XXIII.—*Iste Deiktikon* in the Early Roman Dramatists

RUTH MILDRED KELLER

PHILADELPHIA

The theory that the force of *iste* in early Latin is uniformly second personal or derogatory and that this force is inherent is untenable. A study of *iste* in Plautus, Terence and the *Scaenicae Romanorum Poesis Fragmenta*, both alone and in relation to *hic* and *ille*, shows that while *iste* occurs in contexts where its force is second personal, or derogatory, it also occurs at times in contexts normally reserved for *hic* or *ille*. The primary force of *iste* is strongly deictic, from which it also developed a resumptive and preparative force. Its second personal force is secondary, developing out of its frequent use in second personal contexts, and does not inhere in the pronoun per se.[1]

1. One phase of usage in early Latin which has been rather generally misunderstood is that of the demonstrative pronouns. Down to the last decade of the nineteenth century, commentators of Plautus and Terence and grammarians, with few exceptions, adhered to what I shall hereafter refer to as the "traditional theory," i.e., that *hic* is a demonstrative pronoun of the first person, used to designate something associated, in time, place, or thought, with the person speaking; also, to indicate *the latter* in the formula *hic . . . ille;* that *iste* is a demonstrative pronoun of the second person, used to refer to something near the person addressed, in time, place, or thought; also to express contempt; and that *ille* is a demonstrative pronoun of the third person, used to designate something remote, in time, place, or thought, from both the speaker and the person addressed; to point out something well-known; also, to designate *the former* in the formula *hic . . . ille*.

2. Among these early traditionalists[2] there are, however, two points of disagreement. Some maintain that *hic* may refer to past as well as present time; also, that *ille* may refer to present as well as past time.[3] The majority, however, do not admit such an inter-

---

[1] This paper has been extensively revised since its original presentation: see *PAPhA* 75 (1944) xxvi.

[2] Beginning with certain none too lucid statements of Priscian (*Institutes* 17.58; 12.1 [ed. Keil, Lipsiae, 1855–1859]), early traditionalists attempted to define for *hic* and *ille* a temporal as well as a spatial sphere of usage, by referring *hic* to things present (or which have not yet occurred), *ille* to things which are already past.

[3] Some, however, finding this theoretical statement at variance with the usage of the writers, would extend this temporal sphere. Cf. Bach (see note 7) 147, and his statement of the situation in the earlier decades of the nineteenth century.

change. Others also contend that in early Latin *iste* may express contempt,[4] although the greater number do not allow the word this function. One or two scholars during this period even suggested that *iste* might, on occasion, be used where *hic* or *ille*[5] would have been expected and that occasionally all three pronouns might be used in reference to the same person or thing.[6]

3. These chance references did not, however, affect the general trend of thought. On the contrary, the traditional interpretation, which had already become well established during the earlier decades of the nineteenth century, was fixed for several decades to come by the appearance in 1891 of Bach's monograph.[7]

4. In Bach's opinion *hic* is a *pronomen* πρωτότριτον whose force approaches that of *meus* and *noster*, *iste* a *pronomen* δευτερότριτον, whose force approaches that of *tuus* and *vester*, and *ille* a *pronomen* τριτότριτον, whose force approaches that of the missing possessive of the third person.[8] As he believes that this first, second, and third personal force is inherent in these words, he takes issue with certain of the other traditionalists regarding the possibility of *iste* being used at times in contexts appropriate to *hic* or *ille*.[9] He also denies to *iste* in early Latin a derogatory force per se. All three pronouns, he maintains, may stand in derogatory contexts, but each retains its inherent personal force.[10] Bach accordingly sees in *iste*, to which this study will be limited, a *pronomen* δευτερότριτον with an inherent

[4] C. J. Grysar, *Theorie des lateinischen Stils* (Köln am Rhein, 1831) 80, 84; K. Reisig, *Vorlesungen über lateinische Sprachwissenschaft* (Leipzig, 1839) 362; Fr. Guilelmus Holtze, *Syntaxis Priscorum Scriptorum Latinorum usque ad Terentium* (Lipsiae, 1861) 1.372; M. Johann Kvičala, "Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der Pronomina, besonders der lateinischen," *SAWW* 65 (1870) 134–137. It should be noted that these scholars cite passages from the early dramatic writers on.

[5] Grysar, *op. cit.* (see note 4) 78, note 2; Kvičala, *op. cit.* (see note 4) 131; cf. also 137; Reisig admits the use of *iste* in reference to the third as well as the second person, but it is not certain whether he would extend this use to the early dramatists, since his examples do not antedate the period of the Republic (*op. cit.* [see note 4] 362).

[6] August O. Friedrich Lorenz, *Ausgewählte Komödien des T. Maccius Plautus*, on *Mil.* 21–23, 132 (1869); on 21–23, 133, 2nd. ed. (1886); on *Pseud.* 304 (1876); on *Most.* 526, 653, 900, 1140 (1866); Holtze, *op. cit.* (see note 4) 1.372, on *Capt.* 2.2.47–52 (= 297–302).

[7] Iosephus Bach, *De Usu Pronominum Demonstrativorum apud Priscos Scriptores Latinos* (Studemund Studien auf dem Gebiete des archaischen Lateins, 2 [1891]).

[8] *Ibid.* 147–149; 211; 286.

[9] *Ibid.* 147; also 211; 327.

[10] *Ibid.* 254–257. Bach, as we shall see later, is correct in stating that all three pronouns may be used in derogatory contexts, but he naturally fails to sense the significance of this fact.

second personal force, whose sole function, therefore, is to express a second personal relation.

5. As we should naturally expect, Bach finds in the dialogue passages of the early dramatic poets, from whom he derives the greater part of his evidence, many occurrences of the second personal use of *iste*, in which one speaker, A, in referring to something belonging to, associated with, or mentioned by a second speaker, B, designates this with *iste*, which I shall hereafter refer to as the "normal use."

6. In the monologues, however, with the exception of those in which there is internal evidence of address to the audience, we should not expect to find occurrences of normal *iste*. Nevertheless, in this case also, Bach maintains that the word still preserves intact its inherent second personal force, since in the monologues either the audience or a character whom the speaker imagines to be present performs the same function as the interlocutor in the dialogues. Those occurrences of the word which prove to be at variance with his theory, especially those in which two, or at times three different pronouns are used by the same speaker in reference to the same person or thing, Bach attempts to rationalize by the much overworked theory of relative position or to remove by textual emendation.[11]

7. Seyffert,[12] in his review of Bach's monograph, while subscribing in the main to the latter's views, points out that even as early as Plautus *iste* may be used to express contempt without reference to a person addressed.

8. The views thus established by Bach and Seyffert have in large measure fixed the interpretation of these words down to the present time, notwithstanding the appearance, just at the turn of the century, of Meader's semasiological study of the pronouns,[13] which pointed the way toward a new interpretation.

9. Meader, like the traditionalists, admits the traditional force of *hic, iste,* and *ille*.[14] However, since he treats these words in the light of their historical development, he differs from them in also recognizing, in the several periods of the language, various devia-

[11] *Ibid.* 211–286 *passim;* 327–386 *passim.*

[12] Oskar Seyffert, "Jahresbericht über T. Maccius Plautus von 1890–1894," *JAW* 80 (1894) 300.

[13] Clarence Linton Meader, *The Latin Pronouns Is: Hic: Iste: Ipse* (New York, 1901).

[14] *Ibid.* 113–116.

tions from the traditionalists' norm resulting from semasiological changes in these words.[15] Thus in the case of *iste* he finds that quite early there are sporadic occurrences of the word in a non-deuterotritonic sense.[16]

10. Only within the past fifteen years, however, have Meader's views begun to find their way into the grammatical literature and then only in the case of several compendious studies[17] and a few casual allusions.[18]

11. Etymology, moreover, which in many cases sheds light upon the original force of an obscure word, or one which has been previously misunderstood, has in this case been of little help owing to the obvious lack of agreement among scholars regarding the derivation of this word and the apparent disregard of its primary force. Brugmann's derivation of *iste* from the pronoun *is* with a suffix *-te*[19]

[15] *Ibid.* Chap. II and III.

[16] *Ibid.* 152–153 (two pages). The occurrences are too frequent to be considered sporadic, as we shall see in the course of this investigation.

[17] Jacob Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax* (Basel, 1920–24); Stolz-Schmalz, *Lateinische Grammatik*[5] (München, 1928); J. B. Hofmann, *Lateinische Umgangssprache* (Heidelberg, 1926); Wilhelm Havers, *Handbuch der erklärenden Syntax* (Heidelberg, 1931); Karl Brugmann, "Die Demonstrativpronomina der Indogermanischen Sprachen," *ASG* 22 (1904); Hermann Hirt, *Indogermanische Grammatik* 6, *Syntax* 1 (Heidelberg, 1934). Brugmann and Hirt confine their attention to the Indo-European background of these pronouns, but in this way they prepare the way for the newer trend in the semasiological interpretation.

[18] A. C. Juret, *Système de la Syntaxe Latine* (Paris, 1926) 99–102, 108 f.; J. Marouzeau, *Traité de Stylistique Appliquée au Latin* (Collection d'Études Latines, 12 [1935]) 147 ff., 182; J. Marouzeau, "Notes sur la Fixation du Latin Littéraire," *MSL* 20 (1918) 79–81; A. Sonny, "Demonstrativa als Indefinita," *Glotta* 6 (1914) 61 ff.; J. Marouzeau, "*Ille* Anaphorique," *REL* 8 (1930) 35; Godofredus Wolterstorff, *Historia Pronominis Ille Exemplis Demonstrata* (Marpurgi, 1907); G. Wolterstorff, "Entwicklung von *ille* zum bestimmten Artikel," *Glotta* 10 (1919) 62 ff.; V. Bulhart, "Zum Gebrauch von ille," *WSt* 52 (1934) 167–171; F. B. J. Kuiper, "Zur Herkunft von lat. *iste*," *Mededeelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandsche Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde*, new series I, 9 (1938). Kuiper, although he does not mention Meader, nevertheless touches upon several points which show that he is not a true advocate of the traditional interpretation (*op. cit.* 500–509).

[19] *Op. cit.* (see note 17) 81. His derivation of *iste* from the der-deictic *is* vitiates Bach's theory that a second personal force is inherent in *iste*. He contends that in the parent speech there was no demonstrative whose function it was to express a second personal relation; that in several of the IE languages such a demonstrative developed at a later time out of the der-deictic pronoun; that *iste*, therefore, had no *obligatorische Beziehung auf die zweite Person* (*Ibid.* 73 f.; 57 f.). For the same derivation see also Walde-Hofmann, *Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg, 1938) s.v.; Ernst Kieckers, *Historische Lateinische Grammatik mit Berücksichtigung des Vulgärlateins und der Romanischen Sprachen* (München, 1930–31) 2.139–140. Also see Ernout-Meillet, *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Latine* (Paris, 1932) for a different derivation of the components.

does, however, point the way toward the newer trend in the semasio-
logical interpretation of the word and serves to corroborate it.

12. Such being the status of the question at the present time, I
should like to examine a few of the most significant passages in the
early Roman dramatists,[20] representing types of usage of the so-
called *pronomen δευτερότριτον* which thus far have either been over-
looked, or forced into the traditional interpretation.   I concede the
facts that in these writers *iste* is in the majority of instances used with
a second personal force, or such a force may readily be supplied from
the context; that in some of these instances the atmosphere of the
passage is also derogatory.   As these two uses are now well recog-
nized, they will form no part of the main investigation, which will
be limited to a consideration of the deviations from this well
recognized norm.

13. In setting the stage for the main investigation it has, how-
ever, seemed advisable first to clarify such issues as have arisen
earlier.   One of these is derogatory *iste*.   Scholars today appear to
be in complete agreement regarding the derogatory force of *iste* in
classical and later Latin and, in so far as any cognizance is taken of
the usage in the early period, there seems no longer to be any dis-
sension in reference to the word possessing this force even among
the early Latin writers.   However, in view of the earlier controversy
centering around this point, it may not be amiss to see what light
the writers themselves may throw upon our problem.

14. As my method throughout will be comparative, I shall ap-
proach this question by considering first the force of *hic* and *ille*.
That *hic* or *ille* even in the Latinity of the later period may express
contempt has not been commonly held, although recently one or two
chance references to such a possibility have made their appearance.[21]
Among earlier classicists,[22] however, the possibility of these words
possessing such a function in any period of the language was unheard

    [20] In 1922 my attention was called to this problem by the late Professor Henry W.
Prescott.   Part of my study, covering Plautus and Terence, was made in my unpub-
lished doctoral dissertation, *Neglected Uses of Iste* (Chicago, 1928).   For the present
paper I have reexamined all the evidence and based my conclusions on examples from
the early dramatic fragments, Plautus, and Terence.

    [21] Raphael Kühner, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*[2] (Hannover,
1912–1914) 2.1.621.

    [22] Kvičala anticipates Bach by two decades in suggesting that *hic* and *ille* may
also be used in derogatory contexts, but since his inquiry is primarily in the field of
comparative philology, I have not included him among the "earlier classicists" (*op.*
cit. [see note 4] 134–135).

of.   Bach, who alone among earlier scholars discusses this point, does so to lend credence to his theory of non-derogatory *iste* by pointing out that *hic* and *ille,* also, may stand in a derogatory context, although their force still remains respectively first and third personal.[23]

15. If we turn to the authors themselves,[24] we find the shrewish Cleustrata (*Cas*. 148–161)[25] venting her indignation at the conduct of her philandering husband.   Her characterization of Lysidamus as that scandal of a man (*flagitium illud hominis*), that gallant (*illum amatorem*), the old carrion (*Accheruntis pabulum*), the debauchee (*flagiti persequentem*), the embodiment of iniquity (*stabulum nequitiae*), and the way in which she plans to make his life miserable can leave little doubt in our minds but that she regards him with extreme disfavor.   Her monologue expresses both anger and contempt[26] and the derogatory context is well established.   However, in directing this invective against her husband, she indicates him with *illud* (155), with *illum . . . illum* (155) and with *illum* (157).   *Ille* in this instance certainly has a pejorative connotation.

16. Similarly, Hegio (*Capt*. 653) refers to Tyndarus and Philocrates as "those rascally captives" (*illi . . . scelesti capti*) and again in 751, when indicating Tyndarus, who has just been led to his doom in the stone-quarries, Hegio uses *illic*, which connotes "that good-for-nothing slave."

17. Sometimes the idea of indignation or even revenge is the predominant one and almost completely overshadows the idea of contempt, although the latter is still present.   Such is Mnesilochus' denunciation of the courtesan (*Bacch*. 489–490), whom he refers to as *illam mulierem*, connotatively "that wretch."   Such, also, is Saturio's threat upon the life of the *leno* (*Pers*. 738), whom he designates as "that scoundrel" (*illunc hominem*).

18. More often, however, in such passages we find simply the idea of disparagement or contempt, or this, at least, is the predominant one. So, for example, in the monologue of the *Miles*, 88–90, where Palaestrio

[23] *Op. cit.* (see note 7) 254–255.

[24] In all passages the reading of the text is that adopted by the following editions: Otto Ribbeck, *Scaenicae Romanorum Poesis Fragmenta*[3] (Lipsiae, 1897–1898); W. M. Lindsay, *T. Macci Plauti Comoediae* (Oxonii, 1904–1905); Kauer-Lindsay, *P. Terenti Afri Comoediae* (Oxonii, 1926).   For some of the translations I am indebted in whole or in part to Paul Nixon, *Plautus* (London, 1916–1938); John Sargeaunt, *Terence* (London, 1912).

[25] The greater number, but not all of the passages analyzed are discussed by Bach (*op. cit.* [see note 7] 211–286 *passim*, 327–386 *passim*).   I have made a complete tabulation of Bach's examples, to which I shall refer.   When no reference is given, it is understood that Bach fails to discuss or cite the passage.

[26] The word "contempt" in this and succeeding passages is used in a very general sense of all types of uncomplimentary expressions.

gives a delineation of the soldier's character. Noteworthy here, as in *Casina* 148–161, is the piling up of derogatory epithets. Palaestrio's remarks reveal no anger. He refers to his master merely as "that soldier" (*ille miles*), but in the connotative horizon there is present in these words the idea of "that good-for-nothing soldier." This concept is then expanded in the words *gloriosus, inpudens, stercoreus, plenus peiiuri . . . adulteri.*

19. In the same way Cleustrata (*Cas.* 534–535) designates her husband and his friend, Alcesimus, as "those vile old wethers" (*illis ignavissumis . . . vetulis vervecibus*). Alcesimus, also, on realizing the ridiculous situation in which his neighbor, Lysidamus, has placed him, speaks of him as "that worthless toothless old goat" (*illius hirqui inprobi edentuli, Cas.* 550).

20. A particularly instructive scene is the one between Hegio, Tyndarus, and Aristophontes (*Capt.* 533 ff.), where the latter, at the very height of his rage, refers to Tyndarus as "that whipping-post" (*illi mastigiae,* 600). He longs for a stone with which to smash out the brains of his fellow-captive (600–601), whom he obviously regards with a mingled feeling of rage and contempt.[27]

21. When Hegio alludes with contempt to this same captive, he uses *huic mastigiae* (659). Thus we see that *hic,* also, may be used with a pejorative connotation. Another instance of this same usage occurs in Syncerastus' monologue (*Poen.* 823–829). There is no anger in the slave's words, but he chafes bitterly over his servitude in the household of Lycus. In fact, he thinks that life in a stone-quarry or mill would be preferable to slaving it under this pimp. He refers to the *leno* as *hunc* (824) and as *hunc* (829). The derogatory idea connoted by *hunc* (824) is then explicitly stated in the words *neque peiiurior . . . peior . . . usquam gentium . . . tam luteus . . . tam caeno conlitus* (825–826). In 829, the juxtaposition of *lenonem* to *hunc* lends to this form, also, an unmistakable derogatory connotation.

