

**Oxford University Working Papers
in Linguistics, Philology & Phonetics**

Volume 7

May 2002

Edited by

Ina J. Hartmann

Andreas Willi

Notes on some Sabellic demonstratives

J. H. W. Penney

1. The Latin anaphoric pronoun *is, ea, id* shows an alternation between a zero-grade stem *i-*, seen in nom. sg. m. *is*, nom.-acc. sg. n. *id*, and a full-grade thematic stem in **eyo-* (f. **eyā-*), seen in acc. sg. m. *eum*, abl. sg. m. and n. *eō*, nom. sg. f. *ea*, acc. sg. f. *eam*, abl. sg. f. *eā*, etc.); the gen. sg. form for all genders is *eius*, which is widely believed to continue a redetermined form of **esyō*, with a simple stem **e-*, on the strength of a comparison with Skt. *áśya* (gen. sg. m. and n.).¹

The Sabellic pronoun that corresponds to this both in form and in function shows a similar alternation between **i-* and **eyo-* in the forms of the nominative and accusative, where the pattern is clearly comparable to that of Latin. Elsewhere the Sabellic pronoun is built on a stem **eiso-* (f. **eisā-*) that is not familiar from Latin; it has been variously explained, most plausibly perhaps as arising by reanalysis of an inherited gen. pl. m. and n. **ei-sōm* (cf. Skt. *eṣām*) with pronominal ending **-sōm* as **eiso-* + ending **-ōm*, but whatever its origin it is characteristic of all cases other than the nominative and accusative. Not all case-forms occur in the texts, but the following may be cited for illustration, supplemented by one or two forms of ‘the same’ in Umbrian, formed from this anaphoric pronoun with a suffixed particle *-ont*.² (On U. **esmik**, *esmei*, which some would include within this paradigm, see §11.)

	Oscan			Umbrian		
	m.	f.	n.	m.	f.	n.
sg. nom.	<i>izic</i>	íúk	ídík	ere(k)		eřek
acc.	<i>ionc</i>	íak	ídík		<i>eam</i>	eřek
gen.	eíseís			<i>erer</i>	<i>erar</i>	
abl.	eísúd	eísak		eru-ku	erak	
loc.	eíseí	e]ísaí				

¹ See Leumann (1977: 466-7), Meiser (1998: 159-60).

² For the paradigms see Buck (1928: 141); for a full list of attestations see Untermann (2000: 229-30, 355-60). For an understanding of the Umbrian forms, it may be helpful to know that Umbrian shows rhotacism of intervocalic *s* and, in its later forms, final *-s*, that the diphthong **ei* is monophthongized to a long vowel written <e>, and that original short **i* gave a vowel that may be written either <i> or <e>.

	Oscan				Umbrian		
pl.	m.	f.	n.	m.	f.	n.	
nom.	<i>iusc</i>			<i>eur-ont</i>			
acc.			<i>ioc</i>		eaf	<i>eo</i>	
gen.	eisunk	<i>eizazunc</i>		eru			
dat.-abl.	<i>eizois</i>	<i>eiza(i)sc</i>			ererunt	<i>erir-ont</i>	

2. This division of the paradigm, between nominative and accusative forms on the one hand and a sigmatic extended stem for the other cases, is also found with the Oscan pronoun *eko-/ekso-* ‘this’, equivalent in function to Latin *hic*:³

sg.				pl.			
	m.	f.	n.	m.	f.	n.	
nom.		ek(úk)			ekas		
acc.	ekúk	ekak	ekík		ekass		
abl.	eksuk	<i>exac</i>			<i>exaisc-en</i>		
loc.	<i>exeic</i>						

In addition there is an adverb **ekss**, *ex* meaning ‘thus’, which must somehow be formed on the sigmatic stem although the details are obscure.

