

CONVERSATIONAL EXCHANGE IN PLAUTUS: *EGO/NOS VERSUS TU/VOS*

Este artículo estudia los empleos de los pronombres personales de sujeto (PPS) en Plauto. La primera parte abarca los empleos del PPS para expresar la identidad y para la presentación de personajes, la oposición, el reparto de papeles (*ego vs. tu*), la comparación y el paralelismo, así como los empleos del PPS que indican cambio de locutor. La segunda parte se dedica al estudio de los PPS en el desarrollo de la acción, dado que sirven para conferirle un giro que contribuirá al desenlace de la pieza. Empleados en esta función, los PPS aparecen en contextos que remiten al orden, a la implicación precisa del elocutor en una función, a la idea de acusación o de incitación y al retorno a la realidad. La tercera parte estudia los PPS en el marco de la escritura de la obra: se los emplea como un procedimiento estilístico y aparecen en pasajes con un solo personaje, así como en las entradas y salidas de la escena.

Ce travail étudie les emplois des pronoms personnels-sujets (PPS) chez Plaute. La première partie comporte les emplois du PPS de l'identité ou de la présentation des personnages, de l'opposition, de la répartition des rôles (*ego vs. tu*), de la comparaison et du parallélisme et, enfin, les emplois du PPS indiquant le changement de locuteur. La seconde partie est consacrée à l'étude des PPS dans le déroulement de l'action. En effet, ils servent à faire prendre l'action un autre tournant qui contribuera au dénouement de la pièce. Employés avec cette fonction, les PPS apparaissent dans des contextes renvoyant à l'ordre, à l'implication précise de l'allocutaire dans une fonction, à l'idée de l'accusation ou de l'encouragement, et, enfin, au retour à la réalité. Enfin, la troisième partie traite les PPS dans l'écriture de la pièce. Ils sont employés comme un procédé stylistique et ils figurent dans des scènes à un personnage, ou encore dans l'entrée en scène et l'adieu à la scène.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Plauto, comedia romana, pronombres personales de sujeto, estructura del discurso, desarrollo argumental, estilo.

KEY WORDS: Plautus, Roman comedy, personal pronouns-as-subject, structure of the discourse, unfolding of a plot, writing.

This study is limited to the use of personal pronouns-as-subject (PPS) in sentences and clauses. Indeed, the use of personal pronoun (PP) in oblique cases is generally justified by syntactical reasons: the personal pronoun is not, then, endowed with a particular semantic nuance.

This study is based on the oppositions between the first two person (*ego, tu*), because the third person does not possess a specific pronoun in Latin. Such an opposition is essentially based on the difference in definitions between the first and the second person: *ego* means that the locutor is defined by his own

discourse / *tu* means that the interlocutor is defined by the locutor in opposition to himself.

Before we outline the structure of our work, we consider it useful to make some remarks on the use of PPS in Latin, i.e. on the form of the subject, the function of PPS and its use with a conjugated verb.

THE FORM OF THE SUBJECT IN LATIN

The form of the subject in Latin presents difficulties associated with verbal endings.

In certain languages like English, the use of PPS is indispensable to indicate the person of a conjugated verb, leaving out the third person in the singular which is the only person to be endowed with a specific ending. In contrast, Latin uses verbal endings to indicate the person. Indeed, in this language verbal endings are specific and constant for each person.

According to H. Vairel's theory, verbal personal endings "indicate the presence of a syntactic noun within the sentence [...] which functions as subject"¹. This can be easily proved by the fact that an adjective in the nominative may be used with a conjugated verb without a PPS: *Poen.* 138: *Nunc mihi blandidicus es...*

Then, if there is an adjective, it necessarily agrees with a noun. Therefore, an adjective is incorporated into a constituent which –although it is not morphologically a noun– functions syntactically as such². This constituent is implied within verbal endings that impose case and number but not gender. This is indicated by the adjective.

Verbal endings are then essential because they indicate the person: "their *signifié* implies two combined, but distinct, constituents: a syntactical noun (N) and a specification of person"³.

THE FUNCTION OF PPS AND ITS USE WITH A CONJUGATED VERB

Although verbal endings are sufficient to indicate the person, Latin also uses personal pronouns. Like verbal endings, these pronouns imply a syntactic noun. Indeed, in a clause in which an infinitive of narration appears, the person

¹ H. Vairel, "Le problème de la 'personne' (particulièrement en latin)", *IG* 2, 1979, 41.

² H. Vairel, *art. cit.* 41.

³ H. Vairel, *art. cit.* 41.

is designated by a PPS for the sole reason that the infinitive can not denote it. Even in this case, PPS can be determined by an adjective which will be in the masculine or the feminine, without PPS changes.

It is very frequent to find, mainly within dialogues, a verbal person expressed by both a PPS and a verbal ending.

A conjugated verb with a PPS is more emphatic than when used without such a pronoun; the emphasis on person or on the verbal act depends on the place where the PPS appears in the sentence: whether it precedes the verb or it comes afterward. Moreover, PPS can be only used as a means to attract the locutor's attention. Their function is then illocutionary. Indeed, PPS bring out the verb and the person and, consequently, the locutor's interest grows. The role of PPS is then to emphasize more the verbal act than the subject of the verb.

Our presentation has a threefold division. In the first part, we examine the PPS within the sequence and the structure of the discourse. The second part deals with the PPS within the unfolding of the plot in Plautus' plays and the third part is devoted to PPS within the writing of these plays.

1. THE PPS WITHIN THE SEQUENCE AND THE STRUCTURE OF THE DISCOURSE

This part deals with the use of PPS expressing the identity or the introduction of a person, opposition, role division (*ego vs. tu*), comparison or parallelism and, finally, change of locutor.

1. 1. THE PPS OF IDENTITY OR INTRODUCTION OF A PERSON

1. 1. 1. When using *ego*, the locutor introduces himself and asserts his presence, which enables him to be linked to reality.

The use of *ego* expressing the locutor's identity is very frequent in Plautus. When presenting a new character, the author makes him pronounce *ego* in his first sentences. In the prologue of *Aulularia*, the god Lar introduces himself to the spectators and reveals his identity and his role:

Aul. 2-3 : Ego Lar sum familiaris ex hac familia

Unde exeuntem me aspexistis.

"I am the Household God of this family from whose house you saw me coming out".

The PPS designating the first person referring to the locutor's identity also appears in copulative sentences endowed with an identifying meaning. Within these sentences *ego* functions as subject and is used by the locutor to indicate

his name⁴, his social condition⁵, his loneliness⁶, his obedience to a person⁷ or a god, i.e. Jupiter⁸, to wonder about his identity⁹ and, finally, his desire to obtain information from his interlocutor about his own horrible and nasty character¹⁰.

1.1.2 When using the PPS to designate the second person, the locutor introduces his interlocutor and connects him with what is known about himself. Consequently, *tu* makes the interlocutor approachable.

The locutor uses the PPS designating the second person to introduce his interlocutor by name¹¹ or by asserting what the interlocutor represents to him. Therefore, in *Asin.* 614, Philaenium reassures Argyrippus about her deep love: *Certe enim tu vita es mihi* (“For, you are certainly my life”). In other passages, by means of *tu* the locutor makes his interlocutor realize his true role. In *Cur.* 9 Palinurus makes Phaedromus understand that he is a servant of himself: *Tute tibi puer es* (“You are your own slave”). Finally, the use of *tu* enables the locutor to ask his interlocutor about his social relationships with a third person: *Pers.* 581: *Esne tu huic amicus?* (“Are you a friend of his?”).

1. 2. THE PPS EXPRESSING OPPOSITION

This PPS presents an opposition between the first and second person. This opposition may single out differences in act, behaviour, thought, speech, etc. In other words, the opposition is a means of affirming personality and can be established between the first and the second person, the first and the third person as well as the second and the third person.

1. 2. 1. Opposition between the first and the second person is made by means of correlative structures –in this case each diptyche comprises one of the

⁴ *Amph.* 379: *Ego sum, non tu, Sosia*; 387: *Ego sum Sosia ille, quem tu dudum esse aiebas mihi*; 861: *Ego sum ille Amphitruo, cui est seruus Sosia*; *Trin.* 985-986: *Quia illum quem ementitus es ego sum ipse Charmides, / Quem tibi epistulas dedisse aiebas.*

⁵ *Asin.* 465: *Peregrinus ego sum*; *Cist.* 765: *Ego serva sum*; *Cur.* 765: *Libera ego sum nata*; *Aul.* 166: *ego diues sum*; *Amph.* 394: *Amphitruonis ego sum seruos Sosia.*

⁶ *Rud.* 202: *Ego nunc sola sum.*

⁷ *Mil.* 611: *Ecce nos tibi oboedients.*

⁸ *Amph.* 989: *Ego sum Ioui dicto audiens.*

⁹ *Trin.* 978: *Quis ego sum igitur?*

¹⁰ *Pers.* 371: *Malusne ego sum?*

¹¹ *Amph.* 427: *Si tu es Sosia ...*

two PPS¹² – or of juxtaposed sentences in which the absence of a conjunction expressing coordination corresponds to a contrast¹³.

Contrast between the locutor and the interlocutor is justified by comparing their fortunate or unfortunate condition¹⁴, their feelings¹⁵, their possessions¹⁶, their information level¹⁷, or, finally, their acts in the past¹⁸.

1. 2. 2. Opposition between the first and the third person is established by means of identical syntactical processes to which we have to add the coordination made by *atque* and the juxtaposition of two sentences. The third person is designated either by his name or a demonstrative pronoun (*is, hic, ille, iste*) or *alii* (+N)¹⁹.