22. In the same way Charmides, in denouncing the sycophant (*Trin.* 958 ff.), refers to him as *sycophantae huic* (958), which approximates the force of "this good-for-nothing swindler," as *hunc* (959), which might be

[27] If the fragments have yielded evidence of the type under consideration and the type is one in which the interpretation is certain, or reasonably so, even in the absence of a complete context, I have cited representative examples. If no specimens of the type are cited, it is understood that the type is either non-existent, or that a complete context is necessary to establish the interpretation. Bach's method of making the same deductions from the *fragmenta* as from Plautus and Terence seems to me unsound. Therefore, I have based my conclusions on Plautus and Terence and introduced the fragments into the footnotes only as supplementary evidence. For the present usage in the scenic fragments, cf. Enn. *Med. Ex.* 9.228–230: ille, illi, illi . . . illi; *Tel.* 4.288: illum; Turp. *Leuc.* 1.101: ille; Afran. *Frat.* 5.164: illius; Turp. *Het.* 3.77: illas; Afran. *Priv.* 6.250: illa; Turp. *Leuc.* 10.112: illa; Liv. Andron. *Ter.* 4.29: illoc.

rendered as "this rascal," and as *hic homo* (963), connotatively "this crook." This interpretation is corroborated by the words *quoi . . . plumbeum* (962).

23. Sometimes, as in the case of *ille*, the idea of rage overshadows that of contempt, although the latter is still implied. Such a case is Simo's tirade against his slave (*Pseud.* 445–448). He points out Pseudolus with *hic* (445), *hic* (446), and *hic . . . hic . . . hunc* (447). The connotation of *hic* is "this good-for-nothing fellow, this rascal" (note *scelerum caput*). Such, also, is the storm of abuse which Ballio heaps upon. his slaves (*Pseud.* 133–139),[28] to whom he contemptuously refers as *hi flagritribae* (137), connotatively "these worthless whipping-posts."

24. Occasionally, there is associated with the idea of contempt an idea of retaliation or revenge. Thus, while contriving to ruin the procurer, first Agorastocles (*Poen.* 423) and later Milphio (818) refer to him as *hunc lenonem*, which might be rendered as "this vile pimp." With these may be compared *Poenulus* 200–202, where the juxtaposition of *scelestus* to *hic . . . homo leno* confirms the present interpretation.

25. More often, however, as in the case of *ille*, we find in such passages merely the idea of disparagement or contempt, or this, at least, is the prevailing thought. Thus Artotrogus in his aside (*Mil.* 21–23)[29] expresses his disgust for the *miles*, whom he refers to as *hoc* (this good-for-nothing soldier) and later as *illic* (he), but also with contempt (note *peiiuriorem . . . gloriarum pleniorem*). In much the same way Cleustrata refers to Lysidamus as "that decrepit old husband of mine" (*illum . . . decrepitum meum virum, Cas.* 559)[30] and to Alcesimus as *hic . . . hunc alterum* (558–560), connotatively "this old fool . . . this other old fool."[31]

26. If we turn now to the *Asinaria*, 358–359, we meet with an entirely different situation. When Leonida asks Libanus what plan he would advocate for outwitting the trader and securing funds for his young master's amour, the latter says: "That (*istuc*) is what I am turning over in my mind." The slaves are both friendly and both have interests in common; therefore, I am unable to discover in *istuc* any idea of contempt. According to the traditional theory *istuc* must, therefore, be second personal. How far does the passage support this theory? Leonida's query shows that he has no cognizance of a plan; furthermore, *istuc* does not refer back to Leonida's question (358). When Libanus pronounces the words *em istuc ago* (358), we still do not know to what *istuc* refers. Not until we reach the clause *quo modo . . . intervortam* (359) does the precise

[28] Cf. *TLL* 6.3.2730.7–8.

[29] Cf. Bach, *op. cit.* (see note 7) 337; Seyffert, *op. cit.* (see note 12) 308; Brix-Niemeyer, *Miles Gloriosus* (Leipzig, 1916) *ad loc.*

[30] Cf. G. Wolterstorff, *Glotta* 10 (see note 18) 68.

[31] For the same usage in the scenic fragments cf. Turp. *Leuc.* 4.104: haec; *Lind.* 3.139: hic; Afran. *Sim.* 3.304 f.: haec; Acc. *Arm. Iud.* 6.152: huius.

application of this word become clear. That the atmosphere of the passage is distinctly first personal should not be overlooked; the main verb, *ago*, is first personal and the verb of the appositional clause is also first personal.[32]   I find it impossible, therefore, to see in *istuc* any reference to a person addressed.[33]   I regard this word as an emphatic *praeparativus*, whose function is merely to point forward to the thing which is about to be explained later by the clause, without giving any indication of the relation of this thing to the other persons or things involved.   I think that it has been employed in this instance instead of the more usual *hoc* because of its ability to indicate the thing with a greater degree of emphasis than would have been the case, had *hoc* been used.

27. Similarly, Congrio (*Aul.* 418) says: "That (*istuc*)[34] I think was a pity," whereupon he determines the application of *istuc* with the clause *quia . . . fodi*, the subject of which is first personal.   In the same way Philocomasium (*Mil.* 1321), while feigning regret at leaving the soldier, says: "That (*istuc*) is what, torments me." She then defines the significance of *istuc* by the appositional infinitive, *abalienarier*, with its first personal subject, *me* (equivalent in force to a first personal clause).   In none of these passages in my opinion does *iste* admit of the traditional interpretation.

28. Differing somewhat from the above passages is Leonida's speech (*Asin.* 323).   When Leonida says: "There! That (*istaec*) is courage," we do not yet know what his conception of courage is.   *Istaec*,[35] therefore, cannot be interpreted from the interlocutor's point of view.   The meaning of Leonida's words does not become apparent until we reach the clause *qui . . . fert*, which explains the exact force of *istaec*.   The tone of the passage, moreover, is clearly hypocoristic.   The fact that the statement is a general truth and that the subjects of both clauses are third personal tends further to give to the passage a distinctly third personal atmos-

[32] I merely call attention to the fact that the subject of both clauses is first personal, since this lends to the context a first personal tone.   I am not, however, attempting, as Bach does (*op. cit.* [see note 7] 233–234), to equate the force of the demonstrative with that of the appositional clause, although if this were done, the passage would certainly tell strongly against Bach.

[33] Cf. Bach, *ibid.* 233 f.   To interpret *istuc* as second personal Havet reads *intervortas* and renders the passage as follows: "Justement, je réfléchis à ton affaire; comment pourras-tu escamoter l'argent à la fois au nouveau venu et à Sauréa (*Pseudo-Plaute, Le Prix des Ânes* [Paris, 1925] *ad loc.*).

[34] Cf. Bach, *op. cit.* (see note 7) 234; E. J. Thomas, *T. Macci Plauti Aulularia* (Oxford, 1913) *ad loc.*

[35] Havet's translation of the passage preserves the traditional interpretation: "A la bonne heure, je trouve en toi l'énergie qui, en temps utile, fait subir le mal en brave" (*op. cit.* [see note 33]).

phere.[36]   The following verse (324) confirms this interpretation.   I find
in *istaec* neither a second personal nor a derogatory force.   In my opinion
istaec (note also the use of the emphatic *-ce*) is merely an emphatic
praeparativus, used here with no personal connotation for the express
purpose of securing a more forceful reference to the topic under considera-
tion than would have been possible if *illaec* had been used.

29. In like manner Acroteleutium (*Mil.* 1233–1235) says: "That
anxiety (*iste metus*)[37] is what tortures me"—a statement which she then
explains in the clauses *ne . . . mutent . . . spernat,* by which the force
of *iste* is determined.   So, also, Nicobulus (*Bacch.* 337–339), on hearing
from Chrysalus the fictitious account of the money, says: "In that (*istuc*)
at least my son acted wisely," whereupon he makes clear his comment
with the clause *quom . . . dedit,* by which the precise application of *istuc*
is defined.   In these three passages I also fail to see in *iste* the traditional
force.

30. A very important passage for our present purpose is Diniarchus'
monologue (*Truc.* 850–853).   "I'll demand back the child from her
(*hac*)," muses Diniarchus.   Then, as her door opens, he continues: "But,
upon my word, here she is, coming out quite opportunely indeed.   It's
certainly a long sting that woman (*ista*) has, for she pierces my heart even
from there."

31. Until recently Phronesium has been his little darling, his soul's
delight[38] and even now he still retains for her something of his former
feeling;[39] therefore, he certainly does not refer to her with contempt.   The
traditionalists,[40] therefore, will naturally explain *ista* from the audience's
point of view.[41]   It is true that Phronesium has appeared earlier and is
known to the audience; it is also true that she enters the stage during
Diniarchus' monologue.   However, as *iste* is also used at times of a
character who is as yet unknown to the audience[42] and as *hic* and *ille* are
likewise used of a character just entering the stage,[43] I do not regard
either of these considerations as the determining factor in the choice of
ista.   But apart from this, one other consideration which precludes the
traditional interpretation is the use of *hac* interchangeably with *ista.*

[36] Under these conditions the traditionalists insist that *illaec* should be used, but
I see nothing illogical in *istaec,* since I regard the word as non-personal (cf. note 32).

[37] On 1233 cf. Brix-Niemeyer, *op. cit.* (see note 29); Bach, *op. cit.* (see note 7) 234;
Seyffert, *op. cit.* (see note 12) 304.

[38] Cf. *Truc.* 434–447.

[39] Cf. 853.

[40] Cf. Bach, *op. cit.* (see note 7) 263; also 340.

[41] See ¶ 40.

[42] See ¶¶ 54–55, where *istaec* is used in a monologue of the *Mercator* of a character
as yet unknown.

[43] For this use of *hic,* cf. *Poen.* 960, *Curc.* 110; for the same usage with *ille,* cf. *Rud.*
79, *Poen.* 613.

Obviously, if *ista* in this monologue has any personal force, whatever personal force it has, that same personal force *hac* must also have, since the two pronouns are used by the same speaker under identical conditions in reference to the same character.

32. In my opinion the interchange of pronouns in this and similar passages proves beyond doubt that no personal force inheres in *hic*, *iste*, or *ille;* it also shows the absurdity of ascribing to these words a first, second, and third personal connotation respectively under all circumstances.   Diniarchus' interest in Phronesium lends to the passage a first personal tone; therefore, according to the traditionalists' assignment of the pronouns, *haec* should have been used instead of *ista*.   The fact that Phronesium is spoken of might also lead us to expect *illa* in place of either *hac* or *ista*.

33. However, one immutable fact remains — if we are ever to arrive at a correct interpretation of many passages in the early Roman dramatists, which have long been misinterpreted, we must interpret what these poets wrote, not read into them what we think they should have written. If Plautus wrote *ista*, there must have been a reason.   Are we to assume that *ista* in this context is first personal, while in others it is second, or that *hac* in this context is second personal, while in others it is first, or are we to assume that neither word has a personal connotation?   I believe that in passages where such an interchange occurs, these words are used with their original deictic force (i.e., they are non-personal).   If this assumption is correct, *hac* and *ista* are in this respect identical and capable, therefore, of being interchanged.[44]   However, I do not mean to imply that the two words are identical in force.   *Ista*, I think, expresses a stronger, more emphatic deixis and the change to this word may very well reflect the change in the speaker's state of mind[45] (note *cor pungit meum*), as he sees the courtesan approach.

[44] In some cases where such an interchange occurs, one pronoun, as we shall see later, is deictic and the other resumptive.

[45] According to Hofmann, "die Pronomina gehören zum ältesten Bestand der Sprachen, sind, zum Teil wenigstens, aus interjektionalen Elementen aufgebaut und behalten in der Umgangssprache diese affektische Abtönung im Zusammenhang mit der lebhaften Aktion, der Betonung und dem Mienenspiel, durchaus bei" (*L. U.* [see note 17] 167). Seyffert believes that "*iste* überall einen besonderen Affekt ausdrückt, . . . Unwillen . . . Spott . . . Bewunderung . . ." and in the present instance "gewissermassen eine gemischte Empfindung" (*op. cit.* [see note 12] 301.   I concede the fact that *iste* is an emphatic deictic, often accompanied, no doubt, by a lively gesture, but I am not willing to grant that any emotional shading is inherent in this word.   While it happens in this case (and the same is true, also, in certain other cases) that the change to *ista* does coincide with a change in the speaker's state of mind (he becomes more emotional), nevertheless I do not wish to press this matter very far.   Clear cases of this manifestation represent a very small minority of even those cases of the word which represent a deviation from the traditionalists' norm, and when they occur, this emotional color certainly derives from the context and is not inherent in the word per se.

34. Somewhat analogous is a passage in the *Eunuchus*, 822–824. When Thais demands' an explanation regarding the eunuch's part in seducing the freeborn Athenian, Pythias says: "They say that he (*illum*) was not the eunuch." "Then who was he," asks Thais, to which Pythias replies: "That (*iste*) Chaerea." "Which Chaerea?" demands Thais, to which Pythias rejoins: "That (*iste*) ephebus, the brother of Phaedria."

35. The attitude of Pythias is entirely neutral. She does not speak with disapproval of Chaerea, but merely conveys to Thais the rumor of his guilt. For this reason I fail to see in *iste* a derogatory connotation. The traditional school of interpretation[46] will accordingly explain *iste* as second personal. The fact that Chaerea is not present prevents us from explaining this word on the basis of relative position.[47] The fact that Chaerea is unknown to Thais (note *qui Chaerea*, 824)[48] likewise invalidates any attempt to explain *iste* from the interlocutor's point of view. In addition to the dramatic difficulties which a second personal interpreta- tion entails, such an interpretation presents still another difficulty — it would then be necessary to interpret *illum* also as second personal, since the two pronouns are used by the same speaker interchangeably in refer- ence to the same person. As in *Truculentus* 850–853, the absurdity of attributing to these words a personal connotation under these conditions is apparent. What we really have is *illum* and *iste* used with their original deictic force with no personal or derogatory connotation. I do not mean, however, to imply that the two words are identical in force. Pythias refers to the seducer as *illum* with no particular emphasis on the reference (about as we should use our third personal pronoun). When Thais fails to grasp the situation, Pythias changes to the more emphatic *iste*, which she uses a second time in determining the identity of Chaerea. In all of these passages I find it impossible to interpret the forms of *iste* in accordance with the traditional theory.[49]

36. Our analysis of the foregoing passages shows that *hic* and *ille*, to which a derogatory force is not ordinarily ascribed, may both be used in contexts which are clearly derogatory; that *iste*, on the other hand, which is commonly held to express either a second per-

To me an emphatic indication of a person or object is one thing, an emotional overtone or color another thing.

[46] Cf. Philippe Fabia, *P. Terenti Afri Eunuchus* (Paris, 1895) *ad loc.*

[47] For the theory of relative position, see ¶ 67. In the dialogues this explanation is invariably resorted to when the character is present, and often even when the char- acter is not present, but merely the house in which the character resides is visible.

[48] Cf. Sidney G. Ashmore, *P. Terenti Afri Comoediae* (Oxford, 1910) *ad loc.*; Meader, *op. cit.* (see note 13) 153.

[49] For the same usage in the scenic fragments cf. Afran. *Cons.* 1.33: isto; Naev. *Taren.* 6.83: isti; Aquil. *Boeot.* 1.5: istorum.

sonal or derogatory relation, may be used in contexts which are both non-deuterotritonic and non-derogatory.

37. We come now to the second issue — the use of *iste* in monologue. Bach, we may recall, contends that *iste* in monologue just as in dialogue is uniformly and exclusively a *pronomen δευτερότριτον*. This naturally raises a question regarding the character of the monologue in the ancient Roman drama.

38. A passage in the *Stichus* may help to throw some light on this question. The parasite, Gelasimus, enters (155) and recounts his difficulties in securing maintenance. In the hope of getting an invitation to dinner, he decides to hold an auction (218 ff.), which he invites all who are interested to attend (*adeste sultis*, 220). He offers for sale *logos ridiculos* (221), asking for bids in terms of breakfasts and dinners. Finally he says (224): *ehem, adnuistin'*. He evidently comes forward at this point and addresses his remarks to some individual in the audience. In the same way the *prologus*, Auxilium, before beginning to unfold to the audience the plot of the *Cistellaria*, bespeaks their attention (154–155). Stratophanes, also, addresses the audience in one of his monologues (*Truc.* 482–483).

39. From passages such as these, in which the speaker has clearly addressed his remarks, or some portion of them, to the audience, Bach maintains that all monologues in the early Roman drama, irrespective of internal evidence, were addressed to the audience (as a whole, or to some individual or class of individuals in the audience), or to someone whom the speaker imagines to be present. According to his interpretation either the audience, or an interlocutor, whom the speaker imagines to be present, replaces in the monologues the real interlocutor in the dialogues and *iste* continues to function as a *pronomen δευτερότριτον*.

40. In cases where it is clear that none of these conditions obtains, he attempts to explain the references in the monologues from the audience's point of view, indicating either a class, or one or more individuals known to them, or seen by them. Such references may be of a general nature and apply to a class of individuals under discussion, or they may pertain to one or more specific characters of the play, who are seen entering or leaving the stage, or who happen to be referred to in a given scene, but who are already known to the audience from their appearance in an earlier scene. Since the pronoun in such cases refers to someone or something associated

with the audience (i.e., their consciousness), the word, according to Bach, still functions as a true δευτερότριτον.[50]

41. Although the monologue as a feature in the technique of the early Roman dramatists and its purpose in plot development have been quite thoroughly investigated, not much attention seems to have been given to the nature of the monologue. Prescott, however, in one of his most recent studies on the monologue, begins by stating that "theoretically . . . the monologue is always legitimate whenever the psychological conditions of the speaker in his reaction to the incidents of the plot at a given moment are such as to warrant either talking to himself, in the form of pure soliloquy, or addressing an imaginary audience, or explicitly or implicitly, as is often the case in Roman comedy, communicating his thoughts to the actual audience in the theater as he stands either alone on stage or in the presence of others of whose eavesdropping he is, ostensibly at least, quite unaware."[51] Thus we see that Prescott admits the existence of true soliloquy in Plautus and Terence.

42. Naturally I am quite ready to agree that the actors in the early Roman drama did, on occasion, address the audience. Since this, however, is a point of no little importance for determining the force of *iste*, I should like to examine a few other passages.

43. Bach sees in the words *urbanos istos mundulos amasios* in Strabax' monologue (*Truc.* 658)[52] and in the comment of the *prologus* on Terence's dramatic technique (*Andr.* 15–16)[53] clear cases of an actor addressing his remarks to certain classes who are present in the audience. A similar interpretation he thinks should be given to *isti* in Afranius, *Fratriae* 1 (156–158), to *isti* in the *Lindia* of Sextus Turpilius 4 (142–144) and similar passages.[54]

44. While this is conceivable, it cannot be indubitably proved in the absence of internal evidence. Furthermore, in view of the fragmentary state of the text, there is no means of proving, so far as I can discover, that the passages from Afranius and Turpilius were even in monologue.

