University of Massachusetts Boston

From the SelectedWorks of Peter Barrios-Lech

Summer 2016

The Volo Command in Roman Comedy (Revised, Pre-Print Version)

Peter G Barrios-Lech, *University of Massachusetts Boston*

Available at: https://works.bepress.com/peter_barrios-lech/8/

THE VOLO COMMAND IN ROMAN COMEDY

The scholarly field of politeness has introduced new perspectives on Latin commands and requests – 'directives' to use the speech-act term.[1] Specifically, researchers have demonstrated how the speaker's choice of request was impacted by factors like his or her authority relative to the addressee, the relationship between the two – whether intimate or more distant – and the burdensomeness of the request.[2] In his letters, for instance, Cicero employs *velim ut facias* and *quaeso ut facias* for minor requests (such as asking for a response to a letter), but reserves *rogo ut facias* and *peto ut facias* for more burdensome ones.[3] In general, these last three request forms (with *quaeso*, *rogo*, and *peto*) are polite because they "emphasize the fact of the petition itself, which creates a connection between the two people in which the asker is subordinated to the person asked, and flatters the latter".[4] To take another example, Wolfgang de Melo demonstrates that between the prohibitions *ne facias* and *ne feceris* one is not "softer" than the other; these forms are distinguished in other ways, but not by the greater politeness of one over the other.[5]

In this contribution, I shall consider how the relationship of speaker to addressee constrains the use of requests and commands expressed with the matrix-verb *volo* and its negated form *nolo*.[6] To give an example of such a directive, at *Poenulus* 1037, a young man prohibits a slave from speaking insults with *nolo*+*AcI* ([sc. *casus*] *accusativus cum infinitivo*): "I don't want you to speak ill of my kinsmen", *meis consanguineis nolo te iniuste loqui*.[7]

---

[1] In what follows, I will occasionally use the term directive which in speech-act terminology is simply any attempt to get the hearer to do something. Cf. Searle 1976, 11. For an analysis of the Latin command from a speech-act theory perspective see Risselada 1993, to which I refer *passim*, below. The pioneering work of Brown and Levinson (1987, 76–78) directed attention to how the factors of *power* (of hearer relative to speaker), *distance* between speaker and hearer, and *degree of the imposition* affect the phrasing of commands, among other "face-threatening acts". Their theory, as briefly outlined, has been dismantled: see e.g. Watts 2003, 95–98. Nevertheless, the work still remains a useful source of ideas for scholars investigating 'socio-pragmatic' aspects of language.

[2] See for instance Ferri 2008, 2012, Hall 1996, 2005, 2009, and Dickey 2012a and 2012b.

[3] Dickey 2012a, 733, 742.

[4] Dickey (2012b, 321–2) further shows that as self-abasing petitions, Cicero uses them particularly with social intimates and inferiors (e.g. his wife, brother, or closest friend; clients or for instance his freedman Tiro).

[5] So de Melo (2007 111, 117), drawing on data from Roman comedy.

[6] I focus exclusively on the first-person present singular indicative form of the verb. I do not consider past tense or subjunctive forms of the matrix-verb *volo* (or *nolo*). Forms with the past tense *volui* and *volebam* appear to convey

In what follows, I will briefly describe the corpus and explain the criteria I used to isolate such *volo* directives (section 1). I will then identify and discuss three major syntactical categories into which such directives fall: *volo*+bald (or complementary) infinitive, *volo*+*AcI*, and *volo*+finite clause with the subjunctive (section 2). Finally, I will show that the expression conforms to certain tendencies: first, the majority of the 181 instances in Roman comedy express peremptory commands (section 3); second, perhaps because the form expresses commands, in only a minority of cases is it directed 'upward', to a hearer with authority greater than the speaker's (section 4). In the last part of this paper, I suggest that the expression is used to characterize on the linguistic level in three plays: *Amphitruo*, *Casina*, and *Captivi* (section 5).

1. Corpus and Criteria of Selection.

I gathered the relevant data by reading through the plays of Plautus and Terence. The data were then checked through a subsequent re-reading. In identifying the relevant expressions, the main criterion used was the context. Consider for instance the following examples:

---

polite directives. In a kind of "deictic shifting", that is, throwing the verb of desiring (whether indicative or subjunctive) to the past tense, the speaker distances himself from his own present wishes; the effect is almost descriptive, as if the speaker is narrating his own past mental state. See, for instance, *Asin*. 452 (merchant addressing slave): *sed si domi est, Demaenetum volebam*; *Capt.* 53 (*prologus* to audience): *sed etiam est paucis vos quod monitos voluerim*; *Capt.* 309 (Tyndarus playing the aristocratic youth, to his captor): *Hegio*, *hoc te monitum*, *nisi forte ipse non vis*, *volueram*. For *vellem*+infinitive, see Ferri (2012, 119-120) on *Poen*. 681: *videre equidem vos vellem quom huic aurum darem*, which he translates "ideally I had wished to have you here when I gave him the money." He explains: "the polite tone is conveyed not just by use of the particle *equidem,* but also by the choice of mood and tense, an imperfect subjunctive: Collybiscus' wish is presented as an irreal hypothesis, thus minimizing the expectation or the claim on the citizens' compliance with the request." Finally, forms with the present-subjunctive *velim* or *nolim*+embedded clause are rare in Plautus and Terence. Commands with *velim* in Plautus: *Aul*. 120, *Men*. 909; Terence: *Eun*. 979, 1069; *Phorm*. 449, 855; with *nolim*: Plaut. *Amph*. 86, *Capt*. 942; Ter. *Ad*. 969.

[7] Unless otherwise noted, translations are mine.

