

ITALIC *e/iste*, HISPANO-CELTIC *išTe*

Despite numerous attempts to provide a satisfactory etymology for Lat. *iste* (and therefore also for its Italic cognates), no commonly accepted account has emerged. In this paper the previous scholarship is reviewed and new evidence from Celtic is considered. It is proposed that Lat. *iste* and cognates were formed from the fusion of the masc. nom. sg. form of the originally deictic pronominal stem **ej-* and the enclitic connective **-te*. At a later date the form was reanalysed as based upon a stem **e/ist-*.

§ 1. Over many years numerous scholars engaged in Latin and Indo-European lexicography have attempted to provide a convincing etymology for Lat. *iste* and its Italic cognates¹. However, despite many attempts, no consensus has emerged, and the matter presently remains in doubt. The previous attempts may be classified into four main groups:

- (a): Brugmann 1904, p. 81 § 31, Thurneysen 1921, p. 198, Otrębski 1966, p. 22, and Leumann 1977, p. 470 § 373 (3), understand *iste* to be formed from the pronoun *is* plus a particle *-te*. Thurneysen further identifies *iste* as a deictic adverb in origin.
- (β): Muller 1924, p. 59², and Ernout/Meillet 1959, p. 324, under-

¹ The following forms are attested: Oscan fem. acc. sg. ESTAM (von Planta 1897, no. 176; see also Kharsekin 1958, pp. 267-268); Umbrian masc. acc. sg. ESTU (IIb24), neut. acc. sg. ESTE (Ia1), *este* (VIa1, 56, VIb62, 63), neut. acc. pl. ESTU (IIa2, IIb23), *esto* (VIa15 [2x]); it remains unclear whether the form ESTAC (with enclitic deictic -C) in a fragmentary inscription from Assisi (discussed by Whatmough 1939, pp. 89-93, and Poccetti 1979, no. 7) is neut. nom.-acc. pl. or fem. nom. or acc. sg.; South Picene (cited after Marinetti 1985) masc. acc. pl. ESTUF (TE.5), ESTUFK (AP.2), and fem. gen. sg. or nom. pl. ESTAS (AP.3).

² Brugmann 1904, p. 80 § 31, and Stang 1966, p. 232, doubt whether such a conflated formation ever existed.

stand *iste* to be formed from a particle **e/is* plus the demonstrative **to-*.

- (γ): Kuiper 1938, esp. pp. 9-13, understands *iste* to be formed from a deictic particle **e* plus a demonstrative stem **sto-*, formed from a conflation of **so-* and **to-*, for which he cites OPr. *stas* as evidence for the existence of such a formation².
- (δ): Walde/Hofmann 1965, I, pp. 721-722, understands *iste* to be a pleonastic pronoun formed from the pronoun *is* plus the demonstrative **to-*.

§ 2. Some concerns immediately arise about proposals (β), (γ) and (δ):

- Re (β): If *iste* were formed from a particle *e/is* plus the demonstrative **to-*, one would still expect the nom. sg. paradigm to be **isse*, **issa*, *istud* rather than the attested *iste*, *ista*, *istud*. To maintain the viability of this proposal one must assume a levelling of the masc. and fem. nom. sg. **so-* forms after **to-*. However, to judge by forms such as masc. acc. sg. *sum*, acc. pl. *sōs* and fem. acc. sg. *sam* in Old Latin (Leumann 1977, p. 470 § 373 [1]), the levelling of the demonstrative stem went in the other direction.
- Re (γ): If *iste* contained both **so-* and **to-*, one would expect the combination to yield **soto-*; cf. the formation of Gk. οὔτος < **só-u-to-s* (with deictic particle **-u*), in which both stem vowels are retained.
- Re (δ): If *iste* were a pleonastic pronoun formed from the stems **ej-* and **to-*, one would expect only the bare stem of the initial element to be present, and the stem **so-* to be found in the masc. and fem. nom. sg.; cf. Skt. masc. nom. sg. *ēśáh* < **ej-só-s*, acc. sg. *ētám* < **ej-tó-m*, fem. nom. sg. *ēśā* < **ej-sā*³.