45. Sometimes the remarks are even more general, as in the father-in-law's criticism of husbands and wives (*Men.* 766–768). In this and

---

[50] *Op. cit.* (see note 7) 257–264, 235.

[51] Henry W. Prescott, "Link Monologues in Roman Comedy," *CPh* 34 (1939) 1.

[52] Cf. Bach, *op. cit.* (see note 7) 258.

[53] For the traditional interpretation cf. Bach, *op. cit.* (see note 7) 259; Edgar H. Sturtevant, *P. Terenti Afri Andria* (New York, 1914); H. R. Fairclough, *P. Terenti Afri Andria* (Boston, 1901); Ashmore, *op. cit.* (see note 48). Stolz-Schmalz, *op. cit.* (see note 17) 476, and Brugmann, *op. cit.* (see note 17) 79, interpret as third personal.

[54] Bach, *op. cit.* (see note 7) 260.

similar passages Bach[55] recognizes references to classes of individuals not necessarily among the spectators, but known to them. In such cases the use of *iste* has, in his opinion, been determined by the audience's point of view.

46. One fact, however, has escaped Bach's notice. If *istaec* (766) has been used because the audience was familiar with the typical shrew, we may reasonably ask why *illi* (768) has been used. Was the audience not equally familiar with the philandering husband? To anyone examining the passage with an open mind the fallacy of Bach's contention will be apparent. Others, no doubt, will explain *istaec* as derogatory. I admit for *istaec* a derogatory connotation, but I find in *illi*, also, a tone of disparagement. The idea of contempt is, in my opinion, not the basic reason for the poet's choice of *istaec*.[56] I think that both pronouns, as in *Eunuchus* 822–824,[57] are here used with their original deictic force. Neither word has a personal connotation. In this instance their function is to designate and at the same time differentiate two classes of individuals.[58] To "those awful females" the *senex* naturally applies *istaec*, the form capable of expressing the stronger deixis (note the use of the emphatic *-ce*) and for this reason, also, the greater degree of contempt, whereas to "the men," whose faults he is inclined to minimize somewhat, he refers with the less emphatic *illi*.

47. Next I should like to consider three monologues in which the reference is neither to the audience nor to a class of individuals among them or known to them, but to a specific character.

48. The monologue of Diniarchus (*Truc.* 434–447) is possibly one of the most interesting and instructive passages of all. The young Athenian, on his return from abroad, calls upon his mistress, Phronesium. When they bid each other farewell, the latter goes into the house, while Diniarchus gives expression to his rapture. Several points deserve consideration. In the first place, since Diniarchus is eulogizing his mistress, the context cannot be derogatory. Furthermore, there is no internal evidence of address to the audience. Phronesium has appeared in the

---

[55] *Ibid.*

[56] See ¶¶ 15–20, where *ille*, also, is used to express contempt.

[57] See ¶¶ 34–35.

[58] If A refers to B and C, he may, on occasion, use either two forms of *hic* (cf. *Eun.* 344–345: hanc . . . huic; *Epid.* 621: hic . . . haec; *Most.* 540–541: huic . . . hic), or two of *ille* (cf. *Phorm.* 332: illis . . . illis; *Pers.* 71: ille . . . illi; *Mil.* 1046: illaec . . . illa), or two of *iste* (cf. *Most.* 668–669: istum . . . istunc; *Truc.* 202–203: istic . . . ista; *Asin.* 603: iste . . . ista). These pronouns designate these characters, but the differentiation depends entirely upon the case-terminations. However, if the same speaker uses *hic* for B and *iste* for C, or *ille* for B and *iste* for C, these pronouns designate these characters, but a much more emphatic, more clear-cut differentiation is obtained by the use of two different words than would be obtained if two forms of the same word were used, since the ear catches the distinction more readily.

previous scene and is, therefore, known to the audience. It is conceivable, though not certain that they may even have watched her enter her house as Diniarchus began his monologue.

49. Bach maintains that if a character has appeared in an earlier scene and is, therefore, known to the audience, forms of *iste* are used in subsequent monologues to designate such a character, because the references are made from the audience's point of view; furthermore, that when a character leaves the stage, *iste* is used while he can still be seen, but *ille* when he can no longer be seen.[59]

50. Let us test the distribution of the pronouns in this passage in the light of Bach's theory. The first pronoun used in referring to Phronesium is *haec* (436). As she has already appeared, it should be *ista;* if she is still visible, it should be *ista;* if she is out of sight, it should be *illa;* yet strangely enough it is neither *ista* nor *illa*, but *haec*. The next pronouns applied to her are *illam* and *illi* (441). By this time she is certainly out of sight; therefore, *illam* and *illi* might be justified. However, since she has already appeared and is known to the audience, *istam* and *isti*, according to Bach, should have been used. She is next referred to by *huic* (442), which is entirely at variance with Bach's theory; then by *isti* (443) and by *istam* (444), which accords with Bach's theory; and finally by *illi* (446), which again represents a deviation from Bach's norm.

51. To interpret such a passage in accordance with Bach's theory would certainly test the ingenuity of even the ingenious Bach. What we really have is three pronouns used interchangeably by the same speaker in reference to one and the same character. What possible reason is there for such an interchange? Is *iste* in this passage a *pronomen δευτερότριτον?* Do *hic, iste*, and *ille* in this case preserve *intact* their inherent *first, second*, and *third* personal force respectively? Obviously, if *iste* in this monologue has any personal force, whatever personal force it has, that same personal force *hic* and *ille* must also have, since the three pronouns are used by the same speaker under identical conditions in reference to the same character.

52. Bach's method of explaining the pronouns in this passage deserves consideration, since it is typical of his method throughout. After setting up what I hope to show is an untenable theory and attempting to interpret all occurrences of these words according to this theory, instead of allowing the passages to speak for themselves, he finds himself confronted in the end by a goodly number of cases which are at variance with his theory. These he either attempts to rationalize by methods which are far from sound, or else he merely begs the issue. So here, he simply notes that such an interchange sometimes occurs. He does not tell us why it occurs:

[59] *Op. cit.* (see note 7) 261–262, but cf. 185, which seems to contradict these statements; also cf. *TLL* 6.3.2703.19–20.

and what is more important still, he does not tell us how we are to inter-
pret such an interchange in accordance with his theory of an inherent
first, second, and third personal force.[60]

53. According to my own interpretation the demonstratives in this
monologue, just as in *Truculentus* 850–853 and in *Eunuchus* 822–824,[61]
are used with their *original* (i.e., *non-personal*) *deictic* force.   Since they
have no personal connotation, they are on a par in this particular and
may, therefore, be interchanged.   No ingenious explanation, moreover,
need be sought to clarify their use.   They do, however, differ in their
deictic intensity, as the present passage clearly shows.   Diniarchus begins
by referring to Phronesium as *haec* (436).   Then follows a short digres-
sion on her fidelity.   At 441 he enters upon what might be termed a new
phase of his eulogy.   The climactic arrangement of the pronouns — *illam
. . . illi . . . huic . . . isti . . . istam*   (441–444) — corresponds   to
his mounting emotion, which reaches its climax as he decides to send
"that sweet thing" (*isti*) a gift, to have five *minae* taken to "that darling"
(*istam*) immediately.   The function of *isti . . . istam* in this passage is
to bring Phronesium momentarily into strong relief.[62]   Momentarily
Diniarchus turns upon her a spot-light, so to speak, then resumes toward
the close with the unemphatic *illi* "that girl" (446), marking as it were
the anticlimax.   The force of *iste* in this passage is strongly deictic,
non-deuterotritonic, with a hypocoristic connotation.

[60] *Op. cit.* (see note 7) 339–340.

[61] See ¶¶ 30–35.

[62] If A, e.g., in a speech of twelve or fifteen lines, or less, refers to B as *hic* four times,
then as *iste* once, then finally toward the close as *hic* once or twice more, or if in such a
speech A refers to B as *ille* several times, then once or twice as *iste*, and finally near the
close as *ille*, or if in such a speech A, as here, refers to B first with the comparatively
unemphatic *ille*, then with the more emphatic *hic*, then twice with *iste*, and finally at
the close resumes once more with the comparatively colorless *ille*, then *iste* in such a case
serves to bring the character momentarily into strong relief.   *Iste* designates the
character more emphatically than the foregoing forms of *ille* and *hic* have done; there-
fore, momentarily, for the space of a few words, or of a line or two, the attention is
focussed more sharply on the character, the word picture is etched more clearly, and
the character is brought forward, as it were, from the level of the background (i.e., the
foregoing lines) just as when a spot-light is turned upon a character for a moment or
two in some dramatic situation on our modern stage.   The *iste* is a linguistic spot-light,
so to speak, which performs the same function in such passages as the spot-light in
modern stage-craft.   This stylistic feature is not to be confused with other stylistic
devices, such as the use of *iste* in a first outburst of indignation (cf. *Epid.* 573, ¶ 70),
or surprise, or in the change to *iste* in some tense moment (cf. *Amph.* 784, ¶ 82), or
when the speaker becomes more agitated (cf. *Truc.* 852, ¶¶ 30–33).   To be sure, the
speaker's emotional state or the dramatic nature of the passage is in all probability
the most potent factor when *iste* is used to bring a character momentarily into strong
relief, but in the latter case the pronouns are always used in a series, from a weaker
demonstrative to *iste*, then back again to one of the weaker words.

54. Demipho's speech (*Merc.* 559–561) may help to throw some further light on Bach's theory of the monologue. The non-derogatory context and the absence of internal evidence of address to the spectators reproduce the conditions which obtain in the preceding passage. In this case, however, Demipho uses *istaec* (561)[63] in referring to his mistress, who has not yet appeared, and who is, therefore, unknown to the audience, whereas in designating his neighbor, who has already appeared and who is, therefore, known, he employs *hunc* (559).[64] Such a passage would seem to be a direct violation of Bach's theory.

55. In my opinion both pronouns are used with their original (i.e., non-personal) deictic force. As in *Menaechmi* 766–768, their function is to designate and at the same time differentiate[65] two absent characters. To his mistress, who is uppermost in his consciousness, he applies the strongly deictic *istaec* (note the emphatic *-ce*), whereas to his neighbor he refers with the less emphatic *hunc*.

56. In the same way Menaechmus Sosicles, after recovering from his feigned insanity, looks about and expresses surprise (*Men.* 876–877) at the departure of his pursuers. Internal evidence of address to the audience is lacking, but the context is derogatory. Menaechmus' pursuers, whom he designates by *isti* (876), are not in the act of leaving the stage, as Bach's theory would imply;[66] they have already departed (note *abierunt*, 876). Under these circumstances Bach's theory would require *illi*, yet Plautus uses *isti*. Is *isti* in this passage a true δευτερότριτον? The traditionalists will naturally interpret *isti* from the audience's point of view,[67] or explain it as pejorative. However, since *iste* is frequently used of characters unknown to the audience[68] and since *hic* and *ille* may also express contempt,[69] I do not think that either consideration has determined the poet's choice of *isti*. The atmosphere of the passage, moreover, is distinctly third personal — the verb of the main clause is third personal and the verb of the identifying clause is also third personal; therefore, I fail to see in *isti* any second personal force. I regard this word as an emphatic *praeparativus*, employed in place of the more usual *illi* to secure a more forceful reference to the pursuers than would have been possible if *illi* had been used.[70]

---

[63] Cf. Bach, *op. cit.* (see note 7) 260–261.

[64] Cf. *TLL* 6.3.2705.26.

[65] See ¶¶ 45–46 and note 58.

[66] Cf. *op. cit.* (see note 7) 261 f.

[67] *Ibid.* 262, where Bach applies Brix' note on 880 to 876, but cf. Seyffert, *op. cit.* (see note 12) 301, for *iste* to express indignation.

[68] See *Merc.* 561 (¶ 54), *Andr.* 216 (¶ 64), *Cas.* 53 (¶ 88), *Bacch.* 507a (¶ 89).

[69] See ¶¶ 15–25.

[70] See *Pers.* 73–74 (¶ 118); also see note 152 for Bach's theory regarding this type.

57. Bach contends that the greater number of monologues referring to specific characters, such as the three just considered, were delivered from the audience's point of view. The fallacy of this contention is apparent and will become more so as we proceed. The rest he maintains were addressed to a character whom the speaker imagined to be present. Some undoubtedly were. So, for example, in the *Aulularia*, when Congrio and the other cooks come tumbling out of Euclio's house, Congrio in burlesque haste begins his monologue by addressing the pedestrians whom he imagines to be passing by (406–407).

58. In this connection, however, I should like to consider the words of Peniculus (*Men.* 94). In Bach's opinion the speaker in this and similar passages addresses an imaginary interlocutor who performs the same function as the real interlocutor in the dialogues. In the present instance Bach[71] refers verses 84–95 to such a character. *Istaec* (94), according to his interpretation, would mean *those bonds which I have mentioned to you, my imaginary interlocutor*.

59. I am duly aware of the second personal forms in these verses. However, I am able to find no positive proof to establish the fact that Peniculus did or did not imagine an interlocutor to be present. Bach seems to me to travel a long road to interpret *istaec* as second personal. In my opinion Peniculus' monologue may quite as well be a true soliloquy throughout and *istaec* mean merely *those bonds* without any personal connotation.

60. In conclusion I should like to point out that although there is internal evidence to show that in monologues the actors did, under certain circumstances, address the audience, there is also internal evidence to prove the existence of true soliloquies. Thus Pseudolus in a monologue (*Pseud.* 905 ff.), on realizing at the end of three verses (908) that no interlocutor is present, asks himself: sumne ego homo insipiens, qui haec mecum egomet loquar solus?[72]

61. Our study of *iste* in the foregoing monologues shows that some monologues in the early Roman drama were addressed to the audience, as is proved by internal evidence; that others were true soliloquies, as is also attested by internal evidence; that in cases where there is no internal evidence, those in which the speaker refers to a class of individuals may, perhaps, have been addressed to the audience, or delivered from their point of view, although they need not, and in some cases cannot be so interpreted; that those in which the speaker refers to a specific individual, in some cases to one who

[71] *Ibid.* 235.

[72] Cf. E. P. Morris, *The Pseudolus of Plautus* (Boston, 1895) *ad loc.*; Lorenz, *op. cit.* (see note 6) *ad loc.*; Bach naturally misses the point (*op. cit.* [see note 7] 305).

is as yet unknown to the audience, prove that *iste* may be used entirely apart from any reference to the audience.   Even if we refer such monologues to an interlocutor, whom the speaker imagines to be present, this fact will nevertheless fail to explain in accordance with the traditional theory the use of two or more pronouns in reference to one and the same individual.   The only possible conclusion, therefore, is that *iste* in monologue does not preserve intact its force of a *pronomen δευτερότριτον*, but that it may be used entirely apart from any reference to a person addressed.

62. In these preliminary remarks I have tried to establish the premise that under certain circumstances *iste* may be both non-deuterotritonic and non-derogatory.   This is a point of no little importance for the interpretation of the remaining types, since the traditionalists (with the exception of a few scholars such as Bach, who see in *iste* only a second personal force) invariably have recourse to the derogatory explanation when they are unable to explain the word as second personal.

63. With these facts in mind I should like to consider one or more representative examples of each of the several types in the four categories comprising a by no means negligible group of passages which thus far have been either disregarded or forced into the traditional interpretation.   In this group in which I find deviations from the traditionalists' norm are passages in which *iste* and *hic*, or *iste* and *ille*, or in some cases all three words, are used interchangeably within the space of a few lines.

I. *Iste* IN THE SENSE OF *Hic*

Type 1.   In this type *hic* and *iste* or in some cases all three pronouns are used by the same speaker in reference to the same person or thing.

64. Two of the best examples in monologue are the two already discussed.[73]   In these two passages the force of the several pronouns used is deictic.   In *Andria* 215–216, *haec* and *ista* are also interchanged, although in this case the character is as yet unknown to the audience.   In this instance, moreover, *haec* (215) serves to designate the character (i.e., its force is deictic) and *ista* (216) is used for an emphatic resumption of the reference.[74]

---

[73] See *Truc.* 850–853 (¶¶ 30–33); *Truc.* 434–447 (¶¶ 48–53).

[74] The order of the pronouns necessarily depends upon whether the speaker desires to indicate the character with emphasis, or to secure an emphatic resumption of the

65. In *Miles Gloriosus* 88–128, the departed soldier is likewise referred to as *ille* (88), *hunc* (95), *hunc* (96), *hic* (104), *huic* (109), *is* (111), *huic* (120), and *istum* (128); Pleusicles is also referred to as *illum* (101) and *illum* (127). I realize that in this instance there is internal evidence of address to the audience (79–85; 98). However, as ten verses intervene between the soldier's exit (78) and Palaestrio's first reference to him (88), he is scarcely in the act of leaving the stage when the slave begins his characterization.[75] I concede the fact that the context is derogatory; I am also aware of the use of *odisse* with *istum* (128). However, I find it difficult to see in the derogatory context the reason for the poet's use of *istum*.[76] I find even greater difficulty in explaining *istum* as second personal, in view of Palaestrio's use of *hic*, *ille*, and *is* interchangeably with *istum* under the same conditions in reference to the same character. In my opinion the force of *istum*[77] is deictic. Its function is to bring the soldier momentarily into strong relief. The use of *istum* (128) in reference to the soldier and *illum* (127)[78] in reference to the young Athenian also serves to designate and at the same time differentiate[79] the two characters, both of whom are spoken of.

66. The same interchange also occurs in dialogue. A particularly instructive passage is *Asinaria* 456. "Master knows that fellow (*istunc*)," says Libanus, still trying to persuade the wary trader to part with his money, and "he (*hic*) knows master."

67. The dialogue naturally raises the question of relative position. This theory, as I have already pointed out, has been much overworked by Bach and the earlier traditionalists in their attempt to force certain passages into the traditional norm. It has also gained quite a foothold in the commentaries of Plautus and

reference. For the reverse order, cf. *Asin.* 456 (¶¶ 66 and 69); *Adel.* 558–560 (¶ 71); *Capt.* 733–738 (¶ 73).