Comparable forms may be cited from Paelignian and Marrucinian: nom. sg. f. *ecuc* (Ve. 213/Pg 9); acc. sg. f. *ecan* (Po. 206/MV 3); nom.-acc. sg. n. *ecic* (Ve. 213/Pg 9); but gen. pl. m. *esuc* (Ve. 218/MV 1). One may also note the Paelignian adverb *ecuf* ‘here’ (Ve. 214/Pg 10), formed from the non-sigmatic stem.

3. The origin of this paradigm is far from clear: both **e-* and **-k-* are well-known deictic elements so that a ready etymology might thus be found for the basic stem **eko-*, but there is no agreement as to whether the sigmatic forms arise from the addition of a pronoun **so-* or through a process of reanalysis of the genitive plural similar to that posited by some for the anaphoric pronoun (see above), or quite simply by analogy with the alternation in the forms of this pronoun. Whatever the explanation, the parallel between the two pronominal paradigms is striking and can hardly be accidental.

4. In Umbrian there is a pronominal stem *es(s)o-* ‘this’. Forms attested in the Iguvine Tables are: gen. pl. n. *esom-e*; abl. sg. m./n. **esu-ku**, *es(s)u*; abl. sg. f.

³ For the attested forms see Untermann (2000: 216-17).

esa; abl. pl. n. *esis-co*, *esir*. There is also an adverbial form **esu(k)**, *eso(c)* ‘thus, as follows’ from the same stem.

Forms of this pronoun occur in prayers accompanying sacrificial offerings (in twenty instances), e.g. TI VIa 25 *di grabouie tio esu bue peracrei pihacclu ...* ‘Jupiter Grabovius, (I invoke) you with this *p.* ox as an expiatory offering ...’ In this context, with reference to the animal or object being presented, Latin would use forms of *hic*, and a similar value ‘this’ may plausibly be assigned to the Umbrian pronoun. Elsewhere the pronoun is used in reference to the ceremonies actually being performed (TI Ib 8, IV 29-30, VIb 47), and it occurs twice in a phrase spoken during the lustration of the *poplo-* (the citizen body *qua* army) requiring specified foreigners to depart *ehesu poplu/ehe esu poplu* ‘from this *poplo-*’. In all these cases the reference is to something in the immediate context, as has been universally recognized.

The adverb **esu(k)** is used in the Tables in the majority of instances to introduce the actual words to be spoken during the various rituals, and twice to present the text of resolutions passed by the brotherhood of priests (Va 1, 14); it has a similar function in VIa 8, where the augural *templum*, we are told, *eso tuderato est* ‘is bounded as follows’, and a list of the boundaries is duly given. There are two instances (VIa 20, VIIb 3) of a form *iso*, *issoc* being used with a following clause introduced by *pusil/pusei* to mean something like ‘in such a way that, in such a way as’, e.g. VIIb 3 *sue neip portust issoc pusei subra screhto est ...* ‘if he shall not have brought (them) in such manner as is written above ...’, and it is not entirely clear if the spelling difference with *i-* in precisely these two instances should be taken to mean that this is to be treated as a different adverb (see Untermann 2000: 348-9); it is certainly true that the function of the adverb in these two instances is more anaphoric than presentational.

5. The function of these forms seems perfectly straightforward, but a complication arises from the fact that in Umbrian there is another pronoun with an apparently rather similar function, namely *esto-*, which raises the question of the deictic system as a whole. If it seems awkward to assume that Umbrian had two demonstrative stems with identical function, it is understandable that scholars should have tried, albeit at times half-heartedly, to find some point of difference between them. The stem *es(s)o-* may correspond functionally to Latin *hic* not simply in terms of near reference but more specifically with first-person deixis, so that *esto-* could be taken to correspond functionally (as also no doubt etymologically) to Latin *iste*, with second-person deixis (so explicitly Muller 1926: 222).