Contrast between the first and the third person expresses difference in speech²⁰, professional competence²¹, power²², possessions and social

¹² On the correlation see L. Tesnière, *Eléments de syntaxe structurale*, Paris, Klincksieck, 1959, 545; P. Monteil, *La phrase relative en grec ancien*, Paris, Klincksieck, 1973, 56; J. Haudry, "Parataxe, Hypotaxe et Corrélation dans la phrase latine", *BSL* 68-1, 1973, 153; A. Minard, *La subordination dans la prose védique*, Paris, Klincksieck, 1936; K. Bertelsmann, *Über die verschieden Formen der Correlation in der Structur der Relativsätze des ältern Latein*, Diss. Jena, Druck von A. Neuenhahn, 1885; E. Sánchez-Salor, *Sintaxis Latina. La Correlación*, Cáceres, Universidad de Extremadura, Dpto. de Filología Latina, 1984; M. Lavency, "La proposition relative du latin classique", *AC* 50, 1981, 445-468.

¹³ Ch. Touratier, *La syntaxe latine*. BCILL 80, Louvain-La-Neuve, Peeters, 1994, 510.

¹⁴ *Rud.* 522: *Ego multo tanta miserior quam tu?*; *Most.* 49: *Neque tam facietis, quam tu uiuis, uictibus.*

¹⁵ *Pers.* 286: *Nam ego me confido liberum fore; tu te numquam speras*; *Men.* 268-269: *Tu magnus amator mulierum es, Messenio, / Ego autem homo iracundus, animi perditii*; *Mil.* 1263: *Non edepol tu illum magis amas quam ego, mea, si per te liceat.*

¹⁶ *Truc.* 160: *Tu a nobis sapiens nil habes; nos nequam abs ted habemus*; *Cist.* 493: *Neque nos factione tanta quanta tu sumus...*

¹⁷ *Asin.* 61: *Tu primus sentis; nos tamen in pretio tibi*; *Truc.* 296: *Scio ego plus quam tu arbitrare scire me.*

¹⁸ *Poen.* 192-132: *Saepe ego res multas tibi mandauis, Milphio, / Dubias, egenas, inopiosas consilii, / Quae tu sapienter, docte, et cordate, et cate / Mihi reddidisti opiparas opera tua.*

¹⁹ On the contrastive use of *alius*, see M. Bolkestein, "Discourse Organization and Anaphora in Latin", in S. C. Herring-P. van Reenen-L. Schøsler, *Textual Parameters in Older Languages. Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, vol. 195*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia, Benjamins, 2000, 124-128.

²⁰ *Pers.* 820: *Non hi dicunt, uerum ego.*

²¹ *Pseud.* 810: *Non ego item cenam condio ut alii coci.*

²² *Pseud.* 924: *Numquam edepol erit ille potior Harpax quam ego.*

condition²³, financial situation²⁴, feelings²⁵, the locutor's life style in the past and that of the third person in the present²⁶.

1. 2. 3. Opposition between the second and the third person designated by a demonstrative pronoun is less frequent and is made by the juxtaposition of two sentences. The opposition reveals difference between the interlocutor's act and that of a person designated by a demonstrative pronoun. These acts are located either in the past or in the future²⁷.

1. 2. 4. In conclusion, PPS contrast, on the one hand, a person designated by *ego* or *tu* and, on the other hand, they root them in reality. Indeed, PPS expressing opposition are mainly endowed with such a function. When asserting what belongs to his sphere or to that of his interlocutor, the locutor aims at distinguishing himself or his interlocutor from others and at emphasizing his speech. At the same time, he is forced to emphasize his bond with reality.

1. 3. THE PPS OF ROLE DIVISION (*EGO VS. TU*)

The opposition between locutor and interlocutor is also highlighted by the use of personal pronouns designating the first and second person in context referring to role division. *Tu* designates the interlocutor receiving commands to be carried out instantly and *ego* designates the locutor performing the action. The use of verbs in the present or future indicative conveys the locutor's rush to accomplish his task. We should note that the addressee of an order may also be another person than the interlocutor. In this case, the verb is used in the third person of the future indicative and expresses the locutor's order²⁸.

PPS of role division appear mostly at the end of scenes²⁹. However, we find certain uses at the beginning of scenes³⁰ or the PPS are pronounced during a dialogue in progress³¹.

²³ *Truc.* 150b: *Hunc nos habemus publicum, illi alii sunt publicani.*

²⁴ *Truc.* 220: *Nos diuitem istum meminimus atque iste pauperes nos.*

²⁵ *Cur.* 46-47: *Ea me deperit; / Ego autem cum illa nolo mutuum.*

²⁶ *Aul.* 724-726: *Egomet me defraudaui / Animumque meum geniumque meum; nunc ergo alii laetificantur / Meo malo et damno.*

²⁷ *Truc.* 960: *Tu dedisti iam, hic daturust; Asin.* 768: *Vocet conuiuam neminem illa: tu uoces.*

²⁸ *Cur.* 369: *Tu tabellas consignato, hic ministrabit, ego edam.* On this use of the future, see Ch. Touratier, *op. cit.*, 110.

²⁹ *Trin.* 582: *Tu istuc cura quod iussi; ego iam hic ero; Mil.* 935: *Vos modo curate; ego illum probe iam oneratum huc acciebo; Asin.* 378: *Ego abeo; tu iam, scio, patiere; Pseud.* 646-647: *At*

1. 4. THE PPS OF COMPARISON AND SIMILARITY

Within the comparative system³², the main clause, in which the item compared, *le comparé*, appears, precedes the subordinate clause, in which the comparative item, *le comparant*, is used. The subordinate clause develops the utterance containing the comparative item and the main clause develops the utterance containing the compared item. The comparison is established, on the one hand, between the first and the second person and, on the other hand, between the first or the second person and the third person.

1. 4. 1. Within structures referring to a comparison between personal pronouns designating the first and the second person, the correlative is either an indeclinable (*tam, tantumdem*) or an adjective (*tanta*); the subordinate clause is introduced by a relative adverb (*quam*³³, *quantum*).

By using a relative adverb (*quam, quantum*) introducing subordinate clauses, the locutor stresses the utterance containing the comparative and he discloses a similarity which has been prepared and announced by the correlative.

This construction is characterized, on the one hand, by the use of a PPS designating the first person at the beginning of the main clause or following the correlative and, on the other hand, by the appearance of short utterances in which the subordinate clause is less developed than the main clause. Indeed, the subordinate clause contains only a PPS designating the second person following the relative adverb.

ego, quando eum esse censebo domi, / Rediero. Tu epistulam hanc a me accipe atque illi dato; Most, 526-527: Nil me curassis, inquam; ego mihi prouidero, 1173-1174: Tu quiesce hanc rem modo / Petere; ego illum ut sit quietus uerberibus subegero; Epid. 303: Quin tu is intro atque huic argentum promis? ego / uisam ad forum; Amph. 853-854: Tu, Sosia, / Duc hos intro. Ego huc ab nauis mecum adducam Naucratem.

³⁰ *Amph. 1035: Vos inter uos partite: ego abeo, mihi negotium est.*

³¹ *Pseud. 33: Immo ego tacebo, tu istinc ex cera cita, 173-175: Vos quae in munditiis, mollitiis deliciisque aetatulam agitis, / Viris cum summis, inclutae amicae, nunc ego scibo atque hodie experiar / Quae capiti, quae uentri operam det, quae[que] suae rei, quae somono studeat; Cur. 138: Tu me curato ne sitiam, ego tibi quod amas iam huc adducam.*

³² On the comparison see M. Fruyt, "Métaphore, métonymie et synecdoque dans le lexique", *Glotta* 67-1/2, 1989, 106-122; M. Le Guern, *Sémantique de la métaphore et de la métonymie*, Paris, Larousse, 1973; G. Molinié, *Eléments de stylistique française*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1986; J. Molino, "Métaphores, modèles et analogies dans les sciences", *Langages* 54, 1979, 83-102; B. Pottier, *Théorie et analyse en linguistique*, Paris, Hachette, 1987, 172, 192-197.

³³ On the syntactical function of *quam*, see Ch. Touratier, *op. cit.*, 639-641.

In *Asin.* 490, the correlative structure *tam ... quam* compares the locutor and the interlocutor's human nature: *Tam ego homo sum quam tu* ("I am as much of a man as you"). In *Trin.* 447, the same comparison is expressed by the use of two juxtaposed clauses: *homo ego sum, homo tu es* ("I am a man, you are a man"). Moreover, the locutors' misfortune is compared by means of the correlative structure *tanta ... quam* in *Rud.* 521: *Ego multo tanta miserior quam tu* ("I am much more miserable than you"). Finally, in *Pers.* 517, *tantumdem ... quantum* draws a parallel between the locutors' level of information: *Ego tantumdem scio quantum tu* ("I know as much as you").

1. 4. 2. Comparisons between PPS designating the first and the third person are indicated by a correlative structure, i.e. *ita ...quam*, which compares the locutor's feelings in the present with these of his interlocutor in the future³⁴, or by two juxtaposed sentences introduced by *sic*. The former contains the item compared and the latter the comparative³⁵. In this case, the comparison is established between the locutor's behaviour in the present and that of his ancestor in the past. Comparison between PPS designating the first person and the third person, designated by a demonstrative pronoun or a NS, is also made by means of the conjunction *quasi*³⁶, which introduces the comparative.

This structure appears within short utterances, which do not comprise more than two lines. Utterances comprising the comparative are shorter than those in which the compared item appears. The compared item is used in the first position within the clause. The comparisons made by *quasi* enable the locutor to contrast his celibacy³⁷ with that of another person, absent from the scene, or to contrast his speech in the present³⁸ with that of another person in the past.

1. 4. 3. *Quasi* is also used to compare a person designated by *tu* with someone else, who is invisible to locutors and spectators. In this case, a comparison is established between the speech of the third person, designated by a demonstrative pronoun, and that of the person designated by *tu*. In *Stich.* 549, Epignomnus asks Antipho to reveal the identity of the old man to whom he entrusted his daughter in order to sleep with her: *Quis istuc dicit? An ille quasi*

³⁴ *Cur.* 326: *Ita me amabit quam ego amo.*

³⁵ *Epid.* 340: *Sic ego ago; sic egerunt nostri.*

³⁶ In *quasi* the presence of *si* has already been suppressed from the period of Plaute and thereby the word indicates a comparison.