[75] Here just as in *Men.* 876–877 (¶ 56) the soldier is clearly off stage before the speaker uses *istum*. Such a passage would seem to be a contradiction of Bach's theory.

[76] All of the pronouns used in referring to the soldier have a pejorative connotation. This accords with our earlier findings regarding these words (cf. ¶¶ 15–25). While I do not believe that *istum* is here used because of its ability to express contempt, I do, however, think that it expresses this idea more intensely. This, however, is the result not of any derogatory idea inherent in the word itself, but because, being a strongly deictic word, whatever idea it expresses, whether pejorative, hypocoristic, or any shade between these two, is naturally driven home with greater force than if a less emphatic word were used.

[77] Cf. Bach, *op. cit.* (see note 7) 265; Seyffert, *op. cit.* (see note 12) 301–302; Meader, *op. cit.* (see note 13) 153.

[78] Cf. Wolterstorff, *Glotta* 10 (see note 18) 68; *TLL* 7.1.360.82–83.

[79] See note 58.

Terence.[80]   As I wish to test the validity of this theory in this and
other dialogues, it may be well to consider exactly what it implies.
The first, second, and third personal force, which Bach believes to
inhere respectively in *hic*, *iste*, and *ille* and the definite line of
demarcation in their usage enables them, in his opinion, to denote
the relative position of the actors on the stage, thereby serving the
same purpose as stage directions in a modern play.   Accordingly,
if *hic* is used in reference to a character, it follows that he must be
near the speaker, if *iste* is used, he must be near the person addressed,
and if *ille* is used, he must be remote from both the speaker and the
person addressed.   This applies not only to the proximity or re-
moteness of the speaker to another character, but of the speaker to
the house in which another character resides.   It also applies to the
proximity or remoteness of an entering or departing character in
reference to the character on stage.   If a character addresses the
audience in the presence of another character and approaches the
front of the stage, it also applies to the proximity or remoteness of
the speaker to the audience and the other character.   It even ap-
plies to the relative proximity or remoteness of concepts in the
speaker's consciousness and their association or dissociation with his
interlocutor.   Therefore, when a speaker refers to the same person
or thing, now by *hic* and again by *iste*, or in one case by *iste* and in
another by *ille*, or in some instances by all three pronouns, this
interchange, according to Bach, results from the constant shift of
position of the characters on the stage in reference to one another.[81]

68. While it is generally agreed that Roman comedy, especially
Plautine, was of a rollicking, boisterous nature, yet if we are to give
credence to Bach's interpretation, we must imagine these comedians
shifting their position on stage with unbelievable speed.   In some
instances, as we shall see later, the speed with which these shifts
are supposedly effected is beyond the realm of plausibility; more-
over, the nature of the shifts which Bach posits is in some instances
also at variance with the dramatic exigencies.

69. Let us return now to the passage in the *Asinaria* and test the use
of the pronouns in the light of Bach's theory.   Libanus, as we have

---

[80] Even in such a scholarly work as *Plautus Captivi* by W. M. Lindsay (London,
1900) and in Ashmore's edition of the Comedies of Terence (*op. cit.* [see note 48]) this
dictum appears.   Also cf. W. M. Lindsay, *Syntax of Plautus* (St. Andrews University
Publications, 4 [1907]) 45.

[81] Cf. Bach, *op. cit.* (see note 7) 211 ff. *passim*, but especially 327–328.

already seen, refers to his fellow-slave, Leonida, first as *istunc* (456) and
then as *hic* (456). If we assume for *istunc* a second personal force due to
the relative proximity of Leonida to the trader, a further assumption is
necessary — that while Libanus delivers the three words *novit atque erum*
Leonida shifts his position, so that when Libanus pronounces the word
hic, Leonida is standing near him. This assumption is highly improb-
able.[82] Furthermore, as the two slaves are jointly interested in the in-
trigue, Libanus clearly does not refer to his fellow-slave with contempt.
One fact, however, is certain — that if the force of *istunc* is second per-
sonal, the force of *hic* must also be, since the two pronouns have been used
interchangeably by the same speaker in reference to the same character.
For my own part, I fail to see in these words the traditional force.[83] I
regard the force of *istunc* as merely deictic (note the emphatic *-ce*), that
of *hic* as resumptive.[84]

70. The recognition scene of the *Epidicus*, 548 ff., presents an analo-
gous situation except that the context is derogatory. When Periphanes
brings about a meeting between Philippa and her lost daughter, Philippa
is astonished at her daughter's appearance. In her first indignant out-
burst she refers to her as *istaec* (573), after that as *haec* (574), *huic* (574),
hanc (575) and *hanc* (576). Periphanes also uses *haec* (574) and *haec*
(578) in referring to the girl. Since Philippa is still under the impression
that the girl is not her daughter, she regards her with contempt. How-
ever, since all three pronouns may be used in derogatory contexts,
Philippa's contempt for this stranger can scarcely account for her use of
istaec.[85] Even if we attempt to explain *istaec* on this basis, the question
still remains why she has used forms of *hic* during the rest of her con-
versation. If we assume that when Philippa used *istaec* (573), the girl
was standing near Periphanes, but that she immediately moved nearer
to Philippa when the latter said *haecine* (574), how are we to explain the
fact that Periphanes in the same verse uses *haec* (574)? The girl can
scarcely have regained her supposed position near Periphanes during the
delivery of one word.[86] In my opinion neither the derogatory context
nor the relative position of the characters has determined the choice of
pronouns. Philippa's use of *istaec* corresponds to her emotional state
and, as in *Truculentus* 853, has in all probability been determined by it.
In her first indignant outburst she uses the emphatic *praeparativus, istaec,*

---

[82] With Bach 333, cf. Seyffert's criticism (*op. cit.* [see note 12] 308).

[83] Cf. Havet *ad loc.*, who emends the text by assigning *erus istunc novit* to Libanus
and *atque erum hic* to the trader, to avoid a break with the traditional interpretation of
the pronouns. Also see his translation of this verse (*op. cit.* [see note 33]).

[84] Cf. *TLL* 6.3.2702.21–23. For the reverse order cf. *Andr.* 215–216 (¶ 64) and
note 74.

[85] See note 76.

[86] Because of this fact Bach proposes a textual emendation (*op. cit.* [see note 7]
332–333).

in place of the more usual *haec,* then as her surprise passes, she resumes the reference with forms of the less emphatic *hic.*[87]

71. In the same way Syrus (*Adel.* 558–560) refers to the music-girl first as *istam* (558) and later as *hanc* (560). In this case the question of relative position does not enter into the interpretation, since the music-girl does not appear in the scene. Syrus, moreover, feels no contempt for the girl, as both, at least according to the fabrications of Syrus, have grievances in common. Here, just as in *Asinaria* 456, I think that the force of *istam* is merely deictic, that of *hanc* resumptive.[88]

72. In *Captivi* 533, Hegio enters, accompanied by the Elean captive, Aristophontes. The Elean reveals to Hegio the trick of Tyndarus. The latter, to escape punishment, tries to convince Hegio that his fellow slave is mad. In the ensuing conversation Tyndarus designates Aristophontes as *hunc* (557) and as *iste* (563). As the characters are present, the advocates of the traditional theory will naturally explain the interchange of pronouns on the basis of relative position.[89] In this case it must be admitted that shift of position is possible and likely to occur owing to the emotional character of the scene. Some of these traditionalists will probably also see in *iste* a pejorative force. It must be admitted that the tone of the passage is derogatory, but this derogatory tone is no more marked in 563[90] than in 557, although in the one case *hunc* has been used to designate Aristophontes and in the other *iste.* In this instance *iste* does not resume *hunc,* but the force of both words is deictic. The order of the pronouns, I think, has been determined by the speaker's mounting emotion. As his anger increases, he changes from the less emphatic *hunc* to the strongly deictic *iste.*

73. In the second scene Hegio has learned that his plan for the recovery of his son through an exchange of prisoners has failed. Accordingly he pronounces a decree of doom upon the wily Tyndarus (733–738). Although the tone of the passage is derogatory, this fact in and of itself can scarcely serve to explain the use of *istum* (733).[91] If we assume that the position of Tyndarus relative to the overseer determined the choice of pronoun, it is also necessary to assume that when Hegio uses *huic* (734),[92] *hunc* (737) and *huic* (738), Tyndarus, who is about to be led away by the overseer, instead of remaining near him, has approached Hegio, by whom his sentence has just been pronounced.[93] While this is

[87] See notes 74 and 84.

[88] Again see notes 74 and 84.

[89] Cf. Bach, *op. cit.* (see note 7) 329, with Seyffert's criticism (*op. cit.* [see note 12] 303).

[90] See note 76.

[91] Cf. Brix-Niemeyer, *Captivi* (Leipzig, 1930) *ad loc.*

[92] Cf. Lindsay, *op. cit.* (see note 80) *ad loc.* For the whole question of relative position and the part played by the demonstratives, cf. Lindsay on 293 and on 38.

[93] Cf. Bach, *op. cit.* (see note 7) 330; also 240.

conceivable, it is certainly not in accordance with the psychology of the situation.   Granting that the emotional nature of the scene is such as to prepare us for sudden shifts of position, the fact still remains that the sense of the passage as well as the occurrence of *istum* and *huic* in successive lines would seem to argue against this explanation.   I regard *istum* as a non-personal deictic and the forms of *hic* as non-personal resumptives.[94]

74. The fourth and fifth scenes of the third act of the *Captivi* deserve a careful perusal, for without question they constitute the most important single document in the whole of archaic Latin for disproving the validity of the traditional theory.   In concluding my discussion of this first type, I should like to tabulate the results of my own examination of these scenes.

75. Hegio uses the following pronouns in designating Tyndarus:

546—istum	633—huic	657—hic	734—huic
556—huic	638—hunc	659—huic mastigiae	737—hunc
565—istum	639—hunc	667—isti	738—huic
573—hunc.	642—huius	731—hunc	749—hunc
574—huiius	654—hic	733—istum	751—illic.
624—illic			

76. Aristophontes uses the following pronouns in designating Tyndarus:

556—huic	579—iste	606—istic	701—huic
567—iste	584—huic	608—istic	728—istunc.
572—huic	600—illi mastigiae	623—istic	

77. This tabulation shows that in referring to Tyndarus Hegio uses *hic, iste,* and *ille;* it also shows that Aristophontes in referring to this character uses the same three pronouns; furthermore, it shows that with *mastigiae* Hegio uses *huic,* and Aristophontes *illi;* whereas *iste,* commonly held to be the appropriate word with a derogatory expression, is not used. In what way can such an interchange be explained?   Is *iste*[95] a true δευτερότριτον?   Do *hic, iste,* and *ille* under all circumstances preserve intact their inherent first, second, and third personal force?

Type 2.   In this type *iste* is used by two successive speakers in reference to the same person or thing.

78. Of this usage we have an excellent example in *Mostellaria* 1170 ff. When Callidamates asks Theopropides to pardon the slave, Tranio, Theopropides replies: "I'd grant you any other request more readily than forgo punishing that fellow (*istum,* 1171) for his deviltry, as he deserves,"

[94] See notes 74 and 84.

[95] For Bach's comments on these scenes cf. *op. cit.* (see note 7) 160, 162, 240–241, 305, 308, 329–330, 335.

to which Callidamates, still urging his plea, says: "Come now, do let the fellow (*istum*, 1172) off." Theopropides' feeling toward Tranio is one of contempt, Callidamates' one of compassion. The derogatory theory, therefore, fails to explain *istum* (1172). Furthermore, since *hic* and *ille* may also express contempt,[96] Theopropides' attitude toward Tranio in itself can scarcely explain his use of *istum* (1171). The dramatic action, moreover, is such that shift of position could not have been a cogent reason for the use of either form, since Tranio has taken refuge at the altar (cf. 1135), where he probably remains throughout the scene. According to the traditional theory *istum* (1172) would be the appropriate form for Callidamates to use in designating his interlocutor's slave, but the real issue is why Theopropides, in speaking of his own slave, should not use *hunc* (1171). If Callidamates has seated himself upon the altar (1143) and Tranio has remained standing near, or if they both occupy the altar, Theopropides' use of *istum* (1171) might, according to the traditionalists, have been determined by relative position.[97] However, since Tranio apparently does not shift his position from this point in the action until Theopropides says *age abi* (1180), we may reasonably ask why Theopropides later (1174) uses *illum*. The use of *illum* (1174) would seem to indicate that the position of Tranio relative to Callidamates was not the determining factor in Theopropides' use of *istum* (1171). Whatever determined the choice of pronouns in this passage, one fact is obvious — since *istum* has been used by two successive speakers interchangeably in reference to the same character, it cannot be interpreted as second personal in the case of both. Therefore, it would be but logical to conclude that neither speaker's use of the word is second personal. I think that both speakers have used this word with its original deictic force. As it has no personal connotation, its use is equally appropriate in the case of either speaker. The strongly deictic character of *iste* rendered it peculiarly suited to highly dramatic dialogues such as this one, and the speaker's use of *istum* (1171) and *illum* (1174), as in certain other cases, may possibly reflect a change in his state of mind, as his anger begins to abate somewhat.[98]

79. Similarly, Demea (*Adel.* 388 ff.) refers to a certain music-girl about whom he is inquiring as *istaec* (388). Demea's use of this word is normal. Syrus, however, instead of using *haec*, violates the traditionalists' law by referring to her first as *ellam* (389)[99] and later as *ista[c]* (405). In this instance there is no idea of contempt associated with either speaker's use of *iste*. Relative position, moreover, is certainly not an

---

[96] See ¶ 15–25.

[97] For Seyffert's interpretation cf. *op. cit.* (see note 12) 303.

[98] See *Epid.* 573–578 (¶ 70) and note 45.

[99] On *ellam* (389) see Ashmore, *op. cit.* (see note 48) *ad loc.*

important factor in the choice of pronouns, since the music-girl does not appear in the scene, although it must be admitted that the house in which she is staying is visible.

80. In the *Phormio*, 773–777, Demea's daughter by the Lemnian is likewise referred to by the slave, Geta, as *istam* (773) and by Demea himself as *ista* (777). In this case relative position obviously does not enter into the interpretation. Moreover, as the identity of the girl has not yet been disclosed, both speakers regard her with contempt. If Geta uses *istam* (773) in reference to a character associated with Demea, the question naturally arises why Demea should not use *hac* in reference to a character associated with himself. In these two passages, just as in *Mostellaria* 1170–1172, both speakers use *iste* with its original deictic force.

Type 3. In this type *iste* is used in association with words of first personal reference in a context traditionally reserved for *hic*.

81. Thus when the slave, Leonida (*Asin.* 653 ff.), informs his young master, Argyrippus, that he has obtained twenty *minae* for his amour, the latter in great excitement requests the slave to put the money-bag upon his shoulder. Leonida, however, being intent upon prolonging his master's suspense, says (658): "I don't want you, since you are my master, to bear that burden (*onus istuc*) for me."[100] The context is not derogatory. The twenty *minae* are in the speaker's possession throughout the conversation (cf. 653–677). Under these conditions he should, according to the traditionalists' assignment of the pronouns, refer to them with forms of *hic*. This requirement he satisfies in part (cf. *has*, 654; *hanc*, 662; *hanc*, 676; *hoc*, 677). However, his use of *istuc* (658) clearly represents a deviation from the traditionalists' norm. His use, moreover, of *istuc* in a clause the verb of which is first personal, in association with the expressed first personal forms, *ego* and *mihi*, represents an even more striking violation of the traditionalists' law. *Istuc* in the present passage is parallel in usage with *hoc* (*Heaut.* 229) and with similar passages, in which forms of *hic* are used in a first personal context. I think that *istuc* is here used with its original deictic force.[101] Its function is to focus the attention at the crucial moment upon the object under consideration and to bring this object momentarily into strong relief.[102]

82. In the same way the slave Sosia (*Amph.* 773) at first uses *hac* in reference to the *cistella*, which he has been carrying. Then, as the situation becomes more tense, when the *cistella* is about to be opened, he changes to the strongly deictic *istam* (784), although he may even then

[100] For the traditional interpretation cf. Havet's translation: "*Non*, je ne *puis* consentir à te *voir*, toi, mon maître, te charger du fardeau que tu réclames" (*op. cit.* [see note 33] *ad loc.*).

[101] Cf. Seyffert, *op. cit.* (see note 12) 303.

[102] See note 62.

have been touching it as he spoke. *Istam*, like *istuc* (*Asin.* 658), is used in a context in which the traditionalists allege that forms of *hic* alone are used. In my opinion both words are here used with their original deictic force. The change to *istam* coincides with the change in the speaker's state of mind and has, in all probability, been determined by it.[103] Whatever may have influenced the choice of pronouns in this and the preceding passage, in these two instances at least, the word is clearly parallel with *hic*.

Type 4. In this type *iste* is substituted for *hic* in the formula *hic . . . ille*.

83. The only occurrence in the authors investigated is *Pseudolus* 502–503. When Simo questions Pseudolus regarding his motive in concealing his young master's affair, the slave replies: "The former evil (*illud malum*) was near at hand, the latter (*istuc*) was a little farther off; the former (*illud*) was imminent, the latter (*huic*) was a few days away." This is a variation of the well-known formula *hic . . . ille*, in which *istuc* has been substituted for *hoc*. Of still greater interest is the following verse, in which *illud* (503) is again used to indicate the more immediate punishment, while *huic* (503) has replaced *istuc* to designate the more remote one.

84. Bach's line of reasoning regarding this passage seems very confused. He regards the use of the pronouns in verse 502 as substantiating his theory, since, in his opinion, *illud* refers to Calidorus, who is absent, and *istuc* to Simo, who is present and addressed. Verse 503 he deletes, since he sees in the change of the pronouns a proof of dittography.[104] Pseudolus at first mentions the punishment which he would receive for disclosing his young master's affair (499), then when Simo asks whether he did not realize that he would receive the same punishment for concealing it (500–501), he says: *scibam* (501). The present verses (502–503) are the slave's reply to Simo's question *quin dictumst mihi* (501). As *illud* refers back to the punishment mentioned earlier (499) by Pseudolus, I see no justification for referring this pronoun to Calidorus; furthermore, I am unwilling to accept an emendation of the text merely because verse 503 is at variance with Bach's theory.

85. Hofmann[105] explains *istuc* (502) as *quod tu dicis*. In my opinion Hofmann's interpretation, also, entails certain difficulties. If we ascribe to *istuc* a second personal force by referring it to the punishment previ-

[103] See *Truc.* 850–852 (¶¶ 30–33) and note 45.