This interpretation often emerges only from translations of the Umbrian terms into Latin with *es(s)o-* rendered by *hic* and *esto-* by *iste* (so, for instance,

Conway 1897, Vetter 1953, Ernout 1961, Meiser 1998); in such cases it is not always clear that the scholars are committed to a difference of function rather than trying to mirror in their translations the different stems used in Umbrian. Elsewhere it appears that uncertainty prevails: von Planta (1892-7) gives *hic* as the translation of *es(s)o-* in his glossary, but for *esto-* he gives both *hic* and *iste* (yet maintaining consistent translation by *iste* in his Latin version of the texts of the Tables); Buck (1928: 142-3) states that *es(s)o-* corresponds in use to *hic*, but *esto-* is simply translated as *iste* without any statement about its use; Devoto (1963) gives the usual glosses *hic* and *iste* in his *Index Verborum*, but in his translation consistently uses *hic* for both. Poultney (1959), on the other hand, translates both sets of forms into English with ‘this’, and in his discussion of demonstratives states (110) that *es(s)o-* has the same semantic value as Latin *hic*, while *esto-* is used sometimes with reference to what has just been mentioned, sometimes to that which is newly introduced, but it ‘has not the special nuance of association with the second person’. More recently Untermann (2000: 236) notes of *esto-* that it is ‘auf Aktuelles, unmittelbar Bevorstehendes oder gegenwärtig Gültiges verweisend’, and is equivalent in function to Latin *hic* rather than *iste*. The instances from the Tables certainly bear this out, and show that the uses of *es(s)o-* and *esto-* are essentially identical.

6. There are eleven instances of *esto-* in the Iguvine Tables. One of them (IIb 24 **iupater saçe tefe estu vitlu vufriu sestu** ‘Jupiter S., to you I present this v. calf’) clearly refers to the sacrificial animal being offered at the time of speaking; four (Ia 1 = VIa 1, IIa 2, VIa 56) refer to the ceremonies actually in progress or being initiated. Exactly similar functions were performed by *es(s)o-* (see §4). There are three instances of reference to something that has just been said: VIb 62, 63 *ape este dersicust* ‘when he shall have said this’, VIIa 51 *este trioper deitu* ‘he is to say this three times’ (VIb 62, 63), to which one might add the two instances of reference back to the list of boundaries given immediately before: VIa 15 *hondra esto tuderor porsei subra screihtor sent* ‘below these boundaries which are written above’, and VII 15-16 *subra esto tudero* ‘above these boundaries’. Finally there is an instance of reference forward, introducing the actual words that follow directly: IIb 23 **estu iuku habetu** ‘use these words’, which is functionally similar to the use of adverbial **esu(k)** noted in §4.

7. The overlap of functions between *es(s)o-* and *esto-* in the Iguvine Tables would seem evident. In the scanty other Umbrian inscriptions there are only a few attestations of either stem: in Ve. 233/Um 8 a nom. sg. f. *eso* occurs in the sentence *cubrar matrer eso beo* ‘this fountain belongs to (lit. ‘is of’) C. Mater (a deity)’, in an inscription on a stone cistern, with reference to the object itself; in

Po. 7/Um 5 a nom.-acc. pl. n. **estac** appears in agreement with **vera** ‘gate’ in a badly broken building inscription, presumably with reference to the structure of which the stone originally formed part. Both of these would most naturally be rendered in Latin with forms of *hic*.

There are also early attestations of the pronoun *esto-* outside Umbria, in certain closely related Sabellic languages. In a ‘Pre-Samnite’ inscription on a bronze stamnos from Campania (Ve. 101/PS 3) we read: *vinuxs veneliis peracis estam tetet venilei viniciiu* ‘V., son of V., P. gave this to V., son of V.’, where *estam* must refer to the object itself. In a South Picene inscription (AP 3) there is a form **estas**, possibly nom. pl. f., but the context is too broken for any certainty over the syntax or the interpretation of the reference. There are also two instances in South Picene of adverbial **estuf(k)** (AP 2, TE 5), most plausibly in the context of a funerary inscription to be rendered ‘here’, with which one may compare Pael. *ecuf* in *ecuf incubat* ‘lies here’ (Ve. 214/Pg 10), although the two South Picene inscriptions still resist complete interpretation.

