third persons. Fuller discussion on this issue at Vairel-Carron (n. 2), 224–8, arguing at 227 that ‘pour les Latins de l’époque de Plaute’ the form was *not* ‘indifférenciée du point de vue de la personne’, but H. Rosén, *Latine Loqui: Trends and Directions in the Crystallization of Classical Latin* (Munich, 1999), 115 disagrees: ‘[o]n the contrary: [t]he meaning of the *-to* imperative ... can be brought to one common denominator, that of the ... apersonal imperative’. Risselada (n. 2), 131 argues for ‘indefinite reference’: ‘this kind of directive ... is addressed to all potential hearers or readers, but is relevant ... only for a particular subset of addressees that meet with particular conditions’. Augustine, bishop of Hippo, notes that there is an explanation why *facito* is used both for the second and for the third persons but then, frustratingly, declines to offer it: *sed nunc [sc. ratio] praetermittenda est, ne ad aliam rem transeamus* (Keil 5.510.11–12).

¹¹ All translations are the author’s unless noted otherwise.

¹² H. Blase, G. Landgraf, J. Golling (edd.), *Historische Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*, vol. 3.1: *Syntax des einfachen Satzes* (Leipzig, 1903), 236; L. Löfstedt, *Les expressions du commandement et de la défense en latin et leur survie dans les langues romanes* (Helsinki, 1966), 22–9 and 38–40 discusses the post-classical diminution in use of the *-to* imperative within the spoken language.

¹³ Blase, Landgraf, Golling (n. 12), 235, who note that the prevalent use of the *-to* imperative in laws ‘bleibt durch die ganze Latinität’.

¹⁴ J.N. Adams, *Pelagonius and Latin Veterinary Terminology in the Roman Empire* (Leiden, 1995), 460 on Pelagonius; Gibson (n. 4), 82 on Pelagonius and Palladius (a writer of an agricultural treatise);

and Terence, separately. Only second-person forms are considered.¹⁵ The second row shows the average frequency: that is, the number of occurrences per 1,000 words.¹⁶

Plautus uses the imperative in *-to* at a rate of 2.3/1,000 words; in Terence, it appears with an average incidence of 1.3/1,000 words. It is interesting to compare the average frequencies in the two contemporaries, Plautus (all extant comedies) and Cato (*Agr.*). The *-to* imperative appears in the former at an average incidence of 2.3/1,000 words; in the latter, 78.4/1,000 words; thus, it appears an astounding 34 times more often in Cato's treatise.¹⁷ Even allowing that the latter figure contains *all -to* imperatives, both second and third persons, the divergence is still striking. The genre in which Cato writes must be determining the higher frequency of the *-to* imperative in his *De agricultura*. To explain this difference, it may be noted that the *-to* imperative has a special affinity for instructions, when compared to the present imperative.¹⁸ Since giving instruction is a treatise's defining function, the *-to* imperative, eminently suited to conveying instruction, appears most frequently in that genre.

To return to its use in Roman comedy, does the diminution in the average frequency of the *-to* imperative from Plautus' to Terence's plays indicate an *actual* diminution in the use of the form? Adams, in an important article on female speech in Roman comedy, introduced the idea that diminution in use of a form from Plautus to Terence could correspondingly imply a diminished frequency in the spoken language from the late third century B.C.E. down to the mid second century B.C.E.¹⁹

In order to test the assumption, namely that Latin speakers were less and less inclined to use the *-to* imperative during the above-stated time frame, we may use the *z*-test. This test allows us to determine whether the difference between two proportions, collected from independent samples, is significant.²⁰ As it turns out, the *z*-test *does* so indicate, at a confidence interval greater than 99.99%. This result strongly suggests that there *was* a regression in the use of the *-to* imperative from the time of Plautus down to Terence's *floruit*. Thus, a form little-used in Cicero's time was probably already in decline during the early to mid second century B.C.E.²¹

Rosén (n. 10), 12 on Cicero's legal language in *De legibus*; and H. Hine, "'Discite ... agricolae': modes of instruction in Latin prose agricultural writing from Cato to Pliny the Elder", *CQ* 61 (2011), 624–54, at 649–50 on Pliny the Elder's use of this form in *HN*, as a 'tribute to Cato'.

¹⁵ I thus exclude 19 forms with third-person reference from my corpus in the above table; cf. Vairel-Carron (n. 2), 230–2; to her list of 18 forms I add Plaut. *Merc.* 1021, *neu quisquam posthac prohibeto*.

¹⁶ I use the exhaustive word-counts conducted by M. Gilleland, 'The linguistic differentiation of character type and sex in the comedies of Plautus and Terence' (Diss., University of Virginia, 1979), 80–3.

¹⁷ The statistic relevant to Cato's treatise on agriculture is calculated by Hine (n. 14), 628.

¹⁸ We return to this point below.

¹⁹ J.N. Adams, 'Female speech in Latin comedy', *Antichthon* 18 (1984), 43–77, at 50.

²⁰ For a description of the *z*-test and a sample calculation, applied to a simple problem in linguistics, see e.g. C. Butler, *Statistics in Linguistics* (New York, 1985), 92–5.

²¹ Cf. Barrios-Lech (n. 4), 59–60, K.–St. II.1, 198 (§50.c. Anmerk. 1) and Vairel-Carron (n. 2), 328, who argued for the diminution of the form along a different tack: according to her, 77.25% of the *-to* imperatives in Plautus do not appear with a subordinate clause, compared with 67.70% in Terence. 22.75% of *-to* imperatives in her data for Plautus appear with the subordinate clause containing a future indicative; her corresponding figure for Terence is 32.30%. She suggests that the cause for these divergences is that the *-to* imperative *solitarium* was receding in the spoken language from Plautus' time to Terence's, but I disagree with the underlying assumption that future imperatives appearing with a subordinate clause are 'frozen' expressions, 'qui sont plus susceptibles de se figer et de se conserver uniquement par la tradition'.

