

# Looking for the Articloid: *Ille* and *ipse* in the *Itinerarium Egeriae*

**Antanas Keturakis**

Institute of English, Romance and Classical Studies  
Department of Classical Philology  
Vilnius University  
Universiteto g. 5  
LT-01131 Vilnius, Lithuania  
E-Mail: [antanas.keturakis@ff.vu.lt](mailto:antanas.keturakis@ff.vu.lt)

**Abstract.** This paper examines the status of the Latin demonstrative *ille* and the intensifier *ipse*, which are the sources of definite articles in modern Romance languages. My analysis is based on the text of the *Itinerarium Egeriae* from the end of the fourth century AD. Using the approach of cognitive linguistics, I suggest how the articloid could be defined and how it could be distinguished semantically from its source element. I argue that both *ille* and *ipse* are used as articloids in the text. However, the original demonstrative meaning of *ille* and the original intensifying meaning of *ipse* are also attested, and in certain cases; though redundant, their use can be caused by the specific stylistics of the text. Furthermore, *ipse* has developed an additional meaning that establishes identity through similarity, and which might have led the path to its further grammaticalization. Therefore, both *ille* and *ipse* have a spectrum of interrelated meanings that range from those attested in Classical Latin to grammatical usage as articloids. However, as definiteness markers, their usage is not extended into contexts reserved for definite articles in languages with fully grammaticalized definiteness markers and hence its use as an articloid in the Latin of the fourth century AD could have been typologically equivalent to that of the articloid in the Baltic languages.

**Keywords:** Late Latin, definiteness, grammaticalization, definite article, articloid

## Introduction

The history of Romance languages offers a unique possibility for the research in language change since it has a long span of language records, a well-documented initial state (Latin) and many different outcomes (Romance languages). While the source and the result of the grammaticalization of definiteness in Romance languages are well understood and there is a wide consensus regarding these topics among linguists, the exact process of development of the definite article and especially its timing within the history of Latin are still much debated. Some late Latin texts, like *Itinerarium Egeriae* from the late fourth century AD, have an unusually high number of demonstratives compared to the texts from the classical period (Hertzenberg 2015, 1). However, even if there is a rich research corpus, there is still little consensus on what exactly the functions of the Latin demonstratives at that time were.

Among others, Hofmann & Szantyr mention that a distal demonstrative *ille* and intensifier *ipse* can be used sporadically as definite articles in late Latin (Hofmann & Szantyr 1965/1972, 191–192). For Menge, it is in the use with proper names that *ille* fulfils the function of the definite article (Menge 1953/1990, 238). However, even if there is evidence for article-like behaviour of the demonstrative in late Latin (Epstein 1993; Adams 2013, 482; Hertzenberg 2015), the functions of the same demonstrative can vary within the same text (cf. Adams 2013, 483). *Itinerarium Egeriae* is a text that has caused a particularly rich discussion within the linguistic community. Even if the fact that the functions of *ille* and *ipse* in this text do not always correspond to their classical usage was already noticed by Löfstedt (1911, 64), there is still an ongoing debate what they are exactly. By some the functions of both *ille* and *ipse* are perceived either as close to that of the definite article (Aebischer 1948; Renzi 1976; Nocentini 1990) or are evaluated with much greater restraint (Hertzenberg 2015, 340; Adams 2013, 483; Fruyt 2003).

This article aims to contribute to the discussion on the status of definiteness marking in late Latin by outlining a definition of an articloid from a typological perspective. First, I will use the framework of Cognitive Grammar to propose additional insights to the non-grammaticalized definiteness markers (articloids) in general and then, in this light, I will discuss the status of *ille* and *ipse* in *Itinerarium Egeriae*. The focus of this article is to explain how *ille* and *ipse* perform their functions in the text and what is the cognitive process behind their usage. The aim of this analysis is not only to provide further insights into the usage of *ille* and *ipse* at the time when *Itinerarium Egeriae* was written but also to contribute to the better understanding of articloids from a cross-linguistic perspective. The focus of this research will be only on *ille* and *ipse*, since they are the only source of definite articles in Romance languages.

## 1 Definiteness

Research on the grammatical category of definiteness and its markers has a long tradition. The beginning of the modern approach to definiteness is the work of Russell (1905). Russell used formal logic to explain how definite descriptions differ from proper names and what the relationship is between definiteness and the existence of objects to which the definite descriptions refer.

However, a breakthrough in the research on definiteness was the work of John Hawkins (1978), which laid the foundations for the current understanding of definiteness. Hawkins focused on the pragmatic circumstances of the definite descriptions, which allowed him to formulate a usage-oriented approach to the uses of definite articles. He noted that the use of definite articles can be explained by patterns that licence a definite interpretation of a noun phrase and that these patterns can be grouped into several categories. Such major types of the usage of definite articles (I will call them types of definiteness) that J. Hawkins systemized are:

- a) Immediate situation use (*Give me **that book***).
- b) Anaphoric use (*I bought **a book** yesterday. <...> I was reading **the book** <...>*).
- c) Indirect anaphora (*I bought **a book** yesterday, but **the cover** was torn*).
- d) Larger situation use (***The sun** is shining in the sky*).