None of these occurrences of *esto-* (and none of those in the Iguvine Tables) seems to require interpretation as having a function different from that of *es(s)o-*, yet various Italian scholars have in recent years claimed explicitly that *esto-* does in fact have second-person deixis, and that in Umbrian, ‘Pre-Samnite’, and South Picene there is a tripartite system of deixis just like that of Latin.

8. Prosdocimi (1978: 742-3, 1979: 168), starting from the need to distinguish functions for the different demonstrative stems in the Iguvine Tables, claims that *esto-* is the deictic corresponding both functionally and etymologically to Lat. *iste*. The second person implied in this context is the user of the Tables, the one who will read and follow the instructions there laid down. He notices that there will be a problem at TI IIb 23-4 **iupater saçe tefe estu vitlu vufru sestu** ‘Jupiter S., to you I present this v. calf’, which is not part of the instructions but comes within a prayer addressed to a deity, so that the implicit second person here cannot be the reader; he is also troubled by the fact that at every other presentation of a sacrificial victim or offering the pronoun *es(s)o-* is used (e.g. VIa 25 *di grabouie tio esu bue ...* ‘Jupiter Grabovius, (I invoke) you with this ox ...’). Prosdocimi’s solution to these problems is to argue that this exceptional use of **estu** is due to rhythmic factors, in effect the rhyme with **sestu**, citing as a parallel Cato *de agr.* 134 *Iuppiter, macte isto fertu esto* ‘Jupiter, be honoured with that *fertum*’, where *isto* echoes *esto* ‘be’, beside the usual formulaic *hic* for offerings in such phrases such as *hac strue, hoc fertu*, etc.⁴

⁴ L. *fertum* is a kind of sacrificial cake, *strues* something similar.

The Cato passage is interesting as providing the only instance of *iste* in prayers in Cato, and it is worth looking more closely at its context. Prayers attending the sacrifice of a sow (*porca praecidaneae*) before the harvest are addressed here to both Janus and Jupiter, but two prayers to each, the first accompanying solid offerings (a *strues* and a *fertum* respectively), the second offerings of wine (*uinum inferium*). In the first prayers we find, as expected, forms of *hic*: *Iane pater, te hac strue ommovenda bonas preces precor ...* ‘Father Janus, in offering this *strues* I pray good prayers to you ...’, *Iupiter, te hoc fertum obmovendo bonas preces precor ...* ‘Jupiter, in offering this *fertum* I pray good prayers to you’. The second prayer to Janus runs: *Iane pater, uti te strue ommovenda bonas preces precatus sum, eiusdem rei ergo macte uino inferio esto* ‘Father Janus, just as in offering the *strues* I prayed good prayers to you, for that same reason be honoured with an offering of wine’, where there is reference in the past tense to the offering of the *strues* (with no demonstrative pronoun) but the presentation this time is of wine. The parallel second prayer to Jupiter is similarly structured but more succinct: *Iupiter, macte isto fertum esto, macte uino inferio esto*. ‘Jupiter, be honoured with that *fertum*, be honoured with an offering of wine’. Once again there is a reference back to the solid offering, but it is not being presented at this stage, so that *hoc fertum* would in this context be out of place: the *fertum* has already been offered, and in so far as it has now been transferred to the possession of the deity being addressed the demonstrative *iste* is entirely appropriate. One may note that in *de agr.* 141, when it is a question of the first offerings proving unsatisfactory and substitutes being presented, the first offerings are designated with *ille* (*si quid tibi in illisce suouitaurilibus lactentibus neque satisfactum sit* ‘if anything in that offering of *suouitaurilia lactentia* was not acceptable’), not with *iste*, precisely because they were not accepted by the god; the new ones being offered are, of course, referred to with *hic* (*te hisce suouitaurilibus piaculo* ‘I (honour) you with this *suouitaurilia* as an expiatory offering’).