1. MI. nisi, quidquid est,
volo scire atque hominem convenire, si apud forumst. (Ter. *Ad*. 152-3)

MI. Except, whatever it is,
I want to know and to meet him, if he is at the forum.

2. AM. Alcumena, unum rogare te volo. AL. quidvis roga. (Pl. *Am*. 708)

AM. Alcmena, I want to ask you one thing. AL. Go ahead, ask whatever you like.

3. NI. habetin aurum? id mihi dici volo.
CH. postquam quidem praetor recuperatores dedit,
damnatus demum, vi coactus reddidit. (Pl. *Bac*. 269-271)

NI. Do you have the gold? That is what I want to be told.
CH. After the praetor assigned arbitrators, the man, after being at last convicted, gave [it] back under duress.

Micio speaks the first example on an empty stage. He merely expresses his desire to meet his son and find out whether the lad has indeed abducted a lyre-player. In the second example, Amphitruo requests permission to ask a question with *unum rogare te volo*, "I want to ask you one thing". Alcumena responds by granting permission, "ask whatever you like", *quidvis roga*. Finally, in the last example, a master demands an answer to a question with *id mihi dici volo*, and his slave complies by answering.

Context, then – particularly how a *volo* expression is responded to, play-internal descriptions of the expression *as* a command or request, whether there are any other characters on stage to hear it – was the most important criterion for identifying utterances with the matrix-verb *volo* (or *nolo*) as directives. In identifying the relevant expressions, I was especially attentive to instances with the *accusativus cum infinitivo* (*volo te facere*) or an embedded subjunctive (*volo ut facias* or *volo facias*), since the work of previous scholars has shown that *volo* commands typically assume either one of these two constructions.[8] As it turns out, the majority of commands and requests with *volo* (or *nolo*) in Roman comedy are conveyed with an *AcI* as the embedded clause; 117, or 64.6% of the 181 total instances (for instance example (3.), above). 36, or 19.9% are expressed with *volo* and a bald infinitive, like Amphitruo's *unum rogare te volo* in example (2.), above. Finally, 28, or 15.5%, contain a finite clause with the subjunctive.[9]

2. The Three Syntactical Categories: *volo*+Bald Infinitive, *Volo*+*AcI*, *Volo*+Finite Clause.

---

[8] Risselada (1993, 281): "the directives [sc. with *volo*] may be expressed by means of a finite clause with or (more usually) without *ut*…or by means of an accusative and infinitive…construction". On *volo* with the embedded subjunctive as a periphrasis for the imperative, see Kühner-Stegmann II.1, 205. Bennett (1966 I, 215-217) hypothesizes that its origins lay in a paratactic expression like *erum exhibeas,–volo* (*Mil*. 546).

[9] On *volo* with *AcI,* see Leumann-Hofmann-Szantyr II.2 355. I have analyzed as *volo*+bald infinitive those instances in which the subject of *volo* and the embedded infinitive are identical; the instance above is so categorized: *unum rogare te volo* (*Amph*. 708). On the other hand, I counted examples like *Most*. 314, *advorsum veniri mihi ad Philolachem/ volo temperi* with an impersonal infinitive, as instances of *volo*+*AcI*. On this kind of " 'man-Passive'", see LHS II.2 418 and K.-St. II.1, 654.

Discussion of examples drawn from each of these three syntactical categories will serve to introduce characteristic features of the *volo* command. Let us begin with the last mentioned category, *volo*+bald or complementary infinitive; we will then consider *volo*+*AcI*, followed by *volo*+embedded subjunctive.

2.1 Volo *commands with complementary infinitive*

4. CH. eamus; et de istac simul, quo pacto porro possim
   potiri, consilium volo capere una tecum. AN. fiat. (*Eu*. 613-614)

   CH. Let's go; and, at the same time, I want to form a plan with you about that girl, namely, how I can take possession of her. AN. Ok.

5. TH. scire volo quoi reddidisti. LY. lusco liberto tuo,
   is Summanum se vocari dixit, ei reddidi. (*Cur*. 543-544)

   TH. I want to know to whom you gave [sc. the money]. LY. To the one-eyed freedman of yours – he said that he was called Summanus – to him I gave it.

6. DO. hospes, volo ego hanc percontari. SAG. a terra ad caelum, quidlubet. (*Per*. 604)

> DO. Guest, I want to question this girl. SAG. Ask anything you please, from earth to the heavens.

If the imperative is the mood of a "directly expressed will or *desideratum*, directed as a command to a person", then the above commands with *volo* ("I want") are simply naked expressions of the speaker's will, or desire.[10] The addressee must infer how, specifically, he is to fulfill that stated desire. Thus, in (4.), when the *adulescens* says "I want to form a plan with you", he is *not* idly sharing a piece of information about his psychological state. Rather, the utterance is relevant to the addressee, who is to act on this piece of news, namely, by helping his friend form a plan.[11]

Similarly, in the remaining examples, the hearer must infer the relevant request from the speaker's stated desire. Thus, the soldier in (5.) might have been more direct by saying, "tell me to whom you gave the money", not "I want to know to whom you gave the money". But despite the indirectness of the latter, it still unambiguously conveys a command. The procurer in (6.) is also indirect, for he intends his utterance, "I want to question this girl" as a request for permission, *viz*., "permit me to interrogate this girl".

By contrast, commands that take the form *volo te hoc facere* and *volo ut illud facias* allow speakers to communicate *explicitly* both the requested action (*hoc facere*/ *illud facias*), and the person of whom the action is requested (*te*/[*tu*]). We turn now to the first of these two constructions.