In thus appears that there are serious objections to proposals (β), (γ) and (δ). Proposal (a), too, presents a difficulty, which will be discussed *infra*.

³ Pedersen 1905, p. 11 (= 1982, p. 15), in fact, suggests that *iste* originally may have been properly so formed, with *-s-* inserted analogically after *is* at a later date. However, one would still expect to find the stem **so-* in the masc. and fem. nom. sg., at least.

§ 3. There is now some extra-Italic evidence which may be brought to bear upon the etymological investigation of *iste*. This comes from the Hispano-Celtic inscription of Botorrita, which has the form *isTe* three times in two clauses:

(ε): *śaum TeCameTinaś TaTus śomei eniTousei isTe anCioś isTe eśanCioś* (Botorrita A8-9) «let him give a tithe of these for the offering, whether it be small or large».

(ζ): *iom ToCoiToś-Cue śaŋniCio-Cue aiuisaś ComPalCoŋeś aleiTeś isTe iŋeś ŋusimus aPulu uPoCum* (Botorrita A10-11 «and the leader of the senates of **ToCoiTom* and **śaŋniCioś*, the *aleiTeś*, the *iŋeś*, (i.e.) Ablū Ubocum (and the other members of the senates), we proclaim (the above agreement) for ever»⁴.

I make the initial assumption, on the grounds of morphology and grammatical function, that the Italic and Celtic forms are exact cognates. Most commentators on the Botorrita inscription, however, on the basis of the context in (ε), have elected to divorce *isTe* from the Italic forms and to treat it as a disjunctive particle, still without an etymology⁵. But such an analysis does not account for the function of *isTe* in (ζ), and therefore can not be correct. Although the interpretation of (ζ) remains incomplete, it appears likely that *isTe* functions there as a deictic marker. It is preferable, then, to account for the apparent disjunctive value of *isTe* ... *isTe* in (ε) by calling attention to the fact that it is used in tandem with antonyms⁶. Thus, *isTe* here, too, may be analysed as having a deictic function; the contrastive sense is due solely to its use with antonyms.

§ 4. We may now attempt to establish the original grammatical status of Lat. *iste* and its cognates more precisely. In the Botorrita inscription, *isTe* seems to behave as a particle, which would make it indeclinable. However, the preservation of the Lat. fem. acc. pl. form *eāste* from an ancient augural formula in Varro, *Ling.* VII 8 (discussed by

⁴ The translations of the passages from the Botorrita inscription will not be defended here. See Eska 1988, pp. 20-21, 22-23, and *passim*, for a detailed presentation. The form *ComPalCoŋeś* could be translated literally as «leader of the colloquium»; see Hamp's forthcoming note in *ZCPH*.

⁵ Cf. Tovar 1973, p. 385, Lejeune 1973, p. 646, de Hoz/Michelena 1974, p. 79, Fleuriot 1975, p. 436, Schmidt 1976, p. 385, Gil 1977, p. 170, Beltrán/Tovar 1982, p. 73, de Hoz 1987, p. 86.

⁶ Cf. the constructions cited by Brugmann 1904, pp. 130-131 § 53.

Norden 1939, pp. 46-51), proves that the form did indeed inflect, just as one finds early forms of Lat. *ipse* in which the initial element is inflected: cf. masc. acc. sg. *eumpse*, abl. sg. *eōpse*, fem. nom. sg. *eapse*, nom. pl. *eaepse* (Leumann 1977, 471 § 373 [4])⁷. We therefore have no choice but to identify the initial element of *iste* as the anaphoric pronoun⁸ of Classical Latin⁹, and *iste* as a deictic adjective/pronoun in origin.