There is then a perfectly good explanation for the occurrence of *iste* in the prayer in Cato that has nothing to do with rhyme or rhythm and everything to do with its function. It is not possible to explain **estu** in TI I Ib23-4 in a similar way: the calf has not already been offered, and this is the first and only mention of it in direct address to the deity. Why then do we find, just on this one occasion, **estu** rather than a form from *esso*-? Are we to believe that on this one occasion the victim is considered from the point of view of the deity rather than the sacrificer? This is the interpretation of Ancillotti and Cerri (1996: 361): ‘il punto di vista è nel destinatario, quindi nella divinità stessa (“codesto vitello” che tu divinità destinataria di questo mio messaggio hai davanti)’. This is hard to credit.

At this point we should look at the instances of *esto-* outside the Iguvine Tables to see if a similar interpretation appears plausible there. The reference to the gate in Po. 7/Um 5 (**estac vera**) appears in a building inscription, where all Oscan and Latin parallels would lead us to expect the *hic*-demonstrative (for Oscan, cf. **ekík sakaraklúm** (Ve. 150/Sa 7), **ekík pavmentúm** (Po. 133/Cm 4), **ekak víam** (Ve. 8/Po 1), **tríbúm ekak** (Ve. 11/Po 3), etc.), and Umbrian too has *eso* in the similar inscription on the cistern (Ve. 233/Um 8). There is simply no good reason, in relation to the gate, to accept here the claim of Rocca (1996: 55) that ‘anche in questo caso, l’autore-esecutore considera l’oggetto iscritto rispetto all’utente scegliendo nel sistema il corrispondente di “codesto”, ossia considerando la scritta pragmaticamente per la lettura da parte del destinatario ...’. Similarly with the gift inscription on the Pre-Samnite stamnos: all parallels suggest that *hic*-deixis is appropriate here; there is quite simply no occurrence of *iste* in such inscriptions in Latin epigraphy of the Republican period. Agostiniani (1979) does his best to make a case: ‘lo stamnos immaginato, eccezionalmente, in prossimità del lettore non dell’autore del testo’; ‘eccezionalmente’ speaks for itself, and again this is not the most natural interpretation.

Agostiniani (1982: 26-7), in a more general discussion, speaks of the need to recognize that inscriptions involve both a Producer and a User, but it is a step too far to argue, as he does, that ‘this’ in an inscription must in consequence necessarily imply ‘in prossimità dell’autore’. It seems rather that just as inscribed objects once spoke *in propria persona*, with first-person verbs and pronouns for self-reference, so they subsequently carry inscriptions designating themselves with demonstrative ‘this’, but with the same deixis, whence the regular choice of *hic* in Latin. ‘Here lies X.’, if found on a tombstone, does not imply proximity to the engraver but proximity to the funerary monument.

As for the South Picene examples, Marinetti (1985: 67-74), accepting the claims of Prosdocimi and Agostiniani, and noting that the local adverb **estuf** seems to be differentiated from **esmín** (on which see below, §11), argues again for second-person reference for the appropriate forms. In fact, since **estas** occurs in a broken and obscure context (see §7 above), it is only **estuf** ‘here’ that is usable; since the inscription in which it occurs seems to be funerary, the obvious parallels are with Latin epitaphs (*hic situs est ...*, etc.) and Paelignian *ecuf*, and parallels for the use of *iste* in such a context in Latin are completely lacking. There is one Latin *defixio* (ILLRP 1144) in which we find *mortuos qui istic sepultus est* ‘the dead man who is buried there (near you)’ and *ille mortuos quei istic sepultus est* ‘that dead man who is buried there (near you)’, where the local adverb *istic* is used, but the context here is quite different: rather than being an epitaph, this text is actually a prayer addressed to the god of the Underworld

(voc. *Dite Pater*), and the second-person reference is thus easily accounted for — the dead man is buried in the god’s realm.

This is in fact the only instance in the Republican Latin inscriptions in Degrassi’s collection of a form of *iste*. Even where an epitaph is addressed to a passer-by in the second person, reference to the monument itself is made with *hic*: e.g. *ILLRP 808 rogat ut resistas, hospes, t[e] hic tacitus lapis* ‘this silent stone asks you, stranger, to stop’; consistent with this is the use of *eko-* in a like context in Paelignian, cf. Ve. 213/Pg 9 *eite uus ... puus ecic lexe* ‘go, you who read/have read this’.

