

Jens Lüdtke

22 From Latin and Vulgar Latin to Romance Languages

Abstract: In the change of deixis from Latin to Romance the contrast between classical and popular Latin usage was more important than other considerations. The starting-point for description is the “origin of the deictic field”, or the “immediate situation”, which accounts for the categories of deixis, i.e. personal pronouns, possessives, demonstratives as well as spatial, temporal and modal deictic adverbs. The diachronic stages taken into account are Latin, Vulgar Latin and Romance. The central points are the reconstruction of the rise of the third person as the pivot of the system of the personal pronouns and the demonstratives, the transition of anaphoric to deictic use and the increase of periphrastic expressions which is interpreted as typological change.

Keywords: Romance Languages, Latin, Vulgar Latin, deixis, diachrony, field theory, deictic field, immediate situation, anaphora, cataphora, spatial deixis, temporal deixis, modal deixis, periphrastic expressions, paradigmatic forms, two-term system, three-term system, typological change

0 Introduction

This article focuses on diachrony and the motivation of change in deixis as far as it may be attested. It is not easy to base change in deixis on language contact (Meillet 1928, 161s., 234–238, 255s.) due to the lack of evidence from the languages prior to and at the moment of their first contact with Latin, apart from the contact with Greek, which formed Latin culture and is also reflected in the translation of the New Testament (Abel 1971; cf. Sornicola 2011, 295–298). We can however claim that the contrast between classical and popular usage was more relevant than the languages in contact, because the inhabitants of the provinces learnt an already finished sub-standard Latin (Meillet 1928, 238; Wüest 1994, 42) over a long period of time.

Latin, Vulgar Latin and Romance are not really three chronological stages. Latin and Vulgar Latin are one language with differences in written and spoken usage, formal and informal registers, high and low varieties. Important changes had occurred in spoken language before the period we call Classical Latin, i.e. the Late Republic and the principate of Augustus. These changes ensued in popular speech parallel to the history of the written language and had retroactive effects on the written language as long as the Romance Languages had no writing system.

Thus, Vulgar Latin is taken to be the manifestation of popular usage contemporary with and subsequent to the standardization of Latin.

As to the state of the literature on the topic, the problems of general evolution of Latin are settled, but many relevant documents have not yet been studied, and the details of non-attested spoken varieties await further clarification. In this sense, research on deixis is still going on vigorously, and diachrony is not the least rewarding field.

I will sketch the theoretical framework of my contribution and fix my terminological conventions. I distinguish language in general (Fr. *langage*), the particular languages (Fr. *langue*) and discourse or speech (Fr. *parole, discours*).

Semantically, language in general is the area of denotation, the particular languages have different meanings (*signifiés*) and discourse is characterized by discourse meanings. In treating deixis, we have the option to focus on denotation, *signifiés* or discourse meanings.

The linguistic conceptualizations that follow from this premise may be very different. The main one is based on discourse meaning and was proposed in Bühler's field theory. This theory (¹1934; 2011) will be applied in the form further developed by Coseriu (1955–1956; 2001) and in additional adjustments I proposed in order to account for the meanings in synchrony (J. Lüdtke 2011). The ordinary English usage of “situation” and “context” does not discriminate all contextual meanings. The fundamental field is Bühler's “origo of the deictic field” or Coseriu's “immediate situation”, which implies the utterance act of a speaker and constitutes a space and a time when he or she says *I, here* and *now* (Coseriu 2001, 56). The immediate situation is a sufficient motivation for comprising the different deictic paradigms in one system. Thus, the grammatical tradition is not arbitrary, but reflects fundamental linguistic facts. When the deictic field is reported in a discourse context, it is converted into a “mediate situation”, Bühler's “symbolic field”, in which the first and second persons are shifted to the third person, ‘here’ to ‘there’ and ‘now’ to ‘then’. Generally, the discourse context or the text are the fields in which anaphoras and cataphoras appear (↗30 Discourse Deixis), both classed as endophoric uses when they are opposed globally to exophoric uses (Halliday/Hasan 1976, 33), i.e. to the immediate situation.

The adjective “deictic” is employed in the literature to refer first of all to what I called immediate situation, and to the relation between a set of particular meanings without recognizing a (debatable) fundamental meaning, which is that of ‘showing’ a thing, a person or an event in an immediate situation, a social space (Jungbluth 2005, 31s.), a discourse context, a text or a universe of discourse. It is not necessary to describe the different coexisting deictic uses as transfers from the reference to the immediate situation to other deictic fields (cf. *ibid.*, 30–35).

Deixis is conveyed by two very different types of expression, i.e. by the endings of person and tense in the flexions of the finite verb, and these as well as all the other deictic categories by means of grammatical words or phrases. I cannot consider the interaction of person and tense as verbal categories together with the deictic categories treated here. However, we should be aware of the fact that both kinds of

categories are called deictic and refer to similar fields, but function in a different way. To this end, I will account for the following deictic paradigms: the categories of deixis are person, which is expressed in personal pronouns, and – dependent on them – possessives and demonstratives; space and time, which are verbalized in the corresponding adverbs; we have to add modal deixis and motion verbs which will be alluded to only now and then. In the paradigm of personal pronouns and in the demonstratives, both speaker and hearer may be united in a dyad (Jungbluth 2005, 6), which is either opposed to a non-person in the system of personal pronouns (Benveniste 1966) or to a distal use in the demonstratives. As to the latter, there is no need to decide between the alternatives discussed in the literature, a person or a distance-oriented system and concentration on speaker or hearer, since exophoric uses are based on the immediate situation of speaking, in which person has priority over space, time and other deictic elements. A discussion as to the problem whether the three-term demonstrative system of Latin developed to a two-term system in Vulgar Latin, whether it was recreated in the history of the Romance Languages, or whether the Latin system was maintained in some of them, would be fitting at this point. We will take into account the basic terms in spatial, temporal and modal deixis, the only ones which had a chance of being maintained in the Romance Languages.

Due to the fact that the knowledge of a language precedes the use of deictics in an immediate situation, and that the main differences between Classical Latin, Vulgar Latin and Romance are given in the semantic structure, this latter domain will be stressed here, since personal pronouns and possessives, the *signifiés* of the demonstratives as well as other types of deixis correlate to each other to a certain extent. However, research will have to account for semantic change by supporting its conclusions on the evidence of discourse meanings.

Although the formal and semantic changes of deictics have their roots in Latin, the ultimate outcome was a typological change in the Romance Languages. Romance evidence is taken first and foremost from Italian, Romanian, Spanish and Portuguese, but secondarily also from French, Occitan, Catalan, Galician and Sardinian (Logudorèse) whenever comparison contributes to illustrate the extent of convergent or divergent changes. I should make clear that I cannot claim at all to register every form that belongs to Latin and Romance deixis.

1 Latin

There is a wide variety of alternative forms and spellings in the history of Latin which cannot be given here.

1.1 Personal pronouns

Latin expresses person and time primarily by the categories of person and tense in the verb system, e.g. *canto* ‘I sing’. We will not take account of them.

Classical Latin used the first and second persons of the personal pronouns, *EGO*, *TU*, *NOS* and *VOS*, for emphasis, the only ones to appear in the immediate situation. The marking of the nominal categories is restricted to case and number, there is no need to mark gender. The nominative was accented, the other cases lacked the morphological distinction between accented and clitic forms. In the following table, the forms of the persons can be read from left to right and the cases from top to bottom:

	singular		plural		third person reflexive
nominative	EGO ‘I’	TU ‘you’	NOS ‘we’	VOS ‘you’	
accusative	ME	TE	NOS	VOS	SE ‘himself, etc.’
genitive	MEI	TUI	NOSTRI/ nostrum	VESTRI/ vestrum	SUI
dative	MIHI	TIBI	NOBIS	VOBIS	SIBI
ablative	ME	TE	NOBIS	VOBIS	SE

Latin did not have a third person pronoun, an apparent deficiency that was partially made up for in the oblique cases by the third person reflexive and in anaphoric use by *IS*, *EA*, *ID* ‘this, that’. *ILLE* ‘that’ was emphatic and *IPSE* even more emphatic as well as exclusive. Quantitatively, the use of demonstratives in this syntactic function increased in post-classical Latin.