2. REGISTER

We turn now to the first of the four debated areas identified above, register. Some scholars argue that the form was stylistically elevated, while others maintain that the *-to* form is stylistically neutral. Thus, for instance, in a recent commentary on Terence's *Hecyra*, we read on *dicito* (ad *Hec.* 76), in the line *senex si quaeret me, modo isse dicito*: 'The fut[ure] imp[erative], with its echo of legal texts and precepts ... may be another mark of Parmeno's self importance.'²² On the other hand, Gratwick, in a comment on the future imperative writes: 'there was nothing fancy in the fut[ure] imperative as such'; and de Melo, in a review of a recent book on Terence's language, agrees: 'I do not believe that the "future" imperative *qua* future imperative has an elevated tone that makes it well suited for official documents like laws. Rather, it seems to me that future imperatives are used in commands in legal language because they are not restricted to the near future like the 'present' imperative.'²³

It may be possible, if not to settle this debate, then at least to present a strong case for understanding the *-to* imperative, at least in the time in which Plautus was active, as *not* elevated. To show this, we need to consider a heuristic device first discovered by Haffter and then elaborated by Happ.²⁴ According to these scholars, in Plautus, the ratio of *cantica* (accompanied stichic or polymetric verses) to unaccompanied, or spoken, verses, *deuerbia*, is 3C:1D, that is, three accompanied verses (marked 'C', for *canticum*) for every single spoken verse (marked 'D', for *deuerbium*).²⁵ Stylistically marked elements are at home in the former, accompanied verses; low-register elements are attracted to the latter setting, unaccompanied, or spoken, verses. If, however, an item is stylistically unmarked, it should be distributed throughout Plautus' plays more or less according to the stated ratio.

Although Haffter applied the ratio to his analysis of padded expressions like *uox mi ad aures aduolauit* for *uocem audiui*, Happ used it to suggest that certain features of verb morphology, for instance, forms such as *amasso* and *faxo*, sigmatic-stem futures, belong to the colloquial register.²⁶ Recent work on Roman music suggests that grouping recitative and sung metre together as stylistically 'higher' than spoken verse (iambic *senarii*) is correct. In his monograph on the subject, Moore argues that we should not distinguish too nicely between *cantica* or polymetric song, on the one hand, and stichic unaccompanied, 'recitative' verse (in trochaic *septenarii*, iambic *septenarii*, trochaic *octonarii* and iambic *octonarii*), on the other: 'polymetric passages often contain meters identical to those found in the stichic passages, and stichic and polymetric passages blend easily with each other'; he concludes the discussion by saying that 'Roman comedy's *deuerbia* (all in iambic *senarii*) were spoken, its *cantica*, both stichic and

²² S. Goldberg, *Terence Hecyra* (Cambridge, 2013), 100. Rather, the *-to* imperative, since it conveys instructions, perfectly suits the tricky and 'wise adviser' slave character-type: see section 5 below.

²³ A. Gratwick, *Plautus Menaechmi* (Cambridge, 1993), 140 and W. de Melo, 'Review of E. Karakasis, *Terence and the Language of Roman Comedy* (Cambridge, 2005)', *Mnemosyne* 59 (2006), 268–74, at 270.

²⁴ H. Haffter, *Untersuchungen zur allateinischen Dichtersprache* (Berlin, 1934), followed, in the main, by H. Happ, 'Die lateinische Umgangssprache und die Kunstsprache des Plautus', *Glotta* 45 (1967), 60–104.

²⁵ For the markings *C* (*canticum*) and *DV* (*deuerbium*) in the manuscripts, see e.g. T. Moore, *Music in Roman Comedy* (Cambridge, 2012), 13–14.

²⁶ Haffter (n. 24), 44–5, Happ (n. 24), 88–92.

polymetric, sung'.²⁷ If, as now seems likely, stichic verse (tr7 and ia7; tr8 and ia8) and polymetric verse were sung, both metrical settings would more likely attract higher-register items than spoken verse.

Yet, Moore provides us with a slightly different ratio than does Haffter. The former scholar has 37% of all metres in Plautus as iambic *senarii*, that is, unaccompanied verses, while the remaining—63%—are accompanied.²⁸ The resulting ratio we get from Moore's percentages is 2C:1D, that is, two accompanied for every one unaccompanied verse. But the percentages, while helpful, are based on the number of verses, and do not take into account that the lines of stichic accompanied verse are longer than those of iambic *senarii*. Thus, the Moore ratio of 2:1 should perhaps be revised upward. It seems better to keep the Haffter/Happ ratio of 3:1.

Let us turn now to the distribution of *-to* imperatives in Plautus (there are 368 countable tokens).²⁹

Table 3: Distribution of *-to* imperatives in Plautus by verse-type.

Facito type in ...	Proportion (# of tokens)
Stichic accompanied verse	52.4% (193 tokens)
Spoken (unacc.) verse	35.6% (131 tokens)
Polymetric acc. verse	12.0% (44 tokens)
TOTAL	100.0% (368 tokens)

The table distinguishes tokens appearing in stichic accompanied verse from those appearing in polymetric accompanied verse. Following Haffter, Happ and Moore, however, we shall treat both types together when computing the ratio: namely 237 tokens appear in both stichic and polymetric accompanied verse (C), while 131 occur in unaccompanied verse (D). Thus, the ratio 237C:131D reduces down to about 9C:5D. Spoken verse seems to contain more tokens than we were led to expect, considering that the *expected* ratio was 9C:3D. The chi-square calculation indicates that this difference is statistically significant.³⁰ Thus, we may tentatively conclude that the form belonged to a colloquial register in the time Plautus was alive. Yet, it must here be admitted that the metrical test is not on its own conclusive; in tandem with this test, inspection of the *contexts* themselves is necessary, as de Melo has convincingly shown.³¹ When we inspect individual passages, we find we must modify the quantitative analysis. For the form is found in high-register and low-register contexts

²⁷ Moore (n. 25), 103.

²⁸ See Moore (n. 25), 15–16 for discussion and see further the helpful tables at 382–3.

²⁹ Not the total, 369: the metrical setting of *Cas.* 870 cannot be determined owing to the fragmentary nature of the text there, so that example is excluded.

³⁰ The chi-square test allows us to determine whether a distribution, like that for the *-to* imperative, accords with the expected distribution, and thus supports a null hypothesis that the token is randomly distributed throughout the plays. Such random distribution would be the expected one for a stylistically unmarked element. The chi-square test in this case forces us to abandon the null hypothesis. For more on this test, see, for instance, Butler (n. 20), 112–26.

³¹ W. de Melo, *The Early Latin Verb System: Archaic Forms in Plautus, Terence, and Beyond* (Oxford, 2007), 10–11 and *passim*.

indifferently, a result suggesting that the *-to* imperative is stylistically neutral.³² Although these findings are certainly not conclusive, the burden is now on those who would wish to argue that the *-to* imperative is elevated.