[104] *Op. cit.* (see note 7) 324; cf. Seyffert's criticism (*op. cit.* [see note 12] 307). Morris (*op. cit.* [see note 72]) keeps verse 503, but interprets the pronouns the same as Bach. Lorenz emends the text by combining 502–503: *quia illud malum aderat, huic erant dieculae* (*op. cit.* [see note 6] *ad loc.*).

[105] *TLL* 7.1.346.21–23.

ously mentioned by Simo, it will then be necessary to attribute to *huic* also a second personal force, since *istuc* is parallel in usage with *huic*. Furthermore, as *illud* (502) and *illud* (503) refer to the punishment mentioned earlier by the speaker, if we are to explain *istuc* as second personal by referring it to the interlocutor, it would be just as logical to explain *illud* as first personal by referring it to the speaker.   Such an analysis clearly shows that the pronouns in this passage do not admit of the traditional interpretation.

86. The occurrences of deictic *iste* with no second personal connotation, which we have already examined, would seem to argue in favor of the same interpretation here.   As this modification of the *hic . . . ille* formula is well attested for the later period, might we not be justified in assuming that the present passage represents a sporadic occurrence of this modification?[106]   Two questions which naturally present themselves are why the poet has introduced such an innovation here and what has determined the order of the pronouns.   To the first of these I may suggest that couching the thought in this unusual form necessarily lends emphasis to the statement, while repeating the idea in the customary manner tends to further clarify the assertion.   The second question is more difficult to answer.   In my opinion, however, Pseudolus' consciousness of his guilt in concealing the affair lends to this punishment (*istuc*), even though more remote, a certain emotional color; accordingly, he refers to it with the strongly deictic *istuc*.[107]   I believe that these considerations explain not only the poet's use of *istuc*, but also the repetition of the thought in verse 503.   If we accept the reading of the manuscript and consider the two verses as a unit, it would be difficult to find a more convincing example of *iste* used as the equivalent of *hic*.   *Istuc* and *huic* are here used in two consecutive lines in a construction which is exactly parallel.

87. Our study of the four types of usage of *iste* in the first category in which *iste* shows deviations from the traditionalists' norm indicates that *iste* may, on occasion, be used as the equivalent of *hic*. In the first two types this equation is effected by the two pronouns being interchanged.   In the first type *iste* and *hic* or at times all three pronouns are used by the same speaker in reference to the same person or thing; in the second type *iste* is used by two successive speakers in reference to the same person or thing.   In the last

---

[106] Hofmann recognizes this usage from Valerius Maximus on, but fails to mention the present occurrence (*Lat. Gr.* [see note 17] 475); Marouzeau cites a passage in Macrobius and another in the *Historia Augusta*, but takes no account of the Plautine usage (*MSL* 20 [see note 18] 80); Meader also discusses the passage in Macrobius, but does not refer to the present passage (*op. cit.* [see note 13] 124).

[107] Cf. *Truc.* 850-853 (¶¶ 30-33) and *Amph.* 784 (¶ 82) with note 45.

two types this equation is brought about by the two pronouns being used in constructions which are exactly parallel to each other. In the third type *iste* is used in association with words of first personal reference in a context traditionally considered appropriate for forms of *hic;* in the fourth type *iste* is substituted for *hic* in the formula *hic . . . ille.*

II. *Iste* IN THE SENSE OF *Ille*

Type 1. In this type *iste* and *ille* or in some cases all three pronouns are used by the same speaker in reference to the same person or thing.

88. Thus in the *Casina*, 35 ff., the *prologus*, in setting forth the plot, refers to Casina as *illam* (42), *eam* (42), *eam* (44), *ea* (47), *eam puellam* (48), *istanc* (53), *eam* (56), and *eandem illam* (61). This monologue contains internal evidence of address to the audience (cf. verses 1–4). However, since the reference is not to a class, but to a particular individual, who has not yet appeared and who is, therefore, unknown, the possibility of interpreting the pronouns from the audience's point of view is precluded.[108] Furthermore, the context is not derogatory. If *istanc* in this passage is second personal, the forms of *ille* must also be, since the *prologus* has used the two pronouns interchangeably in reference to Casina. As in *Eunuchus* 822–824,[109] and other passages, where *iste* and *ille* are thus interchanged, I think that these words are used with their original non-personal force. In this instance both pronouns seem to be deictic. The change to the strongly deictic *istanc* serves to bring Casina momentarily into strong relief.[110]

89. A monologue of the *Bacchides* shows the same interchange of pronouns, but under somewhat different conditions. Mnesilochus, imagining himself duped by Bacchis, his mistress, and his friend, Pistoclerus, expresses his indignation (500–514). In this instance there is no internal evidence of address to the audience. The reference, just as in the preceding passage, is to a specific character, who has not yet appeared and who is, therefore, unknown, although in this case the house in which the character resides is visible. The tone of the passage, moreover, is derogatory. Mnesilochus designates Bacchis with *illa* (503), *illam* (505), *isti*

[108] In this instance Bach also concedes this fact. However, he prefers to explain this deviation from the traditionalists' norm on the basis of post-Plautine authorship rather than to find a logical interpretation for *istanc* (*op. cit.* [see note 7] 265). On *illam* (61) cf. Bach 299.

[109] See ¶¶ 34–35.

[110] See note 62.

and *istanc* (507a), *illam* (508), and *illa* (512).[111]   Granting that the context is derogatory, I still find it impossible to see greater contempt in the forms of *iste* than in those of *ille*.[112]   I find equal difficulty in interpreting the forms of *iste* as second personal, since they have been used interchangeably with forms of *ille* by the same speaker in reference to the same character. In my opinion the forms of *iste* and *ille* are used with their original deictic force.   The function of *isti . . . istanc* in this passage, just as of *istanc* (*Cas.* 53), is to bring Bacchis momentarily into strong relief.[113]   In this case, however, the assonance may conceivably have helped to influence the choice of pronoun.

90. Of a slightly different nature is the comment of the *prologus* on Terence's dramatic technique in the opening monologue of the *Adelphi*, 15–18.   As in the preceding passage there is no internal evidence of address to the audience and the context is likewise derogatory.   In this instance, however, the reference is to a class, who may, or may not have been among the spectators, or known to them.   The *prologus* refers to this class first as *isti* (15),[114] then as *illi* (17).   As both words have a pejorative connotation, this fact in and of itself will not account for the poet's use of *isti*.   If we explain *isti* (15) as second personal, the same explanation will be necessary for *illi* (17), since the *prologus* has used the two forms interchangeably in reference to this class.   I regard the force of *isti* as deictic, that of *illi* as resumptive.[115]   In my opinion neither word has a personal connotation.

91. The same type also occurs in dialogue.   A particularly instructive passage is the dialogue of the *Epidicus* (153–156), where the slave, Epidicus, counsels his master regarding the disposition of the music-girl and the captive.   "There is a rich soldier from Euboea," says Epidicus, "with no end of money.   As soon as he finds out that you bought that girl (*istam*, 154) and brought this other girl (*hanc*, 154) along, of his own accord he will immediately beg you to hand that (first) girl (*illam*, 155) over to him.   But where is that girl (*illa*, 156) you brought along with you?"

92. This is a passage of unusual interest for determining the force of the demonstratives.   The context is not derogatory.   The reference is to two specific characters, neither of whom is present or has yet appeared.

---

[111] On *illa* (503) cf. Bach, *op. cit.* (see note 7) 288; on *isti . . . istanc* (507a) cf. Seyffert, *op. cit.* (see note 12) 302.

[112] For the use of *hic* and *ille* to express contempt, see ¶¶ 15–25; also note 76.

[113] See note 62.

[114] Cf. Bach, *op. cit.* (see note 7) 259–260, 342, 360.

[115] For the same usage with *iste . . . hic* see *Asin.* 456 (¶¶ 66 and 69); *Adel.* 558–560 (¶ 71); *Capt.* 733–738 (¶ 73).   The poet's desire to designate the class emphatically and to pick up the reference with no particular emphasis necessarily determines the order of the pronouns.

The question of relative position does not, therefore, enter into the interpretation. In direct violation of the traditionalists' laws Epidicus refers to the music-girl whom he has purchased as *istam* (154), and to the captive whom his master has brought along as *hanc* (154). He then violates these laws still further by using *illam* (155) interchangeably with *istam* (154) to designate the music-girl, *illa* (156) interchangeably with *hanc* (154) to refer to the captive, and the two forms of the same pronoun — *illam* (155) and *illa* (156) — to indicate the two different characters. If we allow these lines to speak for themselves, it is impossible to interpret them in accordance with the traditional theory.[116]

93. As in all cases where such an interchange occurs, I think that these words are used with their primary force (i.e., they have no personal connotation). The force of *istam* (154) and *hanc* (154) is deictic. The function of *istam* (154) is to refer with emphasis to the music-girl, that of *illam* (155) to resume the reference.[117] The function of *istam* (154) and *hanc* (154) is to designate and at the same time differentiate the two characters.[118] To the music-girl, of whom they are trying to dispose and around whom interest centers,[119] Epidicus naturally applies the strongly deictic *istam*, whereas to indicate the captive he uses the less emphatic *hanc*. Later these same characters are designated with *illam* (155) and *illa* (156), but in this case the differentiation depends entirely upon the context.[120] *Illa* (156) is an unemphatic *praeparativus*, whose function is to point forward to the captive, who is then identified further by the clause *quam tu adduxisti tecum*. Noteworthy is the use with *illa* of the second personal forms in the identifying clause.[121]

94. The dialogue of the *Phormio*, 748 ff., is of much the same nature. When Chremes questions Sophrona, the nurse, regarding the whereabouts of his long-lost daughter, the latter explains to him the circumstances (751–754). The conditions of this dialogue are analogous with those of the preceding one except that in this case the character has appeared in an earlier scene and is, therefore, known. Furthermore, the house in which he resides is visible. Sophrona refers to Antipho as *huic* (752), as *isti* <*c*> (753), and as *ille* (754). The fact that Antipho is the husband of her mistress would, according to the traditionalists, explain Sophrona's use of *huic;* Chremes' query *Antiphonin* (753) would, in their opinion, also justify her use of *isti* <*c*> in the sense of *that fellow whom you mention;*

[116] Cf. George E. Duckworth, *T. Macci Plauti Epidicus* (Princeton, 1940) *ad loc.*, with literature there cited, to which add Bach, *op. cit.* (see note 7) 305 and *TLL* 6.3.2718.11–14.

[117] See note 115.

[118] See note 58.

[119] See note 45.

[120] See note 58.

[121] Cf. *Mil.* 16–18 (¶ 112).

but the change to *ille* I find it impossible to explain in accordance with the traditional theory.   What we really have is *hic*, *iste*, and *ille* all used interchangeably by the same speaker in reference to the same character — one, moreover, who is not present, but merely spoken of.   These forms in my opinion are used with their original deictic force.   With *huic* (752) Sophrona indicates Antipho, whose identity she determines with the clause *qui est dominus*;[122] as the situation grows more tense, she reiterates her statement, changing to the strongly deictic *isti* <*c*> (753);[123] then at the close she resumes with the unemphatic *ille* (754).   The function of *isti* <*c*>, as in *Casina* 53 and *Bacchides* 507a, is to bring Antipho momentarily into strong relief.[124]

95.   Differing somewhat from the two preceding passages is the dialogue of the *Rudens*, 808 ff., in which the procurer tries to drag from the altar the two shipwrecked girls, who have taken refuge there.   Just as in the preceding passages, the reference is to a particular individual.   In this case, however, this individual is present.   The tone of the passage, moreover, is derogatory.   Daemones places on either side of the altar a slave, whom he instructs to cudgel the procurer if he makes any further attempt to seize the girls (808–816).   From the words of Daemones *alter . . . ambo* (808–809), we naturally assume that the two slaves are standing on either side of the altar by the time Daemones says *sic. audite nunciam* (809).   However, if we attempt to explain the pronominal references according to the theory of relative position, we immediately encounter difficulties.   Daemones' use of *istunc* (811) in reference to the procurer is in accordance with the traditional assignment of the pronouns, whereas his use of *illic* (810) represents a deviation from the traditionalists' norm.[125]   His reference to the procurer as *illic* (810) and to the girls as *illas* (810) is a still further violation of the traditionalists' law.   Granting, moreover, that Daemones views the procurer with contempt, I still find it impossible to explain *istunc* (811) on this basis.[126]   In my opinion both words are here used with their original (non-personal) force; both words have a pejorative connotation.   I regard the force of *illic* (810) as deictic, that of *istunc* (811)[127] as resumptive.   The function of the former is to point out the procurer with no particular emphasis on the reference, that of the latter to pick up the reference emphatically,[128] although in

[122] Cf. *Cist.* 680–681 (¶ 119).

[123] See note 45.

[124] See ¶¶ 88–89 and note 62.

[125] Cf. Bach, *op. cit.* (see note 7) 341 with Seyffert's criticism (*op. cit.* [see note 12] 301).

[126] For the use of *hic* and *ille* in derogatory contexts, see ¶¶ 15–25.

[127] Cf. Friedrich Marx, "T. Macci Plauti Rudens," *ASG* 38.5 (1928) *ad loc.*

[128] The order of the pronouns necessarily depends upon whether the speaker desires to indicate the character with emphasis, or to secure an emphatic resumption of the reference.   For the reverse order see *Adel.* 15–18 (¶ 90); *Epid.* 153–156 (¶¶ 91–93).

this instance, just as in other passages,[129] the assonance may possibly have helped to influence the choice of pronouns.

Type 2. In this type *iste* is substituted for *ille* in the formula *hic . . . ille.*

96. Probably the best example of this type is found in a dialogue of the *Bacchides*, 708. When Mnesilochus makes two requests for money from the slave, Chrysalus, the latter replies: "When I have attended to the former matter (*hoc*), then I'll attend to the latter (*istuc*). This is a variation of the well-known formula, *hic . . . ille,* in which *istuc* has been substituted for *illuc.* According to Hofmann,[130] *istuc* is more demonstrative and refers to the person addressed. I concede the fact that *istuc* is more demonstrative (i.e., more strongly deictic), but I disagree with Hofmann's interpretation. Chrysalus' interlocutor has made two requests. Chrysalus, however, refers to the first request as *hoc,* to the second as *istuc.* If we attribute to *istuc* a second personal force by interpreting it from the interlocutor's point of view, it will then be necessary to interpret *hoc,* also, as second personal. From this analysis it is apparent that the pronouns in this passage do not admit of a personal interpretation. As in the case of *Pseudolus* 502–503,[131] I believe that both words are used with their original deictic force (i.e., they are nonpersonal). I regard the present passage as one of several sporadic occurrences in early Latin of this modification of the *hic . . . ille* formula, which becomes fairly common later on. Expressing the idea in this unusual form necessarily increases the effect of the statement. The order of the pronouns[132] I think has probably been determined by Chrysalus' attitude in the matter. To the first request he acquiesces quite readily, but when Mnesilochus makes the second request, he is somewhat annoyed.[133] To the first request, therefore, he refers with the less emphatic *hoc,* but to the second he applies the strongly deictic *istuc.*

97. Similarly, Sceledrus (*Mil.* 516) in speaking of Philocomasium and her alleged double, refers to the former as *haec* and to the latter as *istaec.*[134] Later Periplectomenus refers to the alleged double as *istam* (533)[135] while Sceledrus uses *illam* (533) in reference to this same girl to whom he re-

---

[129] See *Bacch.* 507a (¶ 89). A study of all the passages in Plautus and Terence reveals a number of such cases.

[130] *TLL* 6.3.2717.61–65.

[131] Cf. above (¶¶ 83–86).

[132] I.e., whether *istuc* should be substituted for *hoc* or *illuc.*

[133] See note 45.

[134] Cf. Bach, *op. cit.* (see note 7) 254, 276–277; for emendation and traditional interpretation also cf. Lorenz, *op. cit.* (see note 6) *ad loc.*

[135] Cf. Bach, *op. cit.* (see note 7) 276–277; Seyffert, *op. cit.* (see note 12) 303, note 2; Brix-Niemeyer, *op. cit.* (see note 29) *ad loc.*; Stolz-Schmalz, *op. cit.* (see note 17) 476.

ferred earlier (516) as *istaec.* In like manner Pyrgopolinices (*Mil.* 983)[136] refers to Philocomasium as *istanc* and to the wife of Pleusicles as *haec.* In this instance he uses *illa* earlier (973) to designate the same character to whom he now refers with *istanc.* In all three passages *iste* is clearly used as the equivalent of *ille,* as is evident from its substitution for *ille* in the formula *hic . . . ille* and also from the fact that the same character, in some cases at least, designates with *ille* either earlier or later the person to whom he refers in the formula with forms of *iste.* As in *Bacchides* 708, I regard *iste* and *ille* as non-personal deictics. I do not mean, however, to imply that these words are identical in force. *Iste,* as I have already noted, is more intensely deictic and its use I think gives to the passage an affect which would not have been possible if *ille* had been used.

Type 3. In this type *iste* and *ille* are used in imprecations. This type shows *three variations:* (1) the speaker invokes a curse upon an ·indefinite character, who by the nature of the case is neither present nor known; (2) he invokes a curse upon a definite character, who is not present (and in some cases has not yet appeared and who is, therefore, unknown); (3) he invokes a curse upon a definite character, who appears in the given scene.

In expressing such imprecations *two techniques* are employed: in the one, which I shall hereafter refer to as the "A technique," the character is designated by *iste* or *ille* and then further defined by a relative clause; in the other, to which I shall hereafter apply the term "B technique," the character is similarly designated, but is not otherwise defined.

98. Thus Laches (*Hec.* 469), irritated by the gossip of his neighbors, calls down the following imprecation upon scandal-mongers in general: "May the gods confound those busy-bodies (*istos invidos*) who take pleasure in reporting such things." In the present passage, representing the first variation, rendered in this case in the A technique, the possibility of explaining *istos* as second personal on the basis of relative position is precluded. Furthermore, as no tale-bearers have been mentioned by the previous speaker, the possibility of explaining *istos* as second personal by interpreting it from the interlocutor's point of view is likewise precluded.