For Hawkins, the referent of a definite description is either unique or inclusive within a pragmatic set of entities shared by the speaker and the hearer (Hawkins 1978, 160). As we see from the examples above, such a pragmatic set could vary from an object in the immediate proximity of the speaker to an object in the entire world.

However, Hawkins's approach still poses some problems, as it cannot easily explain all instances of definiteness once we turn to a practical application of Hawkins' taxonomy of definite article uses to authentic texts (Fraurud 1990). Hence, recent work has yielded further insights into definiteness, especially within the framework of Cognitive Grammar. In this article I will use the theory developed by Stéphanie Bakker (Bakker 2009, 146–161), which was applied with promising results to explain the usage of the definite article in ancient Greek. She developed a cognitive explanation of the phenomenon of definiteness. Instead of using a more traditional approach consisting in listing and grouping different meanings of types of definiteness, Bakker looked for a unified account that could be applied to every definite description and would explain the use of definiteness markers. According to Bakker, a nominal is definite when it is or **can be** unequivocally related (anchored) to the cognitive ground available for the speaker and the hearer in the current discourse space (CDS) (Bakker 2009, 160). According to Langacker, “[t]he ground consists of the speech event, the speaker (S) and hearer (H), their interaction,

and the immediate circumstances (notably the time and place of speech)” and the CDS is ‘comprised of the ground, the context and the shared knowledge of the speaker and the hearer and relationships construed in the speech event’ (Langacker 2001, 144). Since any already grounded instance (cf. Lambrecht 1994, 106–108; Langacker 2000, 49) or even a situation (Bakker 2009, 159), as part of the current speech event, can serve as an available cognitive ground, the speaker has a certain freedom to *present* the referent as definite or indefinite. Any referent can be presented as definite if the speaker assumes that the hearer is able to unequivocally relate it to the ground:

(1) *If you arrive in Mexico City, make your way to the zócalo.* (*ibid.*, 165)

Few English speakers who do not speak Spanish or have some knowledge about Mexican culture would know what the *zócalo* is. However, the cognitive relationship between the *zócalo* and Mexico City is sufficient to present the referent of the nominal as identifiable, even if the hearer hears about it for the first time. Thus, to be definite, the referent of a nominal does not have to be identifiable in the traditional sense. Its identifiability can only be understood as its successful mapping in the CDS, where it has established relationships with other elements of the CDS.

In this case, the types of definiteness that were systemized by J. Hawkins can be understood as circumstances that allow an unequivocal relationship between the referent of the nominal and the cognitive ground. In the case of the immediate situation use, the immediate reach is part of the CDS, hence if there is a thing that can have an unequivocal relationship with it, it can be presented as definite. The discourse and its referents constitute the ground in the case of anaphoric use, the situation itself and referents associated with it in the case of indirect anaphora, and the entire world as we know it serves as the ground in the case of larger situational uses.

Bakker’s conception of definiteness seems very promising since it proposes a unified account of when the nominal can be interpreted as definite and there is no need to further investigate whether there is “one definiteness or several” (Lyons 1999, 157). Uniqueness, inclusiveness, or identifiability can, for example, be understood in this model as conditions ensuring that the unequivocal relationship between the referent and the cognitive ground can be successfully established.

## 2 The articloid

Aebischer coined the term articloid in his article on Late Latin demonstratives (Aebischer 1948, 186). It was perceived as a natural transitional state between demonstratives and definite articles through which the grammaticalization of definiteness markers gradually progresses. From a theoretical perspective, Greenberg created a model of the

evolution of definiteness markers (Greenberg 1978/1990), according to which definiteness markers may pass through three main stages from “pure demonstrative” to a noun marker. A “zero stage” can be added to the scheme where definiteness marking is possible but not compulsory (Greenberg 1978/1990, 247–252). Typological research strongly suggests that the definite and indefinite articles in European languages might be a feature of the European linguistic area (Haspelmath 2001, 1494) and articloids are attested in languages that have had close contacts with languages that have grammaticalized definiteness markers: the Baltic languages (Rosinas 2009), Polish, Czech (Dickey 2015, 191), Sorbian (Marti 2012, 300) and Slovenian.

Rosinas’ seminal work on demonstratives in the Baltic languages (Rosinas 2009, 87–93) provides the basis for an understanding of how articloids function in Lithuanian and Latvian. From a structuralist perspective, Rosinas lists the functions of the articloid, which could be subsumed under two groups: definiteness marking<sup>1</sup> and expressive usage. Since morphologically both the demonstrative and the articloid are identical, Rosinas argues that *tas* is to be understood as an articloid when its ‘spatial or temporal coordinates are neutralised’ (*ibid.*, 86), and therefore its main function is to ‘identify the referent instead of locating it’. According to his data, articloids have been used in Lithuanian ever since the language was first attested. Since modern Lithuanian does not have a definite article, his analysis shows that an articloid can be used for centuries without being grammaticalized into a definite article.