Unfortunately, the distribution of the *-to* imperative over *cantica* and *deuerbia* in Terence can tell us nothing about the register the form occupied in the mid second century B.C.E., for, as Bagordo has demonstrated, Terence does not distinguish *cantica* from *deuerbia* passages on the stylistic level like Plautus does.³³ However, as in Plautus, so too in Terence: the form appears in high-register and low-register contexts indifferently, suggesting that it was at home in both contexts, and was perhaps stylistically unmarked in the later author, too.³⁴

3. IS THE *-TO* IMPERATIVE THE SOFTER FORM COMPARED TO THE PRESENT IMPERATIVE?

It has long been remarked that the *-to* imperative, like the present imperative, can convey a wide variety of speech acts, from commands and requests, to permissions and advice.³⁵ Thus, it would appear that both forms are alike in being neutral forms of expression. Yet, scholars from the Roman Imperial period did not appear to think so. For instance, the Latin grammarian Consentius, citing Arruntius Celsus (third century B.C.E.), suggests that the *-to* imperative was considered the softer form:

2. In the passage, the need for the verb of the imperative to be non-past is discussed. (Keil 5.374.35–5.375.2)

nam qui dicit ‘fac’, ante imperat, quam id fiat; sed hic tamen qui dicit ‘fac’ properat, ut ait Celsus; ille etiam morari sinit, qui dicit ‘facito’.

For one who says ‘fac’ commands before the object of the command should be carried out; but he hurries [the addressee] on, as Celsus says; the one who says ‘facito’ permits there to be a delay.

³² Plautus: the *-to* imperative in low-register contexts at *Amph.* 770, *Aul.* 55–6, *Capt.* 112–14, routine commands to a slave; in *Bacch.* 327–8 it co-occurs with the colloquial *heus*; the *-to* imperative in high-register contexts at *Mil.* 161–5, in language which clearly mimics that of a formal edict, introduced at *Mil.* 159 with the phrase *nunc adeo edico omnibus*, though the present imperative is equally at home in such mock edicts (see *Capt.* 803–4, *prius edico* ... | *continete uos domi, prohibete a uobis uim meam*), mock edicts which the eavesdropping old man calls *basilicas* (*Capt.* 811); in *Persa*, the slave has wrapped his *pallium* around himself *gloriose* (307), and spits *magnifice* (308). He then utters a string of future imperatives: *adito* | *uidebitur. factum uolo. uenito. promoneto* (310–11), although here it is probably the asyndetic pile-up of these imperatives that conveys the tone, not the future imperatives as such; at *Rud.* 103, the young man’s *salueto* may strike a loftier tone in his address to an *ignotus*: *pater salueto*; at *Rud.* 1342, the slave and pimp stand before the temple of Venus, as the slave leads the pimp in an oath, *tum ego huic Gripo, inquito et me tangito*. On *inquito* in formal/ceremonial contexts, see below.

³³ A. Bagordo, ‘Langversstil und Senarstil bei Terenz’, in P. Kruschwitz, W.-W. Ehlers and F. Felgentreu (edd.), *Terentius Poeta (Zetemata 127)* (Munich, 2007), 127–41. It should be mentioned, however, that this study is carried out only for rhetorical figures and on a single play. Confirmation awaits a more thoroughgoing analysis.

³⁴ Terence: the *-to* imperative in high-register contexts at *Ad.* 970, manumission formula; *Phorm.* 984, the legal formula *lege agito*; in low-register contexts, at *Ad.* 281–2, *absolutote* co-occurs with the colloquial *heus*; *An.* 865, order to a *lorarius* to bind a slave; *Eun.* 503, in a string of commands to a maidservant; *Eun.* 593–4, *facito* and *lauato* co-occur with *heus tu*.

³⁵ See for instance the nice analysis of Unceta-Gómez (n. 4), 43–4 and, earlier, K.-St. II.1, §50(c)5, page 199.

'He permits there to be a delay' (*ille etiam morari sinit*) suggests that, with *facito*, the person presenting a task for completion to the addressee was being less peremptory about it. In fact, Diomedes reports the scholarly view that the label *imperatius* not be assigned to the *-to* imperative at all:

3. (339.13 K)

quem sermonem nonnulli censuerunt mandatiuum potius quam imperatium dici, quoniam praesenti tempore imperare solemus ut fiat, in futurum uero magis mandare.

And this expression some have seen fit that it be called *mandatiuus*—the mood of entrusting someone with something, rather than *imperatius*—the mood of command, since we are used to commanding something to be done in the present, but rather entrust things to be done for the future.

Although arguments had been made that the *-to* imperative was in fact the stronger form, these were refuted by Loch,³⁶ and, indeed, according to the present *communis opinio*, the *-to* imperative is, like the present imperative, neutral.³⁷

Now, while it is true that both the present imperative and the future imperative similarly convey a wide range of directive forces, from commands to advice, a closer comparison of the two forms reveals that the present imperative appears to have a greater affinity for commands, while the *-to* imperative has a greater affinity for permissions and instructions.

If we take into account a pool of 384 present imperatives, gathered from three Roman comedies, we find that 177 (or 46.1%) of these convey commands.³⁸ By contrast, 131 (or 30.3%) of *-to* imperatives convey commands. The *z*-test calculation indicates that the difference between these two proportions is significant.³⁹ While we cannot state on this basis that the present imperative is the more peremptory of the two forms, we could tentatively conclude that it has a greater affinity to commands than does its relative, the *-to* imperative.

To turn now to permissions, it has long been noted that the future imperative tends to convey such a speech act.⁴⁰ When issuing a permission, the speaker allows the addressee to do something the latter presumably already wants to do. For instance, the second turn in the following constructed example features a permission:

4.

- A. I want an ice cream.
- B. Have an ice cream, then.

³⁶ See the note at Loch (n. 2), 6 for the earlier view, since refuted, that the future imperative was stronger than the present.

³⁷ Loch (n. 2), 11–12. See, in addition to the work cited at n. 35, Bennett (n. 2), 359–61, especially at 359: 'the future imperative covers substantially the same field of meaning as the present.'

³⁸ Present imperatives from three plays have been analyzed: Plautus' *Captivi* and *Truculentus* and Terence's *Phormio*. 421, and not the grand total (434), *-to* imperatives in extant Roman comedy are considered, since I exclude greetings and farewells: these are, strictly speaking, not directives; rather they are ritualized speech-acts: see Risselada (n. 2), 117–18. I also exclude Plaut. *Amph.* fr. XII Lindsay, *ibi scrobes ecfodito plus sexagenos in dies*, because the context is absent, and *Persa* 667, where the reading is uncertain.

³⁹ For the *z*-test, see n. 20 above. I came to the same conclusion, but with an expanded data-set, at Barrios-Lech (n. 4), 42. However, I believe the new method here introduced to be more rigorous.

⁴⁰ On its permissive force, see e.g. Blase, Landgraf, Golling (n. 12), 248 and, more recently, Risselada (n. 2), 137.

An example of a ‘permission’ speech-act from Roman comedy is the following:

5. The young man Philocrates laments that his friend, a free man, was mistakenly sent to the quarry. The old man Hegio addresses Philocrates. (Plaut. *Capt.* 948–9)

HE. at ob eam rem mihi libellam pro eo argenti ne duis:
gratiis a me, ut sit liber, ducito.