9. If one abandons the notion that *esto-* is functionally equivalent to *iste*, with second-person deixis, how then is the co-occurrence of the two demonstrative stems *es(s)o-* and *esto-* in Umbrian to be explained? How in particular are we to account for the fact that we find **estu vitlu** alongside *esu bue* in presentations of victims: what is the difference between the two passages that might explain the choice of demonstrative form? One obvious difference — obvious though not, I think, so far recognized as crucial — is that in the *tio(m) esu bue* formula we have an ablative, but in **tefe estu vitlu** an accusative.

If all the forms from *esto-* and *es(s)o-* are arranged by case, the following pattern emerges:

sg.	pl.		
	m.	f.	n.
nom.		<i>eso</i>	estas (?)
acc.	estu	estam	este
gen.			estum
abl.	<i>es(s)u</i>	<i>esa</i>	

with adverbial **estuf** ‘here’ and **esu(k)** ‘as follows’.

Leaving aside for the moment nom. sg. f. *eso*, it can be seen that the remaining case-forms combine to give a paradigm showing an alternation between one stem (*esto-*) in the nominative and accusative and a second stem (*es(s)o-*) in the other cases. This immediately recalls the alternations that are found in the anaphoric pronoun **eio-/ *eiso-* in both Oscan and Umbrian (cf. §1) and in the Oscan pronoun *eko-/ ekso-* ‘this’ (cf. §2), and the similarity extends to the fact that the second stem shows a characteristic sigmatic form. Furthermore, the local adverb formed from the basic stem *eko-* in Paelignian *ecuf* is matched by the South Picene adverb **estuf(k)**, again formed from the same stem as the nominative and accusative.

The nom. sg. f. *eso* does, of course, present a problem, but it does not seem altogether implausible to postulate an analogical reformation on the basis of the oblique stem. An alternative possibility will be sketched below (§10) in connection with the derivation of the Umbrian stems.

Another possible difficulty might be adverbial **esu(k)**, if Meiser (1986: 119-20) is correct in taking this to be in origin the acc. pl. n. of *es(s)o-*, ending in **-ā*. He is certainly right in his contention that it cannot be an old abl. sg. m./n., since in the Latin alphabet it is consistently spelled <ESO>, while the abl. sg. m. singular of *es(s)o-* is consistently spelled <ESU>; and is likely to be right in his contention that a neuter singular **es(s)od* is to be excluded (*pace* Untermann 2000: 217) given that undoubted nom.-acc. sg. neuter forms of demonstratives in Sabellic all seem to show analogical extension of **-id* from the anaphoric pronoun (cf. Osc. **ekík**, U. **este**). But if a starting-point in a case-form with original **-ā* is sought, an alternative possibility would be that this is an old instrumental singular (feminine), such as is perhaps to be recognized in the Umbrian postposition **-ta/-to** ‘from’.⁵

10. If one accepts that these forms make up a single paradigm, the question arises as to how the combination of stems is to be explained. Is the paradigm suppletive, and if so what is the source of the two stems and how did they come to be paired? Or are they somehow etymologically connected?

It seems quite possible that *esto-* is ultimately cognate with Lat. *iste*, even if there are difficulties in establishing a reconstruction: are we to postulate **esto-* or **isto-*? If the proto-form can be analysed at all, are we to recognize the pronoun **is* with an attached particle (with Umbrian *es-* under the influence of other pronouns with *e-*), or perhaps rather a particle **es* prefixed to the pronominal stem **to-* (with Lat. *is-* under the influence of *is*)?⁶

As for *es(s)o-*, it is almost universally regarded as identical to the Oscan *ekso-* stem, with assimilation of the consonant cluster (so, for instance, Buck 1928: 91, 142; Poultney 1959: 81, 110; Untermann 2000: 217-18). The attraction of this etymology, given the equivalence of function, is evident. The almost total restriction of *es(s)o-* to cases other than the nominative and accusative would also find a parallel in the Oscan paradigm. But it is not clear how the association with the quite different stem *esto-* would have come about, how the two stems

⁵ See von Planta (1892-7: 2.454), Muller (1926: 222), and especially Brugmann (1897-1916: II/2.189, 702, 713, 787). Latin adverbs such as *interea* may also continue old instrumental forms.