³⁷ *Stich.* 543-544: *Sed ille erat caeleps senex, / quasi ego nunc sum.*

³⁸ *Stich.* 545-546: *Deinde senex ille illi dixit, cuius erat tибicina, / quasi ego nunc tibi dico.*

tu? (“Who says that? The same one as you?”). *Ille* denotes the old man that Epignomnus compares with his interlocutor in terms of age and celibacy³⁹. This is referred within the preceding lines.

Comparison between the second and the third person is also made by means of a correlative structure, i.e. *quoque ... eo*, which draws a parallel between two characters on the stage. In *Pseud.* 858, Ballio commands his slave to follow with his eyes the cook who is designated by *hic*: *Quoque hic spectabit, eo tu spectato simul* (“Wherever he looks, you look there too”).

1. 4. 4. In conclusion, the correlation is the most frequent process to establish a comparison between the first and the second person, on the one hand, and the first or second person and a third person, on the other hand.

1. 5. THE PPS INDICATING CHANGE OF LOCUTOR

Within a dialogue, the stress is put on the addressee. Discourse refers entirely to allocutive situation and is characterized by metalinguistic constituents and a great frequency of interrogative forms⁴⁰. In Plautus, we distinguish two sorts of responses in which PPS appear. The former is based on the alternative use of *ego/tu* and the latter is expressed by the repetitive use of the identical PPS.

1. 5. 1. Within the former type of response, the first sentence, which is mainly a direct interrogative clause, comprises *tu* by means of which the locutor asks his interlocutor about his identity⁴¹, his health⁴², his aptitude to carry out an exploit⁴³ or, finally, his longing to see a horrible event realized⁴⁴. The locutor uses *tu* to doubt his interlocutor's speeches⁴⁵. The interlocutor's responses are

³⁹ *Stich.* 539: *Fuit olim, quasi ego sum, senex, 543-544: Sed ille erat caeleps senex. / Quasi ego nunc sum.*

⁴⁰ On the function of the dialogue and his opposition to the monologue, see O. Ducrot-S. Todorov, *Dictionnaire encyclopédique des sciences du langage*, Paris, Éditions du Seuil, 1972, 387. On the history of the word from the antiquity to the present time, see P. Charaudeau-D. Maingueneau, *Dictionnaire d'analyse du discours*, Paris, Éditions du Seuil, 2002, 178-179.

⁴¹ *Cur.* 419-420: *Quaeso, tunc is es, / Lyco trapezita?*; *Pseud.* 607: *Tunc es Ballio?*; *Rud.* 1055-1056: *Tunc es, qui haud multo prius / Abiisti hinc erum arcessitum?*

⁴² *Aul.* 186: *Ain tu te ualere?*

⁴³ *Cist.* 231: *Potine tu homo facinus facere strenuom?*

⁴⁴ *Asin.* 608: *Cur tu, obsecro, inmerito meo me morti dedere optas?*

⁴⁵ *Most.* 369: *Tutin uidisti?* TR. *Egommet, inquam; Amph.* 725 : AM. *Tu me heri hic uidisti?* AL. *Ego, inquam, si uis decies dicere.*

short and made mainly in an affirmative tone. Responses are constituted of a sole term, i.e. *egomet*⁴⁶, or a short sentence in which *ego* is used by the locutor in order to introduce himself⁴⁷, to reveal his difficult financial situation,⁴⁸ to turn down his interlocutor's proposal, i.e. to show his bravery⁴⁹. However, responses can be formulated in a direct interrogative clause comprising *ego* followed by a personal pronoun-as-object of the second person (*te*) and expressing the locutor's astonishment at the question of his interlocutor, who seeks to know why he is longing for his death⁵⁰.

In certain passages, the first sentence comprising a PPS, which designates the second person, is an order that the interlocutor agrees to comply with. In *Men.* 216 the hero in question orders his servant, Peniculus, to follow him : *Sequere tu*. On the other hand, Peniculus responds: *Ego hercle uero te et servabo et te sequar* ("By Jove, I will watch you and follow you, both"). His unconditional obedience is expressed by the appearance of *ego* at the beginning of the sentence and by the use of the coordinating syntagm *et ... et*. This syntagm links two verbs in the indicative future, *servabo / sequar*, expressing the locutor's blind submission to the orders of his master⁵¹.

In the first type of response, we find a sentence with *ego*, and in the second, a sentence with *tu*. Within this sort of dialogue, *egone*, a form stressed by the emphatic particle *-ne*, appears in a direct interrogative clause. By means of *egone*, the locutor expresses his excessive joy at learning his impending encounter with his master⁵². Through *egone*, the locutor also protests against his interlocutor's claim that he is ignorant of the current situation⁵³, that he has done him a disservice⁵⁴ or that he is being impudent⁵⁵. The locutor again uses *egone* to convey his astonishment at the sources of his interlocutor's information about facts which took place in the past⁵⁶. The interlocutor gives affirmative responses

⁴⁶ *Pseud.* 625; *Most.* 369; *Amph.* 725.

⁴⁷ *Cur.* 419: *Ego sum*; *Pseud.* 607: *Immo uero ego eius sum Subballio*; *Rud.* 1056: *Ego is sum*.

⁴⁸ *Aul.* 186: *Pol ego haud perbene a pecunia*.

⁴⁹ *Cist.* 232: *sane ego me nolo fortem perhiberi uirum*.

⁵⁰ *Asin.* 609.

⁵¹ On the emphatic cordination, see Ch. Touratier, *op. cit.*, 534.

⁵² *Pseud.* 722-723: PS. *Liberam hodie tuam amicam amplexabere*. CA. *Egone?*

⁵³ *Most.* 954-955: TH. *Quin sex mensis iam hic nemo habitat*. PI. *Somnias*. / TH. *Egone?* TH. *Tu*.

⁵⁴ *Trin.* 633-634: LE. [*Qui*] *Bene cum simulas facere mihi te, male facis, male consulis*. / LY. *Egone?* LE. *Tune*.

⁵⁵ *Truc.* 586: PHR. *Impudens, mecator*. Cyame's. CY. *Egone?* PHR. *Tu*.

⁵⁶ *Amph.* 745-747: AL. *Quippe qui ex te audiui ut urbem maximam / Expugnauiisses regemque Pterelam tute occideris*. / AM. *Egone istuc dixi?*

by means of *tu*⁵⁷, which is emphasized in certain passages by the juxtaposition of *istic*, an adverb indicating place where the locutor stands. *Tu* is also emphasized by the reflexive pronoun *ipsus*, which is endowed with the exclusive meaning “you and no other”⁵⁸. *Tu* can be additionally stressed by emphatic particles, such as *-te* (*tute* followed by *istic*⁵⁹) and *-ne* (*tune*)⁶⁰.

In certain passages, the locutors' responses are formulated in direct interrogative clauses based on an identical structure, the only exception being that each one is endowed with its own expressive connotation. In *Merc.* 633, the locutor conveys his embarrassment by means of the direct interrogative clause *Quid ego facerem?* Subsequently, the interlocutor responds by means of a direct interrogative clause by which he expresses his astonishment: *Quid tu faceres?* Moreover, in *Asin.* 700, Argyrippus expresses his astonishment at the request of Libanus to let him jump on his back: *Ten ego ueham?* (“What, carry you?”). Then, Libanus uses a direct interrogative clause by which he reveals the impossibility of providing him with money in another way: *Tun hoc feras argentum aliter a me?* (“Then, will you get this cash from him any other way?”).

1. 5. 2. The second type of responses is founded on the repetitive use of an identical PPS, which appears in the first or the second position within the sentence, and expresses similitude or opposition between the locutor's acts, opinion and feelings. Within this type of response, PPS are mainly preceded by *at* or *et*. They do not introduce coordination in terms of syntax, but rather a new response which is semantically similar or different and is naturally linked to the one preceding it. The structure of the new response is parallel to that of the preceding one. The link established by the morphemes *at* or *et* is then, as Touratier indicates, “entirely semantic and does not correspond to a particular type of endocentric structure which constitutes the coordination”⁶¹.

⁵⁷ *Truc.* 586; *Most.* 953.

⁵⁸ *Most.* 723. On the usages of *ipse*, see A. Bertocchi, (manuscript) “Some properties of *ipse*”, to be published in H. Rosén (ed.), *Papers from the Seventh International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics*, Innsbruck, Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft; A. Christol, “*Ipse*: 'Articloïde' ou article dans la *Peregrinatio?*», *Lalies* 13, 1992, 143-153; R. Jiménez Zamudio, “La forma pronominal latina *ipse*: su origen”, *Emerita* 57, 1989, 119-127; H. Perdicoyianni, “The use of *autos* and *ipse* in Origen's *Homelies on Jeremy*, as translated by St Jerome”, *PhiN* 17, 1999, 1-15.

⁵⁹ *Amph.* 747.

⁶⁰ *Trin.* 634.

⁶¹ Ch. Touratier, *op. cit.*, 528.

We will cite here certain representative responses expressing similitude or opposition established between the locutors' acts, opinions or feelings.

Semantic similitude of the locutors' responses is expressed by their resolution to accomplish an act, i.e. to come off stage, at the moment the verb indicating movement is uttered⁶². The locutor's responses are also similar in expressing their offer of precious gifts in the past⁶³ and their common trust in the words of a character on stage⁶⁴.

On the other hand, semantic opposition of responses is established by the contrast in expressing the locutor's acts⁶⁵ or intentions⁶⁶, the difference between the determination of the locutor who threatens with punishment and the strong desire of the latter to die⁶⁷, or between the locutor's information about a subject and his interlocutor's longing to be informed about it⁶⁸. Semantic divergence of responses also appears in the locutors' promises expressed by verbs in the future indicative and the future perfect⁶⁹ as well as in the locutor's affirmation of his professional qualities as a cook, on the one hand, and the persistence of his interlocutor to ask a true cook and not a thief, on the other. This is an implicit way for the interlocutor to reject the affirmation of the cook and therefore to deny his qualities⁷⁰.

1. 6. In conclusion, we assert that within the structure of discourse PPS are used to determine the identity of the locutors, to express similitude or opposition between their personality and assignments and, finally, to indicate their change within a dialogue.