HE. For that reason, don’t give me a cent for him:
(Go ahead and) take him from me for free, that he may be free.

Hegio, the old man, allows Philocrates to take the unfortunate young man with *ducito*. In this case, and in others, the *-to* imperative permits the hearer to do something whenever the latter desires.⁴¹ We should distinguish from such permissions ‘conditioned’ permissions, such as the following:

6. A slave boldly promises that he will steal money from his old master. The old man’s friend chimes in, expressing amazement at the slave’s audacity. (Plaut. *Pseud.* 511–13)

CALL. certe edepol scio,
si apstuleris, mirum et magnum facinus feceris.
PS. faciam. SIMO si non apstuleris? PS. **uirgis caedito.**

CALL. I know for certain that
if you succeed in stealing the money, you’ll have carried out a grand and miracu-
lous deed.
PS. I’ll do it. SIMO If you don’t? PS. Go ahead and flog me with a switch.

In this case, whatever the type of speech act, the *-to* imperative is triggered here in the first place by a (temporal) condition, namely [*si non apstulero,*] *uirgis caedito*.⁴² And we should also note the constructed example, 4 above. In that case, the position in the discourse of ‘have an ice cream, then’, as the second turn in a two-part sequence, similarly triggers the use of a permissive speech-act.

Of the 95 *-to* imperatives functioning as permissions, 49 are triggered either by the conditional clause or by the position in the discourse. This leaves us with 46 tokens to work with. When we similarly exclude from our 384 *present* imperatives all those permissions triggered by a conditional clause or the position in the discourse, we arrive at 21 tokens. That is, there are 21 present imperatives motivated not by the conditional clause, or the position in the discourse, but by the communicative intention (that is, to permit something to the addressee).

Once we exclude the tokens on the criteria described above, we find that 10.6% of the *-to* imperatives in Roman comedy convey permissions. This proportion differs significantly from the proportion of present imperatives, 5.5%, that communicate permissions. Thus, we can tentatively conclude that the *-to* imperative has a greater affinity to conveying permissions than does the present imperative.⁴³

⁴¹ One type of permission that recurs is the phrase *audacter dicito* (‘you can say that as boldly as you please’ [the implication is that you can say that whenever you like]): e.g. Plaut. *Epid.* 16, *Merc.* 726, *Mostell.* 916, *Pseud.* 828.

⁴² Thanks to the anonymous reader of the article for pointing this out to me. Again, the method used here is new, and more rigorous.

⁴³ This corroborates the position taken at Barrios-Lech (n. 4), 60.

Plautus are softened. Of the present imperatives in the same author, 7.9% receive mitigators. This variation is probably not due to chance.⁴⁸ Rather, I suggest that the *-to* form at the time Plautus was writing did not prefer softeners, compared to the present imperative, because the former was felt to be a milder expression anyway.⁴⁹

4. IMPERATIVE IN *-TO* AS A PRESENT-IMPERATIVE SUBSTITUTE

4.1 *Status quaestionis*

Scholars have long discussed the use in EL of the *-to* imperative to express a command for immediate execution, but they have not agreed on how prevalent this use is. Christian Neue had listed passages in which the imperative in *-to* refers to the present. Charles Thurot later analysed these passages and concluded that, with the exception of a small minority, all of these may be taken as referring to the future time. As Thurot says, the imperative in *-to* ‘ne s’emploie d’un avenir immédiat que dans un trop petit nombre de passages’.⁵⁰ Riemann, however, later disagreed:

[t]outefois on recontre chez Plaute un *assez grand nombre de passages* où l’impératif en *-to* désigne une action dont on demande l’accomplissement immédiat; mais chez Térence ces exceptions sont moins nombreuses [emphasis Riemann’s].⁵¹

The pendulum then swung the other way. Hofmann and Szantyr say that such instances of the *-to* imperative requesting that an action be carried out immediately are ‘spärlich und nicht eindeutig’, and Vairel-Carron agreed.⁵²

As the above overview of scholarly opinion suggests, researchers do not agree whether the *-to* imperative can convey an order intended for immediate execution. Nor is it always clear how to distinguish between immediate future (that is, directly after the command is conveyed) and non-immediate future. As Vairel-Carron suggests, there are no right answers to these questions.⁵³ A Latin speaker probably chose to use a *-to* imperative based on his or her own subjective view of what counted as ‘non-immediate future’. Similarly, scholars rely on their own subjective view of what counts as a non-immediate future to determine whether or not a *-to* imperative belongs to the category *futurum pro praesente*.

⁴⁸ According to the *z*-test. Ultimately, though, the result should not be treated as definitive, for, in some cases, to assess whether an imperative is softened or not is a subjective matter.

⁴⁹ There is a similar pattern in Terence: 7.8% of all present imperatives are softened, whereas a slightly smaller proportion (6.2%) of *-to* imperatives are. Yet, the *z*-test shows that there is no significant variation between these two proportions. Is it possible that, by the time Terence was writing, the *-to* imperative was not necessarily felt to be milder than the present imperative?

⁵⁰ C. Neue, *Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache* (Berlin, 1875), 403–5 with C. Thurot, ‘De l’impératif futur latin’, *RPh* 4 (1880), 113–17, quote from 117.

⁵¹ Riemann (n. 2), 185.

⁵² Vairel-Carron (n. 2), 243 n. 1: ‘passages de ce genre (that is, *imperatius futuri pro imperatuo praesentis*) sont extrêmement rares’, cf. H.–Sz. II.§188, page 341: ‘Die allateinische Belege für Imper. Fut. statt Imper. Praes. sind noch spärlich und nicht eindeutig’; they cite the interesting example of Enn. *scaen.* 420: *extemplo ... me necato et filiam*.

⁵³ Vairel-Carron (n. 2), 327: ‘there are no strict breaks or boundaries between the immediate future [the relevant time-sphere for the present imperative] and the less-immediate future; between the distant future and an indefinite future. One passes from one to the other imperceptibly and gradually.’

To take just one example, Riemann claims that the following *-to* imperative is intended for immediate execution:⁵⁴

8. A *leno* demands a letter from a slave. (Plaut. *Persa* 500)

DO. cedo sane mihi. TO. at clare recitato. DO. tace, dum pellego. TO. recita: hau uerbum faciam.

DO. Do give it to me. TO. But recite out loud! DO. Quiet, while I read. TO. Recite! I won't utter a word.

When he tells the pimp *at clare recitato*, does the slave Toxilus intend that his command be executed immediately? In the event, the pimp does not begin reciting until after two more exchanges transpire. That is, the pimp does not immediately obey the command *recitato*, but he *does* immediately comply with *recita*.