---

[10] At K.-St. II.1, 195, the imperative is defined as "der Modus des unmittelbar ausgesprochenen Willens oder Gewollten, der als Befehl an eine Person gerichtet wird." See Risselada's apt comments on this definition in light of speech act theory at 1993, 23-24.

[11] This account is based on Grice's (1975, 41-58, esp. 45-56) Cooperative Principle and its maxims, and Searle's (1975, 59-82) account of indirect requests based on felicity conditions.

2.2 Volo *commands with AcI as the embedded clause*.

7. PY. istuc quod das consilium mihi,
te cum illa verba facere de ista re volo. (*Mil*. 1114-1115)

PY. As to that advice you're giving me,
I want *you* to speak with her about that matter.

8. PH. nolo ego cum improbis te viris, gnate mi,
neque in via, neque in foro necullum sermonem exsequi. (*Trin*. 281-282)

PH. I don't want you to pursue any conversation, my dear son,
with wicked men, not on the street, not in the forum.

9. LY. profecto ego illunc hircum castrari volo,
ruri qui vobis negotium exhibet. (*Mer*. 272-273)

LY. I really do want that goat castrated,
the one in the country that's giving you problems.

10. GY. video ego te Amoris valide tactum toxico,
adulescens; eo te magi' volo monitum. AL. mone. (*Cist*. 298-299)

> GY. I see that you have been absolutely touched with love's poison, young man; the more for this reason do I want you to have been advised. AL. Go ahead: advise away.

Both (7.) and (8.), in contrast to the first set of passages with *volo*+bald infinitive, contain clear reference to the person for whom the command is relevant with the second person singular accusative *te*; they also explicitly state the action requested from the hearer: *cum illā verba facere* in (7.) and *cum improbis viris…necullum sermonem exsequi* in (8.). These infinitives have, moreover, non-past reference and are "agent-controlled", typical semantic features of a verb that conveys directive force.

Example (9.), however, does not contain such clear-cut indications of directive force. When he says "I really do want that goat castrated" to his slave (*profecto ego illunc hircum castrari volo*), the speaker leaves unmentioned the agent who should carry out the request, only indicating that the addressee is to oversee its completion.[12] Consider, on the other hand, the following command, uttered by an old man to a doctor: *magna cum cura illum curari volo*, "I want him to be taken care of with great care" (*Men*. 895). As in the previous example, the speaker does not indicate *who* is to fulfill the request, but the doctor's response shows that he was the intended agent: *quin suspirabo plus sescenta in die/ ita ego eum cum cura magna curabo tibi*, "I will huff and puff more than six-hundred breaths a day: in that way I'll take care of him for you with great care" (*Men*. 896-897).[13]

---

[12] Risselada (1993, 269-270), in her discussion of expressions like *fac ut sciam,* discusses precisely the issues raised by this passage. I agree with her that in cases in which "the embedded clause does not contain an explicit agent expression", *who* is to carry out the requested action can only be decided "on the basis of context and the situation in which the utterance occurs".

[13] *in die* Lambinus for MSS *in dies*.

There is also a passive in (10.): “I want you to have been advised”. That this is a request for permission is indicated by the young man’s reaction, *mone*, “[go ahead and] advise [me]”. This is one instance of a small group of *volo* directives with the perfect passive infinitive conveying a request relevant to the present time. A similar example appears in a Terentian prologue: “wherefore I want you all to have been beseeched as follows: let not people’s talk be able to do more injustice than justice”, *quare omnis vos oratos volo/ ne plus iniquom possit quam aequom oratio* (*Haut*. 26-27).

What governs the choice between, say, *volo orare te* and *volo te oratum esse*? It is tempting to assert that politeness is the deciding factor. After all, the latter expression makes the request less confrontational by omitting mention of the speaker, and throwing the *present* act of beseeching into the past.[14] Not, then, “I want to beseech you”, but “I want you to have been beseeched.” Moreover, there are five directives of the type *volo te oratum esse* in Plautus and Terence. In three, a low-status character makes a request of a high-status one; the remaining two are spoken by *prologi*, who are often polite in their addresses to the audience.[15]

Yet similar examples with the 3rd person, for instance *te conventum cupit*, “she wants you [to have been] met” (*Cur*. 304), argue against politeness as a reason for choosing the construction in question. The deciding reason for the speaker to choose it instead appears to be a stylistic one, namely, "if someone wants to indicate emphatically the object of his or her wish as already completed".[16]

---

[14] This would then constitute “deictic shifting”, on which, see Brown and Levinson 1987, 119-122.

[15] The relevant examples in Roman comedy are, in Plautus: *Asin*. 38 (slave to master): *neque hercle istuc dico nec dictum volo*; *Cas*. 21-22 (*prologus* to audience): *vos omnis opere magno esse oratos volo/benigne ut operam detis ad nostrum gregem*; *Cist*. 298-299 (*meretrix* to *adulescens*): *video ego te Amoris valide tactum toxico/adulescens*; *eo te magis volo monitum*; *Per.* 370 (*virgo* addresses her father): *nam ego tibi cautum volo*. In Terence: *Haut.* 26-27 (*prologus* to audience): *quare omnis vos oratos volo/ne plus iniquom possit quam aequom oratio*. See *Capt*. 309, but with *volueram*: *Hegio*, *hoc te monitum*, *nisi forte ipse non vis*, *volueram*. Other polite utterances in prologues: *As*. 14: *date benigne operam mihi*; *Cas*. 1-2: *Salvere iubeo spectatores optumos/ fidem qui facitis maxumi – et vos Fides*; *Men*. 4-5: *quaeso ut benignis accipiatis auribus*.

2.3 Volo *commands with an embedded subjunctive*.

Let us now consider some examples of *volo* commands with an embedded subjunctive.