Personal pronouns could be emphasized paradigmatically in all cases, with the exception of the genitive plural, by the suffix *-MET*, cf. *EGOMET* ‘I myself’, and syntagmatically by *IPSE* or by both, cf. *MEMET IPSUM*.

1.2 Possessive adjectives and pronouns

The possessives are personal pronouns transposed into adjectives. Therefore, their meanings are similar and not restricted to ‘possession’. *MEUS* ‘my’ corresponds to *EGO*, *TUUS* ‘your’ to *TU*, *NOSTER*, *NOSTRA*, *NOSTRI/NOSTRUM* ‘our’ to *NOS* and *VESTER*, *VESTRA*, *VESTRI/VESTRUM* ‘your, plural’ to *VOS*. *SUUS* ‘his, her, their’ is only reflexive, in correspondence to the oblique cases *SUI*, *SIBI*, *SE*. Otherwise, the genitive of *IS* is used, as in non-reflexive *FILII EORUM* ‘their sons’ vs. reflexive *FILII SUI* ‘their own sons’. These adjectives may be converted to nouns, e.g. in the pronouns *MEI* pl. ‘my people’, *MEUM* ‘mine’, *TUA* pl. ‘yours, plural’, *SUUM* ‘his, her, their own’. Identity suffixes for possessive pronouns were *-PTE* und *-MET*, cf. *MEAPTE*, *MEAMET*.

1.3 Demonstrative adjectives and pronouns

The demonstratives formed a three-term system and were used as adjectives and nouns; they were marked for case, number and gender. The basic opposition was between *HIC*, *ISTE*, *ILLE* and anaphoric *IS*. The declension did not correspond with the current nominal endings, for the genitive singular was *-IUS* in all genders, the dative had several forms, and the ending of the neuter nominative and accusative was final *-D*. The demonstratives seem to have been accented in exophoric and unaccented in endophoric usage. Even if there was an affinity between *HIC* and the first person, *ISTE* and the second person, *ILLE* and the third person, the border separating the semantic domains is far from being clear-cut (Sornicola 2011, 222). My semantic interpretation is based on the discourse meanings indicated by the *OLD*.

HIC ‘this’ refers to the space near the speaker.

		singular			plural	
nominative	<i>HIC</i>	<i>HAEC</i>	<i>HOC</i>	<i>HI</i>	<i>HAE</i>	<i>HAEC</i>
accusative	<i>HUNC</i>	<i>HANC</i>	<i>HOC</i>	<i>HOS</i>	<i>HAS</i>	<i>HAEC</i>
genitive		<i>HUIUS</i>		<i>HORUM</i>	<i>HARUM</i>	<i>HORUM</i>
dative		<i>HUIC</i>			<i>HIS</i>	
ablative	<i>HOC</i>	<i>HAC</i>	<i>HOC</i>		<i>HIS</i>	

The most usual types of discourse meaning already had appeared in Latin and are given here in order to exemplify them. *HIC* indicated the reference to the speaker or writer in an immediate situation, to a person in a particular occasional field, in the field of anything visible, of the world the speaker knows or lives in, enlarging these fields to the place, time or events, present, immediately preceding or ensuing. *HIC* may also refer to a discourse context that has just been mentioned or that follows immediately, i.e. when it is used as anaphora or cataphora.

In opposition to the other demonstratives *ISTE* ‘that’ marks either a person, thing or event in a space nearer the hearer or addressee or the communicative space including both interlocutors.

		singular			plural	
nominative	<i>ISTE</i>	<i>ISTA</i>	<i>ISTUD</i>	<i>ISTI</i>	<i>ISTAE</i>	<i>ISTA</i>
accusative	<i>ISTUM</i>	<i>ISTAM</i>	<i>ISTUD</i>	<i>ISTOS</i>	<i>ISTAS</i>	<i>ISTA</i>
genitive		<i>ISTIUS</i>	<i>ISTORUM</i>	<i>ISTORUM</i>		<i>ISTARUM</i>
dative		<i>ISTI</i>			<i>ISTIS</i>	
ablative	<i>ISTO</i>	<i>ISTA</i>	<i>ISTO</i>		<i>ISTIS</i>	

ISTE belongs especially, but not exclusively to the domain of the addressee in an immediate situation, to persons or things merely presented in his or her mind or to the discourse context of the hearer.

ILLE ‘that’ refers to the space beyond the proximity to speaker and hearer.

		singular			plural		
nominative	ILLE	ILLA	ILLUD	ILLI	ILLAE	ILLA	
accusative	ILLUM	ILLAM	ILLUD	ILLOS	ILLAS	ILLA	
genitive		ILLIUS		ILLORUM	ILLARUM	ILLORUM	
dative		ILLI					
ablative	ILLO	ILLA	ILLO			ILLIS	

ILLE denotes a person or thing a speaker indicates from an immediate situation, that belongs to the world the speaker or the hearer knows or to the discourse context that has just been mentioned or follows.

The demonstratives had emphatic paradigmatic forms as in the case of HICE, but the emphasis was expressed normally by syntagmatic determinations as in HIC + IPSE, ILLE, ISTE, TALIS; QUIDAM + HIC; ISTE + IPSE, TUUS; ILLE + QUIDEM, IPSE.

The anaphoric/cataphoric pronoun is represented by *is*, ‘this’, ‘that’.

		singular			plural		
nominative	IS	EA	ID	II	EAE	EA	
accusative	EUM	EAM	ID	EOS	EAS	EA	
genitive		EIUS		EORUM	EARUM	EORUM	
dative		EI			IIS		
ablative	EOC	EA	EOC		IIS		

As an endophoric pronoun, it referred cataphorically to a person or thing previously mentioned or implied. Typically, it was followed by relative or other clauses constituting its discourse context.

IDEM and IPSE. With regard to the later developments, the inventory is not complete without the identity pronoun IDEM and the emphatic pronoun IPSE. In Classical Latin IDEM ‘the same’ expressed comparative identity (‘x is identical to y’) and IPSE ‘himself, etc.’ exclusiveness (Romoth 1990, 5). Adjectival IDEM could precede or follow the noun it belonged to without any semantic difference.

		singular			plural		
nom.	IDEM	EADEM	IDEM	IIDEM	EADEM	EADEM	
acc.	EUNDEM	EANDEM	IDEM	EOSDEM	EASDEM	EADEM	
gen.		EIUSDEM		EORUNDEM	EARUNDEM	EORUNDEM	
dat.		EIDEM			EISDEM		
abl.	EODEM	EADEM	EODEM		EISDEM		

Adjectival IPSE was used in the same position as IDEM: it followed when it was joined to other pronouns.

		singular			plural		
nominative	IPSE	IPSA	IPSUD	IPSI	IPSAE	IPSA	
accusative	ISPUM	IPSAM	IPSUD	IPSOS	IPSAS	IPSA	
genitive		IPSIUS		IPSORUM	IPSARUM	IPSORUM	

dative		IPSI		IPSIS
ablative	IPSO	IPSA	IPSO	IPSIS

The meanings of *IPSE* are centred on two clusters, namely exclusiveness and emphasis, i.e. ‘himself, herself, itself, oneself, etc.’ as opposed to others, on the one hand, and reinforcement of a reflexive or possessive pronoun, ‘in person’, ‘the actual’, ‘himself, etc., in addition to others’, ‘by himself, etc.’, ‘this or that very’, which emphasize identity, on the other hand. Additional distinctions are expressed by means of paradigmatic reinforcement in *IPSEMET* and the syntagmatic procedures quoted in the section on demonstratives (cf. *OLD*, s.v.; Romoth 1990, 36–40).