The point of this discussion is to show that, when assessing the relevant temporal sphere of cases like these, interpretations will be subjective. Nevertheless, it must be stated that, unlike Plaut. *Persa* 500, passage 8 above, relatively few of the 434 *-to* imperatives in Roman comedy are difficult to interpret.

Let us take a closer look at these difficult passages. In Plautus, there are 341 relevant tokens for our consideration, after we subtract suppletive forms (*esto*, *scito* and *memento*), and two other tokens.⁵⁵ After subtracting such forms in Terence, we are left with 58 total tokens. Thus, the total number of relevant cases is 399. Of these, 69 are of doubtful interpretation, so, 17.3% of the countable total (399). This 17.3% falls into the following groups: the *-to* imperative relevant to 'time now *and* in the future', formulas like *lege agito*, and those instances that genuinely refer to the immediate present. Let us take each group in the order presented.

4.2 The *-to* imperative meaning 'now and in the future'

Facito can mean 'do this now and in the foreseeable future'.⁵⁶ A sub-genre of this type of command is the 'timeless instruction'—one that is relevant for now and all time. This is the instruction of laws and pieces of wisdom conveyed as advice. For instance, the slave of Plautus' *Curculio*, assuming the role of *magister amoris*, says:

9. (Plaut. *Curc.* 28–30)

PA. ita tuom conferto amare semper, si sapiis
ne id quod ames populus si sciat, tibi sit probro.
semper curato ne sis intestabilis.

⁵⁴ Riemann (n. 2), 182.

⁵⁵ On *scito*, *memento* and *esto* as suppletives, see H.–Sz. II.§188 and Rosén (n. 10), 115. For the two other tokens excluded, see n. 38 above.

⁵⁶ Vairel-Carron (n. 2), 240 says that the use of the imperative with *-to* indicates that 'the order is valid for a period further than the immediate present, with the context showing, in a sufficiently clear way, that it is also valid for the immediate future.' Thus, according to her, *salueto* = 'fare well' for the distant future but also (by implication) for the present time. I prefer as simpler the explanation that verbs with atelic aspect, when conveyed as commands, tend to attract the *-to* imperative, though it may well be that in some cases the speaker wishes to conversationally implicate that the *-to* imperative also applies to the present (on conversational implicature, see H.P. Grice, 'Logic and conversation', in P. Cole and J. Morgan (edd.), *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts* [New York, 1975], 41–58).

PA. Always make your loving brief, if you're wise,
 so that it won't be a source of disgrace to you, if the people discover the object of
 your affection.
 Always be careful that you are not without test – imony.

The adverb, *semper* 'always', indicates that Palinurus' instructions are relevant both now and in the future.⁵⁷

This time-scope of the *-to* imperative is often apparent even without the presence of the adverb, as in the following passage:

10. A young man to a woman unknown to him. (Plaut. *Men.* 725–8)

MA. non, inquam, patiar praeterhac,
 quin uidua uiuam quam tuos mores perferam.
 MEN. mea quidem hercle caussa uidua uiuito
 uel usque dum regnum optinebit Iuppiter.

MA. I won't suffer [this treatment], I say, any longer,
 rather, I'll live spouseless, rather than put up with your ways.
 MEN. [Go ahead and] live spouseless for my sake
 for even so long as Jupiter holds on to his reign.

Obviously the command *uiuito* is relevant to the immediate future—Matrona can begin her solitary life right now as soon as she hears it—but it is also relevant to the more distant future as well: she may continue being spouseless 'so long as Jupiter holds sway'.⁵⁸

The semantic property of certain verbs makes the *-to* imperative a suitable candidate to express that verb as a request or command. In particular, these verbs display atelic aspect, that is, these verbs do not imply a limit or end: thus, for instance, 'be well', or 'consider, reflect' against verbs with telic aspect, like 'give' and 'recover'.⁵⁹ For example, the greeting *salueto* 'be well' is valid not just for the immediate present but also for the time following; the same goes for *ualeto*.⁶⁰ On the same grounds, curses with *uiuere* attract the *-to* form: *Iuppiter te, miles, perdat; intestatus uiuito* (*Curc.* 622), or passage 10 above. And again on the same grounds, the phrase *gratiam habere*, 'feel grateful', when conveyed as a command or request, selects exclusively the *-to* imperative.⁶¹

⁵⁷ Pieces of wisdom conveyed as 'timeless' advice: Plaut. *Cas.* 209, *Cist.* 62, 64, *Mostell.* 255, *Pseud.* 312, *Trin.* 323, 485; Ter. *Haut.* 221, 590, *Ad.* 417. Fatherly advice: *Trin.* 295–6.

⁵⁸ Similar: Plaut. *Aul.* 55–6, *Men.* 334, *Poen.* 890, *Rud.* 836, *Truc.* 197, 953. Cf. Riemann (n. 2), 171.

⁵⁹ For an introduction to this concept, see H. Filip, 'Lexical aspect', in R.I. Binnick (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Tense and Aspect* (Oxford, 2012), 721–51, especially 721–4 with the useful tests for telicity there.

⁶⁰ Loch (n. 2), 10–11, however, and Riemann (n. 2), 179 see instances of *ualeto* as 'present for future', but this cannot be the case given the meanings of the verbs, as argued above. Of course, the present imperatives *salue* and *uale* are much more frequent, but this does not imply that, when *salueto* and *ualeto* are used, they are replacements for *salue* and *uale*. Rather, the two forms overlap in temporal scope (= now and in the future). *Bene ambulato* refers to a journey the addressee will make in the not-too-distant future, after he parts ways with the interlocutor.

⁶¹ For this meaning, see *OLD* s.v. *gratia* 3d.

11. A young man begs a *senex* to let a slave off punishment. (Plaut. *Trin.* 1180)

CA. sine te exorem. TH. age, abi, abi impune. em huic habeto gratiam.

CA. Allow me to win you over. TH. (*finally relenting; to the slave*) Come on, go, go without punishment. There—feel grateful to that man.

We find no such examples with the present imperative, but two with the *-to* imperative.⁶² Since this is such a small number, however, the conclusion must remain tentative, that speakers cast gratitude expressed with *gratiam habere* only by way of the *-to* imperative.

A considerable number of *-to* imperatives frame what Risselada calls a ‘metadirective’.⁶³ Metadirectives make explicit the intended reaction to an utterance. Thus, the intended reaction to a question is an answer; a metadirective would be ‘answer me’ in the utterance ‘where are you going? Answer me’, *quo te confers? dic mihi*. The intended reaction to an assertion is belief or agreement. A metadirective would be ‘believe me’ in the assertion ‘I’m going to Rome, believe me’, *Romam eo, crede mihi*.