⁶ See Leumann (1977: 470-1), Untermann (2000: 237). For an attempt to explain the origin of **es-* see Meiser (1998: 163).

that would presumably once have been distinct in function came to be combined and distributed within the paradigm according to the pattern attested in the texts.

Meiser (1998: 163) proposes to reconstruct parallel formations in Italic from **es-* with pronominal **so-* and **to-*, giving two stems, ‘nebeneinander nur noch im Umbr. bezeugt, vgl. Abl. *ESSU* “hōc” bzw. *ESTU* “istum”’. One may note that the translations seem to presuppose a functional difference, which is here denied. It might nonetheless be tempting to pursue this line and start from a single paradigm that preserved the original distribution of **s-* and **t-* in the Indo-European pronoun, since this would provide an admirable explanation for nom. sg. f. *eso* (to IE **sā*) beside acc. sg. f. **estam** (to IE **tām*). For the oblique cases built on *es(s)o-*, however, something more is needed.

A possible solution would be to suppose that *esto-* and *es(s)o-* are related to each other in just the same way as Sabellic **eyo-* and **eiso-*, Oscan *eko-* and *ekso-*, in other words that *es(s)o-* represents the sigmatically extended form of *esto-*, viz. **estso-*, with assimilation.⁷ The origin of the extension will be an enigma, just as it is for Oscan *ekso-*, but at least the paradigm, on this reconstruction, will share an overall pattern with other Sabellic pronouns.

11. A further question connected with demonstratives concerns U. **esmik** and *esme(i)*. The first of these forms is probably dat. sg. m./n., attested in the Iguvine Tables at Ia 28, 31, with what appears to be anaphoric function; the second may be dative or locative in VIa 5, 18 but is locative in VIb 55, and in all three of these instances the value of the pronoun seems rather to be ‘this’, as is reflected in most Latin versions of the Tables by the use of *hic*. In VIb 55, after an instruction to whoever belongs to certain foreign groups to depart from ‘this *poplo-*’ (*eetu ehesu poplu*), the text continues *nosue ier ehe esu poplu, sopir habe esme pople ...* ‘if he does not go (*vel sim.*), if anyone catches him [or ‘if anyone is caught’] in this *poplo-* ...’, where the association with *esu* suggests similar deixis for *esme*. In VIa 5, 18 the phrase *esmei stahmei stahm(e)itei* comes in connection with observing birds immediately after the datives *mehel/tefe tote iiou(e)ine* ‘for me/you, for the Iguvine state’ and can either indicate a further beneficiary or designate the place of observation (the meaning of *stahmei stahm(e)itei* is unfortunately obscure); on any interpretation the pronoun can hardly be anaphoric, since this is not a reference back to something just mentioned (nor a reference forwards), and ‘this’ must be the appropriate translation. This all suggests that these forms have a basic meaning ‘this’, but can occasionally be used anaphorically (just like *hic* in Latin). This is consistent

⁷ The precise form of the extension, and whether one should suppose syncope from something like **estVso-* (or from **ekVso-* for Oscan), does not affect the main point, which is the parallel with the Oscan paradigm.

with the evidence of South Picene: a possible dative **esmik** (RI 1), locatives (incorporating the postposition **-en*) **esmen** (CH 1, TE 2) or **esmín** (AP 1, MC 1, MC 2).⁸ In these funerary texts, the forms most probably have the function ‘this’ (with reference to the monument) or ‘here’.