It is clear that the dyadic space of the first and second person pronouns interacted with a correlative demonstrative system, otherwise it would be difficult to explain how the demonstrative pronoun *ILLE* and the identity pronoun *IPSE* finally took the function of a third person pronoun. Thus *ILLE* was reserved for distal use, whereas the difference between *ISTE* and *HIC* in proximal use is controversial.

According to H. Lüdtkke (²2009, 128s.), the meaning of *ISTE* was primarily proximal, as opposed to distal *ILLE*; the reference to the second person (*TU*) and the corresponding pejorative connotations were secondary. Before the second century A.D., *ISTE* had become less frequent in literary usage and more emphatic than *HIC*, the unmarked form.

In spoken or non-literary language, demonstratives could be combined with *ECCE* ‘see! look!’, a particle attested in archaic writers. It is predominant in classical, post-classical, Christian and late writers. Semantically similar *ECCUM* prevails in Plautus and Terence, but appears sporadically in later periods of the history of Latin (Sornicola 2011, 276s.) and manifests traces of declension in *ECCUM*, *ECCOS*, *ECCAM*, *ECCAS*, *ECCA*. The function of *ECCE* may be assimilated to that of an adverb, that of *ECCUM* to a pronoun; both are construed with the nominative or the accusative (ibid., 278s.). As to their meaning, however, they were finally used as if they were indeclinable deictic verbs.

ECCE/ECCUM was introduced as a demonstrative particle and established an opposition between distal *ILLE* and emphatic distal *ECCE ILLE*. As early as Plautus, the non-attested syntagmatic expression *ECCE ILLE*, which may have been initially a periphrasis, coalesced in a grammaticalized form, *ECCILLE* ‘that over there’, losing its emphatic meaning in the process. On the other hand, *ECCUM* still formed syntagmatic constructions in Plautus, e.g. in *ECCUM IPSUM* (Sornicola 2011, 272), where *ECCUM* is employed to attract attention. The second element in *ECCILLE* establishes a specific exophoric or in *ECCUM IPSUM* an endophoric relationship, i.e. the reinforcement of the identity of an element with something aforementioned. Similarly, we will observe the frequent spread of periphrases in the transition from Latin to Vulgar Latin and from Vulgar Latin to Romance which continues up to the present time.

1.4 Deictic adverbs and other correlative expressions

A striking feature of Latin is the system of correlative deictic adverbs. It stresses morphological relationships in the paradigms which may be illustrated by local *UBI* ‘where?’ – *IBI* ‘there’ – *ALICUBI* ‘elsewhere’, temporal *CUM* ‘when’ – *TUM* ‘then’, *NUNC* ‘now’ – *TUNC* ‘then’ and modal *TAM* ‘so’ – *QUAM* ‘how?’. This system disappeared in a long process of erosion.

1.4.1 Spatial deixis

Spatial deixis is dealt with at this point because the basic forms are adverbs that are derived from demonstrative pronouns; they are fossilized cases. The demonstratives correlate to the spatial adverbs and manifest the same oppositions, i.e. the space near the speaker, the space near the addressee and the space beyond both of them. One is used as a purely anaphoric adverb and another one expresses local identity. In addition, there is a transverse connexion between this set of oppositions and motion verbs, the syntactic functions implying \pm motion, and lastly, the correlative non-deictic interrogative and relative adverbs.

The spatial adverbs form correlative paradigms which include the interrogative adverbs:

<i>UBI</i> ‘where?’	<i>QUO</i> ‘whither?’	<i>UNDE</i> ‘whence?’	<i>QUA</i> ‘along where?’
<i>HIC</i> ‘here’	<i>HUC</i> ‘hither’	<i>HINC</i> ‘hence’	<i>HAC</i> ‘by this way’
<i>ISTIC</i> ‘there by you’	<i>ISTOC/ISTUC</i> ‘to or towards the place where you are’	<i>ISTINC</i> ‘from the place you are in’	<i>ISTAC</i> ‘by that route’
<i>ILLIC</i> ‘at that place’	<i>ILLOC/ILLUC</i> ‘to that place, thither’	<i>ILLINC</i> ‘from that place, from there’	<i>ILLAC</i> ‘by that way’
<i>IBI</i> ‘(in)to that place’	<i>EO</i> ‘to that place, thither’	<i>INDE</i> ‘from that place’	<i>EA</i> ‘along that path’
<i>IBIDEM</i> ‘(in)to that place, just there’	<i>EODEM</i> ‘to the same place’		<i>EADEM</i> ‘by that same route’

These adverbs are further specified by motion verbs as in “*INDE* abeo, exeo, insurgo, revertor” ‘to leave, rise, return from here’ and by prepositions as in “*HUC* ex Asia decedo” ‘to come here from Asia’.

1.4.2 Temporal deixis

NUNC ‘now’ denotes the moment of speaking or writing in an immediate situation, *TUM*, *TUNC* ‘then’ both the moment before or after an immediate situation. *NUNC* meaning ‘nowadays’ and *TUNC* ‘at that time’ could refer to a wider situational field. These

adverbs disappeared in Vulgar Latin. The reference to the days was better established than the inclusion of the immediate situation with *HODIE* ‘today’, *HERI* ‘yesterday’ and to a certain extent *CRAS* ‘tomorrow’.

The phrases *NUDIUS TERTIUS* ‘the day before yesterday’ and *PERENDIE* ‘the day after tomorrow’ show that these and similar expressions were less frequent, since they do not continue in the Romance Languages. When *HODIE* was transposed to a discourse context, ‘the day before’ was expressed by *PRIDIE* and ‘the day after’ by *POSTRIDIE*.

1.4.3 Modal deixis and other forms of deixis

SIC ‘so, thus’ has exophoric and endophoric uses, correlative *ITA* and *UT* only endophoric ones. *TAM* ‘so, as’ is a comparative demonstrative particle used with adjectives and adverbs in correlation with *QUAM* ‘how?’. These particles are implied in *TALIS* ‘of such character or kind’ – *QUALIS* ‘of what kind or quality?’; *TANTUS* ‘so great’ – *QUANTUS* ‘how great?’, *TANTUSDEM* ‘just as great, as much, etc.’. Indeclinable correlative adjectives are *TOT* ‘that, so many’ – *QUOT* ‘how many?’.

2 Vulgar Latin

Latinists and Romanists extrapolate their evidence from different linguistic facts, the former analyse a wide range of mainly Classical Latin texts, the latter make use of the material offered by ‘Vulgar’ Latin texts and the history of the Romance Languages. Both coincide only partially in their evidence and conclusions.

The changes from Classical to Vulgar Latin are more conspicuous in the nominal than in the verbal system and have consequences for the adverbs as well.

I did not unify the forms of the etyma and point out minor inconsistencies, because that would have made necessary the discussion of diachronic phonology.

The great etymological dictionaries are taken for granted and are not listed in the references.

2.1 Personal pronouns

Only some major changes can be mentioned here. The datives and ablatives *NOBIS* and *VOBIS* were replaced by the accusatives *NOS* and *VOS*. The datives *MIHI* and *TIBI* contracted to tonic *MI* and *TI* or were substituted by *AD ME*, *TE*, *NOS*, *VOS*, and analogically the genitives by *DE ME*, *TE*, *NOS*, *VOS*. The personal pronouns merged with the preposition *CUM* into *MECUM* ‘with me’, *TECUM*, *NOBISCUM* and *VOBISCUM*, and the two aforementioned compound pronouns were replaced by **NOSCUM*, *VOSCUM*, today only

retained in Pt. *connosco* ‘with us’ and *convosco* ‘with you (pl.)’ (≈11 European Portuguese). The reduced system, which is the outcome of these changes, developed different series of forms depending on whether they carried the accent or not and whether they were free or bound forms.