The element *-te* I would then propose is to be identified as the enclitic connective **-te* (as in Gk. *αὐτε*, Lat. *aut*, Osc. *avt*, *auti*, *aut*, Umb. *ute*, *ote* < **h₂ew-te*¹⁰), which has been discussed by Dunkel 1982/83, pp. 184-186, and *passim*. Lat. *iste* ← **éi-s* + **-te*, then, is parallel in formation to *quisque* ← **k^wéi-s* + **-k^we*. Perhaps this new, strengthened, formation arose after *is* lost its original deictic force and became anaphoric in function; *iste* then could have assumed its deictic rôle, as exemplified in Terence, *Eun.* 823-824:

THAIS:	quis fuit igitur?	
PYTH.:		iste Chaerea.
THAIS:	qui Chaerea?	
PYTH.:		iste ephebus frater Phaedriae.

It is clear from examples such as those in Terence and the Botorrita inscription that the close relationship of Lat. *iste* with the second person can not have been original (so Hofmann/Szantyr 1965, p. 183 § 105 [b])¹¹. Rather, the original function was one of distinctive specification. In view of this assessment of the original function of *e/iste*, it now

⁷ This does not contradict the Celtic facts; since the grammatical contexts in which *isTe* occurs are both masc. nom. sg., they are not fully diagnostic of its precise grammatical status. However, as I intend to discuss elsewhere, other considerations suggest that *isTe* may have been fossilised as a particle.

⁸ It seems originally to have been deictic in function (Hofmann/Szantyr 1965, p. 185 § 105 [d]).

⁹ The often discussed question of whether Lat. *iste* or Umb. *este* (and the other non-Latin Italic forms) preserves the original vocalism of the form can now be resolved. The answer is: Neither. Hamp 1975/1976, pp. 59-69, has demonstrated that the Indo-European vocalism of the masc. nom. sg. anaphoric pronoun was **ei*. Lat. *i-* and Umb. *e-* represent individual levellings of the paradigm, on which see Hamp 1982, p. 98, and 1986, p. 399, respectively. Obviously, the paradigm was also levelled in Continental Celtic.

¹⁰ Osc. *auti* must represent a remodelling of an earlier **aute*, probably after the cognate of Lat. and Pael. *et*, Umb. *et*, *et* < **eti* (cf. Gk. *ἐτι*, Skt. *áti*). Umb. *ute*, *ote* may continue either original **aute* or the remodelled **auti*.

¹¹ Perhaps the second element of *iste* became identified with that of the strengthened 2. nom. sg. pronoun *tūte*, of obscure origin (Leumann 1977, p. 461 § 367 [1], wonders whether *tūte* might represent a reduction of **tū-tū*).

seems to me that all of the examples of *este* in the Iguvine Tables are susceptible to interpretation as deictic markers, rather than as simple demonstratives (pace von Planta 1897, p. 423, § 339, and Poultney 1959, p. 110 § 109 [d]). Thus, for example, we may propose the following translations for consideration: ESTE PERSKLUM AVES ANZERIATES ENETU (Ia1) «Commence *this particular* ritual by observing the birds», PUNE SESTE, URFETA MANUVE HABETU. ESTU IUKU HABETU: IUPATER SAÇE, TEFE ESTU VITLU VUFURU SESTU (IIb22-24) «When you dedicate (it), have an URFETA in (your) hands. Use *these very* words: 'Jupiter Saçius, to thee I dedicate *this particular* votive bull-calf», *surur, purdouitu proseseto naratu; prosesetir mefa spefa ficla arsueitu, aruio fetu, este esono heri uinu heri poni fetu* (VIa56-57) «In the same manner, let him make the presentation (and) let him pronounce over the cut off (parts); let him add to the cut off (parts) a *mefa spefa* cake (and) a *ficla* cake¹², (and) let him offer grain. Let him carry out *this particular* sacrifice either with wine or with *poni*», etc.¹³

§ 5. It seems, then, that we can now verify that proposal (a) *supra* is correct in principle. That the masc. nom. sg. form of the initial element was fossilised when *e/iste* was reanalysed as based upon a stem *e/ist-*¹⁴ is not altogether expected, but perhaps could have been due to its status as the basic member of the paradigm.