In Roman comedy, then, we find metadirectives cast in the *-to* imperative, such as the following:

12. A courtesan tries to convince a young man to continue visiting her. (Plaut. *Truc.* 867–9)

PH. sed tamen
cogitato mus pusillus quam sit sapiens bestia,
aetatem qui non cubili <uni> umquam committit suam.

PH. At any rate,
consider the little mousey, how clever a beast it is,
since he doesn’t ever entrust his life to a single bedroom.

In the terminology of speech-act theory, the ‘illocutionary point’, or intent, of Phronesium’s words is to assert something, simply that ‘the mouse does not stay long in one place’.⁶⁴ Her words’ ‘perlocutionary effect’, that is, the intended reaction, is that the addressee consider them. Now, this consideration is to take place *after* the full story is recounted, and continue for some time after that. The metadirective *cogitato*, ‘consider’, ‘turn it over [in your mind]’, conveys precisely that sense here.⁶⁵

⁶² Apart from the example quoted, see *Curc.* 699. *Habeto* is similar when it means ‘consider’; e.g. *Poen.* 542, *per iocum itidem dictum habeto quae nos tibi respondimus* ‘consider the answer we gave you as a joke’.

⁶³ See Risselada (n. 2), 44–5.

⁶⁴ The force of *cogitato* in these cases is made clear in the following: *Mil.* 1364: *cogitato identidem tibi quam fidelis fuerim*. *Cogitato* similarly precedes an extended comparison at *Mil.* 915–17; or wise advice that deserves further reflection: e.g. Plaut. *Poen.* 237, Ter. *Eun.* 759. Eight examples of *cogitato* in Roman comedy. Similar is the expression *facito (ut) cogites*: Plaut. *Stich.* 519 (*hoc tu facito ut cogites*), *Trin.* 485 (*semper tu hoc facito ... cogites*), Ter. *Ad.* 500 (*hoc tu facito cum animo cogites*), *Ad.* 808 (*quaeso hoc facito tecum cogites*); seven examples in Roman comedy. Interestingly, both examples in Terence (there are only two) are put in the mouth of old characters: *Ad.* 500, 808. The examples of *credito* at *Haut.* 577 and *Phorm.* 874 imply belief not only right now but also continued into the future. It should be noted that the parallel idiom in Greek has a present imperative: Men. *Sam.* 697 and 703 (Arnott).

⁶⁵ Though not necessarily metadirectives, the expressions *facito ut memineris* and *putato* are similar, as they imply action that should be undertaken immediately and be continued: *facito ut memineris*:

Twice *inque* appears within a *stipulatio*, a quite formal context, like passage 11 above.⁶⁸ But twice it appears in an unmarked context, where character A coaches character B on what to say to character C.⁶⁹

Inquito, by contrast, appears confined to formal contexts, when the speaker attempts to elicit from the addressee a context-appropriate formula.

13. The son-in-law attempts to secure a blessing on the marriage from his future father-in-law. (Plaut. *Aul.* 787–9)

LY. bono animo es, bene dice. nunc quae res tibi et gnatae tuae
bene feliciterque uortat—ita di faxint, inquito.
EVC. ita di faciant.

LY. Be of good cheer, speak kindly. Now let the matter turn out well and prosperously for you and your daughter. ‘Gods so see to it’: say it.
EVC. May the gods see to it.

14. A slave tries to bind a *leno* to an oath. (Plaut. *Rud.* 1338–43)

GR. Venus Cyrenensis, testem te testor mihi,
si uidulum illum quem ego in nauis perdidit
cum auro atque argento saluom inuestigauero
isque in potestatem meam peruenerit,
tum ego huic Gripo—inquito et me tangito
LA. tum ego huic Gripo (dico, Venus ut audias)

GR. Venus of Cyrene, I call upon you as my witness,
if I shall have tracked down the case which I lost on a ship,
intact with its gold and silver,
and if it will have come into my possession,
then shall I unto Gripus here—say this, and touch me
LA. then shall I unto Gripus here (I say this, Venus, so that you may hear)

The third passage may be, like the first two, formal. In it, a slave assumes the role of accountant to review his master’s recent business transactions.

15. (Plaut. *Trin.* 425–7)

ST. tarpezitae mille drachumarum Olympico,
quas de ratione dehibuisti, redditae,
qua sponsione pronuper tu exactus es?
LE. nemp’ quas spopondi. ST. immo ‘quas dependi’ inquito.

ST. (*in informal, business-like tone*) Has the banker Olympicus been paid the one thousand drachmas that you owed him according to the account?

LE. Yes, the ones I promised as a pledge.

ST. No, say rather ‘the ones I was forced to pay’.⁷⁰

Three *hapax legomena* in Roman comedy appear in this passage, a fact that supports viewing its context as an elevated one: *pronuper*, the reduplicated perfect of *spondeo*, and the uncontracted form of *debeo*, *dehibeo*.

⁶⁸ Thus, Plaut. *Bacch.* 883 occurs in a ‘*stipulatio*-scene’, as does Plaut. *Pseud.* 535–8, passage 11 above.

⁶⁹ Ter. *Haut.* 329, a passage like the one from Ter. *Phorm.* 917–19, passage 12 above.

⁷⁰ Transl. W. de Melo, *Plautus*, vol. 5 (Cambridge, MA and London, 2013), 163.

There is perhaps a single example of *futurum pro praesente* in Terence, but even this should probably be excluded.

18. A slave to an *adulescens*. (Ter. *Phorm.* 229–30)

GE. nunc prior adito tu, ego in insidiis hic ero
succenturiatu', si quid deficias. PH. age.

GE. Now you go forward beforehand, I shall be here in hiding,
as a substitute, if you should at all withdraw. PH. Go on, then.

Although Geta at first glance appears to be telling the young man to 'attack now (*nunc*)', the following points should be considered. First, *nunc* here marks the next step in a progression ('given the foregoing, **then**').⁷⁴ Prior to these lines, the young man has agreed to carrying out one step of the plan; given his compliance, the slave can therefore 'now (*nunc*) tell him to attack (*adito*, *Phorm.* 229). Second, the verb describing what Geta will do is future tense (*ero*), and parallel with his instruction to the young man (*adito*). Finally, Barsby, the most recent translator and himself an expert on the *sermo Terentianus*, interprets the whole passage along these lines, that is, 'accordingly, you attack first [not necessarily now, but later], and I'll be in hiding as a substitute'.⁷⁵

Geta's utterance, therefore, does not constitute *futurum pro praesente*. Two results follow from this. First, with Geta's *nunc prior adito tu* (passage 18) excluded, there are no examples of the *futurum pro praesente* in Terence. That means all *-to* imperatives in the African poet are 'properly' *future* imperatives. This fact then constitutes yet another example of Terence as *puri sermonis amator*, according to the praise of C. Julius Caesar, himself an author recognized for clarity, simplicity and correctness.⁷⁶ Second, the chi-square calculation shows that there is a *tendency* for slaves to use the *futurum pro praesente* in Roman comedy, that is, the connection between slave speech and *futurum pro praesente* as a characterizing feature is somewhat strong.⁷⁷ Yet, given the small number of tokens (sixteen in total, of which slaves speak nine), we must treat this result cautiously. We may wonder whether in fact the *-to* imperative is constrained by any sociolinguistic factors. To this question we now turn.