⁶² *Pers.* 217: SO. *Eo ego hinc haud longe.* PAE. *Et quidem ego <eo> haud longe;* *Truc.* 848: *Ego abeo.*

⁶³ *Truc.* 946: STRAT. *Dedi ego huic aurum.* STRAB. *At ego argentum.*

⁶⁴ *Poen.* 1325-1330: ANTA. *Ita me Juppiter / Bene amet, bene factum. Gaudeo et uolup est mihi / Siquid lenoni optigit magni mali, / Quomque e uirtute uobis fortuna optigit. / ANTE. Credibile ecastor dicit; crede huic, mi pater. / HA. Credo. AG. Et ego credo.*

⁶⁵ *Men.* 1085-1086: MES. *Sed uter uostrorum est aduectus mecum nauis?* ME. I. *Non ego. / ME. II. At ego;* *Asin.* 827: PA. *Ego istuc curabo.* DI. *At ego te opperiar domi.*

⁶⁶ *Cur.* 687-688: TH. *Heus, tu, leno; te uolo. / PH. Et ego te uolo. CA. At ego uos nos ambos.*

⁶⁷ *Cur.* 723-4: TH. *Ego te in neruom, haud ad praetorem hinc rapiam, ni argentum refers. / SA. Ego te uehementer perire cupio, ne tu [me] nescias.*

⁶⁸ *Merc.* 889: EV. *Ego scio. CHA. Ego me mauelim.*

⁶⁹ *Men.* 544-546: ME. *Fiat. Cedo aurum; ego manupretium dabo. / ANC. Da sodes aps te; <ego> post reddidero tibi. / ME. Immo cedo aps te; ego post tibi reddam duplex.*

⁷⁰ *Aul.* 322: ANTH. *Ego, et multo melior. STR. Cocum ego, non furem rogo.*

2. THE PPS WITHIN THE UNFOLDING OF A PLOT

Most PPS play a primary role within the development of the theatrical action: they contribute to re-launching the plot and combining events and acts which constitute the plot. Briefly, they make the action take another turn which will contribute to the plot's unfolding. Used with this capacity, PPS appear in contexts referring to orders, to the involvement of the interlocutor in a specific role, to accusation or encouragement, and, finally, to the realization of his true situation.

2. 1. THE PPS OF ORDER

In this context, it is the tone which is dominant. PPS is sharp and indicates the irrefutable character of speech. We should note that PPS are followed by an imperative⁷¹ or a subjunctive that expresses order or prohibition⁷². PPS are then used to support the verb and to convey the authority of the locutor.

2. 1. 1. Verbs in the imperative are most often used with a PPS. It is difficult to distinguish between the nominative and the vocative because of the function of the personal pronoun of the second person. Even within sentences with a conjugated verb in the second person, we cannot be certain that *tu / uos* is in the nominative case. According to H. Pinkster's theory, "the use of *tu* when addressing someone in a company of more than two people clearly fulfils an identifying function. The use of *tu* will probably have been accompanied by non-linguistic signals as a movement of the eyes, or the hand as well. It is to be expected that, if more persons are addressed successively, *tu* will be repeated"⁷³.

In *Rud.* 1089, by using the first *tu*, Trachalio addresses Gripus, a slave, and, by using the second *tu*, he addresses Daemones, an Athenian old man:

Cave malo ac tace tu. Tu perge ut occepisti dicere.

"Look out for trouble and keep quiet. (To Trachalio) Go on, you, with what you started to say".

⁷¹ *Aul.* 327: *Tace nunciam tu*; *Asin.* 679: *Age sis tu in partem nunciam hunc delude atque amplectare hanc*; *Amph.* 660: *Sequere hac tu me*; 771: *Secede huc tu, Sosia*; *Pers.* 85: *Curate vos*; 246: *PAE. Et tu hoc taceto*; *Truc.* 386: *Concedite hinc uos intro atque operit<e> ostium*; 788: *Loquere tu.*

⁷² *Most.* 215: *Scapha, id tu mihi ne suadeas, ut illum minoris pendam*; *Rud.* 1385-1386: *Ne tu, leno, postules / Te hic fide lenonia uti; non potes*; 1390: *Immo hercle mea, ne tu dicas tua*; *Trin.* 370: *Tu modo ne me prohibeas accipere, siquid det mihi*; *Poen.* 527-528: *Ne tu opinere, haud quisquam hodie nostrum curret per uias / Neque nos populos pro cerritis insectabit lapidibus.*

⁷³ H. Pinkster, "The pragmatic motivation for the use of the subject pronouns in Latin: the case of Petronius", in *Hommage à Guy Serbat*, Paris, Petters, 1987, 370-371.

Both occurrences of *tu* are true vocatives which identify the addressee, i.e. his slave and the old Athenien, but nothing in the text does not indicate their identity.

2. 1. 2. In certain passages, the interlocutor's address is made by two different lexemes. In *Aul.* 329-330, Strobilus first addresses Congrio simply by *tu* and then calls him by name, while the cooks are designated by *uos*.

Aul. 329-330: *Tu Congrio,*

Eum sume atque abi intro illuc, et uos illum sequimini.

“Congrio, you take this one (*pointing*) and go into that house (*pointing to Euclio's*), and you (*pointing some of the attendants*) follow him”.

Tu is a true vocative which identifies the addressee, Strobilus' slave, whose name is indicated immediately thereafter. Then, Strobilus addresses cooks by *uos* which is also a true vocative used to designate the change of the addressee.

2. 1. 3. In certain passages, the verb does not appear in the imperative; instead, the indicative future is used and functions as an imperative. This use of the future expresses a lesser order, which implies, however, a threat⁷⁴.

2. 1. 4. Certain occurrences of *tu* are accompanied by an interjection and, subsequently, *tu* is a vocative. This interjection is either a demotivated imperative (*age*)⁷⁵ or a primary interjection (*heus, eho*), i.e. an interjection which is not subject to etymological analysis. *Heus* and *eho* appear mainly at the beginning of a sentence⁷⁶, and the sentence which follows could be uttered alone without any syntactical change. Moreover, *heus* and *eho* never appear alone. Used at the first position within the line and followed by *tu*, these

⁷⁴*Poen.* 1036: *Maledicere huic tu temperabis, si sapis; Pseud.* 508: *Tu uiues, tu argentum dabis.*

⁷⁵ On the motivation and demotivation, see M. Fruyt, “Lexique et conscience linguistique en latin: la motivation”, in *Mélanges Kerlouégan. Annales littéraires de l'Université de Besançon*, Besançon, 1994, 255-267; C. Justus, “Word order and the first person imperative”, in R. Sornicola-E. Poppe-A. Shisha-Halevy (eds.), *Stability, Variation, and Change of Word-Order Patterns over Time*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia, Benjamins, 2000, 166-184; *Asin.* 679: *Age sis tu in partem nunciam hunc delude atque amplexare hanc*, 891: *Age, tu interibi ab infimo da sauium; Pers.* 606: *Age age nunc tu.*

⁷⁶ However, we single out certain usages of *heus* coming after a vocative (*Men.* 832: *Filia, heus!*) or a conjunction (*Bac.* 327: *Atque heus tu!*).

interjections are employed by the locutor either to call someone to come to the door⁷⁷ or to address him at the moment of speech⁷⁸.

2. 1. 5. In the above passages, PPS are accompanied by a gesture in order to identify the addressee. Therefore, *tu* functions as a (quasi-)deictic⁷⁹. This deictic function also extends to certain uses of *ego*. When protesting his honesty and good intentions, the locutor designates himself by a gesture and, at the same time, he uses the reinforced form of PPS designating the first person:

Poen. 149 : *Egone istuc ausim facere, praesertim tibi?*

“Would I be capable of doing this, especially to you?”

2. 1. 6. In conclusion, regarding the uses of the PPS with an imperative or the future indicative, we affirm that an order can be given to more than one addressee and refers to acts that the addressee has to accomplish immediately.

2. 2. THE PPS EXPRESSING THE INVOLVEMENT OF THE INTERLOCUTOR IN A SPECIFIC ROLE

PPS expressing an order are compatible with those indicating the involvement of the interlocutor in a specific role. In this context, PPS emphasize what is said and make the interlocutor feel much more responsible, when he is addressed. These uses differ from those appearing in the context of role division because only the second person is implied. Indeed, the locutor has to convince his interlocutor about his responsibility. What is interesting about this use is that the PPS *tu* is halfway between the nominative and the vocative: *tu* remains the subject and, at the same time, it is endowed with a nuance of address, indeed a deictic function.

In *Poen.* 58, the Prologue addresses the spectators and therefore involves them in the plot; he entrusts them with a role and makes them participate in the action; he then gets their attention by granting them with a certain responsibility:

Vos iuratores estis

“You are the Commissioners”.

⁷⁷ *Most.* 988: *Heus uos, ecquis hasce aperit?*

⁷⁸ *Pers.* 672: *Heus tu, serua istum*; *Poen.* 709-710: *Heus tu, qui furem captas, egredere ocius, / Vitute inspectes aurum lenoni dari*; *Trin.* 1059: CH. *Heus tu, asta ilico; audi.* ST. *Heus tu, no sto*; *Merc.* 189: *Eho tu, eho tu, quin cauisti ne eam uideret, uerbero?*

⁷⁹ On the deictic uses of the personal pronouns, see C. Kerbrat-Orecchioni, *L'énonciation. De la subjectivité dans le langage*, Paris, Armand Colin, 1980, 40-44.

We have to note that *uos* expresses insistence and that it has a particular syntactical function between the nominative and the vocative.

2. 3. THE PPS OF ACCUSATION

PPS clearly indicate the addressee. The locutor uses *tu* in order to attract the interlocutor's attention and, at the same time, to blame him. The locutor, thereby, reproaches his interlocutor of criminal acts⁸⁰ or of professional lapse⁸¹.

2. 4. THE PPS OF ENCOURAGEMENT

PPS are used to put the addressee in a new psychological state. Therefore, they express notions of encouragement, reassuring and support.