11. DA. nihil hercle hic tibi est, ne tu speres. iuris iurandi volo
gratiam facias. GR. perii hercle! (*Rud*. 1414-1415)

DA. There's really nothing for you here, so don't expect it. I want you to release him from his oath. GR. I'm done for!

12. CH. nunc si commodumst,
Dionysia hic sunt hodie: apud me sis volo. (*Hau*. 161-162)

CH. Now, if it's convenient,
the Dionysia are here today: I want you to be at my place.

13. ST. volo eluamus hodie, peregrina omnia relinque, Athenas nunc colamus. (*St*. 669)

---

[16] K-St. II.1, 713-714, Anmerk. 4: "…wenn man mit Nachdruck den Gegenstand des Wunsches als schon vollendet bezeichnen will"; see there for further examples.

ST. I want us to be purified today! Leave behind everything foreign. Let us now inhabit Athens![17]

We see in (11.) a command, as an old man directs his slave to release someone from a promise made under oath; (12.) is an invitation: a *senex* asks his neighbor to participate in a celebration by coming to his house, and in (13.) we have a proposal whereby a slave recommends that he and his friend commence celebration on the occasion of their return home.

The foregoing discussion may elicit the question whether there are any functional differences between these syntactical forms. That is, might *volo*+*AcI* be more suited to conveying commands, while *volo*+subjunctive, say, tends to express requests? Risselada has shown that there is no such functional difference between *volo*+*AcI* and *volo* with the embedded subjunctive.[18] A review of the data gathered for this investigation confirms her view.[19]

Volo+bald infinitive, however, appears to be different. As we saw above, this form expresses directives in an indirect manner.[20] Because it conveys directives indirectly, it seems polite, and so especially suited to requests, which leave compliance optional. To take another example, in *Mercator*, a father addresses his son as follows: *paucula etiam sciscitare priu' volo*, "I want to inquire about a few things first", to which the son replies, *dic quid velis*, "tell me what you want" (383). The father is requesting permission to ask some questions. Of the 36 total tokens of *volo*+bald infinitive, more than half (55.6%) convey requests like this.[21] We may hypothesize that compared to *volo*+*AcI* or *volo*+subjunctive, *volo*+bald infinitive "prefers" requests.

---

[17] Trans. adapted from de Melo 2013.

[18] Risselada (1993, 288), speaking of the *volo* command (and the related polite expression with *velim*), notes "[n]o general correlation can be established between the form of the embedded clause and the speech act type".

[19] 60.7% of *volo*+subjunctive convey commands, while 25% convey requests; 64.1% of *volo*+*AcI* convey commands, and 22.2% requests. A simple statistical test, to be described below, finds that the difference between the proportions is not statistically significant.

[20] Of the 36 total such directives (*volo*+bald infinitive), I count 12 as metadirectives. To briefly explain the metadirective with an example, when we ask a question, the intended (perlocutionary) effect on the hearer is a response. Thus, "answer me" or the like, when accompanying a question, is a metadirective. In *quis est ille*? *dic mihi*, or, more relevantly, *volo scire*, the latter phrases are metadirectives. For a lucid account of this, see Risselada 1993, 44-45.

A simple statistical test seems to confirm this hypothesis.[22] Specifically, it indicates that *volo*+bald infinitive is specialized for requests compared to *volo*+*AcI* and *volo*+subjunctive. In what follows, I will variously refer to all three of these categories with the general term *volo* command or *volo* directive, and will discuss all three together. When relevant, however, I will raise the distinction among them that we noted above.

3. ***Volo*** **Directives Tend to Express Peremptory Commands.**

Writing in the 4th C CE, Donatus had closely associated *volo* directives with peremptory commands. He comments on its use at *An*. 418, where a father orders his son to marry: "I want you to marry today", *hodie uxorem ducas…volo*; and on the use at *Ad*. 378-379, where a slave orders his subordinate as follows: "when I come, it [sc. the eel] shall be de-boned. I don't want you to do it sooner", *ubi ego venero, exossabitur;/ priu' nolo*:

14. *ad An*. 418 HODIE VXOREM 'volo' et 'nolo' nimis imperiosa et superba dictio est, ut alibi.

---

[21] 55.6% of all instances of *volo*+bald infinitive convey requests; 38.9% convey commands

[22] A modified version of the z-test was used to answer questions like the following. Is the difference in the proportions – 55.6% of *volo*+bald infinitive convey requests, compared to 22.2% of *volo*+*AcI* – statistically significant, or due simply to chance? If the former, then we may assume that the prevalence of *requests* among the tokens of *volo*+bald infinitive is due to the syntactical form used to express them. This is not the place to introduce the test and explain it; for such introduction and explanation see Butler 1985, esp. 92-95.

ad An. 418 HODIE VXOREM ‘volo’ and ‘nolo’, an exceedingly imperious and haughty utterance, as it is elsewhere.

15. *ad Ad*. 379 PRIVS NOLO superbe et pro auctoritate non dixit ‘non oportet’ sed ‘nolo’

ad Ad. 379 PRIVS NOLO he didn’t say ‘you shouldn’t’, but ‘I don’t want you to’, haughtily and in accordance with his authority.