99. I grant that the context is derogatory. However, before attempting to interpret *istos* on this basis, I should like to consider Alcesimarchus' speech (*Cist.* 481): "May all the powers above consume that girl (*illam*)." Parallel with *istos* (*Hec.* 469) is *illam*[137] in the present passage, representing

---

[136] Cf. Bach, *op. cit.* (see note 7) 254; Brix-Niemeyer, *op. cit.* (see note 29) *ad loc.;* *TLL* 6.3.2705.31–33.

[137] Cf. Seyffert, *op. cit.* (see note 12) 301, note 1.

the same variation of the type, rendered in this case in the B technique. Both contexts are clearly derogatory. However, I find it impossible to see anything fundamentally more derogatory in *istos* than in *illam*, used under exactly the same conditions. Both words are used with their original, non-personal force. Both words have a pejorative connotation. In my opinion they do, however, differ in intensity. The invective expressed with the strongly deictic *istos* is, accordingly, driven home with greater force [138] than the one expressed with the unemphatic *illam*.[139]

100. Similarly, Tranio (*Most.* 668) calls down an imprecation upon the former owner of the house, whom he refers to as *istum*. Parallel with *istum* in this passage is *illum* (*Phorm.* 123), where Geta invokes a curse upon Phormio. Both passages represent the second variation, rendered in each case in the B technique. Relative position does not enter into the interpretation of *istum* owing to the nature of the variation. As the context is derogatory and as there is implied in Theopropides' remarks (662, 668) some allusion to the former owner, although he is not specifically mentioned, the traditionalists will interpret *istum* from the interlocutor's point of view[140] or explain it as pejorative. However, since we have just seen *istos* used (*Hec.* 469) in an imprecation where no second personal force is possible, I do not think that the interlocutor's point of view is the determining factor in the present passage. Neither do I think that the derogatory context has determined the poet's choice of *istum*, since *illum* (*Phorm.* 123)[141] has been used under exactly the same conditions. In my opinion *istum* and *illum* are non-personal deictics. Both words have a pejorative connotation. As in the preceding pair, the curse rendered with *istum* is more emphatic than the one expressed with *illum*.[142]

101. In like manner, Leonida (*Asin.* 467) calls down an imprecation upon the trader, whom he designates as *istum*.[143] Parallel with *istum* in the present passage is *illum* (*Cas.* 279)[144] in the curse which Lysidamus invokes upon Chalinus. Both passages represent the third variation,

---

[138] See note 76.

[139] The early Roman dramatists afford only one specimen of this type, rendered with *iste* (*Cist.* 481, discussed above), but cf. Aquil. *Boeot.* 1.1: illum; Naev. *Appel.* 2.19: illum.

[140] Cf. Bach, *op. cit.* (see note 7) 263; Seyffert, *op. cit.* (see note 12) 300; Edwin W. Fay, *T. Macci Plauti Mostellaria* (Boston, 1902) *ad loc.*, with cross-references and especially Introduction, section 48 (1); Lorenz, *op. cit.* (see note 6) *ad loc.*

[141] Cf. Seyffert, *op. cit.* (see note 12) 301, note 1.

[142] The scenic fragments afford no specimen of this type, rendered with *iste*, but cf. Enn. *Tel.* 4.288: illum, which in the absence of a complete context might be classified here.

[143] Bach wavers between interpreting *istum* as addressed to the audience or on the basis of relative position (*op. cit.* [see note 7] 264); cf. Seyffert's criticism (*op. cit.* [see note 12] 300); for the traditional interpretation cf. Havet, who renders *istum* as *ton étranger* (*op. cit.* [see note 33] *ad loc.*).

[144] Cf. Seyffert, *op. cit.* (see note 12) 301, note 1.

rendered in each case in the B technique. *Istum* admits of the tradi-
tional interpretation. A second personal force is possible on the basis of
relative position and the derogatory connotation is likewise obvious.
However, as we have already seen imprecations expressed in the same
way (*Hec.* 469, *Most.* 668) where relative position does not enter into the
interpretation, I do not believe that this is the determining factor in the
use of *istum* here. Furthermore, the parallelism in the usage of *istum* and
illum prevents us from interpreting *istum* on a derogatory basis. I regard
istum and *illum* as non-personal deictics. Both forms have a pejorative
connotation. In this instance, as in the preceding passages, I believe that
the imprecation expressed with the strongly deictic *istum* is more intense
than the one rendered with the comparatively unemphatic *illum*.[145]

Type 4. In this type *iste* is used in reference to a character who
is not present, but spoken of, in a context traditionally reserved
for *ille*.

102. One of the best examples in monologue is Demipho's speech
(*Merc.* 559–561), which I have already discussed.[146] Another passage of
interest is *Amphitruo* 1041–1045, where Amphitruo, still unaware of Jupi-
ter's identity, gives expression to his rage. The conditions of the present
monologue differ in certain respects. In this instance Jupiter has recently
left the stage and is, therefore, known to the audience, although Amphi-
truo is at first unaware of his departure (cf. *ubi illest*, 1045). The con-
text, moreover, is derogatory.

103. Amphitruo refers to Jupiter as *istic* (1041), as *illum* (1043), and
as *ille* (1045). Although Amphitruo imagines Jupiter to be present, yet
the context clearly shows that the latter does not function as an inter-
locutor. If we attempt to explain *istic* from the audience's point of view,
the question naturally arises why forms of *ille* have been applied to
Jupiter later. If we try to interpret *istic* as derogatory, we must bear in
mind the fact that the speaker uses *illum* (1043) and *ille* (1045) in refer-
ence to this same character; furthermore, that when he vows vengeance
upon Jupiter (cf. *ulciscar*, 1043), he designates him with *illum*, not *istum*.

104. The use of *istaec* (*Merc.* 561) in a non-derogatory context to
indicate a character as yet unknown, the interchange of *istic* with *illum*

---

[145] For the same usage in the scenic fragments cf. Turp. *Leuc.* 2.102: *istunc* with
Enn. *Tel.* 4.288: *illum*. In the absence of a complete context *Tel.* 4.288 might be
classified under the second or third variations. A complete study of imprecations
shows that in nearly half the instances in which imprecations are rendered with *ille*,
they are directed against an indefinite character. In more than half the instances, even
when the character is definite, he has not yet appeared and is, therefore, unknown.
Do these facts have any bearing upon our contention that *ille* is the weakest of the
deictics? Might it be that the more or less colorless *ille* was considered more appropri-
ate to these less definite contexts?

[146] See ¶¶ 54–55.

and *ille* in the present passage, and the use of *illum* with the word *ulciscar* all seem to argue against the traditional interpretation of *istic*.[147]   As in other cases where such an interchange occurs, I think that *iste* and *ille* are used with their original deictic force.   Both words are pejorative, but neither has a personal connotation.   For this reason they may be thus interchanged.   They do, however, differ in deictic intensity, as the present passage clearly shows.   In his first indignant outburst[148] Amphitruo refers to Jupiter with the strongly deictic *istic* (note the use of *-ce*), then continues with forms of the comparatively unemphatic *ille*.   In my opinion *istic* is here used merely to designate an absent character and to give emphasis to the reference.

105. The same type also occurs in dialogue.   Thus in the scene of the *Phormio*, in which Chremes and Demipho formulate plans for breaking off Antipho's attachment with the Lemnian, Demipho inquires (798): "Have you told that girl *(istac)* why we are bringing this woman *(hanc)* over?" referring to the fact that Chremes' wife is about to visit the Lemnian and persuade her to free Antipho.

106. In the dialogue passages of this fourth type relative position does not enter into the interpretation, since the characters are not present, but spoken of.   In the present case the context also is not derogatory. With *istac* (798) Demipho designates the Lemnian, who is not present, who has not appeared earlier and who consequently cannot be known; with *hanc* (798) he indicates Chremes' wife, who is likewise absent, but who has appeared recently and who is, therefore, known.   That Demipho in direct violation of the traditionalists' assignment of the pronouns uses *istac* instead of *illa* in reference to the first character and *hanc* in place of *istam*, or possibly *illam*, in reference to the second should not be overlooked.   I find it impossible to interpret *istac* in accordance with the traditional theory.   I regard the force of *istac* and *hanc* as deictic (i.e., nonpersonal).   I think that their function is to designate and differentiate the two absent characters.[149]   To the Lemnian, around whom interest now centers, Demipho naturally applies the strongly deictic *istac*, whereas to Chremes' wife he refers with the less emphatic *hanc*.

107. In the same way Diniarchus (*Truc.* 202–203) refers to the Babylonian soldier as *istic* (202) and to Phronesium as *ista* (203).   The conditions of this dialogue are the same as those of the preceding one except that in this instance the speaker uses forms of *iste* in reference to two different characters, neither of whom has yet appeared and who cannot,

---

[147] Cf. Bach, *op. cit.* (see note 7) 261, 340; Seyffert, *op. cit.* (see note 12) 301.

[148] With *istic* cf. Philippa's use of *istaec* (*Epid.* 573, ¶ 70).   In the latter instance the character is present and the speaker continues with forms of *hic*, but in other respects the two passages are closely similar.   Also see note 45.

[149] See *Merc.* 559–561 (¶¶ 54–55) and note 58.

therefore, be known.   In this passage, just as in the preceding one, I find it impossible to interpret *iste* as a *pronomen δευτερότριτον*.   In both cases the force of *iste* is deictic.   It designates the two absent characters with emphasis, but in this case the differentiation depends upon the case terminations.[150]

108. Our study of the four types of usage of *iste* in the second category in which *iste* shows deviations from the traditionalists' norm indicates that *iste* may, on occasion, be used as the equivalent of *ille*.   In the first type this equation is effected by the two pronouns being interchanged.   In this type *iste* and *ille* are used by the same speaker in reference to the same person or thing.   In the three remaining types this equation is brought about by the two pronouns being used parallel to each other.   In the second type *iste* is substituted for *ille* in the formula *hic . . . ille;* in the third type *ille* is used in imprecations just as *iste* is; in the fourth type *iste* is used of a character who is not present, but spoken of, just as *ille* is.

III. *Iste* as a Pronoun of Prospective Identification

Type 1.   In this type *iste* serves as the antecedent of a relative clause of either general or specific application.   Such clauses show *three variations:* (1) with a *second personal* verb; (2) with a *first personal* verb; (3) with a *third personal* verb.

109. As the authors investigated have yielded no evidence of *iste* identified by a generalizing clause of the first variation, I shall begin by considering the dialogue of the *Captivi*, 987–988, where Philocrates says: "Tell me, was that boy (*istic*) whom you sold (*quem vendidisti*) to my father the one who was given to me for my own?"   This passage shows *iste* defined by a specific clause of the first variation.   The context is not derogatory.   Philocrates uses *istic* (987) in reference to Paegnium-Tyndarus, who is not present, but who has recently been mentioned by Stalagmus.   *Istic* might, therefore, be interpreted from the interlocutor's point of view.[151]   It is also defined by the clause, *quem vendidisti*, the subject of which is second personal.

110. In passages such as this Bach sees further evidence that a second personal force inheres in *iste*, since, in his opinion, the force of the pronoun is the same as that of the identifying clause.   He

---

[150] See note 58.
[151] Cf. Lindsay, *op. cit.* (see note 80) *ad loc.*; Brix-Niemeyer, *op. cit.* (see note 91) *ad loc.*

also finds in *hic* and *ille*, identified by relative clauses the subjects of which are first or third personal respectively, additional proof that a first and third personal force inheres in these words.[152]

111. The passage in the *Captivi*, 987–988, might on first consideration seem to substantiate Bach's contention regarding *iste*. However, if we turn to the dialogue of the *Asinaria*, 619, where Leonida says: "But this lady (*haec mulier*) whom you're hugging (*quam amplexare*) isn't smoke, is she?" we find the same usage with *hic*. The atmosphere of the passage is clearly second personal. According to the traditionalists' view *istaec* would be the appropriate form for Leonida to use in designating Philaenium who is near to (i.e., in the embrace of) Argyrippus, to whom his remarks are addressed. Leonida, however, uses *haec*, which he then renders more explicit with the clause *quam amplexare*, the subject of which is second personal. How are we to explain this apparent violation of the traditionalists' law? According to my own interpretation *haec* is a non-personal *praeparativus*, whose function is merely to point forward to the person, who is about to be identified later by the clause, without giving any indication of the relation of this person to the other persons involved. In whatever way we interpret this passage, one fact is certain — that *hic*, the so-called *pronomen* πρωτότριτον, is here defined by a clause the subject of which is second personal.

112. In the dialogue of the *Miles Gloriosus*, 16–18, where Artotrogus says: "Of course, you mean that one (*illum*), whose legions you puffed away (*quoius . . . difflavisti*) with a breath," we find this same usage with *ille*. Artotrogus designates with *illum* (16) one of Pyrgopolynices' former opponents in battle, whom he then defines with the clause *quoius legiones difflavisti* (17). The atmosphere of the passage is distinctly second personal — the main verb, *dicis*, is second personal and the verb of the defining clause with its expressed second personal subject, *tu*, is also second personal. In the previous speech, moreover, Pyrgopolynices has just mentioned this opponent. Under these conditions the traditionalists' law would require *istum*, yet strangely enough Artotrogus uses *illum*.[153] As in *Asinaria* 619, I should interpret *illum* as a non-personal *praeparativus*, whose function is merely to point forward to the character under consideration, without giving any indication of the relation of this character to either speaker or interlocutor. The significant fact, however, for our present purpose is that *illum*, the so-called *pronomen* τριτότριτον, is in this instance defined by a clause the subject of which is second personal.

113. The same parallelism in usage also appears in the following group. Thus Pythias (*Eun.* 949) refers to Chaerea as *istum* and then defines the reference with the clause, *quem adduxti;* so Geta (*Phorm.* 136)

[152] *Op. cit.* (see note 7) 215–216, 191–193, 314–317.
[153] Cf. Wolterstorff, *Glotta* 10 (see note 18) 85; *TLL* 7.1.356.33.

refers to the subject under discussion as *hoc*[154] and then identifies this further with the clause, *quod audis;* similarly, Erotium (*Men.* 426) refers to her mistress's *palla* as *illam*[155] and then renders the reference more explicit with the clause *quam . . . dederas.*

114. In both these groups we find that *iste*, *hic*, and *ille* have each been defined by a clause the subject of which is second personal.[156]   If, for purposes of the argument, we assume with Bach that *iste* is a true δευτερότριτον, and that the second personal clause, used to define *iste* in *Captivi* 987–988 and *Eunuchus* 949 and similar passages, proves that this force is inherent, we are still face to face with the necessity of finding a logical explanation for passages in which *hic* and *ille* are similarly defined. In such cases, certainly, the force of the clause is not the same as that traditionally ascribed to these pronouns.

115. If further evidence is necessary to show the fallacy of Bach's contention, we need merely consider the dialogue of the *Trinummus*, 582, where Lesbonicus says: "Take care of that matter (*istuc*) which I ordered (*quod iussi*).   This passage shows *iste* identified by a specific clause of the second variation.   The context is not derogatory.   Lesbonicus, in addressing Stasimus, uses *istuc* (582) in reference to his previous instructions.   The traditionalists will naturally see in *istuc* a second personal force.   It is true that *istuc* might be interpreted from the interlocutor's point of view.   However, before attempting to interpret *istuc* in this way, it may be well to recall that Lesbonicus earlier (578) referred to these same instructions as *hoc*.[157]   To me the context seems to be first personal. I regard *istuc* as a *praeparativus*, whose function in this instance is merely to designate the thing, which is to be identified later by the clause *quod iussi*.   In this and similar passages I think that *istuc* has been used to secure a more emphatic reference to the matter under consideration than would have been possible with *hoc*.   However, the noteworthy feature of the passage is the fact that the determining clause is in this case first personal.

116. Some further light may be thrown upon this usage by comparing this passage with a dialogue in the *Asinaria*, 196, where Argyrippus inquires: "Where are those talents (*illaec*) which I gave (*quae dedi*) you before?"   Argyrippus, in addressing Cleareta, uses *illaec* in reference to the talents which he had previously given her.   According to the traditionalists' assignment of the pronouns *istaec* would be the appropriate

---

[154] Cf. Bach, *op. cit.* (see note 7) 160.

[155] Cf. Bach 317; also Wolterstorff, *Historia* (see note 18) 19.

[156] For the same usage in the scenic fragments cf. *Mil.* 455: *isto . . . quo iubes* with Titin. *Full.* 10.28: *haec . . . ubi tu solitu's* and Naev. *Triph.* 98: *illo . . . ubi . . . despuas.*

[157] Bach does not comment on *istuc*, but interprets *hoc* (578) as *meum negotium quod ego habeo* (*op. cit.* [see note 7] 154).   In this connection cf. *Pers.* 812–814.

form to indicate the talents given to, or in the possession of the interlocutor.   Argyrippus, however, violates this assumed law by referring to them as *illaec*.[158]   In my opinion *illaec* is an unemphatic *praeparativus*, which serves merely to designate the talents, with no indication as to their relation to either speaker or interlocutor.   It is then defined precisely, like *istuc* (*Trin.* 582), by the clause *quae dedi*.   The important point for our present purpose is that *illaec* is here defined by a clause the subject of which is first personal.

117. The parallelism in usage in *Trinummus* 582 and *Asinaria* 196 is apparent, yet in the one case *iste* is used, in the other *ille*.   In the same way Simo (*Andr.* 421–422) refers to a request which he has made as *istuc* (422), which he then defines more exactly with the clause *quod postulo*.   Parallel with *Andria* 421–422 is *Miles* 36, where Pyrgopolinices refers to a request which he has made as *illuc*,[159] which he renders more explicit with the clause *quod dico*.   In each pair *iste* and *ille* have each been defined by a first personal clause.   In neither instance, however, is the force of the clause the same as that traditionally ascribed to these pronouns.[160]

118. Let us turn now to Saturio's monologue (*Pers.* 73–74), where he says: "If this were done, I'll warrant that those fellows (*isti*), who attack (*qui . . . oppugnant*) other people's property here with their white net, would disappear."   This passage shows *isti* defined by a generalizing clause of the third variation.   The context is derogatory, but this fact in itself will not explain the use of *isti*.[161]   With *isti* Saturio refers to the class of informers.   The traditionalists will, therefore, interpret *isti* as *those who are among the spectators*, or *whom the spectators know*.[162] I am able to find no positive proof to show that there were informers in the audience, although they were certainly familiar with this class.   One fact, however, must not be overlooked — that in speaking earlier (71) of one member of this class, Saturio uses *illi*.   If the relation of the informers to the audience has determined the use of *isti* (73), we may reasonably ask what has determined the use of *illi* (71).   In my opinion *isti* is an emphatic *praeparativus*, serving merely to designate this class without indicating any personal relation.   The particulars of the situation are then given in the identifying clause *qui . . . oppugnant*, which determines the force of *isti*.   The distinctive feature of the passage is the use of *isti* in a

---

[158] Bach 317.