2. 4. 1. By the use of *tu*, the locutor reassures the addressee. When perceiving that Agarastocles has lost his courage, and subsequently their plan could not be realized, Milphio attempts to inspire him:

Poen. 972: *Quid tu mihi testis ? Quin tu insistis fortiter?*

“Why speak to me of witnesses? Why don't you go after him boldly?”

In this text, it is the tone which mainly reassures the interlocutor. But the tone and the personal pronoun-as-subject are not indissociable: both have their effects on the addressee.

2. 4. 2. PPS conveying encouragement also affirm a certain reality and express thereby a certain credibility.

When introducing Collybiscus to Lycus, who mistrusts them, the witnesses do not want to reveal that they know him. They will then give vent to their responsibility, in case things should turn out badly for Lycus:

Poen. 649: *Ly. Quis hic est ?*

Adu. Nescimus nos quidem istum qui siet.

“Lyc. Who is he?”

Adv. We really do not know who he is”.

⁸⁰ *Mil.* 42-45: *Memini: centum in Cilicia / Et quinquaginta, centum in Scytholatronia, / triginta Sardis, sexaginta Macedones / Sunt homines quos tu occidisti uno die; Epid.* 334-335: *Quippe tu mi aliquid aliquo modo alicunde ab aliquibus blatis, / Quod nusquamst.*

⁸¹ *Pseud.* 149-150: *Verum ita uos estis praediti neglegentes ingenio inprobo, / Officium uestrum ut uos malo cogatis commonerier.*

By declaring *nescimus nos* the witnesses emphasize specifically the verb and its *signifié*. Moreover, the use of *nos* shows the willingness of the locutor to stress his speech. *Nos* confirms the witnesses' honesty: Lycus can not have a sense of the impending trap.

2. 4. 3. In light of the above data, we assert that *tu* functions as a morpheme expressing inspiration and trustworthiness.

2. 5. THE PPS INDICATING RETURN TO REALITY

We have seen that *ego* is linked to reality. Thence, when doubting the reality of what he sees or hears, the locutor uses PPS in order to reconnect to concrete reality again. This use of *ego* appears in two different contexts.

Used in the first context, *ego* appears in direct interrogative clauses with verbs meaning 'to see' (*uideo, conspicio, aspicio*) or with the following expression: *oculis utilitatem optineo*⁸². In *Poen.* 1122, at the appearance of Hanno on the stage, Giddeus uses the following direct interrogative clause: *Nam quem ego aspicio* ("Why, who is that I see?") in order to end the illusion of which he believes to be a part.

Returning to reality may be more brutal and less agreeable. We find this use in the scene where Milphio recites his four truths to his master. Agarastocles permits Milphio to treat himself as he likes without any risk of reprisals. Knowing that Agarastocles has promised this behaviour while in a state of exaltation, Milphio brutality brings him back to reality by means of two pronouns which are diametrically opposed. Therefore, he gives each one the position he deserves: that of his master who gives orders and has the power of live and death over his slave, and that of slave who obeys:

Poen. 145-8 : Ag. *Si tibi lubido est aut uoluptati, sino.*

Suspende, uinci, uerbera; auctor sum, sino.

Mi. *Si auctoritatem postea defugeris,*

Vbi dissolutus tu sies, ego pendeam.

"AG. If you find any joy or pleasure in it, I let you. Hang me up, bind me, beat me; I authorize you, I let you. MI. If you withdraw your authority later on when you are released, I will hang".

⁸² *Epid.* 4: *Epidicumme ego conspicio?*, 634-636: *Satin ego oculis utilitatem optineo sincere an parum? / Videon ego Telestidem te, Periphanei filiam, / Ex Philippa matre natam [as] Thebis, Epidauri satam?*; *Men.* 1001: *Pro di immortales, obsecro, quid ego oculis aspicio meis?*, 1062: *Pro di immortales, quid ego uideo?*; *Trin.* 1071: *Satin ego oculis plane uideo?*

The PPS referring to a return to reality reappear in contexts where the locutor realizes his misfortune. *Ego* expresses then despair and discloses the locutor's tragic and plaintive condition. Moreover, *ego* attracts the spectators' attention, because they perceive a new turn in the plot regarding the character's emotional state. The locutor's misfortune is mainly conveyed by verbs such as *perii*, *cecidi*, *interii*, *occidi*, appearing most often with the adjective *miser*⁸³.

2. 6. Conclusion on the second part

In Plautus' plays, *tu* is used to indicate to the addressee his appropriate behaviour should be, to inspire in him with courage, and to reproach him for criminal acts and lack of professional lapses. Finally, *ego* enables the locutor to realize what his real condition is.

3. THE PPS IN THE WRITING OF THE PLAY

In the writing of his plays, Plautus uses PPS as integral part of his style and they appear in monologues and in aside speeches, as well as in the coming on-and-off stage.

3. 1. When endowed with the first function, PPS appears in stylistic devices, i.e. in figurative interrogation and exclamations; they are also used to stress certain forms, to emphasize sentences and speeches, to express the passage from the general to the particular, and, finally, to function as a pure stylistic redundancy.

3. 1. 1. The PPS in figurative interrogation

Figurative interrogation consists of asking a question in order to express the locutor's deepest conviction and to defy the interlocutor to be able to deny or even to respond. The difference between figurative interrogation and literal interrogation is that the latter expresses the doubt, ignorance and curiosity of the locutor who seeks to be informed about a situation or an event.

In Plautus, figurative interrogation conveys surprise, protestation, indignation and even irony.

⁸³ *Rud.* 844: *Nunc pol ego perii*; *Aul.* 413: *Attat, perii hercle ego miser*; *Merc.* 510: *Tum pol ego perii misera*; *Epid.* 253: *Cedo ego occidi*; 325: *Interii hercle ego*; *Asin.* 287: *Perii ego oppido, nisi Libanum inuenio iam, ubi ubi est gentium*; *Truc.* 618: *Tum pol ego et donis priuatus sum et perii*.

3. 1. 1. 1. Within a figurative interrogation, *ego* is used by the locutor to express his violent and deep emotional state upon hearing a stupefying news, i.e. the decision of his son to get married with a woman without dowry⁸⁴. The locutor's surprise is also caused by the revelation of his interlocutor's immoral acts regarding the fate of his master or his daughter. For example, Callidorus lets his anger explode when Ballio says that he has betrayed his mistress for a large sum of money⁸⁵. Moreover, Euclio is stupified by Lyconides' confession that he has done violence to his daughter.⁸⁶ The locutor's astonishment, i.e. Simia, is also evoked by the request of his interlocutor, i.e. Ballio, to hand over to him the very person who has caused his loss, the frightening Pseudolus⁸⁷. Finally, the locutor's surprise explodes at the disclosure of his interlocutor's feelings. Phronesium, Stratophanes' lover, is surprised by the declaration of her servant, Astaphium, who reveals her anger Stratophanes⁸⁸.

Furthermore, the locutor's surprise is caused by the interrogation of his interlocutor, in which the former expresses his wrath or his doubt regarding what course of action to take. In *Amph.* 815-816, the hero in question lets his anger explode at the Alcmena's ingenuous question about her culpability:

Tute edictas facta tua ; ex me quaeris, quid deliqueris?

“You have recounted your doings yourself; and you ask me how you have sinned?”

In her turn, Alcmena persists, in an astonished and naive tone, in asking him to justify his reproach:

Quid ego tibi deliqui, si cui nupta sum tecum fui?

“How could I have sinned, when I was with you I married?”

In addition, in *Most.* 555, Tranio is amazed by the question of Theopropides who asks him a piece of advice about his behaviour:

TH. *Quid nunc faciundum censes?*

TR. *Egon quid censeam?*

“Th. What do you think should be done? Tr. What do I think?”

⁸⁴ *Trin.* 378: *Egone indotam te uxorem ut patiar?*

⁸⁵ *Pseud.* 345-347: BA. *Vtrum uis, uel quater quinis minis, / Militi Macedonio. Et iam quindecim habeo minas. / CA. Quid ego ex te audio?*

⁸⁶ *Aul.* 794-796: LYC. *Ego me iniuriam fecisse filiae fateor tuae / Cereris uigilis per uinum atque impulsus adulescentiae / EVC. Ei mihi, quod facinus ex te ego audio?*

⁸⁷ *Pseud.* 1226: BA. *Saltem Pseudolum mihi dedas. SI. Pseudolum ego dedam tibi?*

⁸⁸ *Truc.* 898: AST. *Merito ecastor tibi succenste? PHR. Egon?*

3. 1. 1. 2. Figurative interrogation is used by the locutor to express his protestation against the speech of the interlocutor. By using *ego*, the locutor disapproves the immoral suggestion of his interlocutor, who incites him to rob his father⁸⁹ or he rejects the professional label that the interlocutor gives him⁹⁰. The locutor also expresses his protestation against his interlocutor's intimate confession about to being scared of a trap⁹¹, and his opposition to the interlocutor's reproaches for doing violence to his daughter⁹², for planning to swindle him out of money⁹³, for cajoling him⁹⁴, and, finally, for having talked nonsense⁹⁵.

3. 1. 1. 3. The third function of *ego* within a figurative interrogation is to express ironically the opposite of what means. In *Truc.* 775, Callicles shows a mocking attitude toward two characters, who are socially inferior to him, i.e. his servant and hair stylist. His attitude is demonstrated in the way he expresses:

Egon tibi male dicam aut tibi adeo male uelim?

“(To his own maid) Am I speaking hard words to you, (to the other) am I holding hard words to you?”

3. 1. 1. 4. In conclusion, we assert that PPS used within a figurative interrogation are endowed with an expressive connotation indicating emotion, anger, disapproval and, finally, the locutor's mocking attitude.

3. 1. 2. The PPS of exclamation

By using PPS the locutor stops speaking and explodes. The *ego* indicating exclamation is an emotional expression, whereas *ego* used in the figurative interrogation is a rather rational one.