Donatus’ claim that the form is an *imperiosa dictio* corresponds with the distribution of the form in Roman comedy:

Directive Sub-Type	***Frequency (All Three Categories)***	***Proportion of Total***	***Frequency (Only Volo+AcI and Volo+Subjunctive)***	***Proportion of Total***
Commands	106	58.6%	92	63.5%
Requests	53	29.3%	33	22.8%
Permissions	8	4.4%	8	5.5%
Proposals	7	3.9%	6	4.1%
Advice	5	2.8%	5	3.4%
Invitations	2	1.0%	1	.7%
TOTAL	181	100.0%	145	100%

Table 1: *volo* and *nolo* commands in Roman Comedy

Why consider *volo+AcI* and *volo*+subjunctive separately, as we have done, in the rightmost 2 columns? Recall that compared to them, *volo*+bald infinitive "prefers" requests. By contrast, *volo+AcI* and *volo*+subjunctive prefer commands.[23]

In fact, the latter two expressions appear to be even more strongly correlated with commands than the present imperative, the quintessential peremptory form.[24] Of all the instances of the present imperative in *Captivi*, *Truculentus* and *Phormio*, 201 out of the total 367, or 54.8%, convey commands, compared to 63.5% of the total tokens of *volo+AcI* and *volo*+subjunctive. The same statistical test used above suggests that the difference between these two proportions is significant. That is, the syntactical form used may be influencing the extent to which it communicates orders.[25]

A brief discussion of two examples will show how the speech-act type of individual tokens was identified. The immediate context can sometimes help. For instance, at *Aulularia* 144-145, the *matrona* Eunomia tells her brother *id quod in rem tuam optumum esse arbitror/ ted id* monitum *advento*: "I come to *advise* you of that which I deem to be the best for your interests". Five lines later she confers this advice with a *volo* directive: *volo te uxorem/ domum ducere* (149-150).

The broader context in which the utterance is embedded often provides important clues as well. To take example (5.) discussed above, the soldier's *scire volo quoi reddidisti*, "I want to know to whom you gave [the money]" (543), directed at a *leno*, is a command. Just some seven lines before, the soldier had threatened the *leno*: *nisi tu mihi propere properas dare iam triginta*

---

[23] The *z*-test shows that compared to *volo*+bald infinitive, *volo+AcI* and *volo*+subjunctive "prefer" commands. In the calculation I consider the latter two expressions together, since they are functionally indistinct, as Risselada has shown and as we have confirmed.

[24] Risselada (1993, 283) had reached a similar conclusion on the peremptoriness of *volo* commands: "in comedy, *volo* is most commonly used to express (binding) directives and *velim* almost exclusively in wishes"; she however declines to give statistics.

[25] The likelihood (99.93%) of significance, though just outside of the conventional threshold (99.95%), is still very high indeed.

minas,…*vitam propera ponere*, "unless you hurriedly hurry to give me the thirty minas now, speedily set aside your life" (535-536). Given his rude tone here and throughout the passage, his directive at 543, *scire volo quoi reddidisti*, can be classified as a command.[26]

4. *Volo* Commands Tend to Be Directed "Downwards".

Is the *volo* command restricted by social parameters? When we consider all three categories – *volo*+*AcI*, *volo*+subjunctive, and *volo*+bald infinitive – together, it appears that the form is generally not directed 'upward', as the following table shows:[27]

Relative to Addressee…	***Frequency***	***Proportion of Total***
Speaker has greater authority	105	60.3%
Speaker and Addressee equals	36	20.7%

---

[26] These contextual cues can help us to determine the speech-act value in many cases; there remain, however, a few cases where the determination of speech-act type must inevitably be subjective.

[27] With regard to the distribution of the form across the two genders, in Plautus, the form appears in the speech of women in roughly the number we would expect. 19 instances of the *volo* command are put in the mouths of women; this represents a proportion of 10.5%. (The proportion of the total speech in Plautus assigned to women is 13.9%.) Terence avoids putting the expression in the mouths of women altogether. At first sight, it would appear that Terence avoids giving the form to women, but the small number of tokens (13) in Terence prevents us from making a firm conclusion. To return to Plautus, if we look closely at the contexts of our tokens, we see that seven are directed to inferiors, a slave or *ancilla* (*Cas*. 867; *Men*. 351; *Mos*. 176, 181, 194; *St*. 154; *Truc*. 502). (The instance at *Cas*. 901 must be left out of account since it is unclear whether a maid or a *matrona* directs *postquam decubuisti, inde volo* [*sc. te memorare*] to the slave.) Two are directed at equals (*Cis*. 82, *Per*. 245); the rest (9 total) are directed at superiors: *Cas*. 233, 544 are put in the mouth of an *uxor dotata*, whose linguistic stamp, as Yela Schauwecker (2002, 197) has shown, is commanding; *Bac*. 77, 93, 99 are put in the mouth of a *meretrix* whose power over the hapless *adulescens* is marked by the *adulescens*' own submission to her at *Bac* 93: *mulier, tibi me emancupo/ tuo' sum, tibi dedo operam*. The instance at *Aul*. 149, the piece of advice given to her brother by the "good" *matrona* Eunomia, has been discussed in the text above. Of the remaining examples, *Cis*. 148 (*meminisse ego hanc rem vos volo*) is directed by the tipsy *lena* to the audience, and *Per*. 358 (*insimulari nolo*) and 370 (*ego tibi cautum volo*) by Virgo, who claims the moral high ground over her father, the parasite Saturio.

Speaker of lower authority	33	19.0%
	174[28]	100.0%

Table 2: Distribution of the *volo* command in Roman Comedy by type of relationship.

Before discussing these statistics in more detail, some examples will clarify how the relationship was identified. This is easy to do when each speaker plays his socially ascribed role during the interaction, as, for instance, in the following passage (a master speaks with his slave):

16. DE. hominem commonstrarier
mihi istum volo aut ubi habitet demonstrarier.
GE. nempe Phormionem? DE. istum patronum mulieris.
GE. iam faxo hic aderit. (*Phorm*. 305-308)

DE. I want that man to be shown to me
or where he lives to be pointed out to me.
GE. You mean Phormio? DE. Yes, the patron of the woman.
GE. I'll see to it he's soon here.