5. THE SOCIO-PRAGMATICS OF THE *-TO* IMPERATIVE

Do the characters of Roman comedy avoid using the *-to* imperative with their superiors? Is it, by contrast, more prevalent in the speech directed to subordinates? We can answer this question, again, by considering the distribution of the *-to* imperative over three different types of relationship.

⁷⁴ For this use of *nunc*, see *OLD* s.v. *nunc* 10a: 'Since or if this is the case, in light of these circumstances, then.'

⁷⁵ Cf. Barsby's translation in J. Barsby, *Terence*, vol. 2 (Cambridge, MA and London, 2001), 37: 'You attack him first; I'll be lying in wait here in reserve in case you need some support.'

⁷⁶ See P. Wessner (ed.), *Aeli Donati quod fertur Commentum Terenti: accedunt Eugraphi commentum et Scholia Bembina*, 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1902–1908), 1.9 for Caesar's epigram on Menander and E. Fantham, 'Caesar as an intellectual', in M. Griffin (ed.), *A Companion to Julius Caesar* (Oxford, 2009), 141–56, at 148–51, for Caesar's style and views on language.

⁷⁷ The confidence interval is 99.92%; this indicates that there is good reason to reject the null hypothesis that the *futurum pro praesente* form is randomly distributed over free and slave speech in the comedies. See further Barrios-Lech (n. 4), 17 on the confidence intervals.

Table 4: *-to* imperative distributed across three speaker-addressee relationships in Roman comedy.⁷⁸

<i>Facito</i> directed to ...	Plautus	Terence	Composite figures (Plautus and Terence)	<i>Comparanda – Present imperative</i>
an inferior	142 (39.3%)	25 (38.5%)	167 (39.2%)	111 (45.3%)
an equal	96 (26.6%)	18 (27.7%)	114 (26.8%)	54 (22.0%)
a superior	123 (34.1%)	22 (33.8%)	145 (34.0%)	80 (32.7%)
TOTALS	361 (100%)	65 (100%)	426 (100%)	245 (100%)

We can treat the figures for Plautus and Terence together as is done in the column marked ‘Composite figures’, because there is no difference between the two authors with respect to the distribution of the *-to* imperative over the three relationship-types.⁷⁹

In the right-most column, labelled ‘*Comparanda – Present imperative*’, we see that 245 present imperatives have been analysed according to the same relationship-types. These present imperatives have been selected at random from three plays, *Bacchides*, *Rudens* and *Adelphoe*. As the *z*-test indicates, when it comes to distribution over the dyad-types (address to an inferior, address to an equal, address to a superior), there is no distinction between present imperative and *-to* imperative.

This result should not come as a surprise given what we saw above, in section (3): both present imperative and future imperative convey a wide range of directives, some of which (permissions, advice and suggestions, addressee-beneficial requests like ‘have a piece of cake’) are not at all authoritative. Although women, as Adams has shown, are more polite than are men, the *-to* imperative, being a non-authoritative form in general, is randomly distributed over the speech of men and women.⁸⁰ That is, it is characteristic of neither gender.⁸¹ But perhaps we can make some observations relevant to the characterization of role-types.

First, among female roles in Plautus, the *-to* imperative perhaps typifies most the *meretrix* and the *lena*.⁸²

Let it be said, first of all, that there are relatively few tokens to work with. And there are even fewer to work with when we come to analyse the speech of women in Terence. Only seven tokens total are assigned to women in the later author: three appear in maidservants’ (*ancillae*) speech, resulting in an average frequency of 1.4 instances per 100 lines. Three occur in the speech of the courtesan (*meretrix*), resulting in an average frequency of 1.3 instances per 100 lines. A single instance is found in the

⁷⁸ 361 (and not 369) tokens appear for Plautus, because in eight cases, the addressee is indeterminate, being either the audience or mixed addressees, or because the context cannot be determined owing to the state of the text.

⁷⁹ As the *z*-test confirms, with the calculation conducted on each of the three pairs of proportions. Thus, in Plautus, 39.3% of all *-to* imperatives are directed ‘downward’, and there is no significant difference between that proportion and the corresponding one in Terence, 38.5%.

⁸⁰ Adams (n. 19), 76.

⁸¹ We can take Gilleland’s (n. 16) word-counts as the basis for the proportion of speech allotted to women and to men: 13.9% of the total speech in Plautus is allotted to women; 86.1% to men. For Terence, the figures are 13.3% (women) and 86.7% (men). In each author, the future imperative is distributed in roughly these proportions.

⁸² A summary of this discussion on the *-to* imperative and linguistic characterization can be found at Barrios-Lech (n. 4), 61–2.

Table 5: The *-to* imperative in female character-types: Plautus.

Character type	<i>-to</i> imperative, average frequency ⁸³	Number of tokens
<i>meretrix</i>	4.2/100	22
<i>pseudomeretrix</i>	2.2/100	6
<i>matrona</i>	1.9/100	10
<i>ancilla</i>	1.6/100	11

speech of the matron (*matrona*), resulting in an average frequency of less than one (.5) instance per 100 lines.

These figures from Terence are useless, as they are based on such small numbers, but it is worth noting that they do corroborate three points represented in Table 5. First, maidservants are among the *least* frequent users of *facito* in both Plautus and Terence, especially when we keep in mind that, in Terence, two of the three instances assigned to a maidservant are actually put in the mouth of a male speaker, who is conveying a woman's words to his listener!⁸⁴ Keeping that in mind, then, we arrive at the second similarity between earlier and later comic poet: courtesans turn out to be the most frequent users of this imperative. Third, matrons appear to use the form in both authors the least frequently, and it should be noted that the 'giftige Frau' character type, best exemplified in the figure of Cleostrata from *Casina*, speaks the *-to* imperative as frequently as does the good matron, instanced in the figure of Alcumena from *Amphitruo*.⁸⁵ The latter two character types—the matron (in general) and the maidservant—are supposed to be exemplars of wifely and servile obedience respectively, and this must account for their overall avoidance of the *-to* imperative, compared to the courtesan, whose generic trait is *procacitas* 'forwardness'.⁸⁶

All the foregoing conclusions can only have value as suggestions. With the corresponding figures for male speakers, we are on safer ground, as the following table shows.

Table 6: The *-to* imperative in male character-types: Plautus.