⁸⁹ *Pseud.* 290: *Egon patri subrupere possim quicquam, tam cauto seni?*

⁹⁰ *Mil.* 1139: *MI. Quid agis, noster architecte? PA. Egone architectus? uah!*

⁹¹ *Most.* 923-924: *TR. Egone te ioculo modo ausim dicto aut facto fallere? / TH. Egone aps te ausim non cauere ne quid committam mihi?*

⁹² *Aul.* 690: *Egone ut te aduorsum mentiar, mater mea?*

⁹³ *Asin.* 93-95: *Defrudem te ego? age sis tu, sine pennis uola. / Ten ego defrudem, cui ipsi nihil est in manu, / Nisi quid tu porro uxorem defrudaueris?*

⁹⁴ *Merc.* 154: *Egon ausim tibi usquam quicquam facinus falsum proloqui?*

⁹⁵ *Cist.* 295: *Dixin ego istaec, obsecro?*

The locutor uses *ego* to convey all sorts of feelings, i.e. his excessive joy⁹⁶, his aversion⁹⁷ and his surprise caused by coincidence⁹⁸. *Ego* also enables the locutor to express regrets about his misconduct⁹⁹ or to bemoan his misfortune¹⁰⁰.

On the other hand, the PPS designating the second person is used by the locutor to blame his interlocutors of perfidy and villainy and, at the same, time, to express his anger¹⁰¹. We should note in *Rud.* 830 the exclamative sentence *heus vos!* which the locutor uses to address a person.

3. 1. 3. The PPS and the reinforcement of forms

In Plautus, the PPS emphasizes a verbal or nominal form.

In *Poen.* 48-49, we can read:

Determinabo: ei rei ego sum factus finitor.

“I shall determine: I have been selected as its surveyor”

Ego is used by the locutor less to refer to himself than to justify *Determinabo*. *Ego sum factus* indicates a delayed-justification of the locutor, justifies and makes plausible *Determinabo*.

Moreover, we detect certain uses of *ego* and *tu* which are reinforced by the adjective *solus* or the reflexive pronoun *ipse*, endowed with the exclusive meaning ‘you and no other’¹⁰² to designate a unique person¹⁰³.

3. 1. 4. The PPS indicating the passage from general to the particular

PPS illustrate a “general truth”. In *Poen.* 217-220, Adelphasium talks about women in general and shows all sorts of embarrassment they cause for men. In order to justify her speech, she gives an example:

⁹⁶ *Rud.* 245-146: *Vt uix mihi / Credo ego hoc, te tenere!*; *Truc.* 701: *Di magni, ut ego laetus sum, ut laetitia differor!*

⁹⁷ *Men.* 189: *Vt ego uxorem, mea uoluptas, ubi te aspicio, odi male!*

⁹⁸ *Mil.* 401: *... Atque ut tu suspicatus es eam uidisse osculantem!*

⁹⁹ *Asin.* 856: *At scelestas ego praeter alios meum uirum frugi rata / Siccum, frugi, continentem, amantem uxoris maxime!*

¹⁰⁰ *Epid.* 56: *Di immortales, ut ego interii basilice!*

¹⁰¹ *Men.* 1015: *Vos scelesti, uos rapaces, uos praedones!*

¹⁰² On the use of *ipse*, cf. *supra* n. 58.

¹⁰³ *Asin.* 163: *Solus solitudine ego ted atque ab egestate abstuli*; 519-520: *Quin pol si reposiui remum, sola ego in casteria / Vbi quiesco, omnis familiae causa consistit tibi*; *Aul.* 190: *Quid tu solus tecum loquere?*; *Stich.* 373: *Tutin ipsum uidisti?*

1. 217-220 : *Nam nos usque ab aurora ad hoc quod diei est*

Ex industria ambae numquam concessamus

Lauari aut fricari aut tergeri aut ornari.

“For from dawn until thus very moment the both of us never cease washing or rubbing or scrubbing or dressing”

By using *nos*, Adelphasium emphasizes her speech. Indeed, *nos* transforms a general truth into a particular case, that of the women in *Poenulus*.

3. 1. 5. The PPS emphasizing a sentence and a speech

Within sentences and speeches, PPS attract the attention of the interlocutor and lead him to what is significant.

3. 1. 5. 1. PPS designating the first person are used by the locutor to emphasize his sentences expressing feelings, such as impatience¹⁰⁴, fear¹⁰⁵, desire¹⁰⁶, precipitation¹⁰⁷, mistrust¹⁰⁸, pain¹⁰⁹, lamentation¹¹⁰, hope¹¹¹. *Ego* is also used by the locutor to indicate his thoughts¹¹², his conduct¹¹³, his knowledge about a situation or an event¹¹⁴, his experience¹¹⁵, and his acts¹¹⁶. In addition to

¹⁰⁴ *Cur.* 212: *Quando ego te uidebo?*

¹⁰⁵ *Most.* 514: *Nil ego formido*; *Trin.* 738-739: *Verum hoc ego uereor ne istaec pollicitatio / Te in crimen populo ponat atque infamiam.*

¹⁰⁶ *Stich.*, 587: *Edepol ne ego nunc mihi medimnum mille esse argenti uelim*; *Cist.* 7: *Eo ego uos amo et eo a me magnam inistis gratiam*; *Trin.* 717: *Ego te uolo.*

¹⁰⁷ *Cist.* 594: *Ego ad anum recurro rursus*; *Stich.* 250: *Ego illo mehercle uero eo quantum potest*; *Asin.* 108: *Ego eo ad forum, nisi quid uis.*

¹⁰⁸ *Pseud.* 318: *Tibi ego credam?*

¹⁰⁹ *Trin.* 287a: *Haec ego doleo, ...*

¹¹⁰ *Asin.* 515: *Verum ego meas queror fortunas, cum illo quem amo prohibeor.*

¹¹¹ *Aul.* 175: *Idem ego spero*; *Amph.* 718: *Amphitruo, speraui ego istam tibi parituram filium.*

¹¹² *Asin.* 820: *Ego sic faciendum censeo*, 861: *Ego quoque hercle illum antehac hominem sempersum frugi ratus*; *Aul.* 266: *Credo ego illum iam indaudisse mihi esse thesaurum domi.*

¹¹³ *Pseud.* 73: *Nunc ego te experiar quid ames, quid simules*; *Amph.* 424: *Iam ego hunc decipiam probe*, 1043-1044: *Ego pol illum ulciscar hodie thessaluae ueneficum / Qui peruorse pertubauit familiae mentem meae.*

¹¹⁴ *Asin.* 466: *Ego certe me incerto scio hoc daturum nemini homini*; *Pseud.* 72: *Haec quae ego sciui ut scires curauit omnia*, 496: *Recte ego meam rem sapio*, *Callipho*; *Trin.* 283: *Noui ego hoc saeculum moribus quibus siet.*

¹¹⁵ *Pseud.* 136: *Neque ego homines magis asinos numquam uidi*; *Men.* 500-501: *Non edepol ego te, quod sciam, unquam ante hunc diem / Vidi neque gnoui*, 594: *Ne magis manifestum ego*

those uses of *ego*, which enable the locutor to express his emotions, his thoughts and deeds or facts referring to his own sphere, *ego* also indicates the locutor's relationships with his interlocutor or a third person. In this context, *ego* expresses commitment¹¹⁷, behaviour, i.e. obedience¹¹⁸, reassurance¹¹⁹, services¹²⁰, and the like.

3. 1. 5. 2. In certain passages, *ego* re-launches a discourse and announces that a significant speech will be uttered or an act of considerable importance will be performed. Then, *ego* appears with a verb in the indicative future meaning «to say, to tell» and refers to the revelation of a secret, a situation and an event. The most frequent expressions are *ego dicam*¹²¹, *ego tibi dicam*¹²², *ego eloquar*¹²³.

3. 1. 5. 3. PPS are used to render a speech more serious and solemn. When using a threatening speech, the locutor mainly uses *ego* with verbs in the indicative future expressing bodily sufferings which he will inflict on whomever he wants to intimidate by means of his threats¹²⁴. *Ego* convinces the interlocutor of the locutor's seriousness, anger and intention to carry out his threats.

hominem unquam ullum teneri uidi, 940: Egomet haec te uidi facere; Most. 905-906: Nusquam edepol ego me scio / Vidisse unquam abiectas aedes, nisi modo hasce.

¹¹⁶ *Cur. 581: Ego illam reddidi qui argentum a te attulit?; Trin. 1061: Pol ego emi atque argentum dedi.*

¹¹⁷ *Rud. 1125-1126: DAE. Non ego te comprimere prosum sine malo? GR. Si istic tacet, / Ego tacebo; Amph. 947-948: ... Vt quae apud legionem uota uoui, si domum / Redissem saluus, ea ego exsoluam omnia.*

¹¹⁸ *Men. 225: ER. Redi cito. CY. Iam ego hic ero; Asin. 705: AR. Inscende actutum. LI. Ego fecero.*

¹¹⁹ *Cist. 595 : Perfectum ego hoc dabo negotium; Most. 387: PHILO. Perii! TR. Habe bonum animum; ego istum lepide medicabo metum.*

¹²⁰ *Pers. 10: Ego neque lubenter seruiuo neque satis sum ero ex sententia, 733-734: Ne ego hodie tibi / Bona multa feci; Trin. 301-302: Semper ego usque ad hanc aetatem ab ineunte adulescentia / Tuis seruiui seruitutem imperiis [et], praeceptis, pater.*

¹²¹ *Most. 484; Aul. 641.*

¹²² *Rud. 388; Cur. 439; Pseud. 336, 801.*

¹²³ *Mil. 382.*

¹²⁴ *Pseud. 382: Exossabo ego illum simulter itidem ut muraenam coquos; Amph. 348: Ego tibi istam hodie, sceleste, comprimam linguam, 556-557: Iam quidem hercle ego tibi istam / Scelestam, scelus, linguam abscidam; Aul. 189: Cui ego iam linguam praecidam atque oculos effodiam domi; Truc. 844: Verum hoc ego te multabo bolo.*

3. 1. 5. 4. In conclusion, PPS stress speech and give it a more serious, stronger tone. Indeed, PPS make the discourse coherent and consistent.