The old man Demipho, angry that his son must marry into a poor family, demands that his slave find the bride's patron with a *volo* command.

In other passages, again, the context provides clues. For instance, at *Pseudolus* 329, the *adulescens* Calidorus, overjoyed that the pimp Ballio will not sell off the courtesan to a rival, ecstatically compares the pimp to Jupiter, "for this man here is a much more powerful Jupiter than Jupiter himself", *nam hic mihi nunc est multo potior Iuppiter quam Iuppiter*. The "deified" pimp then commands his subjects as follows, "I don't want sacrificial victims; I want to be placated with the entrails of lambs", *nolo victumas; agninis me extis placari volo* (330). Similarly, when disguised as a master, the slave Tyndarus commands his *actual* master, who in turn has assumed the guise of a slave, with a *volo* command: *nunc animum advortas volo/ omnium primum salutem dicito matri et patri*, "Now I want you to pay attention. First of all, give my greetings to mother and father" (*Capt*. 397-398). In this interaction, the relevant relationship is that between a master (the speaker) and his slave (the addressee).

---

[28] 7 tokens were excluded for reasons I will explain shortly.

Thus, the relevant relationship can be determined by the socially ascribed role in combination with the context.[29] To return to the statistics offered above, of the total 174 tokens counted,[30] nearly two-thirds, or 60.3%, are directed "downward" to social inferiors. Do speakers tend to use the *volo* command with inferiors?

We can consider the distribution of a similar expression, the present imperative, over the same three dyad-types (a speaker addresses an inferior, equals converse, an inferior addresses a superior). I have selected three plays, *Bacchides*, *Rudens*, and *Adelphoe*, and analyzed 245 present imperatives selected at random points from the plays. As above, the socially ascribed status and context are used to assess the type of relationship between speaker and hearer. The results are as follows:

---

[29] As Brown and Fraser (1979, 53) note: "certain features which are generally attributed to participants, such as social distance and social power, are in fact not always stable attributes of individuals, but are context dependent assessments which may be shifted depending on the setting and activity type."

[30] 7 instances have been excluded from the total 181 for one of the two following reasons. (1.) Addresses to the audience have been excluded, since the addressees are necessarily of various statuses (*Poen*. 16-35 is the *locus communis* for the varied composition of the audience): *Bac*. 1211, *Cas*. 21, *Cist*. 148 and *Hec*. 26. (2.) Uncertain speaker and/or addressee: The speaker attribution at *Cas*. 901 is uncertain; the speaker of *Cist*. 299, *te magi' volo monitum* is uncertain: Lindsay assigns it to the courtesan Gymnasium, Leo to a slave. Finally, the speaker of fr. 146 Lindsay is uncertain: *exi tu Dave, age sparge, mundum esse hoc vestibulum volo*: "come out, Davus, come on sprinkle [this with water]: I want this vestibule to be clean! (i.e., "clean this vestibule!"). The vocative *Dave,* however, clearly identifies the addressee as a slave.

Talk directed…	***Volo – Frequency (All 3 Categories)***	***Proportion of Total***	***Present Imperative – Frequency***	***Proportion of Total***
To an inferior	105	60.3%	111	45.3%
To an equal	36	20.7%	54	22.0%
To a superior	33	19.0%	80	32.7%
	174	100.0%	245	100%

Table 3: Present Imperative and the *volo* command compared.

Application of the z-test makes clear that the divergence between the proportion of the present imperative directed downward, 45.3%, and that for *volo*, 60.3%, is not due to chance variation. Rather, the syntactical form must be influencing the proportions we observe. Thus, Donatus' point, that *volo* is an *imperiosa dictio*, is confirmed.

To flesh out these statistics, let us inspect more closely the 53 instances of the expression assigned to a *senex* in Plautus. These are all, with two notable exceptions, directed to a social inferior.[31]

The two 'exceptions' that prove the 'rule' (*viz*. that the *volo* directive when uttered by Plautine *senes* is directed "downward") occur at *Aulularia* 563 and 569 and are spoken by the wealthy Megadorus to the much poorer Euclio.[32] The poor Euclio had earlier observed that he was exceeding his station in marrying his daughter to the wealthy Megadorus.[33] Thus, in these two exceptional instances, Megadorus may be understood to be addressing a social inferior. At *Aulularia* 563, Megadorus demands that his neighbor explain a curious phrase: *volo ego ex te scire qui sit agnus curio*, "I want to know from you what an *agnus curio* is". At *Aulularia* 569, Megadorus invites Euclio to drink with him: "I want to drink with you today, Euclio", *potare ego hodie, Euclio, tecum volo*.

---

[31] Typical examples of a *senex* commanding an inferior include the earlier-discussed example (8.) *Trinummus* 281-282, a father instructing his son, and example (9.) *Mercator* 272, a master commanding a slave.

[32] An argument could be made for adding *Mil*. 770 and *St*. 538 as "exceptions that prove the rule". In the former, Palaestrio has claimed his *imperium* over his addressees, a *senex* and an *adulescens*. The *senex*, or "subordinate", commands the slave-as-general with a *volo* command, thus a "subordinate" commands a "superior". In the latter, Antipho appears to enjoy a friendship with his sons-in-law, who are younger than he. The passage, however, proves

In the foregoing, we have seen that *volo*+bald infinitive is functionally distinct from *volo*+*AcI* and *volo*+subjunctive. The former expression is specialized for requests, while the latter two expressions, when compared to *volo*+bald infinitive, "prefer" commands. Moreover, all three expressions, taken together, are most likely to be spoken by a superior to an inferior.