[159] Bach 317.

[160] For the same usage in the scenic fragments cf. *Capt.* 252: *isti quos . . . iussi* with *Phorm.* 564: *illam . . . quam . . . scio;* also *Mil.* 988: *istunc . . . quem . . . dˀdi* with Laber. *Cacom.* 13–14: *ille . . . quem . . . narravi.*

[161] See ¶¶ 15–25, where *hic* and *ille* are also used in derogatory contexts.

[162] Cf. Bach, *op. cit.* (see note 7) 258; also cf. *Pers.* 62–64.

third personal context, defined by a clause the subject of which is also third personal.

119. With this passage I should like to compare Halisca's monologue (*Cist.* 680–681), where she says: "I am no wiser for asking or pestering those creatures (*hos*), who are always glad (*qui . . . sunt lubentes*) when a woman is in trouble." This passage represents the same variation. In her efforts to recover the lost *cistella*, Halisca bespeaks the help of the spectators (678–679). Then, on finding them unresponsive, she resumes her soliloquy (680). She refers to the audience as *hos* and further qualifies the reference with the clause *qui . . . sunt lubentes*. One point of interest is the use of *hos*, not *istos*, in a context which is clearly derogatory.[163] Another point, calling for comment, is the speaker's use of *hos* in a third personal setting under conditions considered by the traditionalists appropriate to *ille*. According to my own interpretation *hos* is a *praeparativus*, which merely refers to the characters without indicating any personal relation.[164] The idea of contempt and the third personal atmosphere, in so far as they exist, result from the identifying clause and the general context. The importance of the passage for our present purpose is that it shows *hos* defined by a clause the subject of which is third personal.

120. The parallelism in usage in *Persa* 73–74 and *Cistellaria* 680–681 immediately strikes our attention, although in the one instance *iste* is used, in the other *hic*. Similarly, in the *Menaechmi*, 876–877, which I have already discussed,[165] Menaechmus refers to his pursuers as *isti* and further identifies them with the specific clause *qui . . . cogunt*. Parallel with *Menaechmi* 876–877 is *Truculentus* 77–78a, where Diniarchus refers to the courtesan as *haec*[166] and defines the reference further with the specific clause *quae . . . habet*. In each pair *iste* and *hic* have each been defined by a clause the subject of which is third personal. However, just as in the second variation, the force of the clause is in neither instance the same as that traditionally attributed to these pronouns. Even from this brief survey it is evident that some passages, at least, fail to conform with the theory posited by Bach.[167]

---

163 See ¶¶ 21–25.
164 Cf. *TLL* 6.3.2702.50.
165 See ¶ 56.
166 Cf. *TLL* 6.3.2705.17.
167 For the same usage in the scenic fragments cf. Naev. *Taren.* 6.83–84: *isti . . . qui . . . prodigunt* with Turp. *Paed.* 8.160–162: *hanc . . . quae . . . studuit;* Afran. *Frat.* 1.156–157: *isti qui . . . neglegunt* with Liv. Andron. *Inc. Fab.* 2.31: *hi qui ascendunt;* Turp. *Lind.* 4.142–144: *isti quibus . . . est* with Acc. *Deiph.* 5.133–134: *hic qui . . . institit;* Pacuv. *Chrys.* 5.83–85: *isti qui . . . intellegunt . . . sapiunt* with Afran. *Temer.* 330–331: *hic . . . qui . . . ludificatus est.*

Type 2. In this type *iste* is rendered more explicit by the use of an appositional substantive clause, indirect question, or infinitive of either general or specific application. Such clauses also show *three variations:* (1) with a *second personal* verb; (2) with a *first personal* verb; (3) with a *third personal* verb.

121. In the authors investigated there are no occurrences of *iste* identified by a generalizing substantive clause, or infinitive of the first variation. I shall, therefore, consider first the scene of the *Miles Gloriosus*, 1216 ff., in which we find *iste* identified by a specific clause of the first variation. In this scene the courtesan, Acroteleutium, discusses with her maid her chances of arousing Pyrgopolynices' interest. She pretends to be apprehensive regarding her charms, but Milphidippa reassures her in the following words (1238): "I've taken care of that *(istuc)*, that you should be *(ut . . . sis)* more beautiful than he expects." The context is not derogatory. However, the traditionalists[168] will naturally explain *istuc* (1238) as second personal. In my opinion such an interpretation does violence to the sense of the passage. *Istuc* does not refer to the previous remark of Acroteleutium; it is an emphatic *praeparativus* whose function is to point forward to the clause *ut . . . sis*, which serves as an appositive of the pronoun.

122. As in the corresponding variation with relative clauses, Bach finds convincing evidence in passages such as this to corroborate his theory that a second personal force inheres in *iste*. He also finds in the second variation with *hic* and in the third with *ille* still further proof that a first and third personal force inheres respectively in these words.[169]

123. This passage, like *Captivi* 987–988, which I have discussed above,[170] might on first sight seem to bear out Bach's contention. However, if we turn to the *Andria*, 899, where Pamphilus says: "Only I make this *(hoc)* one request of you, don't believe *(ut ne credas)* that this old gentleman has been suborned by me," we find the same usage with *hic*. Pamphilus, who is about to make a certain request of his father, prepares for his statement with *hoc*. This pronoun clearly does not refer to either speaker or interlocutor, but is here used as a *praeparativus* like *istuc (Mil.* 1238). The nature of the request does not become apparent until we reach the appositional substantive clause *ut ne credas*,[171] which determines the precise application of *hoc*. The importance of the passage for our

---

[168] Cf. Bach, *op. cit.* (see note 7) 233–234.
[169] Bach 233–234, 162–166, 288–289.
[170] See ¶ 109.
[171] Cf. *TLL* 6.3.2731.79.

present purpose is that it shows *hoc* defined by a clause the subject of which is second personal.

124.   Similarly, in a fragment of Afranius, *Incendium* 4.194–195,[172] speaker A, in discussing a certain matter with B, admonishes him thus: "Bear that (*illud*) in mind; don't babble (*ne . . . blateres*) foolishly." This fragment, which is also presumably part of a dialogue, shows the same usage with *ille*.   A, who is about to give B a certain piece of advice, prepares for his statement with *illud*.   Thus far we have no clue as to what *illud* signifies.   I regard *illud* as an unemphatic *praeparativus*, whose function, like that of *istuc* (*Mil.* 1238) and *hoc* (*Andr.* 899) is merely to point ahead to the appositional substantive clause *ne . . . blateres*, by which its exact application is defined.   The significance of the fragment is that it shows *ille* identified by a clause the subject of which is second personal.   Of those who would see in *istuc* (*Mil.* 1238) an inherent second personal force on the basis of the identifying clause, we may reasonably ask what the force of *hoc* and *illud* is.[173]

125. The parallelism in usage in the three passages immediately strikes our attention.   As in the corresponding variation with relative clauses, we find that *iste*, *hic*, and *ille* have each been identified by a clause the subject of which is second personal.   Granting that *istuc* (*Mil.* 1238) seems to corroborate Bach's theory, the fact nevertheless remains that the force of the pronoun and clause in *Andria* 899 and in *Incendium* 4.194–195 is clearly at variance with the traditionalists' view.

126. If further evidence is necessary to disprove the validity of Bach's hypothesis, we have only to turn to the scene of the *Rudens*, 706 ff.   In this scene Daemones prepares to punish the procurer for holding two free-born Athenians as slaves.   As the girls are about to be taken from him, Labrax voices the following protest (717): "I did not take the auspices today for that purpose (*isti rei*), to gossip (*ut . . . fabuler*) with a thief."   *Furcifero* lends to the passage a derogatory tone.   However, as we have repeatedly seen that all three pronouns may be used in similar contexts,[174] this fact in and of itself will not explain the use of *isti*.   The traditionalists[175] will naturally see in *isti* a second personal force.   But if we allow the passage to speak for itself, the absurdity of such an interpretation will immediately become apparent. The pronoun clearly does not refer back to Trachalio's recent denunciation of the *leno* (712–716); furthermore, as Labrax has not yet made clear

---

[172] I have introduced into the text this one fragment, since it is the only example of this type in the early Roman dramatists.

[173] The scenic fragments afford three specimens of this type with *iste* and five with *hic*, but our parallels are necessarily incomplete in the absence of further specimens with *ille*.

[174] See ¶¶ 15–25.

[175] Bach, *op. cit.* (see note 7) 231.

the purport of *isti . . . auspicavi*, the pronoun cannot be interpreted from his interlocutor's point of view. In my opinion *isti* is an emphatic *praeparativus*, used here in a distinctly first personal context. Its function is merely to point ahead without expressing any personal relation. Its application becomes clear only after we reach the clause *ut . . . fabuler*, which serves as an appositive of the pronoun.[176] The importance of the passage for our present purpose is that it shows *iste* depending on a first personal verb and itself determined by a clause the subject of which is first personal.

127. Some further light may be thrown upon this usage by comparing this passage with the opening scene of the *Amphitruo*. In this scene we may recall that Mercury, in the guise of Sosia, tries to compel the real Sosia to deny his identity. To this end he tells the slave certain incidents of the war from which Sosia has just returned. When Mercury mentions the draining of the cask of wine, Sosia says in an aside (431): "That's (*illud*) a fact, I did drink off (*ut ego . . . ebiberim*) a jug of pure wine." If, for purposes of the argument, we assume with the advocates of the traditional theory, that *isti* (*Rud.* 717) should be interpreted from the interlocutor's point of view, we may reasonably ask from whose point of view *illud* (431) should be interpreted. If from the interlocutor's, then why not *istud?* If from the speaker's, then why not *hoc?* In this case *factumst illud* does in a sense confirm Mercury's statement (429–430), whereas *isti rei* (*Rud.* 717) certainly does not refer back to the judgment which Trachalio pronounces upon Labrax (*Rud.* 712–716). According to my own interpretation, *illud* is an unemphatic *praeparativus*, whose function, like that of *isti rei* (*Rud.* 717), is merely to point forward to the appositional substantive clause *ut ego . . . ebiberim*, by which its exact force is determined.[177] The distinctive feature of the passage is that *illud* in this case is defined by a clause the subject of which is first personal and that this first personal force is further emphasized by the use of the first personal pronoun, *ego*.

128. The parallelism in usage in *Rudens* 717 and *Amphitruo* 431 is obvious, yet in the one case *iste* is used, in the other *ille*. In neither instance, however, is the force of the clause the same as that traditionally ascribed to the pronouns.[178]

129. In concluding the present category, I should like to consider *Mercator* 985–986, where Eutychus makes the following criticism of morality: "If that (*istuc*) is the proper thing, for old men to play the gallant (*scortari senes*) in their old age, what will become of the affairs of state?" This is an excellent example of *iste* identified by a generalizing

---

[176] For a more complete statement regarding the type, see ¶¶ 26–27.

[177] Bulhart considers *illud* anaphoric (*TLL* 7.1.342.39).

[178] For the same usage in the scenic fragments cf. *Asin.* 358–359: *istuc . . . quo . . . intervortam* with Pomp. *Praec. Post.* 1.131: *illo quid faciam.*

infinitive with a third personal subject. The context is derogatory. This fact, however, will not account for the use of *istuc*.[179] I regard this passage as a particularly convincing case of *iste* in a non-deuterotritonic sense.[180] The atmosphere of the passage is distinctly third personal. The fact that the statement is a general truth precludes all possibility of referring *istuc* to Demipho or interpreting it from his point of view. I think that *istuc* is an emphatic *praeparativus*, whose function is merely to point forward to the appositional infinitive *scortari*, by which its exact application is defined. The use of *senes* as the subject renders the phrase the equivalent of a third personal clause.

130. With this passage I should like to compare the comment of Lyconides' slave (*Aul.* 587), where he says: "This (*hoc*) is the duty of a good slave, to do (*facere*) as I do." This passage also is generalizing. *Hoc* clearly does not refer back to anything previously mentioned by the speaker. *Hoc* like *istuc* (*Merc.* 985) points forward to the appositional infinitive *facere*, by which the application of the pronoun is determined. Although no subject is expressed with *facere*, the context clearly calls for a third personal subject (cf. French *on*, German *man*). Therefore, this phrase also is the equivalent of a third personal clause.

131. When considered from the standpoint of usage, *Mercator* 985–986 and *Aulularia* 587 are analogous, yet in the one case *iste* is used; in the other *hic*. Similarly, in *Amphitruo* 590–591, Sosia uses *istaec* as a pronoun of prospective identification and then renders its application explicit with the generalizing indirect question, *si . . . vincitur*. Parallel with *Amphitruo* 590–591 is *Truculentus* 9, where the *prologus* uses *hoc* in the same way and then defines the reference with the clause *quoia . . . ventumst*.

132. The same parallelism in usage is also found in specific clauses of the third variation. Thus, in *Heauton* 910, Menedemus uses *istuc* to prepare for the appositional clause *quod ille . . . dat*, by which its exact force is determined. Parallel with *Heauton* 910 is *Eunuchus* 642, where Phaedria uses *hoc* as a *praeparativus*, whose precise application he defines by the substantive clause *quod . . . egreditur Pythias*.[181]

133. Similarly, in *Mostellaria* 208–209, Scapha uses *istuc* to point ahead to the appositional substantive clause *ut . . . ille amet*, by which the specific application of the pronoun is determined. Parallel with *Mostellaria* 208–209 is *Phormio* 324–325, where Geta uses *hoc* in the same way and then renders its force explicit by means of the clause *ne istaec fortitudo . . . erumpat*.

134. In each pair, whether of general or specific application, *iste* and *hic* have each been determined by a clause the subject of which is third

---

[179] See ¶¶ 15–25 for the use of *hic* and *ille* in derogatory contexts.

[180] For the traditional interpretation cf. Bach, *op. cit.* (see note 7) 233 with discussion of textual emendation (*ibid.*, 274–275).

[181] Cf. *TLL* 6.3.2731.44.

personal. However, just as in the second variation, the force of the clause is in neither instance the same as that which the traditionalists ascribe to the pronouns.[182]

135. This brings us to an evaluation of Bach's theory. Our study of the two types of usage in the third category in which *iste* shows deviations from the traditionalists' norm indicates that *iste* may, on occasion, be used as a pronoun of prospective identification or definition (i.e., as a *praeparativus*). In the first type it is identified by generalizing or specific relative clauses, the subjects of which are second, first, or third personal; in the second type it is similarly identified by various appositional clauses and infinitives showing the same three variations. Such passages invalidate Bach's theory that *iste*, identified by a second personal clause, is further proof that a second personal force inheres in this word. Similar deviations in the case of *hic* and *ille* also disprove his contention regarding these words.

136. I think that the force of *iste, hic,* and *ille,* when used as *praeparativi,* is deictic. Their function is merely to point forward to a person or thing whose identity is to be determined subsequently by a clause. Whatever personal force these words seem to have under these conditions derives from the identifying clause and the general context. They are, per se, non-personal and in this respect identical; therefore, there is nothing illogical in the use of a second, first, or third personal clause to identify each of the three words. I do, however, believe that they differ in deictic intensity — *iste* being the most strongly deictic, *hic* less so, and *ille* the weakest of the three.

IV. *Iste* with Possessives

In this category there are *five possible variations.* The demonstrative may be modified (1) by *meus;* (2) by *noster;* (3) by *tuus;* (4) by *vester;* (5) by *suus.*

137. I shall begin by considering *Menaechmi* 911, where the doctor asks Menaechmus: "Don't you know how much harm you are doing to your ailment (i.e., that ailment of yours, *isti . . . tuo*)." This dialogue represents the third variation. The context is not derogatory. The

---

[182] For the same usage in the scenic fragments cf. Afran. *Consobr.* 1.33–34: *isto . . . ubi malunt* with Pacuv. *Herm.* 16.179–180: *hoc . . . ut videantur; Bacch.* 445: *istac . . . quando fecit* with Pomp. *Pisc.* 2.120: *hoc . . . quod . . . plorat; Cas.* 654: *istuc . . . quid . . . est* with Turp. *Leuc.* 18.129–130: *hoc . . . solentne.*

doctor refers to his interlocutor's disease as *isti* (911). The pronoun, therefore, is normal. He then adds the possessive adjective *tuo* to render this reference more specific. The juxtaposition of *isti*, the so-called *pronomen* δευτερότριτον, and *tuo*, the possessive adjective of the second person, is also in accordance with the traditional assignment of the pronouns.

138. Bach[183] sees in the collocations *iste tuus (vester)* additional proof that a second personal force inheres in *iste*, since in his opinion the force of the demonstrative approximates that of the qualifying possessive. He also finds in the collocations *hic meus (noster)* corresponding proof that a first personal force inheres in this demonstrative.[184] Meader,[185] on the other hand, regards the collocations *iste tuus (vester)* as the beginning of an early weakening of this demonstrative, which leads gradually to its use as a prototritonic pronoun.

139. The passage in the *Menaechmi* might, on first consideration, seem to lend credence to Bach's theory regarding *iste*. However, if we turn to the dialogue of the *Eunuchus* (1051–1052), where Chaerea says: "Nothing, brother, is more worthy of love than your Thais (i.e., this Thais of yours, *Thaide hac . . . tua*)," we find the same usage with *hic*. As Thais is not present, relative position does not enter into the interpretation. In direct violation of the traditionalists' law Chaerea refers to his brother's mistress as *hac* (1051). He then deviates still further from the traditionalists' norm by using in juxtaposition to *hac* the possessive adjective *tua*.[186] Phaedria in his reply also departs from the traditionalists' norm by referring to his own mistress as *illam* (1053). In my opinion the force of *hac* is deictic. It serves merely to designate the character under consideration without giving any indication of the relation of this character to either the speaker or the interlocutor. Whatever personal force the expression has derives from *tua*. The significant feature of the passage for our present purpose is that it shows *hac*, the so-called *pronomen* πρωτότριτον, used in juxtaposition to *tua*, the possessive adjective of the second person.