The pivot of the system is the rise of the third person. All the demonstratives could be used in this function in the standard language, but preference was given to *ILLE*. However, the specific changes that finally led to the modern Romance personal pronouns are better explained in the context of the restructuring of the demonstratives (2.3.), since *IS* was substituted by other demonstratives and *IDEM* by *IPSE*.

The adverbs *INDE* and *IBI* took the meaning of personal pronouns which started from the discourse meanings ‘from that person, place or thing’ and ‘in the company of that person’.

2.2 Possessive adjectives and pronouns

The most important innovation is the extension of reflexive *SUUS* to a non-reflexive function of the third person: *SUUS FILIUS* ‘his, her, their own son’ also took the meaning ‘his, her, their son’, when referring to another person’s son without any distinction of gender and number. The ambiguity implied in the new meaning could be compensated by the genitive plural of the third person demonstrative *ILLORUM* ‘of them, their’ in Late Latin and was conserved in Gallo-Romance, Catalan, Romansh, standard Italian and Romanian. *VESTER* did not persist in Romance, but was probably replaced by analogical, and already archaic, *VOSTER*. The atonic forms *MUS*, *MI*, *MUM*, *MA*, *TUS*, etc. appeared side by side with tonic *MEUS*, *MEI*, *MEUM*, *MEA*, *TUUS*, etc. in early non-standard and Vulgar Latin. Both types were to be preserved in Romance, but with divergent functions.

2.3 Demonstrative adjectives and pronouns

There are four major changes in the transition from Classical to Late Latin: the loss of the endophoric pronouns *IS EA ID* and *IDEM EADEM IDEM*, of the demonstrative *HIC HAEC HOC*, the emergence of *IPSE IPSA IPSUD* as a demonstrative pronoun and the development of syntagmatic determinations.

These transformations are interrelated, and can only partially be accounted for by any separate treatment which necessarily deals with the subject in a linear discourse.

According to Wüest (1994, 46), who deduced his conclusion from the comparative study of the Romance Languages, it is impossible to decide whether the three-term system was Proto-Romance or followed a two-term system. On the contrary, other scholars conclude that the written evidence of Vulgar Latin supports the hypothesis that the three-term system in Latin was reduced to a two-term system in Vulgar Latin

(Bork 1998, 81; H. Lüdtke ²2009; Manoliu 2011), and subsequently developed new three-term systems.

Owing to a lack of space, the formal analogical changes in the paradigms will not be discussed. There are various preconditions for the internal changes of the demonstrative system: the general increase of explicit subjects with verbs in the third person in Late Latin texts (Herman 2006), which will not be considered here, the elimination of *IS*, *IDEM* and *HIC* in spontaneous language, the replacement of *HIC* by *ISTE* (Abel 1971, 69–90, 205, in the Latin of the Bible) or by the reinforced syntagmatic forms *ECCE-ISTE* or *ECCU-ISTE* and the semantic change of *IPSE* in its shifting to anaphoric discourse reference (H. Lüdtke ²2009, 138–149).

The ‘non-specific’ use of *HIC*, *HOC* in Classical Latin was replaced by *ISTE* as a specific proximal demonstrative in a first phase, after that *ILLE* was used as a non-specific demonstrative in a second phase. Thus, the use of short forms decreased even in *ID EST* and *AD ID*, which were replaced by *HOC EST* and *AD HOC*, followed by the other forms of this anaphoric pronoun, then leading to the elimination of *IS EA ID* and *HIC HAEC HOC* in proximal language. Only the neuter *HOC* was retained in the argumentative or adversative adverbial *PER/PRO/*POR HOC*, where it was not in opposition to *ISTE* or *ILLE*, and was grammaticalized to an adverb or a conjunction, as in It. *però* and other languages (Hölker 2010), and in *ECCE HOC* > It. *ciò* where *IPSU(M)* alone or *IPSU(M)/IPSO* may be assumed as an alternative basis (Sornicola 2011, 298–301). The other forms of the paradigms of *IS* and *HIC* were replaced by *ILLE* or *IPSE* in different geographical areas. The gradual elimination of pronominal anaphoric *IS* led to the replacement at first by *HIC* – as shown by the Romance adjectival survivals *HOC ANNO* ‘this year’, *HA(C) HORA* ‘this hour’ – and later by *ILLE ILLA ILLUD*. As a parallel, adjectival cataphoric *IS* as in *IS HOMO QUI* ‘that man who’ was likewise substituted by *ILLE* in *ILLE HOMO QUI*. The pronominal form *ILLE* inherited the function of *IS* and resulted in the emergence of the personal pronoun of the third person, i.e. It. *egli, ella*, Sp. *él, ella, ello*, and the adjectival forms originated the definite article, i.e. It. *il/lo, la*, Sp. *el, la, lo*. The next stage was the replacement of *HIC* by *ISTE* in proximal use by the end of the second century; this change is attested by the more frequent use of *ISTE* in the *Vetus Latina* and in the Christian writer Tertullian (ca. 160–220).

A parallel change in distal use was the semantic change of *IPSE* which became a *medial* deictic, i.e. it either neutralized the opposition ‘proximity’/‘distance’ or referred to the second person in opposition to the first *and* the third person, resulting in the following structure:

first person	second person	third person
ISTE ISTA ISTUD	IPSE IPSA IPSUD	ILLE ILLA ILLUD

The difference between the identity pronoun and adjective *IPSE* (‘this is an x’) and the equality pronoun and adjective *IDEM* (‘a and b are the same’) (Romoth 1990, 5) was eliminated and *IPSE* acquired the anaphoric meanings ‘x itself’ – ‘even x’ – ‘only x’ – ‘the x in question’ – ‘the aforementioned x’ (cf. Selig 1992, 153–160; Sornicola 2008;

2011, 287–292). The further semantic evolution of *IPSE* is explained by the distinction of two kinds of anaphora introduced in Imperial Latin. *IPSE*, replacing *IS*, became obligatory in cases of a second mention, for instance in the author of the *Itinerarium Egeriae* or *Aetheriae*, which dates approximately from the end of the fourth century; thus, after introducing “montem Dei”, the ‘mountain of God’ or Sinai, the author refers to it immediately after by “*ipsum montem*” (V, 12) ‘this mountain’. Alternatively, the anaphoric relationship was also established by an abstract noun; the *Itinerarium* offers “*ut perexiremus montes ipsos*” (IV, 5), ‘that we pass through those mountains’, which are simply called “*ipsa parte*”, ‘that part’, in the next line. In this way, the distinction of two types of anaphora was created: a lexical and a semantic one.

The fundamental explanation of how the transition of an anaphoric to a deictic use came about is given by Teyssier (1981) and H. Lüdtke (2009, 139–142): the speaker may use for instance Pt. *esse* ‘that’ as a deictic when his or her interlocutor had mentioned an object before to which he or she had referred to by anaphoric *esse*. Thus, H. Lüdtke distinguishes the anaphora of two different noun phrases by *hic* (or later on *iste*) and *ille*, on the one hand, and the anaphora of one noun phrase by means of the neutral anaphoric *ipse*. Thereupon both employments were transferred to the dialogue.