5. Some Possible Cases of Linguistic Characterization with the *Volo* Command.

To conclude the paper, I would like to suggest that in three plays, Plautus employs the *volo* directive to underscore the speaker's authoritative stance. First, in the *Amphitruo*, all eight occurrences are spoken either by Jupiter or by Amphitruo, and in each case to his wife or to a slave.[34] It should be kept in mind, however, that of these, one is in fact a request for permission, at *Amphitruo* 708: *Alcumena, unum te rogare volo*; one is an agreement to a proposal whereby the speaker tells the addressee to "go ahead" with the proposed action:

---

that they are not equals: father-in-law makes a highly imposing request of his sons-in-law, which they in turn cannot refuse.

[33] At *Aul*. 235 Euclio says, "this is a great peril, to transition from the status of donkey to bull" *hoc magnum est periclum ab asinis* [*i.e. infimo ordine*] *ad boves* [*i.e. summum ordinem*] *transcendere*. Cf. *Aul*. 196.

[34] 708, 751 (*bis*), 898, 593, 609, 769, 980. The last mentioned example at *Am*. 980, *volo deludi illunc* occurs in a string of commands to the "slave", in reality, Mercury, and could be taken as a motivation for those preceding commands, and not a command in itself.

17. AL. vin proferri pateram? AM. proferri volo (*Am.* 769).

AL. Do you want the dish brought out? AM. Yes, I want it done.

And later at *Am*. 897-898, Jupiter/Amphitruo's tone is conciliatory, as he requests his wife's attention:

18. AL. sed eccum video qui <modo> me miseram arguit
stupri, dedecoris. IV. te volo, uxor, conloqui.

AL. But *there's* the one who just now accused poor me of disgrace,
defilement. JU. I want to speak with you, wife.

I submit, however, that it is in keeping with the ideology of master-slave relations, and indeed all relations featuring an imbalance of power, that the subordinate, as an extension of his or her superior, should not wait to be commanded.[35] In general, the mere expression of a superior's desires suffices for the subordinate to know what she or he needs to do. Hence, the just-quoted *volo* directives from *Amphitruo*, though not commands at all, still convey expressions of a superior's wish, and the expectation that a subordinate act on it.

Consider now the instances from *Casina*. In that play, the only time a slave employs the *volo* directive occurs in an inversion scene. (All other examples in the play proper are spoken by a *senex* or *uxor dotata*.[36]) There, the *vilicus* Olympio temporarily occupies a position superior to that of his own master.[37] In this scene, we find Olympio imperiously commanding some cooks as follows:

---

[35] As expressed by Aristotle, the slave is indeed an extension of his master, an instrument or tool: "the slave is an instrument with life (δοῦλος ἔμψυχον ὄργανον), and the instrument is a lifeless slave" (*EN* 8.11.6); the idea is picked up later by Varro, *RR* 1.17.1, who calls the slave an *instrumentum vocale*. See Kathleen McCarthy 2000, 21-22, on the paradox in this assumption.

19. OL. propere cito intro ite et cito deproperate
ego iam intus ero, facite cenam mihi ut ebria sit
sed lepide nitideque volo, nil moror barbarico bliteo (745-747).

OL. Quickly, in you go, fast, and hurry it up!
I'll soon be inside. See to it that my dinner is abundant.
But I want you to make it nice and neat. I don't care for barbarian nonsense!

The slave's command (*sed lepide nitideque* [*sc. vos eam facere*] *volo, nil moror barbarico bliteo*) echoes his master's from an earlier scene (490-491): *tene marsuppium, abi atque obsona*, *propera*, *sed lepide volo [sc. te obsonare]*.

In that earlier scene (437-514), there is no explicit inversion of roles between slave and master; that is, each character plays the "normal" role. There, the *senex* speaks 11 of the 18 total directive acts, for a proportion of 61.1%. Yet in the later "inversion of roles" scene (720-758), from which Olympio's lines above are quoted, the slave speaks 15 of the total 23 directives, representing a proportion of 65.2% of the total directives in this scene. These figures provide statistical underpinning for the inversion that takes place in this later scene.

---

[36] Of the total instances of the *volo* command in this play, *Cas* 21 is spoken by the *prologus*, *Cas*. 273, 491, 501, 503 are spoken by a *senex*. 748 is the exceptional instance spoken by the *vilicus*; 233, 544, 867 and perhaps 901 are spoken by a *matrona*. 901 is a contested line. Friedrich Leo follows Camerarius, who assigns the line to the *matrona* Cleostrata. Schoell however, followed by Lindsay, and others (e.g MacCary Willcock 1976, de Melo 2011) assign the contested line to Pardalisca.

[37] The slave initiates the encounter with his master as follows: *cesso magnufice patriceque amicirier atque ita ero meo ire advorsum*? (723). And some 15 lines later, the *senex* Lysidamus addresses his slave as his patron: *obsecro te/ Olympisce mi, mi pater, mi patrone* (738-739).