For this reason, it seems best to follow Cowgill (1970: 140) in detaching these forms from the paradigm of the anaphoric pronoun (cf. Untermann 2000: 355-7), despite the seductions of a direct equation with Skt. *asmai*, Goth *imma*, and attaching them instead (while still recognizing pronominal endings **-smōi*, **-smei*) to the paradigm of *es(s)o-* ‘this’. Cowgill postulated **ekso(s)m-* with syncope, but clearly a derivation from **estso(s)m-*, in line with the reconstruction of the paradigm suggested above, would work just as well.

12. If U. *esto-* and *es(s)o-* do constitute a single paradigm, and if they belong together in the way that has been suggested here, rather than originating as separate stems that were later combined, then there is no good evidence for a demonstrative pronoun with second-person deixis anywhere in Sabellic. This cannot, however, be taken as any sort of proof that Sabellic did not have a threefold system of deixis, just like Latin with *hic*, *iste*, and *ille*. The fact that Latin epigraphy of the Republican period, which is so much greater in extent than that of Sabellic, can offer only a single instance of a form of *iste* shows the danger of arguing from negative evidence in this connection.

References

- Agostiniani, Luciano (1979). ‘A proposito di Vetter 101 = LIA 20 D. Sui deittici in italico’. *SE*, 47: 386-8.
 — (1982). *Le ‘iscrizioni parlanti’ dell’Italia antica*. Florence.
 Ancilotti, Augusto, and Cerri, Romolo (1996). *Le tavole di Gubbio e la civiltà degli Umbri*. Perugia.
 Brugmann, Karl (1897-1916). *Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen* (2nd edn.). Straßburg.
 Buck, Carl Darling (1928). *A Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian* (2nd edn.). Boston.
 Conway, Robert S. (1897). *The Italic Dialects* (2 vols.). Cambridge.
 Cowgill, Warren (1970). ‘Italic and Celtic superlatives and the dialects of Indo-European’, in George Cardona, Henry M. Hoenigswald, and Alfred Senn (eds.), *Indo-European and Indo-Europeans*. Philadelphia, 113-53.

⁸ **Jesmak toutaih** in R 1 is too uncertain in reading and interpretation to be useful here; for an explanation of **esmak** as a locative form, see Klingenschmitt (1992: 91).

- Devoto, Giacomo (1962). *Tabulae Iguvinae* (3rd edn.). Rome.
- Ernout, Alfred (1961). *Le dialecte ombrien*. Paris.
- Klingenschmitt, Gert (1992). 'Die lateinische Nominalflexion', in Oswald Panagl and Thomas Krisch (eds.), *Latein und Indogermanisch*. Innsbruck, 89-135.
- Leumann, Manu (1977). *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*. Munich.
- Marinetti, Anna (1985). *Le iscrizioni sudpicene*. Florence.
- Meiser, Gerhard (1986). *Lautgeschichte der umbrischen Sprache*. Innsbruck.
- (1998). *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*. Darmstadt.
- Muller, Frederik (1926). *Altitalisches Wörterbuch*. Göttingen.
- Planta, Robert von (1892-7). *Grammatik der oskisch-umbrischen Dialekte* (2 vols.). Strassburg.
- Pocchetti, Paolo (1979). *Nuovi documenti italici a complemento del Manuale di E. Vetter*. Pisa.
- Poultney, James Wilson (1959). *The Bronze Tables of Iguvium*. Baltimore.
- Prosdocimi, Aldo Luigi (1978). 'L'umbro', in A. L. Prosdocimi (ed.), *Lingue e dialetti dell'Italia antica*. Rome/Padua, 585-787.
- (1979). 'Le iscrizioni italiche. Acquisizioni, temi, problemi', in *Le iscrizioni pre-latine in Italia* (Atti dei Convegni Lincei, 39). Rome, 119-204.
- Rocca, Giovanna (1996). *Iscrizioni umbre minori*. Florence.
- Untermann, Jürgen (2000). *Wörterbuch des Oskisch-Umbrischen*. Heidelberg.
- Vetter, Emil (1953). *Handbuch der italischen Dialekte*. Heidelberg.