In Latin, the new stem *ist-* adopted the regular Latin pronominal flexion, while the basic form *iste* was retained as the masc. nom. sg. form. In the other Italic dialects, the new stem *est-*, as far as can be determined from its exiguous remains, seems to have adopted *o/ā*-stem flexion, while the basic form *este* was retained (in Umbrian, at least) as the neut. nom.-acc. sg. (and perhaps also the unattested masc. nom. sg.) form¹⁵.

JOSEPH F. ESKA

¹² These sacrificial cakes have recently been discussed by Vine 1986, pp. 111-127.

¹³ The single Oscan example is not decisive in this respect: VINUXS VENELIIS PERACIS ESTAM TETET VENILEI VINICIU «Vinucus Venelius Peracius(?) gave *this* (jar) to Venilus Vinicius». The South Picene inscriptions are not sufficiently understood to be helpful.

¹⁴ A similar reanalysis also occurred in the Continental Celtic dialects, and resulted in the demonstrative forms *Hisp.-Celt. šTarh* (fem. acc. sg.) and *šTena* (neut. acc. pl.), *Lep. išos* (masc. nom. sg.) and *Gaul. isoc* (adv.) and *ison* (masc./neut. acc. sg.). I intend to discuss these forms in a future paper.

¹⁵ I am not sure that von Planta 1897, p. 212 § 288 (2 [g]), Buck 1928, p. 143 § 198 (4), and Poultney 1959, p. 110 § 109 (d), are correct to assume that Umb. neut.

REFERENCES

- Beltrán, Antonio, y Antonio Tovar. 1982. *Contrebia Belaisca (Botorrita, Zaragoza) I. El bronce con alfabeto «ibérico» de Botorrita*. Zaragoza, Universidad de Zaragoza.
- Brugmann, Karl. 1904. *Die Demonstrativpronomina der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Leipzig, B.G. Teubner.
- Buck, Carl D. 1928. *A Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian*. Boston, Ginn & Co.
- Dunkel, George. 1982/83. «IE conjunctions: pleonasm, ablaut, suppletion». *KZ* 96, pp. 178-199.
- Ernout, A., et A. Meillet. 1959. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine. Histoire des mots*. Paris, C. Klincksieck.
- Eska, Joseph F. 1988. *Towards an interpretation of the Hispano-Celtic inscription of Botorrita*. Unpublished University of Toronto dissertation.
- Fleuriot, Léon. 1975. «La grande inscription celtibère de Botorrita». *EC* 14, pp. 405-442.
- Gil, Juan. 1977. «Notas a los bronce de Botorrita y de Luzaga». *Habis* 8, pp. 161-174.
- Hamp, Eric P. 1975/1976. «Miscellanea Celtica III. The British Interrogative Pronominals». *SCelt* 10/11, pp. 59-69.
- 1982. «The Anaphora *ei in Latin». *AJPh* 103, pp. 98-99.
- 1986. «The Indo-European Anaphora *ei in Umbrian». *AJPh* 107, pp. 398-400.
- Forthcoming. «Celtiberian ComPalCes». *ZCPH*.
- Hofmann, J. B., und Anton Szantyr. 1965. *Lateinische Grammatik, zweiter Band, Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*. München, C. H. Beck.
- de Hoz, Javier. 1987. «La epigrafía celtibérica». In *Reunión sobre epigrafía hispánica de época romano-republicana*, ed. Guillermo Fatás, pp. 43-102. Zaragoza, CSIC.
- de Hoz, Javier, y Luis Michelena. 1974. *La inscripción celtibérica de Botorrita*. Salamanca, Universidad de Salamanca.
- Kharsekin, A. I. 1958. «Etruscan and Oscan inscriptions in the Hermitage Museum of Leningrad». *SE* 26, pp. 267-272.
- Kuiper, F. B. J. 1938. *Zur Herkunft von lat. 'iste'*. Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandsche Akademie van Wetenschappen, Nieuwe Reeks, Deel 1, Afdeling Letterkunde, no. 9. Amsterdam, Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij.
- Lejeune, Michel. 1973. «La grande inscription celtibère de Botorrita (Saragosse)». *CRAI*, pp. 622-647.
- Leumann, Manu. 1977. *Lateinische Grammatik, erster Band, Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*, Neuausgabe. München, C. H. Beck.
- Marinetti, Anna. 1985. *Le iscrizioni sudpicene I. Testi*. Firenze, Leo S. Olschki.