3. 1. 6. The redundant PPS

By “redundant personal pronouns” we mean those which are not relevant. They may be used without an expressive connotation or appear in set phrases.

3. 1. 6. 1. The PPS used as a simple redundancy

In certain passages, the use of PPS is not justified. They function as a pure redundancy. For example, the expressions *ut ego suspicor*¹²⁵, *ut ego dico*¹²⁶, *ut tu praedicas*¹²⁷, *ut ego opinor*¹²⁸, *quid tu agis*¹²⁹, *Quid ais tu?*¹³⁰ are set phrases without any nuance of insistence, intention or aim.

3. 1. 6. 2. The PPS with a conjunction indicating strong coordination

After a conjunction indicating strong coordination, such as *at*, *sed*, we find mainly a conjugated verb with a PPS indicating the second person. As these conjunctions express opposition, the PPS may, in turn, be endowed with a nuance of opposition, which is, however, lesser than that of the conjunction.

In *Poen.* 173, we can read:

MI. *Non scis?*

AG. *Non hercle.*

MI. *At ego iam faxo scies.*

“Mil. You don't know?

Ag. Really, I don't.

Mil. Well, I will soon let you know”.

In this passage, we feel a lesser opposition between the master, who is ignorant of the situation, and Milphio who will explain what he means.

¹²⁵ *Trin.* 1113.

¹²⁶ *Rud.* 1072.

¹²⁷ *Pseud.* 473.

¹²⁸ *Most.* 480.

¹²⁹ *Epid.* 9.

¹³⁰ *Poen.* 985, 990.

Moreover, in *Truc.* 410-411, Diniarcus reveals Phronesium the identity of the true mother of the child which secretly brought by Syra:

*Eum nunc non illa peperit quae peperit prior,
Sed tu posterior.*

“It seems this boy wasn’t born of the mother that bore him first, but of you in a second birth”.

Used with a discriminative meaning, *sed* juxtaposes the first mother of the child (*illa peperit quae peperit prior*) to the second (*tu posterior*), i.e. Phronesium. *Tu* is certainly endowed with a meaning expressing opposition to *illa peperit quae peperit prior*, which is, however, lesser than that of *sed*.

3. 1. 6. 3. The PPS in correlation

In correlation, the use of PPS is required for syntactical or stylistic reasons:

Poen. 292-293: *Pol id quidem hau mentire; nam tu es lapide silice stultior
Qui hanc ames...;*

“Oh, Lord! you do not lie, for you are more foolish than a flint, because you love her”.

The use of *tu* is justified both by the strong coordination *nam* and the relative clause. Indeed, *tu* emphasizes the clause; the correlation makes the relationship expressing ‘cause a effect’ much stronger than if *tu* were not explicitly uttered and merely implied in the verbal ending. Semantically, *tu* does not bring anything to the sentence; but from a syntactical point of view, the pronoun creates a balance between the two clauses by linking them and providing the relative clause with an antecedent¹³¹.

3. 1. 7. Used within stylistic devices, PPS may or may not be relevant. Endowed with an expressive connotation, PPS express the locutor's feelings and emotion or attract the attention of the interlocutor to what will be said or done. Used with an impertinent and redundant meaning, their use is justified for syntactical reasons.

¹³¹ Cf. also *Most.* 188: *Tu ecaster erras, quae quidem illum expectes unum; Men.* 904: *Ego stultius sum, qui isti credam.*

3. 2. The PPS in scenes involving one character

In theatrical plays, the monologue is a soliloquium, justified by the presence of the spectators, whom the character can not address directly, but he must inform them about his identity, his feelings and the development of the play¹³².

A particular case of the monologue is the *aside*. The locutor talks to himself by lowering his voice and, consequently, he is excluded from the discourse made by the other characters in the scene¹³³.

3. 2. 1. The PPS in monologues

3. 2. 1. 1. As the monologue is a self talk, which is justified by the presence of the spectators, the locutor's attention is centred on his current situation¹³⁴, his embarrassment¹³⁵, the act which he is about to perform at the moment he utters his speech¹³⁶ or that he performed in the past¹³⁷, and the way by which an act could be performed in a very near future¹³⁸. *Ego* is also used by the locutor to indicate his decision¹³⁹, to express his fear and uncertainty¹⁴⁰, his surprise at the sight of a new character¹⁴¹, and, finally, his longing to play a different role than the one he must play in the current situation¹⁴². In addition, by using *ego* the

¹³² P. Charaudeau-D. Maingueneau, *op. cit.*, s.v.

¹³³ P. Charaudeau-D. Maingueneau, *op. cit.*, s.v.

¹³⁴ *Rud.* 585: *Sed quid ego hic asto infelix uividus?*; *Pseud.* 773: *Neque ego amatorem mihi inuenire ullum queo,...*; *Most.* 145: *Ego sum in usu factus nimio nequior.*

¹³⁵ *Trin.* 718-720: *Quid ego nunc agam / Nisi uti sarcinam constringam et clipeum ad dorsum accommodem, / Fulmentas iubeam suppingi soccis?*; *Aul.* 447: *Quid ego nunc agam? ne ego edepol ueni huc auspicio malo.*

¹³⁶ *Aul.* 698: *Nunc ego mecum cogito.*

¹³⁷ *Most.* 118: *Haec argumenta ego aedificiis dixi*; *Merc.* 262: *Quam ego postquam aspexi ...*

¹³⁸ *Stich.* 75: *Principium ego quo pacto cum illis occipiam, id ratiocinor.*

¹³⁹ *Pseud.* 1241-1242: *At ego iam intus promam uiginti minas / Quas promisi, si effecisset*; *Stich.* 440: *Aut egomet ibo atque opsonabo opsonium*; *Pers.* 457-458: *Nunc ego lenonem ita hodie intricatum dabo, / Vt ipsus sese qua se expediat nesciat*; *Most.* 427-428: *Ludos ego hodie uiuo praesenti hic seni / faciam, quod credo mortuo numquam fore*; *Mil.* 814: *Eripiam ego hodie concubinam militi...*

¹⁴⁰ *Pseud.* 1019: *Nimisque ego illum hominem metuo et formido male,...*; *Aul.* 389: *Numnam ego compilor miser?*

¹⁴¹ *Men.* 463: *Sed quid ego uideo? Menaechmus cum corona exit foras.*

¹⁴² *Pseud.* 1057: *Ego periurare me mauellem miliens / Quam mihi illum uerba per deridiculum dare.*

locutor designates his social status¹⁴³, reproaches himself for not performing an act¹⁴⁴, justifies his love¹⁴⁵ and confirms his experience¹⁴⁶.

3. 2. 1. 2. When the speech is addressed to a thing, the monologue is justified by the presence of an object, which excludes at the outset the alternance of interlocutors. These uses are few in Plautus and stress the appearance of *tu*.

The object which the locutor addresses is either a precious one, i.e. a pot¹⁴⁷, or an edifice, i.e. Sagaristion's house¹⁴⁸. In this passage, the locutor comes close to the house and addresses his landlord, designated by his name (l. 459: *Sagaristio*). Afterwards, in l. 461, he uses *tu* to address him twice. Syntactically, *tu* is the anaphora of *Sagaristio*. But semantically, *tu* functions as a form of metonymy, in which the *house* is substituted for the landlord and his habitant at the same time.

We also detect a use of *tu* in a speech addressed to someone else except that the addressee is absent from the scene. The addressee is a deity, i.e. Cupido, and the use of *tu* is also anaphoric¹⁴⁹.

3. 2. 1. 3. The monologue of Pseudolus contained within lines 394-414 is a particular case of monologue addressed to oneself. Indeed, *tu* (l. 394) designates the locutor himself and therefore is justified by his physical presence. This form of monologue also excludes at the outset the alternance of interlocutors and is considered a soliloquy. The alternance of *tu* with *ego* in the sequel of the monologue is noteworthy¹⁵⁰.

¹⁴³ *Aul.* 704: *Ego sum ille rex Philippus.*

¹⁴⁴ *Most.* 362: *Sed ego, sumne ille infelix, qui non curro curriculo domum?*

¹⁴⁵ *Truc.* 441/443: *Egone illam ut non amem. egone illi ut non bene uelim? ... / ... Ego isti non munus mittam?*

¹⁴⁶ *Pseud.* 1017: *Peiorem ego hominem magisque uersute malum / Numquam edepol quemquam uidi quam hic est Simia; Stich.* 79: *Ego meas noui optume.*

¹⁴⁷ *Aul.* 580-581: *Edepol ne tu, aula, multos inimicos habes / Atque istuc aurum quod tibi concreditum est.*

¹⁴⁸ *Pers.* 459-461: *Sagaristio, heus! exi atque educe uirginem, / Et istas tabellas quas consignauit tibi, / Quas tu attulisti mi ab ero meo usque e Persia.*

¹⁴⁹ *Merc.* 854-856: *Egomet mihi fero quod usust. O Cupido, quantus es! / Nam tu quemuis confidentem facile tuis factis facis, / Eundem ex confidente actutum diffidentem denuo.*

¹⁵⁰ *Pseud.* 404, 406.

3. 2. 1. 4. We have to analyse another sort of monologue: that of the prologue. In the prologue, a sole character is on stage; he speaks and states clearly how things stand at the very beginning of the play. We assume that the prologue has a particular function. Indeed, it defines the limits of the play and gives an outline of the situation. By using *ego*, the Prologue indicates his identity¹⁵¹, expresses his fear¹⁵², recognizes his stupidity, which is incompatible with his divine nature¹⁵³, discloses his benefits he has made to the state¹⁵⁴ and talks about his experience¹⁵⁵. The Prologue also gives scenic and dramaturgical indications: he presents his outfit¹⁵⁶, announces what he is doing at the moment of the speech¹⁵⁷, indicates two of the leading characters of the play¹⁵⁸, reveals the plot to the spectators¹⁵⁹ but also refuses to show the place where the play is unfolding¹⁶⁰.