140. Similarly, in the dialogue of the *Adelphi*, 395–396, where the wily Syrus asks Demea: "You wouldn't let your son (i.e., that son of

---

[183] *Op. cit.* (see note 7) 216–218, 148.

[184] *Ibid.* 157–159, 148; cf. Stolz-Schmalz, *op. cit.* (see note 17) 474.

[185] *Op. cit.* (see note 13) 116; also cf. Stolz-Schmalz, *op. cit.* (see note 17) 476, in whose opinion this collocation derives from an original supplementary explanation through *tuus*.

[186] Reisig sees in this collocation, which he equates with *iste*, a deuterotritonic significance (*op. cit.* [see note 4] 361).

yours, *illum tuom*) do such things, would you?" we find this usage with *ille*. Syrus employs *illum* (395), not *istum*, in reference to Demea's son, who is not present, but who is known from an earlier appearance. He then deviates still further from the traditionalists' norm by combining with *illum* the possessive adjective *tuom*. According to my own interpretation the force of *illum* is deictic.[187] It serves merely to indicate the character around whom the conversation centers, whereas *tuom* renders explicit the personal relation of this character. In whatever way we interpret the pronoun, one fact remains — that *illum*, the so-called *pronomen τριτότριτον*, is here qualified by *tuom*, the possessive adjective of the second person.

141. The same parallelism in usage also appears in the following group. Thus Mercury (*Amph.* 285) refers to the words of Sosia as *istis*, which he then qualifies by adding *tuis*.[188] So Charmides (*Trin.* 828–829) refers to Neptune's renown as *hanc* (828), which he further qualifies with the possessive adjective *tuam*.[189] So, also, Libanus (*Asin.* 19) refers to the wife of Demaenetus as *illam*, to which he adds the possessive adjective *tuam*.[190] In this case he identifies the character still further with the clause *quam tu metuis*. In both these groups we find that *iste*, *hic*, and *ille* have each been used in juxtaposition to *tuus*.[191]

142. If we turn now to the *Miles Gloriosus*, 535–536, where Periplectomenus says: "Go into your own house at once, see whether that girl of yours (*istaec vostra*) is within," we find the same usage with *vester*. This dialogue represents the fourth variation. The context is not derogatory. Periplectomenus, in addressing Sceledrus, refers to Philocomasium as *istaec* (536). He then qualifies this reference further with *vostra*. *Istaec*, like *isti* (*Men.* 911), is here used with its normal force. The use of *vostra* in juxtaposition to *istaec* is also in accordance with the traditionalists' laws.[192]

143. With this passage I should like to compare *Adelphi* 165, where Sannio says: "I know your ways (i.e., these ways of yours, *vostra haec*). This dialogue shows the same usage with *hic*. Sannio employs *haec* in reference to the excuses which Aeschines will make after the slave-girl has been carried off. If the traditional assignment of the pronouns is correct, we may reasonably wonder why Sannio has not used *istaec*. Sannio,

---

[187] Cf. Wolterstorff, *Glotta* 10 (see note 18) 83; also *TLL* 7.1.361.27.

[188] Cf. Bach, *op. cit.* (see note 7) 216; Meader, *op. cit.* (see note 13) 116.

[189] Cf. Bach, *op. cit.* (see note 7) 159; Oskar Seyffert, "Jahresbericht über T. Maccius Plautus von 1886–1889," *JAW* 63 (1890) 12.

[190] Cf. Bach, *op. cit.* (see note 7) 299; *TLL* 7.1.360.80; also see Havet's rendering of the verse (*op. cit.* [see note 33]).

[191] For the same usage in the scenic fragments cf. Acc. *Teleph.* 8.623: *istaec tua* with *Andr.* 510: *hanc tuam* and Enn. *Alex.* 6.40: *illa* <*tua*>.

[192] Cf. Bach, *op. cit.* (see note 7) 216, 276–277.

however, deviates still further from the traditionalists' norm by qualifying *haec* with the possessive adjective *vostra*.   As I fail to see in these pronouns any inherent personal force, I naturally find nothing irregular in the use of *haec* in this context.   According to my own interpretation the force of *haec* is deictic.   Its function is merely to designate the thing under consideration without indicating any personal relationship.   I think that the personal force in this case derives from *vostra* and the passage is entirely normal.

144. In the same way in the dialogue of the *Heauton* 473, where Chremes says: "Syrus is whispering with that fellow of yours (*illo vostro*)," we find this usage with *ille*.   Chremes uses *illo*, not *isto*, in reference to his interlocutor's slave.   He then departs still further from the traditionalists' norm by combining with *illo* the possessive adjective *vostro*.   In my opinion *illo* is an unemphatic deictic.   Its function is merely to indicate the character around whom the conversation centers, whereas *vostro* determines the personal relation of this character.[193]   In whatever way we interpret the pronoun, one fact is certain — that *illo*, the so-called *pronomen τριτότριτον*, is here qualified by *vostro*, the possessive adjective of the second person.   In this group also we find that *iste*, *hic*, and *ille* have each been used in juxtaposition to *vester*.[194]   If, for purposes of the argument, we assume with Bach that *iste* is a true δευτερότριτον, and that the possessive adjectives of the second person, used to qualify *iste* in *Menaechmi* 911, *Amphitruo* 285, *Miles Gloriosus* 535–536, and similar passages, prove that this force is inherent, we are still face to face with the necessity of finding a logical explanation for passages in which *hic* and *ille* are similarly qualified.   In such cases, certainly, the force of the possessive adjective is not the same as that traditionally ascribed to these pronouns.

145. Even from this brief sketch it is evident that the usage of the early Roman dramatists fails to bear out Bach's contention regarding the collocations *iste tuus (vester)*.   If further evidence is necessary, we need merely turn to the dialogue of the *Trinummus*, 433 f., which shows a similar deviation with *meus*.   In this scene Stasimus refers to Philto as *istum*, which he further qualifies by adding *meum*.   This specimen differs from the others in this category in that *meum*[195] is here used as a predicate word, not as an attributive of *istum*.   With this passage I should like to compare the dialogue of the *Epidicus*, 486–487, where Periphanes refers

[193] Bulhart regards *illo* as a border-line case of *ille* as a definite article (*TLL* 7.1.361.26–27).

[194] For the same usage in the scenic fragments cf. Pacuv. *Dulor.* 28.153: *ista . . . vestra* with Liv. Andron. *Aeg.* 4.8: *haec vostrorum* (not quite the same as *haec vostra*, but shows the juxtaposition of the two forms).   In this case our parallel is necessarily incomplete.

[195] Cf. Seyffert, *op. cit.* (see note 12) 304.

to his son as *illum* (486), which he also qualifies by the addition of *meum*.[196] The parallelism in usage in *Trinummus* 433 f. and *Epidicus* 486–487 is obvious, yet in the one case *iste* is used, in the other *ille*. In neither case, however, is the force of the possessive adjective the same as that traditionally ascribed to the pronoun.

146. If we turn now to the scene of the *Poenulus*, 811, we find still another deviation with *noster*. In this passage the advocates refer to men like Agorastocles as *isti . . . divites*, to which they add the possessive adjective *nostri*.[197] The significant feature of this passage is the juxtaposition of the so-called demonstrative of the second person with the possessive adjective of the first person.

147. In concluding the present category, I should like to consider the monologue of the *Miles Gloriosus*, 868–869, which shows a similar deviation with *suus*. In this scene Palaestrio refers to Lurcio as *hunc subcustodem* (868), which he then qualifies by the addition of *suom*. The noteworthy feature of this passage is the juxtaposition of the so-called demonstrative of the first person with the possessive adjective of the third person.

148. As the scenic writers have yielded no evidence for the collocations *ille noster* or *iste suus*, our parallels for *noster* and *suus* are necessarily incomplete. However, within a wider literary range such collocations also would undoubtedly appear.

149. Our study of the several types of usage of *iste* in the fourth category in which *iste* shows deviations from the traditionalists' norm indicates that while *iste* may, on occasion, be used in juxtaposition to *tuus* or *vester*, it may also be used in juxtaposition to *meus* or *noster*. It also reveals similar deviations from the allegedly normal combination of demonstrative and possessive in the case of *hic* and *ille*. These facts prove the fallacy of Bach's attempt to equate the force of the demonstrative and possessive in such collocations and to make deductions from them. Although these deviations do not invalidate Meader's theory, they do not, in my opinion, serve to corroborate it.

150. Might it be that the Romans, on occasion, combined a possessive with a demonstrative to give a more precise personal force to certain expressions because the personal force later associated with these demonstratives was less well established in this period of the language than is commonly believed? If such were the case,

---

[196] Cf. Bach, *op. cit.* (see note 7) 299; Wolterstorff, *Glotta* 10 (see note 18) 68; *TLL* 7.1.360.80.

[197] Cf. Stolz-Schmalz, *op. cit.* (see note 17) 476; Seyffert, *op. cit.* (see note 12) 302.

the several deviations from the classical norm, in this and the preceding categories, would no longer cause us any difficulty.

151. This study of *iste*, both alone and in relation to *hic* and *ille*, shows that while *iste*, in the early Roman dramatists, occurs predominantly in contexts the force of which is second personal or derogatory, it also occurs with reasonable frequency in contexts devoid of such a force.   *Iste* is a demonstrative pronoun whose primary force is merely strongly deictic.[198]   Neither a deuterotritonic nor a derogatory force is inherent in *iste* and in the beginning it had no personal connotation.[199]   This strongly deictic force rendered it peculiarly suited to use in dialogue and similar situations, where a second personal force necessarily appears.   From its very frequent use in such second personal contexts it developed its "normal" or deuterotritonic force.   This secondary or deuterotritonic force derives from the context and is not inherent in the pronoun per se. In the beginning this deuterotritonic significance was probably thought of as belonging to the context, as in reality it did, and the pronoun was still regarded as merely strongly deictic, but gradually it came to be associated in the minds of the Romans with the word itself and to be regarded as a part of it.[200]

152. As a result of this strongly deictic force *iste* also developed a strongly resumptive force, in which it picks up with emphasis a reference to a person or thing, previously referred to with *hic* or *ille*. In consequence of this same strongly deictic force *iste* also developed a strongly preparative force, in which it points forward emphatically to a person or thing, about to be identified later by a defining relative clause, or an appositional substantive clause or infinitive.

[198] According to Donatus the ancients themselves recognized for *iste* a deictic force. Thus, in his commentary on *Adelphi* 377, Donatus says: "CONGRUM ISTUM MAXIMUM διαστολή, quia erant alii non maximi; ut e contrario (*Verg. Geo. II 99*) 'argitisque minor,' quia est et maior. nam 'istum' quod ait δεικτικόν est; videtur enim ostendere digito, quem dicat" (Wessner [Lipsiae, 1902–1905] 23.1).   In his analysis of *Andria* 332, he makes a similar comment: "NUPTIAS EFFUGERE EGO ISTAS M. QUAM TU A. interposita distinctione vultuose hoc dicitur, *hoc est cum gestu*" (*ibid.* 32); and again, in discussing *Adelphi* 981, he says: "ISTOC VILIUS quasi nihil minus; negatio est enim floccum ostendentis aut quid tale cum ἐλλείψει, qua subauditur 'quicquam' et 'non dabo' " (*ibid.* 24.4).

[199] The usage of the early Roman dramatists bears out this contention and it is further substantiated by the etymology posited by Brugmann, *op. cit.* (see note 17) 81 and Walde-Hofmann, *op. cit.* (see note 19) s.v.

[200] Cf. Brugmann, *op. cit.* (see note 17) 73 f.; also 11.

153. This strongly deictic force also rendered *iste* peculiarly suited to highly dramatic or emotional contexts, both monologues and dialogues, where its connotation may be derogatory, hypocoristic, or any shade of meaning between these two. This emotional color, however, is inherent in the context, not in the pronoun per se.[201]

154. By reason of this strongly deictic force *iste* also developed in the early scenic writers certain stylistic features, such as its use in combination with *ille*, less often *hic*, to designate and at the same time differentiate two persons or things, to bring a person or thing momentarily into strong relief, to denote a change in the speaker's state of mind, to give expression to an outburst of surprise or indignation, or to refer to a person or thing when the situation is very tense.

155. As the deuterotritonic force of *iste* is secondary, I think that instead of attempting to interpret all occurrences of the word according to the classical norm, or of positing manifestations of an early weakening of the word, it would be nearer to the truth to admit that in early Latin this secondary force is not yet fully established. I believe that in this period we see *iste* in the half-way stage of its development. It is not yet fully crystallized into a deuterotritonic pronoun.[202] Accordingly, it may, on occasion, be used in contexts

---

[201] See note 45.

[202] Professor Joshua Whatmough of Harvard University, to whose kindness I am indebted for a number of very valuable suggestions, agrees with me, but to the best of my knowledge no other scholars thus far have advanced the present interpretation. Those scholars who recognize deviations from the traditionalists' norm usually take cognizance only of those cases appearing in the late Republic and at the beginning of the Empire (exceptions are Meader, *op. cit.* [see note 13] 152–153, 116; Stolz-Schmalz, *op. cit.* [see note 17] 476), and without exception they regard these deviations as manifestations of an early weakening in the deuterotritonic force of *iste*, which leads gradually to its encroachment upon the sphere of usage of *hic*. It happens, however, that *iste* appears with equal frequency in contexts traditionally reserved for *ille*. It also happens that these alleged manifestations of an early weakening are fairly frequent (between 350 and 400 cases in Plautus and Terence), too frequent in my opinion to be explained as the beginning of an early weakening of the force of *iste*. Such an explanation presupposes that the semasiological development of *iste* is leading it in two different directions. It also presupposes that the semasiological development of the pronouns is far in advance of the morphological and syntactic development of the period. I believe that in early Latin *iste* exhibits contemporaneously a primary force (which is strongly deictic, but non-personal) and a secondary force (which is deuterotritonic). I do not think that *iste* in early Latin is as completely crystallized into a deuterotritonic pronoun as in the Ciceronian period (but cf. Brugmann, *op. cit.* [see note 17] 56 ff., who seems to think that the change is partly completed before the beginning of the

normally reserved for *hic* or *ille*, or interchanged with these words, in which case all three words are used with their primary force (i.e., they are non-personal deictics); consequently, it may also, at times, be juxtaposed to a possessive adjective of either the second or first person, in which case it is also used with its primary force (i.e., it is a non-personal deictic), while the possessive adjective gives the necessary personal connotation.   Just as many words show a morphological wavering[203] in this early stage of the language and as many constructions exhibit similar irregularities[204] when judged by the generally accepted norm of the classical period, so *iste*, when it appears now with its normal or deuterotritonic force, now in con-

literary tradition, partly going on) nor do I think that it is ever entirely crystallized in the *sermo cottidianus*.   Two factors, therefore, would explain the frequent deviations from the alleged norm in the early Roman dramatists: (1) the period in which these authors wrote (i.e., in this period the crystallization is less complete than later); (2) the character of their works (i.e., they reflect to a great extent the spoken language of the period, which is always less regular than the literary language).   If my theory is correct, the use of *iste* in contexts normally reserved for *hic* and *ille* would simply mean that, when thus interchanged, all three words are used with their primary force.

   [203] Thus we find *opino* (Pacuv. *Chrys.* 14.101) beside *opinor* (Afran. *Inc. Fab.* 10.416), showing a wavering between active and deponent forms within the same verb, forms such as *scibo* (Acc. *Alphes.* 2.74) beside *audies* (*ibid.*), representing a similar wavering in the method of forming fourth conjugation futures, a form such as *proficisceret* (Turp. *Het.* 6.81) in place of the later deponent form, infinitives such as *mittier* (Titin. *Set.* 13.124) and *utier* (Acc. *Ter.* 8.647) beside *velitari* (Afran. *Priv.* 18.267) and other infinitives, showing the usual classical formation, third declension forms such as *laetitudinem* (Acc. *Alcim.* 2.61) and *miseritudo* (Acc. *Alphes.* 7.79) in place of the first declension forms of the classical period, also many third declension forms in *-udo, -tudo,* and *-itudo,* such as *tarditudine* (Acc. *Alcim.* 7.69), *honestitudo* (Acc. *Myr.* 6.16), and *gracilitudo* (Acc. *Amph.* 6.88), which in the classical period are formed with different suffixes.

   [204] In the same way we find indirect questions now with the indicative (*non . . . scis . . . quantum . . . honorem . . . habeo* [*Mil. Glor.* 1074–1075]), now with the subjunctive (*haud scit . . . quantum . . . damnum adportet* [*Heaut.* 747]), *quom* causal clauses at one time with the indicative (*quom hic nugatur, contra nugari lubet* [*Trin.* 900]), at another with the subjunctive (*demiror quid sit . . . praesertim quom . . . recte . . . pepererit* [*Hec.* 529–531]), *quom* adversative clauses in one instance with the indicative (*insanire me aiunt, ultro quom ipsi insaniunt* [*Men.* 843]), in another with the subjunctive (*panticesque . . . madefactatis, quom ego sim . . . siccus* [*Pseud.* 184]), *dignus* with the genitive (*non ego sum salutis dignus* [*Trin.* 1153]), with the accusative (*di tibi omnes id quod es dignus duint* [*Phorm.* 519]), and with the ablative (*quia — <quia> non nostra formam habet dignam domo* [*Merc.* 395]), *potior* with the genitive (*eodem die, <tui> viduli ubi sis potitus* [*Rud.* 1337]), with the accusative (*hic potitur gaudia* [*Adel.* 876]), and with the ablative (*si ille hodie illa sit potitus muliere* [*Pseud.* 1071]), *fruor* and *utor* with the accusative (*hocin me miserum non licere meo modo ingenium frui* [*Heaut.* 401]; *cetera quae volumus uti* [*Asin.* 199]), and with the ablative (*tu illis fruare commodis* [*Eun.* 372]; *mea lege utar* [*Phorm.* 533]), as well as various other deviations from the classical norm.

texts normally reserved for *hic* or *ille*, reveals a comparable semantic flux.[205]

156. Like the traditionalists I think that *iste* differs from *hic* and *ille*, but I think that the fundamental difference consists not in its reference to the second person, but in its deictic intensity. All three pronouns are deictic, but *iste* is the most strongly deictic, *hic* less so, and *ille* the weakest of the three.

[205] Cf. Hirt, *op. cit.* (see note 17) 161.