acc. sg. *este* comes from a form **estid*, modelled after the inherited pronominal flexion. It may be preferable to take the form at face value, and assume that it continues the basic form *este*, like masc. nom. sg. *iste* in Latin. The fact that some Latin forms of *iste* are found with *o/ā*-stem flexion (e.g., masc. gen. sg. *istī* [Plautus, *Truc.* 930], masc./neut. dat. sg. *istō* [Apuleius, *Met.* V 31, VI 17, VII 26] and fem. dat. sg. *istae* [Plautus, *Truc.* 790]), which would probably result in identical masc. and neut. nom. sg. forms in the case of *iste*, may speak in behalf of such a suggestion. Cf. the remarks of Thurneysen 1921, pp. 198-199, speaking of Lat. *hic*, Osc. EKÍK and Pael. *ecic* as well as *iste* and *este*: «Doch blieb die alte Form als Nominativ Sg. bestehen, im Lateinischen als maskuliner. Im Oskisch-Umbrischen sind sie als neutrale Akkusativ (und damit auch als Nominativ) bezeugt. Ob aber der maskuline Nominativ dort verschieden gebildet oder vom Neutrum ungeschieden war, dafür fehlen einstweilen Belege.»

- Muller, F. 1924. «Zur Geschichte des Artikels und zur Wortfolge besonders in den italienischen Sprachen». *IF* 42, pp. 1-59.
- Norden, Eduard. 1939. *Aus altrömischen Priesterbüchern*. Lund, C. W. K. Gleerup.
- Otrębski, Jan. 1966. «Die lateinischen Demonstrativpronomina». *Die Sprache* 12, pp. 16-25.
- Pedersen, Holger. 1905. *Les pronoms démonstratifs de l'ancien arménien*. Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskabs Skrifter, Sjette Række, Historisk og Filosofisk, Afdeling 6, no. 3. København, Bianco Lunos Bogtrykkeri.
- 1982. *Kleine Schriften zum Armenischen*, hrsg. Rüdiger Schmitt. Hildesheim, Georg Olms.
- von Planta, Robert. 1987. *Grammatik der oskisch-umbrischen Dialekte*, zweiter Band. Strassburg, Karl J. Trübner.
- Poccetti, Paolo. 1979. *Nuovi documenti italici*. Pisa, Giardini.
- Poultney, James W. 1959. *The Bronze Tables of Iguvium*. Baltimore, American Philological Association.
- Schmidt, Karl Horst. 1976. «Zur keltiberischen Inschrift von Botorrita», *BBCS* 26, pp. 375-394.
- Stang, Chr. S. 1966. *Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen*. Oslo, Universitetsforlaget.
- Thurneysen, Rudolf. 1921. «Alte Probleme». *IF* 39, pp. 189-202.
- Tovar, Antonio. 1973. «Las inscripciones de Botorrita y de Peñalba de Villastar y los límites orientales de los celtiberos». *Hispania Antiqua* 3, pp. 367-405.
- Vine, Brent. 1986. «An Umbrian-Latin Correspondence». *HSPH* 90, pp. 111-127.
- Walde, Alois, und J. B. Hofmann. 1965. *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, zwei Bände. Heidelberg, Carl Winter.
- Whatmough, Joshua. 1939. «A New Umbrian Inscription of Assisi». *HSPH* 50, pp. 89-93.