This is the origin of the restoration of a three-term system in post-Classical Latin, comprising a structure with two stages of intensity, an emphatic and a very emphatic term. Thus, we have to add to *iste ipse ille* the very emphatic extensions by means of *ecce/eccu(m)*. The introduction of *ipse* into the two-term system of *iste* and emphatic *ecce/eccu-iste* vs. *ille* and *ecce/eccu-ille* produced two formal innovations: the creation of the very emphatic form and the analogical change of the neuter *ipsum* to *ipsud*. We have to bear in mind that the type *ecce-* is limited to French and in part to Occitan.

IPsud is attested in Late Latin (↗4.1 Varieties in Italy 1), the emphatic forms in Romance, e.g. in Valencian (↗8 Catalan; ↗24 Language Change and Language Contact), in Corsican, in southern Italian and Ligurian dialects (↗4.1 Varieties in Italy 1), in Tuscan and, in a selection of both emphatic and non-emphatic forms, in Pt. *este esse aquele* and Sp. *este ese aquel* (↗9 European Spanish; ↗11 European Portuguese; ↗0 Introduction).

Then, the long forms *iste* vs. *ille* took the place of *ipse*, losing the feature ‘emphatic’. The former very emphatic overlong demonstratives *ecce-iste* or *eccu-iste* vs. *ecce-ille* or *eccu-ille* became simple emphatic forms. This system did not spread to Romanian (↗1 Romanian), parts of northern Italy (↗3 Italian; ↗4.2 Varieties in Italy 2: Alpine Varieties; ↗5 Ladin), Graubünden in Switzerland and France (↗6 French); accordingly, the two-term system is a preservation of a former development stage there. *ipse* either disappeared or became a honorific personal pronoun as in Rom. *dânsul* ‘he’ or simply a personal pronoun as in It. *esso* ‘he’.

The greatest innovation is the emergence of polyfunctional *ille* as a third person pronoun, which established a new opposition to the former emphatic pronoun *ipse* as

a demonstrative. *ILLE* was also a nominal determinant later to become an article in Romance, in competition with the results of *IPSE* in some parts of Romania. A strong argument in favour of the anaphoric origin of deictic *IPSE* is the emergence of the definite article in Sardinian (↗ Sardinian) and some dialects of Catalan.

2.4 The identity pronoun

After an initial phase of confusion of *IDEM* and *IPSE* the latter prevailed (Romoth 1990, 43–46, 56). Combinations of demonstratives with *IPSE* proliferated, among which *ISTUM IPSUM* is continued in It. *stesso* ‘himself’ and *lo stesso* ‘the same’.

The most widespread form was recreated by the reanalysis of the emphatic accusative of the reflexive pronoun followed by the superlative of *IPSE* as in *SE-MET IPSIMUM* into *SE MET-IPSIMO-*, which is the basis of It. *medesimo*, Fr. *même*, Gal. Pt. *mesmo*, Sp. *misimo*. A similar reanalysis explains *METIPSUM* > Occ. *medeis*, *mezeis* and reinforced **METTIPSUM* > Cat. *mateix*, Occ. *meteis* (Romoth 1990, 53–56).

2.4.1 Spatial deixis

Vulgar Latin *IBI* took also the meaning of *EO*, in the same way as interrogative *UBI* did that of *QUO*, whereas both *UBI* and *UNDE* could express permanence in a place and motion, and conserved only the paradigmatic forms *HIC* ‘here’ and *ILLAC* ‘there’. The difference of ±motion disappeared and was transferred to the motion verbs. But the expression of motion is so infrequent in the Romance Languages that it is difficult to find good equivalents as may be shown by the examples “*hic*” ‘here’, “*huc*” ‘hither’, “*illic*” ‘at that place’ and “*illuc*” ‘thither’ taken from Plautus and their translations into French and Spanish:

Lat. “*nam hic apud nos nihil est aliud quaesti furibus*” (*Aulularia* 83);
 Engl. ‘Because *here* at our place there’s nothing else to be gained for thieves’;
 Fr. ‘Qu’est-ce que les voleurs pourraient y [literally: *ici* chez nous] gagner d’autre’;
 Sp. ‘Pues *aquí* no hay otra cosa de ganancia para los ladrones’.

Lat. “*hinc ego et huc et illuc potero quid agant arbitrarier*” (*Aulularia* 607);
 Engl. ‘From here I’ll be able to observe *in this direction* as well as *that* what they’re doing’;
 Fr. ‘De là, je pourrai épier tout ce qu’on manigance *d’un côté* comme *de l’autre*’;
 Sp. ‘Desde *aquí* podré observar lo que hacen *aquí* y *allí*’.

The increase of periphrastic or syntagmatic expressions in nominal syntax is an important typological change which evolves to become what Coseriu (1988) called the “typological principle of the Romance languages”. This change took place mostly in Vulgar Latin. Both Vulgar Latin and Romance, with the exception of French, have a basic distinction between “non-actual”, “non-relational” or “internal” functions like

gender and number, and “actual”, “relational” or “external” functions like case in the noun or comparison in the adjective. The innovations in which periphrases appear finally establish the typological principle: internal determinations are expressed by means of paradigmatic distinctions as in *HIC* + *-CE* ‘here’, *ILLAC* ‘there’ and external determinations by syntagmatic procedures as in *ECCE/ECCUM*/**ACCE*/**ACCUM* + *HIC*, *AC/AD* + *HIC* and prepositions followed by adjectival demonstratives and nouns, for instance *DE ILLO LOCO* ‘from that place’. The evidence is mostly Romance and normally shows merged forms. The meaning of endophoric *IBI*, *INDE*, *EO* and *EA* integrated the semantics of *ILLIC*, *ILLUC*, *ILLINC* and *ILLAC*; the surviving forms *IBI*, *INDE* and *ILLAC* had both exophoric and endophoric meanings.

2.4.2 Temporal deixis

As long as Latin was a spoken language, the classical terms and popular innovations coexisted, but are documented only occasionally, e.g. in *AD TUNC* ‘at that time’ or *MODO* ‘now’. Most terms can only be reconstructed on Romance evidence, as *HAC HORA* ‘now’, **ACCUM* + *MODO* ‘now’, **(IN)TUNC (CE)* ‘then’, *(AC/AD) TUNC (CE)* ‘then’, *ILLA HORA* ‘then’, *(DE/AD) MANE* ‘tomorrow’, **(HORA) MANEANA* ‘tomorrow’ may show.

2.4.3 Modal deixis

In Late Latin, *SIC* could take the meaning of *TUM* and was combined with *ITA* and *UT* in the pleonasm *SIC...ITA UT* or *ITA SIC*. Since by the same time *QUOT* and *TOT* were substituted by *QUANTI* ‘how many’ and *TANTI* ‘so many’, it is plausible to assume that these forms had disappeared in spoken Latin as well.

3 Romance Languages

This section is dedicated to the Latin-Romance continuity on the one hand, and to the Romance innovations on the other. For obvious reasons of space it is not possible to prove the continuity of morphemes by the discussion of details of phonetic change. It should be sufficient for the actual purpose to establish the persistence or the loss of a formal type. In this sense, Sp. *ayer* will be taken as the result of the transmission of *HERI*, whereas the introduction of an analogical *a-* will be neglected. We will concentrate on the innovations that occurred in Late Latin or early Romance, which can only be reconstructed by using evidence from the Romance Languages. Attention will also be given to some major changes that happened later on.