Character type	<i>-to</i> imperative, average frequency ⁸⁷	Number of tokens
<i>seruus</i>	2.4/100	130
<i>senex</i>	2.3/100	76
<i>adulescens</i>	1.7/100	48

⁸³ Measured as x *-to* imperatives/100 lines, where a line = to a ten-word unit. The last measure has been chosen to avoid giving unwieldy statistics.

⁸⁴ Ter. *Eun.* 595, 596.

⁸⁵ The relevant statistics are, for the 'vitriolic wife' type, 4 tokens of the *-to* imperative, representing 2 instances per 100 lines, and for the 'good wife' type, speaking 6 instances, at a corresponding average frequency of 2.3 per 100 lines.

⁸⁶ Apuleius (*Flor.* 16), in describing the comedies of Philemon, says: *rarae apud illum [sc. Philemonem] corruptelae, tuti errores, concessi amores. nec eo minus et leno periurus et amator feruidus et seruulus callidus et amica illudens et uxor inhibens et mater indulgens et patruus obiurgator et sodalis opitulator et miles proelior, sed et parasiti edaces et parentes tenaces et meretrices procaces.*

⁸⁷ Measured as x *-to* imperatives/100 lines.

As Adams observed, the *adulescentes* in Roman comedy, ‘in their role as hopeful lovers ... often seek to curry favour with masterful slaves and others. Old men and slaves are rarely coaxing or polite’.⁸⁸ This observation, made with reference to the distribution of the polite imperative softener *obsecro*, holds also for the distribution of the *-to* imperative over these character types—*adulescentes*, *senes*, *serui*. Young men, the most polite of the three, predictably employ the direct form of command, the *-to* imperative, least frequently, while ‘masterful slaves’ and old men, the most authoritative males in the world of the *palliata*, speak them at about equal incidence. Still, it is unlikely that the differences in the rate of use were so sharp as to make the slaves and the *senes* stand out compared to the *adulescens*.

The figures for Terence parallel those of Plautus. In the later playwright’s work, young men speak eight instances, representing less than one (.75) instance per 100 lines. 25 tokens are to be found in the speech of old men, with a resulting frequency of 1.5 per 100 lines. Finally, slaves use the form 21 times, which results in an average frequency of 1.9 per 100 lines. The reason why slaves use the form most frequently is not far to seek: it is a feature of the genre that slaves give instructions, advise and command the young lover. Unsurprisingly, then, most of the forms of the *-to* imperative in Terence are given to the adviser and instructor par excellence, the slave as *callidus* or wise adviser.

Indeed, we find that both of the Roman comic poets prefer to have tricky slaves employ the *-to* imperative. In Plautus, tricky slaves speak most (81) of the total 131 tokens (62%) assigned to *serui*. Of the total speech assigned to male slaves in Plautus, tricky slaves utter 46.1%. The chi-square test shows us that Plautus deliberately assigns more tokens of the *-to* imperative to his *callidus* than to the other types of slave, because the *callidus seruus* assumes a special role of adviser and planner in Plautine comedy. We find the same result in Terence. In the latter author, *callidi serui* utter 15 of the 21 (71.0%) total *-to* forms assigned to slaves, and, of all the speech assigned to male slaves, tricky slaves in Terence claim a 48.1% share. The chi-square test indicates that Terence deliberately assigns more tokens of the *-to* imperative to his tricky slaves.

One final statistic merits attention: a politeness ‘index’; that is, the number of mitigators per 100 *-to* imperatives spoken by each character type surveyed above. For women, any statistics would be unreliable since they are based on very few tokens indeed. In Plautus, we find only one *-to* imperative softener in matrons’ speech; courtesans employ mitigators only twice each and maidservants three times. Women never soften *-to* imperatives in Terence.

We have more data for the male speakers in Plautus. Among men, *adulescentes* soften these forms at a rate of 8.3 per 100 *-to* imperatives (4 instances); *serui* at a rate of 3.1 per 100 (4 instances). *Senes* soften *-to* imperatives least frequently, at a rate of 1.3 softeners per 100 such forms (1 instance).⁸⁹

Unfortunately, again, we do not have a lot of data to work with when considering the politeness index of male characters in Terence. Young men speak one mitigator, and it

⁸⁸ Adams (n. 19), 56.

⁸⁹ It should be noticed, however, that two of the instances of *-to* imperative put in the mouth of slaves are patently mock politeness. See *Asin.* 375 *quaeso, aequo animo patitor* [sc. ‘when I punch you in the face’], and *Mil.* 865 ‘please, do at any rate accept my share in my absence, if the misfortune is divided between us’, *quaeso tamen tu meam partem, infortunium | si diuidetur, me absente accipito tamen*.

will be recalled that 8 forms of the *-to* imperative appear in the speech of *adulescentes*. Thus, the latter group modify about 12 times per 100 forms (12.5 times, to be precise). Old men soften the form 8 times per 100 forms (2 softeners over 25 *-to* imperatives), and slaves never soften the *-to* imperative. Although these findings are not reliable, it may be noted that the same general pattern obtains in both Plautus and Terence, with young men the most polite in both authors.

6. CONCLUSIONS

It is time to summarize the findings of this contribution. First, the use of the *-to* imperative was probably declining in usage from the late third century and down to the middle of the second century B.C.E. Second, the second-person form probably does not belong to an elevated register. Third, the *-to* imperative shows a greater affinity for instructions and permissions compared to the present imperative. *Fac*, however, shows a greater affinity for commands than does *facito*. Fourth, there are few instances of the *-to* imperative which look for immediate fulfilment of the request: 16 out of 399 total countable instances of the *-to* imperative in Roman comedy, or 4.0%. There is some evidence to suggest that *futurum pro praesente*, that is, *facito* referring to fulfilment in the immediate future, was characteristic of servile characters in Roman comedy. Such an 'improper usage', a *uitiosa locutio*, accorded with the prevailing notion which held that slaves were inferior to free men, and their speech, correspondingly, was less correct. Fourth, although the tokens were few in number, it was suggested that the courtesan employed the *-to* imperative most often of the female character-types in both Plautus and Terence. By contrast, in both authors, maidservants and young men employ the *-to* imperative least often, on average. But the differences in the average frequency with which male characters utter the form were probably not so great that the original audience members could distinguish slave, young man and old man in that way. Finally, the *callidus seruus*, typically the starring role and executor of the ruse, uses the *-to* imperative most often in Plautus and in Terence. In this regard, he is clearly distinguished from his peer, the 'good slave'. The prevalence of the *-to* imperative, typical of instructions, is indeed well suited to the *callidus*, who often advises and instructs other, often more powerful, characters.

University of Massachusetts Boston

PETER BARRIOS-LECH
peter.lech@umb.edu