In contrast, by using *tu* the Prologue addresses the spectators and therefore involves them in the play: he gives them a role and makes them participate in the action. Consequently, the prologue attracts the attention of the spectators by conferring them a certain responsibility¹⁶¹.

The function of PPS is then double: on the one hand, they emphasize the characters and the speech, they arouse the interest of the spectators, and, on the other hand, they give dramaturgical indications.

3. 2. 2. The PPS in aside speeches

In Plautus, the aside speech is used either to make a character address the spectators without being heard by the other characters on the stage or make him speak, whereas the others are in conversation from which he is excluded.

¹⁵¹ *Aul.* 2-3: *Ego Lar sum familiaris ex hac familia / Vnde exeuntem me aspexistis.*

¹⁵² *Amph.* 30-31: *Atque ego quoque etiam, qui Iouis sum filius, / Contagione mei patris metuo malum.*

¹⁵³ *Amph.* 55-57: *sed ego stultior, / Quasi nesciam uos uelle, qui diuus siem.*

¹⁵⁴ *Amph.* 39-40: *meruimus / Et ego et pater de uobis et re republica.*

¹⁵⁵ *Men.* 23: *Ego illos non uidi, nequis uostrum censeat.*

¹⁵⁶ *Amph.* 116-117: *Nunc ne hunc ornatum uos meum admiremini, / Quod ego huc processi sic cum seruili schema.*

¹⁵⁷ *Poen.* 123: *Ego ibo, ornabor.*

¹⁵⁸ *Amph.* 94-95: *hanc fabulam, inquam, hic Jupiter hodie ipse aget, / Et ego una cum illo.*

¹⁵⁹ *Aul.* 32-33: *Eam ego hodie faciam ut hic senex de proximo / Sibi uxorem poscat.*

¹⁶⁰ *Men.* 10: *Ego nusquam dicam, nisi ubi factum dicitur.*

¹⁶¹ *Poen.* 58: *Vos iuratores estis, 123: uos aequo animo noscite.*

3. 2. 2. 1. When appearing in the first type of the aside, by the use of *ego* the locutor announces to the spectators his attributes¹⁶² or his decision about what he is going to do¹⁶³ and his misfortune¹⁶⁴. Likewise, by the use of *ego*, the locutor also recognizes a character on the stage¹⁶⁵, expresses his embarrassment by means of rhetorical questions conveying his deliberation¹⁶⁶ or his wish¹⁶⁷, admits his imbecility¹⁶⁸ and, finally, indicates that he gets the same information as that of his interlocutor¹⁶⁹.

3. 2. 2. 2. Used in the second type of the aside, *ego* affirms the locutor's identity, because it enables him to be contrasted with the others characters on stage.

In *Poen.* 368-369, while Milphio is speaking to Adelphasium with mock fervour, Agorastocles, who is speaking in an aside, expresses his disapproval and his anger in an irritated aside:

Mene ego illaec patiar praesente dici? Discrucior miser,

Nisi ego illum iubeo quadrigis cursim ad carnificem rapi.

“Shall I allow these things to be said in my presence? I am a poor, distracted fool, if I do not have him dragged off in a chariot to the hangman at once”

The rage of Agorastocles explodes by means of two pronouns: *me*, used as the subject of the ablative absolute and *ego*, functioning as the subject of *patiar*; he asserts himself as the omnipotent master in comparison to Milphio, and, at the same time, he attempts to comfort himself, because he feels defenceless. Agorastocles then uses PPS to affirm his authority and to encourage himself by persuading himself about his power.

¹⁶² *Merc.* 852-854: *Egomet mihi comes, celator, equus, agaso, armiger; / Egomet sum mihi imperator, iedm egomet mihi oboedio; / Egomet mihi fero quod usust.*

¹⁶³ *Pseud.* 603: *Iam pol ego humc stratioticum nuntium aduenientem probe percutiam; Aul.* 577-578: *Ego id cauebo; nam alicubi abstrudam foris. / Ego faxo et operam et uinum perdiderit simul.*

¹⁶⁴ *Most.* 562-564: *Scelestus, natus deis inimicis omnibus. / Iam illo praesente adibit. Ne ego homo sum miser, / Ita et hinc et illinc mihi exhibent negotium; Truc.* 357: *Vah, uapulo hercle ego nunc atque adeo male.*

¹⁶⁵ *Epid.* 458: *Nunc demum scio ego hunc qui sit.*

¹⁶⁶ *Most.* 662: *Quid ego nunc agam...?; Cist.* 713: *Quid ego erare dicam?*

¹⁶⁷ *Trin.* 958: *Enim uero ego nunc syncophantae huic syncophantari uolo...*

¹⁶⁸ *Trin.* 929: *Quis homo est mei insipientior qui ispe egomet ubi sim quaeritem?*

¹⁶⁹ *Aul.* 548: *Tam hoc scit me habere quam egomet: anus fecit palam.*

3. 3. The PPS in the coming on stage

When appearing on the stage, a character exchanges short turns of phrase with his interlocutor. The first turn of phrase expressing greetings, by means of which the locutor addresses his interlocutor, appears in the form of the imperative (*Salua*), within a direct interrogative clause (*Ut uales?*) or an affirmative sentence containing an illocutionary verb (*iubeo*) followed by *saluere*. In contrast, the type of phrase used as a response appears either within a sentence that may or may not contain a verb. In the first case, *et tu* is used before or after the imperative *salua*. In the second case, the sentence contains only *tu* preceded by the morpheme *et*¹⁷⁰. By using the morpheme *et*, which is followed by *tu*, the interlocutor speaks, in his turn, and keeps up the conversation by means of “a new response linked naturally with the preceding one which it extends”¹⁷¹. At the beginning of the sentence, the morpheme *et* does not then introduce a coordination, but is endowed with an additional and coherent function, which is appropriate to its *signifié*¹⁷².

3. 4. The PPS in the coming off stage

3. 4. 1. As in the end of the prologue, we have a flood of PPS announcing the end of the monologue and the beginning of the play, we find PPS pronounced by the characters before they left the stage. These PPS are not the exact counterpart of the PPS appearing in the prologue or when a character comes on to the stage. The PPS of the coming off stage are not systematically used.

In *Poen.* 787-791, Lycus is caught in the act, keeping Collybiscus and his money at home. Lycus is ruined. For him, the play is over: he will reappear only once (V, 6) just to finish himself off.

Nunc pol ego perii certo, haud arbitrario.

Consulto hoc factum est, mihi ut insidiae fierent.

Sed quid ego dubito fuguere hinc in malam crucem

Prius quam hinc oporto collo ad praetorem trahor?

Eheu, quom ego habui harioles haruspices!

“Oh, Lord! Now I am completely ruined, no doubt about it. This was done purposely to trap me. But why don't I hurry up and escape from here and go hang,

¹⁷⁰ *Truc.* 123: DI. *Salua sis./ AST. Et tu; Trin.* 48: CA. *Vt uales?/ Megaronides./ ME. Et tu edepol salua, Callicle; Most.* 568-569: TR. *Saluere iubeo te, Misargyrides, bene./ DA. Salua et tu.*

¹⁷¹ Ch. Touratier, *op. cit.*, 528.

¹⁷² Ch. Touratier, *op. cit.*, 528.

before I am dragged off from here to the judge by the neck? Damnation! When I had oathsayers, seers!"

This is the last speech of Lycus in which he accumulates a series of *ego* expressing despair at the moment he makes his final appearance on stage. This makes the situation more tragic and plaintive. The accumulation of *ego* attracts the attention of the spectators for several reasons: first, because the misfortune falls on Lycus himself, *ego* is then the person for which the spectators can't help but feel sorry; then, because he is about to leave, *ego* makes the spectators remember him. Lastly, this succession of *ego* attracts the attention; the spectators are now informed that something important will happen: this is the exit of Lycus.

If *ego* is used by the locutor to express his misfortune and announce his impending exit from the scene, *nos* indicates the decision made by the locutors to accomplish an act immediately¹⁷³.

3. 4. 2. In the coming off stage, the PPS designating the second person show the end of an episode. Its role is then to close the act or the scene. In most of these uses, *tu* appears in short turns of phrase expressing farewell and is preceded by the morpheme *et*¹⁷⁴. We also found certain uses of *uos*, by means of which the locutor addresses the spectators and asks them to applaud him¹⁷⁵.

3. 5. Within the writing of the plays, PPS are used with an expressive connotation and therefore belong to the affective syntax. Furthermore, they are endowed with a double dramaturgical function: they are used to start the action or the scene, on the one hand, and to end them, on the other.

In conclusion to our study on the conversational exchange of PPS in Plautus, we would like to assert that most of them are endowed with a expressive connotation. The pure redundant PPS, which is not used from a syntactic and semantic point of view, is rather rare. At the end of our analysis,

¹⁷³ *Poen.* 1422: *Age sis, eamus ; nos curemus; Merc.* 1009: *Illac per hortum nos domum transibimus.*

¹⁷⁴ *Poen.* 808: *AG. Tu sequere me intro. Vos ualete. / ADU. Et tu uale; Aul.* 175: *MEG. Vale. / EVN. Et tu, frater; Asin.* 745: *AR. Valete. / LE. Et uos amate; Pers.* 709: *DO. Vale. / SA. Et uos.*

¹⁷⁵ *Capt.* 1034-1035: *Nunc uos, si uobis placet, / Et si placuimus neque odio neque odio fuimus, signum hoc mittite; Stich.* 775: *Vos, spectatores, plaudite atque ite ad uos comissatum; Most.* 1181: *Spectatores, fabula haec est acta; uos plausum date; Bac.* 1211: *Spectatores, uos ualere uolumus et clare adplaudere.*

we have the feeling that it is up to reader to appreciate the richness of the PPS through his own interpretation. Even this is sometimes debatable, we think that our analysis proved that how much a PPS can be rich and how it is regrettable to pass over them quickly during a reading. Indeed, all expressive connotations implied in the PPS render the text subtle and witty and only the perceptiveness of an attentive reader can be disclose them.

UNIV. DE HELSINKI

HÉLÈNE PERDICOYIANNI-PALÉOLOGOU