3.1 Personal pronouns

The difference between tonic and atonic forms in Latin produced accented, or free, and clitic forms, e.g. in It. *io*, *me* vs. *mi*, Rom. *eu*, *mie*, *mine* vs. *îmi*, *mi*, *mă*, Sp. *yo* vs. *me*, etc. The category of case is maintained in the clitic forms contrary to its loss in the noun, with the exception of Romanian, which retained for instance in feminine nouns the distinction of a nominative-accusative (*casă* ‘house’) and a genitive-dative ((*a unei*) *case* ‘(of/to a) house’). The personal pronoun became obligatory as a grammatical subject in French, Romansh, the Ladin of the Dolomites (↗5 Ladin), some northern Italian dialects (↗4.1 Varieties in Italy 1; ↗4.2 Varieties in Italy 2: Alpine Varieties), in the Spanish of the Dominican Republic (↗10.2 Spanish Varieties of Latin America 2: Mexico and Central America), and in some varieties of spoken Portuguese (↗12 Brazilian Portuguese; ↗13 Creoles). The innovative third person, which marks the categories of gender and number, is not intrinsically deictic, but may be used as such in the case of ostension. There is one set of forms as in Sp. *él*, *ella*, *ellos*, *ellas* or two in It. *lui*, *lei*, *loro* and *esso*, *essa*, *essi*, *esse*. All the Romance Languages are familiar with the difference between an inclusive use of ‘we’, which includes the addressee, and an exclusive use, ‘you, plural’, which refers to the addressee or addressees. Catalan created the forms *nosaltres*, *vosaltres* and Spanish *nosotros*, *-as*, *vosotros*, *-as* composed of *nos*, *vos* + *altres* and *nos*, *vos* + *otros*, *-as*, which originally had emphatic meaning by contrasting explicitly the addressee in the first case and the speaker in the second one to another person or persons in the discourse context. The corresponding Italian forms (*noialtri*, *noialtre*; *voialtri*, *voialtre*) are optional.

Even if *vos* as a honorific form of address goes as far back as Imperial Latin, this plural in the function of a singular spread in the particular Romance Languages generally in medieval times, and was conserved in Fr. *vous* as the only polite form and besides other honorifics in It. Rom. *voi*, Cat. *vós*, Gal. *vós*. The type Sp. *vuestra merced* ‘Your Grace’ replaced older *vos* and coalesced in the form *usted*; cf. Gal. *vostede*, Cat. *vostè*. In some varieties of American Spanish, *vos* was maintained in familiar speech and is used in agreement with the singular or plural endings of the second person in the verb (↗10.1 Spanish Varieties of Latin America 1: South America; ↗10.2 Spanish Varieties of Latin America 2: Mexico and Central America). Similarly, the Portuguese of Brazil produced *você*, which started from *vossa mercê* (↗12 Brazilian Portuguese). Another form type stems from the substitution of this (type of) feminine Romance phrase by a third person pronoun followed by a finite verb form in the third person singular in the Italian hispanism *Ella* or *Lei* ‘you’ (↗3 Italian). These pronouns are substitutes of *Vostra Eccellenza* ‘Your Excellency’ or *Vostra Signoria* ‘Your Lordship’; the plural is *Loro*.

Romanian has three forms of address, an informal one, *tu*, and two formal ones with *dumneata* as a middle term and *Dumneavoastră* as a more formal one (↗1 Romanian). A similar three-term distinction is given in the third person where *el*, *ea*, *ei*, *ele* are the general forms, *dânsul* < *de* + *însul*, *dânsă*, *dânşii*, *dânsele* for the category ‘animate’, especially persons, and *dumnealui* (masc. sg.), *dumneaei* (fem. sg.), *dum-*

nealor (masc. and fem. pl.) are used for persons both in their presence or absence. All the Romanian pronouns are declined with the exception of *Dumneavoastră*.

3.2 Possessive adjectives and pronouns

We find the following synchronic types in the Romance Languages: 1. One set of forms is maintained in Italian, Sardinian, Romanian, Romansh, Catalan and Portuguese. 2. The difference between tonic and atonic forms is attested in French, Occitan and Spanish, but the function of stress is different from Latin in these languages. The accented forms appear in nominalizations, in predicative function and after the noun. 3. There are two formal types in adjectival use, the one with (Italian, Romanian, Catalan, Galician, Portuguese) and the other without the definite article (for instance French, Romansh), which may coexist in the same language like general It. *il mio, tuo, nostro, vostro* ‘di + me, te, noi, voi’ in *il mio libro* ‘my book’ and *mio*, etc. in *mio marito* ‘my husband’. The third person possessive is either the result of *suvs* or, if it refers to more than one person, of *ILLORUM* > Fr. *leur*, Cat. *llur* and is used deictically in special cases. The Romance ambiguity of the non-distinction of gender and number in It. *il suo libro*, Sp. *su libro* may be resolved by disambiguating structures like It. *il di lui libro, il loro libro*, Sp. *su libro de él, de ellos, de ellas* ‘his book, their book’.

3.3 Demonstrative adjectives and pronouns

The demonstrative pronouns of the actual Romance Languages still reveal traces of both the two-term and the three-term system in Vulgar Latin usage. The two-term system was preserved in French (↗6 French), Occitan, Romanian (↗1 Romanian), Dalmatian, and most dialects of northern Italy (including Friulian and the Ladin of the Dolomites; ↗5 Ladin; ↗4.1 Varieties in Italy 1; ↗4.2 Varieties in Italy 2: Alpine Varieties) and central Italy (↗3 Italian), with the exception of the following areas where a three-term system was re-established: Tuscan, Iberian Peninsula, large parts of Sardinia and southern Italy, other Italian dialects, Corsica, Valtellina, western Liguria and Piemonte (Bork 1998, 87s.). In §3, I discussed the problem of how the three-term system was reduced to a two-term system in Vulgar Latin, which was to be restored later to a triadic system (↗21 Typology; ↗23 From Old French and Middle French to Contemporary French). A strong argument in favour of the restoration is the actual presence of three-term paradigms in a large southern Romance area. In other cases, the former system was simplified again as in It. *questo – quello* (↗3 Italian), Cat. *aquest – aquell* (↗8 Catalan; ↗24 Language Change and Language Contact) and Occ. *acest/aquest – aquel*.

The typological principle continues to work in Italian and in Brazilian Portuguese as a secondary differentiation (Jungbluth 2005, 170–180), e.g. in *questi qui* ‘this one here’, *questo sedile qua* ‘that seat there’.

3.4 The identity pronoun

The Romance Languages continue different forms. *IPSE* is a conservation in Old Occ. *eis*, *eps*, Old Fr. *es* and was abandoned soon (723 From Old French and Middle French to Contemporary French). Innovative *METIPSE* or *METIPSUM* is still attested in Old Occ. *mezeis*, *meteis*, Sp. and Pt., and is vital in modern Catalan. Most languages continue the superlative **METIPSIMUM* which was used as an emphatic form in Fr. *même*, Old Occ. *medesme*, It. *medesimo*, Gal. Pt. *mesmo*, Sp. *mismo*. This contrasts with already classical *ISTUM IPSUM* > It. *stesso* and **ECCUM* (or *ATQUE*) *ILLUM SIC* > Rom. *același* (or better *ECCE-ILLU* > *acel(a) + și*). When the identity pronouns meant ‘the same’, they were combined with anaphoric demonstratives in the medieval stages of the languages and in modern times with the article. The outcome of an enduring positional vacillation was the general type attested in It. *lo stesso re* ‘the same king’. In emphatic use the languages soon preferred the position of the pronoun **METIPSIMUM* after the noun, cf. Sp. *el rey mismo* ‘the king himself’, or before the noun in case of *propio*, cf. Sp. *el propio rey*. The emphatic meaning ‘even’ is an extension of the type ‘himself, etc.’ as in It. *lo stesso re*, Sp. *el mismo rey* ‘even the king’. The last phase of this development is attested in the change from pronoun to adverb in Pt. *mesmo a hora de jantar* ‘even the time of dinner’ and may be due to French influence (Romoth 1990, 210–214). Rom. *îns(u)* (< *IPSE*) ‘this’ + reflexive pronoun, among other etymologies, is specialized for both emphatic functions; its inflectional categories are gender, number and case, for instance in *eu însumi* ‘I myself’, *zeul însuși* ‘the god himself’. Rom. *singur* is more frequently used in spoken language than *însuși* (Romoth 1990, 228–252).