Finally, in the *Captivi*, of the nine instances of the expression in question, the slave Tyndarus speaks five, but *only when he is playing the role of his master, Philocrates* (351, 383, 388, 429, 430).[38] The "master" Tyndarus directs all of these to the "slave", in reality, Philocrates disguised as a slave, with one exception. This occurs at *Captivi* 351, and is perhaps not authoritative like the rest are, but certainly in keeping with the "master's" dignified tone throughout:[39]

20. HE. mittam equidem istunc aestumatum tua fide, si vis. TY. *volo*.
quam citissime potest, tam hoc cedere ad factum volo. (*Capt*. 351-352)

HE. I will send that man on bail on your guarantee, if you want. TY. *I want that done*. I want this to pass to action as quickly as possible.[40]

The foregoing analysis is only intended to suggest that Plautus conveys Jupiter/Amphitruo's authority by giving him all the instances of the *volo* command, and that the same author supports the authoritative stance of the relevant character in *Casina* and *Captivi* by having him employ the expression at key moments in those plays. It must be kept in mind however that the number of tokens is small, and not every example cited is authoritative, as, for instance, the very last mentioned one (*Capt*. 351-2), and the above-mentioned instances from *Amphitruo*.

---

[38] Otherwise, the form is spoken once by the parasite Ergasilus at *Capt*. 175, once by the captive Aristophontes at 602, and twice by the *senex* Hegio at 264, and 965, both times to a slave.
[39] On Tyndarus' dignified, tragic tone, see Leo 1912, 135-137, followed by Haffter (1934, 68-69, 121).
[40] Translation: de Melo 2011, with some modification.

We can however more definitively conclude the following: (1.) *volo*+*AcI* and *volo*+subjunctive typically convey peremptory commands; (2.) *volo*+bald infinitive “prefers” requests to the former two expressions; (3.) all three expressions tend to be used in contexts where the speaker enjoys greater authority than the hearer due to the former’s socially-ascribed role or to the situation.[41]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bennett, C. E. 1966. *Syntax of the Early Latin Verb*, vol. 1 (Hildesheim)

Brown, P., Levinson, S. 1987. *Politeness. Some Universals in Language Usage* (Cambridge)

Butler, Christopher. 1985. *Statistics in Linguistics*. (Oxford and New York)

de Melo, W. 2007. *The Early Latin Verb System* (Oxford)

—. 2011-13. *Plautus,* vols. 1-5 (Cambridge, MA)

Dickey, Eleanor. 2012a. *How to say ‘please’ in Classical Latin*, *CQ* 62.2, 731–748.

—. 2012b. *The rules of politeness and Latin request formulae*, in: Probert, P. and Willi, A. (eds.) *Laws and Rules in Indo-European* (Oxford), 313–328.

Ferri, Rolando. 2008. *Politeness in Latin Comedy: Some Preliminary Thoughts*, *MD* 61, 15–28.

—. 2012. “How to Say No in Latin.” In: Martti Leiwo, Hilla Halla-aho, Marja Vierros (eds.), *Variation and Change in Greek and Latin. Papers and monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens, 17*. Helsinki, 105-127.

Fraenkel, Eduard. 2007. *Plautine Elements in Plautus*. 1922. Trans. Tomas Drevikosky and Francis Muecke (Oxford).

Fraser, C. and Brown, P. 1979. “Speech as a Marker of Situation.” In: Klaus Scherer, and Howard Giles (eds.), *Social Markers in Speech*. Cambridge, 33-62.

Gilleland, Michael. 1979. *The Linguistic Differentiation of Character Type and Sex in the Comedies of Plautus and Terence* (Diss. University of Virginia, USA)

Grice, H.P. 1975. “Logic and Conversation.” In: Peter Cole, Jerry Morgan (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 3: Speech Acts*. New York, 41-58.

Haffter, Heinz. 1934. *Untersuchungen zur Altlateinischen Dichtersprache* (Berlin)

Hall, Jon. 1996. *Cicero Fam. 5.8 and Fam. 15.5 in the Light of Modern Politeness Theory*, *Antichthon* 30, 19–33.

—. 2005. *Politeness and Formality in Cicero’s Letter to Matius (Fam. 11.27)*, *MH* 62, 193–213.

—. 2009. *Politeness and Politics in Cicero’s Letters* (Oxford)

Kühner, R., Holzweissig, F., Stegmann, K. ^{2}1912-1914. *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*, vol. II.1 (Hannover)

LeBreton, Jules. 1901. *Etudes sur la langue et la grammaire de Cicéron* (Paris)

Leo, Friedrich. 1895. *Plauti Comoediae* (Berlin)

---

[41] My warm thanks go to *Mnemosyne*’s anonymous referee, for thorough and incisive commentary on earlier drafts, and to Eni Halilaj, who patiently explained to me the pertinent aspects of statistical theory. I should also like to thank James Dobreff for help with Latin grammatical terminology.

—. 1912. *Plautinische Forschungen: Zur Kritik und Geschichte der Komödie* (Berlin)

Leumann, M., Hoffman, J.B., Szantyr, A. 1963–1977. *Lateinische Grammatik*, vol. II.2 (Munich)

Lindsay, W.M. 1910. *Plauti Comoediae* (Oxford)

MacCary, W.T., Willcock, M.M. 1976. *Casina: Plautus* (Cambridge)

McCarthy, Kathleen. 2000. *Slaves, Masters, and the Art of Authority in Plautine Comedy*. (Princeton)

Ritschl, F, Loewe, G., Goetz, G., Schoell, F. 1878-1902. *T. Macci Plauti Comoediae* (Leipzig)

Risselada, Rodie. 1993. *The Imperative and Other Directive Expressions in Latin: A Study in the Pragmatics of a Dead Language* (Amsterdam)

Schauwecker, Yela. 2002. *Zum Sprechverhalten der Frauentypen bei Plautus*, *Gymnasium* 109, 191–211.

Searle, J.R. 1975. “Indirect Speech Acts.” In: Peter Cole, Jerry Morgan (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 3: Speech Acts*. New York, 59-82.

—. 1976. *A Classification of Illocutionary Acts*, *Language in Society* 5, 1–24.

Watts, R. 2003. *Politeness* (Cambridge)