It is possible to emphasize personal pronouns as well as spatial, temporal and modal deixis by means of identity pronouns, e.g. the expressions Fr. *moi-même* ‘myself’, It. *tu stessa* ‘you yourself (fem.)’, Rom. *el însuși* ‘he himself’, Sp. *aquí mismo* ‘exactly here’, Pt. *hoje mesmo* ‘just today’, Sp. *asimismo* ‘just so, likewise’. In Italian, the identity pronouns are attested with the meanings ‘himself’, ‘the same’ and ‘even’; *medesimo* and *stesso* are used as synonyms, but *medesimo* has become less frequent. Spanish gives preference to *mismo* over *propio*, and both may be placed before or after the noun; the intermediate position is emphatic in the case of the meanings ‘himself’ and ‘even’ (Romoth 1990, 168–195). The use of Pt. *mesmo* and *próprio* is similar to the corresponding Spanish forms with the exception of adverbial *mesmo*, meaning ‘even’ as in Fr. *même* (Romoth 1990, 196–218).

3.4.1 Spatial deixis

The Romance Languages distinguish at least a ‘proximal’ place or space that may coincide with that of the speaker, include it or be near it and a space outside of that of the speaker which is interpreted as ‘distal’. Another structure consists in a parallelism between the three spaces of the personal pronouns and local deixis.

Both structures may coexist in languages like Spanish and Portuguese, where the two-term system can also be found.

Romance evidence shows that a few simple Latin forms survived, other ones were reinforced by means of ECCE or ECCUM, but *ACCE or *ACCUM are also offered as an explanation as well as later adaptations, which will be mentioned in each nomination of an etymon. There are two terms in the following cases: Fr. *ici* < ECCE HIC, *là* < ILLAC; Cat. *aquí* < ECCUM HIC, *allà* < ILLAC; Pt. *cá* < (EC)CU(M) HAC, *lá* < AD ILLAC; Sp. *acá* < ECCUM HAC, *allá* < ILLAC. Italian has two terms for each space, that is to say *qui* < *(EC)CU(M) HIC and *qua* < (EC)CU(M) HAC, *lì* < ILLIC, *là* < ILLAC, which are normally synonyms, but may be opposed as point vs. area or as a more limited space to a larger space (Vanelli/Renzi 1995, 271–274).

This constellation has a three-term counterpart in Pt. *aquí*, *aí*, *ali*, and Sp. *aquí*, *ahí*, *allí*, which are the results of ECCUM HIC, HIC and ILLIC.

Romanian may serve as example of an innovating language. It recreates the terms of the permanence in a place with *aici* ‘here’ < *AD HICCE OR ECCU’-HIC and *acolo* ‘there’ < *ECCUM ILLOC like the other Romance Languages, but also the semantic distinction +motion by means of *încoace* < IN-(E)CCUM-HOC ‘hither’ and *încolo* < IN-ECCUM-ILLOC ‘thither’, without considering paradigmatic expressions for ‘on this side’ and ‘on that side’ it has semantically in common with Portuguese and Spanish. I can only allude incidentally to the Romansh and Franco-Provençal dialects, which create quite complex systems of spatial deixis due to the very special orientation in mountainous regions (74.2 Varieties in Italy 2: Alpine Varieties).

Usually the rich spatial deictic system of Latin was recreated in Romance by syntagmatic means. I only quote the equivalents which are parallel to the paradigmatic forms in Latin and answer the following questions:

	where?	whither?	whence?	which way?
Fr.	où	où, vers où	d’où	par où
Rum.	unde	unde	de unde	pe unde
It.	dove	dove, verso dove	di dove, da dove	per dove
Pt.	onde	aonde	de onde, donde	por onde
Sp.	dónde	adónde	de dónde	por dónde
Fr.	ici	ici, vers ici	d’ici	par ici
	là	là	de là	par là
It.	qui	qui, verso qui	di qui, da qui	per di qui
	qua	qua, verso qua	di qua, da qua	per di qua
	lì	lì, verso lì	di lì, da lì	per di lì
	là	là, verso là	di là	per di là
Rom.	aici	încoace	de aici	pe aici
	acolo	încolo	de acolo	pe acolo
Pt.	aquí	aquí, para aquí	daquí	por aquí
	aí	aí	daí	por aí
	ali	ali, para ali	dali	por ali

	cá	cá, para cá	de cá	por cá
	lá	lá, para lá	de lá	por lá
Sp.	aquí	aquí, hacia aquí	de aquí	por aquí
	ahí	hacia ahí	de ahí	por ahí
	allí	allí	de allí	por allí
	acá	para acá	de acá	por acá
	allá	para allá	de allá	por allá

Current grammars and dictionaries show that the treatment of this domain is inadequate, if it is treated at all (cf. Vanelli/Renzi 1995, 274–277). In Italian, I abstained from quoting literary and obsolete forms. Generally speaking, it is relevant to find out that there are many more syntagmatic combinations of this type as well as syntagmatic determinations following the type preposition + demonstrative + noun, cf. Sp. *en este lugar* ‘in this place’.

It is striking that all the Romance Languages express -motion (as opposed to +motion) or being in a place by means of a paradigmatic form which is also used for the local origin. The other motions require prepositions (cf. §2.4.1).

3.4.2 Temporal deixis

The basic distinction is the inclusion of the time of utterance in the immediate situation, when a speaker says ‘now’, compared to the past or the future, but very few Latin forms are conserved. The correlative relationships (cf. §1.4.2) were lost everywhere and the reference to the moment of the utterance, ‘now’, and the moment before or after, ‘then’, was innovated on the basis of heterogeneous elements. If there is a common denominator, that implies the lexemes occasionally meaning ‘time’ and ‘hour’:

Old Fr. *or* < HA(c) HORA, substituted by *maintenant*, Fr. *alors* < AD ILLAM HORAM, It. *ora* < HORA and its synonym *adesso* < AD IPSUM, scil. TEMPUS, *allora* < AD ILLAM HORAM, Rom. *acum(a)* < *ACCUM MODO, *atunci/atuncea* < AC/AD TUNC (CE),
 Cat. *ara* < AD HORAM/HAC HORA, *aleshores*,
 Pt. *agora* < HAC HORA, *então* < *INTUNC,
 Sp. *ahora* < HAC HORA, *entonces* < *INTUNCE.

The temporal deictic used for the moment before or after the moment of utterance is applied as endophoric to the discourse context.

The adverb for the day in which the utterance occurs continues HODIE, with the exception of Rom. *astăzi* < *astă + zi* < ISTA DIE, in Fr. (*aujourd’hui*), It. *oggi*, Cat. *avui*, Pt. *hoje*, Sp. *hoy*; HERI is maintained in Fr. *hier*, It. *ieri*, Rom. *ieri*, Cat. *ahir*, Sp. *ayer*, and recreated in Pt. *ontem* < AD NOCTE(M); CRAS was substituted by MANE ‘in the morning’ in Rom. *mâine*, or prepositional phrases in It. *domani*, Cat. *demà* < DE MANE OR Pt. *amanhã*, Sp. *mañana* < *(HORA) MANEANA, and implies a semantic change. The days before yesterday or after tomorrow are expressed by innovations in the particular

languages, e.g. in Fr. *avant-hier*, It. *l'altro ieri/ier(i) l'altro* 'the day before yesterday' and *après-demain, dopodomani/doman(i) l'altro* 'the day after tomorrow'. When the perspective is shifted from 'today' to another day in a discourse context, each language has a different solution, cf. Fr. *ce-jour-là, le lendemain*, It. *quel giorno, la vigilia/il giorno prima, il giorno dopo*.

3.4.3 Modal deixis

The basic terms are derived from SIC. Sometimes the forms are explained as analogical forms, e.g. in Pt. *assim*, Gal. Sp. *así* or *as* reinforced by other elements in Cat. *així* < *AC'SIC OR ECCUM-SIC, Rom. *aşa* < A + SIC OR ECCUM-SIC + -a, It. *così* < (EC)CUM SIC. TALIS is well conserved in Fr. *tel*, It. Log. *tale*, Rom. *atare* < ECCU(M)-TALIS, Occ. Cat. Gal. Pt. Sp. *tal*, so is TANTUS in It. Gal. Pt. Sp. *tanto*, Log. *tantu*, Rom. *atât* < ECCUM-TANTUM, Fr. Occ. Cat. *tant*, and TAM OR TANTU in Cat. Gal. Sp. *tan*, Pt. *tão*.

In Romanian *astfel* < *ăst* (*ăsta* < *ISTUS) + *fel* < Hungarian *féle* and *asemenea* < ASSIMILIS are more common than *atare*. These complex expressions show that the adverbs which have the immediate 'so' as a reference are generally adverbial phrases. It is an exception to find Pt. *outrossim* as an equivalent for 'likewise' or Fr. *autrement* and It. *altrimenti* for 'otherwise'; usually the phrases are formed by means of nouns meaning 'sort, kind, way', that is to say by Fr. *manière, façon*, It. *modo*, Rom. *fel, Pt. modo, maneira*, Sp. *modo, manera*, e.g. Fr. *de la même façon*, It. *allo stesso modo*, Rom. *la fel* (besides *tot așa*), Pt. *da mesma maneira*, Sp. *del mismo modo*, and Rom. *altfel* < *alt* < ALT(E)RUM + *fel*, Pt. *de modo diferente, de outra forma*, Sp. *de otro modo, de otra manera*. Here the typological principle applies that relational functions are expressed by syntagmatic expressions.

4 References

- Abel, Fritz (1971), *L'adjectif démonstratif dans la langue de la Bible latine*, Tübingen, Niemeyer.
- Aetheria (1999), *Pellegrinaggio in Terra Santa. A cura di Nicoletta Natalucci*, Bologna, Edizioni Dehoniane.
- Benveniste, Émile (1966), *La nature des pronoms*, in: Émile Benveniste, *Problèmes de linguistique générale*, Paris, Gallimard, 251–257.
- Bork, Hans Dieter (1998), *Das Schicksal der lateinischen Dreiersysteme im Romanischen*, in: Udo L. Figge/Franz-Josef Klein/Annette Martinez Moreno (edd.), *Grammatische Strukturen und grammatischer Wandel im Französischen*, Bonn, Romanistischer Verlag, 81–102.
- Bühler, Karl (1934), *Sprachtheorie. Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache*, Jena, Fischer (English translation, 2011, *Theory of language: the representational function of language*, translated by Donald Fraser Goodwin, in collaboration with Achim Eschbach, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins).
- Coseriu, Eugenio (1955–1956), *Determinación y entorno: dos problemas de una lingüística del hablar*, *Romanistisches Jahrbuch* 7, 29–54.

- Coseriu, Eugenio (1988), *Der romanische Sprachtypus. Versuch einer neuen Typologisierung der romanischen Sprachen*, in: Jörn Albrecht (ed.), *Energiea und Ergo*, vol. 1: *Schriften von Eugenio Coseriu (1965–1987)*, Tübingen, Narr, 207–224.
- Coseriu, Eugenio (2001), *Détermination et entours*, in: Eugenio Coseriu, *L'homme et son langage*, Louvain/Paris, Peeters, 31–67.
- Halliday, Michael A. K./Hasan, Ruqaiya (1976), *Cohesion in English*, London/New York, Longmans.
- Herman, József (2006), *On the grammatical subject in Late Latin*, in: József Herman, *Du latin aux langues romanes*, vol. 2, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 55–64.
- Hölker, Klaus (2010), *Zu den Resultaten von PER HOC in den romanischen Sprachen*, in: Christiane Maaß/Angela Schrott (edd.), *Wenn Deiktika nicht zeigen: zeigende und nichtzeigende Funktionen deiktischer Formen in den romanischen Sprachen*, Münster, LIT, 161–186.
- Jungbluth, Konstanze (2005), *Pragmatik der Demonstrativpronomina in den iberoromanischen Sprachen*, Tübingen, Niemeyer.
- Lausberg, Heinrich (²1972, ¹1969), *Romanische Sprachwissenschaft. III. Formenlehre/Zweiter Teil*, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter.
- Lüdtkke, Helmut (²2009, ¹2005), *Der Ursprung der romanischen Sprachen. Eine Geschichte der sprachlichen Kommunikation*, Kiel, Westensee.
- Lüdtkke, Jens (2011), *Los entornos en la lengua española en América*, in: María Eugenia Vázquez Laslop/Klaus Zimmermann/Francisco Segovia (edd.), *De la lengua por sólo la extrañeza. Estudios de lexicología, norma lingüística, historia y literatura en homenaje a Luis Fernando Lara*, vol. 2, México, El Colegio de México, 865–887.
- Manoliu Manea, Maria (2011), *Pragmatic and discourse changes*, in: Martin Maiden/John Charles Smith/Adam Ledgeway (edd.), *The Cambridge History of the Romance Languages*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 472–531.
- Meillet, Antoine (1928), *Esquisse d'une histoire de la langue latine*, Paris, Hachette.
- OLD – (²2012), *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, 2 vol., Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Plaute (1932), *Amphitryon – Asinaria – Aulularia*, texte établi et traduit par Alfred Ernout, Paris, Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres".
- Plauto (2002), *Anfitrión, Aulularia, Los cautivos*, introducción, traducción y notas de José Antonio Enríquez González, Madrid, Alianza.
- Plautus (2011), *Amphitryon · The Comedy of Asses · The Pot of Gold · The Two Bacchises · The Captives*, ed. and translated by Wolfgang de Melo, Cambridge, Mass./London, Harvard University Press.
- Romoth, Susanne (1990), *Die Identitätspronomina in der Romania*, Genève, Droz.
- Selig, Maria (1992), *Die Entwicklung der Nominaldeterminanten im Spätlatein*, Tübingen, Narr.
- Sornicola, Rosanna (2008), *Sul problema dei resti di IPSE nella Romània*, in: Romano Lazzeroni et al. (edd.), *Diachronica et Synchronica. Studi in onore di Anna Giacalone Ramat*, Pisa, Edizioni ETS, 537–562.
- Sornicola, Rosanna (2011), *Per la storia dei dimostrativi romanzi: i tipi neutri [tso], [so], [ço], [tso] e la diacronia dei dimostrativi latini*, Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 127:2, 220–314.
- Teyssier, Paul (1981), *Le système des déictiques spatiaux portugais au XIV^e, XV^e et XVI^e siècles*, Cahiers de linguistique hispanique médiévale 6, 5–39.
- Väänänen, Veikko (1967), *Introduction au latin vulgaire*, Paris, Klincksieck.
- Vanelli, Laura/ Renzi, Lorenzo (1995), *La deissi*, in: Lorenzo Renzi/Giampaolo Salvi/Anna Cardinaletti (edd.), *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione*, vol. 3, Milano, il Mulino, 261–376, 550–559.
- Veldre-Gerner, Georgia (2007), *Demonstrativa im Text. Eine vergleichende Untersuchung zum Französischen und Italienischen*, Tübingen, Niemeyer.
- Wüest, Jakob (1994), *La construction du système des démonstratifs en protoroman*, in: Jacqueline Cerquiglini-Toulet/Oliver Collet (edd.), *Mélanges de philologie et de littérature médiévales offerts à Michel Burger*, Genève, Droz, 41–49.