In the light of Cognitive linguistics, both articles (and, by extension, articloids) and demonstratives are grounding elements that inform the hearer (or the reader) that they can successfully anchor the referent to the cognitive ground (Langacker 2001, 166) or, in Bakker’s term, inform the hearer that there is an unequivocal relationship between the referent and the cognitive ground, hence providing the basis for the identification of the referent. The main difference between them is that definite articles and definite articloids perform only the function of informing that the referent is already accessible in the CDS, whereas demonstratives also provide a crucial piece of information to ensure this accessibility. Demonstratives indicate (literally or metaphorically) a spatial relationship between two entities and therefore provide (directly or indirectly) information needed to successfully anchor the referent (cf. Langacker 2001, 172). Therefore, the articloid is an element that informs the listener or the reader that the referent of a nominal is accessible and identifiable in the CDS or when this informing function becomes more prominent than its original lexical meaning.

Thus, *ille* in Late Latin should be qualified as an articloid when it does not single out a referent by invoking a contrast (spatial or metaphorical) with other possible referents.

<sup>1</sup> Rosinas himself used the term ‘definiteness marking’ to denote anaphoric tracking (Rosinas 2009, 87).

Since in classical Latin *ipse* is not a demonstrative, it does not imply a spatial contrast as *ille* does. As an intensifier, in classical Latin it has a meaning of ‘self’, ‘himself’. Therefore, it can be qualified as an articloid if its lexical intensifier meaning providing information needed to anchor and identify the referent is lost, or if it is attenuated to the point that the informing function becomes the main one.

### 3 The *Itinerarium Egeriae* and definiteness marking

The text of the *Itinerarium Egeriae* has drawn a lot of attention for its “vulgar coloration” (Prinz 1960). Since P. Aebischer introduced the notion of articloid (Aebischer 1948, 198) to determine the functions of demonstratives in the text, there have been several major studies that either deepened his approach or contested it. Renzi proposes the theory of two grammars interplaying to affect the usage of the *Itinerarium Egeriae*. On the one hand, the use of demonstratives in the text does not violate any rule of classical Latin; on the other hand, their frequency does not correspond to that in any classical author (Nocentini 1990, 143; Hertenberg 2015, 1). Hence, according to Renzi, at the time of the *Itinerarium Egeriae* the demonstratives must have had a new function, an innovation that allows their extensive use (Renzi 1976, 30–31). A. Nocentini proposes the idea that *ille* and *ipse* in the *Itinerarium Egeriae* are either demonstratives or determiners. According to him, the intermediate phase in the development of the definite article that is attested in the *Itinerarium Egeriae* does not require the introduction of a new grammatical or functional category (i.e., that of an articloid). In his view, *ille* and *ipse* are simply used in precisely defined contexts (*ille* with relative restrictive phrases and *ipse* in anaphoric contexts) (Nocentini 1990, 143).

Nevertheless, other researchers contest the idea that the demonstratives in the *Itinerarium Egeriae* represent a major step in the grammaticalization of the definite article. M. Fruyt does not accept that *ille* is an articloid in the text (Fruyt 2003, 109), let alone *ipse*. While the *Itinerarium Egeriae* shows some innovations in the use of *ille* and *ipse*, these are mostly related to the style of the text, especially in the context of early Christian writing (*ibid.*, 118–119). A. Adams also emphasizes the stylistic peculiarities of the text that should be considered when discussing the status of demonstratives (Adams 2013, 482), viz., among other traits, the author’s inclination for emphasis and repetition, and an urge to be very explicit. As Maraval emphasizes, the style of the *Itinerarium Egeriae* is consistent with the general trend in the writing of early Christianity and the influence of other Christian writings is easily recognisable (Maraval 1982, 53–54). While the text is not written in the purely classical style, it is not a faithful representation of the everyday Latin of its time either (*ibid.*, 52).

Furthermore, there is a distinction in style between the first (paragraphs I to XXIII) and the second part (paragraphs XXIV to XLIX) of the manuscript. This is reflected

by the usage of *ille* and *ipse* as well. While the first part of the *Itinerarium Egeriae* has only 10% more words than the second, in the first part there are almost twice as many instances of *ille* in full nominal phrases and almost three times more of *ipse*. Nocentini explains this difference through the author's need to express herself in different registers. According to him, the first part is more colloquial because the main subject is 'singular events' seen from a personal perspective. And since the second part relates how the paschal celebrations proceed in Jerusalem, a 'more elevated, impersonal style' is more appropriate here (Nocentini 1990, 149–151).

Hence, research into the status of demonstratives in the *Itinerarium Egeriae* calls for a cautious approach. The following paragraphs will aim at illustrating the main types of usage of *ille* and *ipse* in the *Itinerarium Egeriae* and evaluate whether they are used as articloids.

### 3.1 *Ille* in the *Itinerarium Egeriae*

In full nominals in *Itinerarium Egeriae*, the demonstrative *ille* is used with nominals that do not have modifiers and with nominals that have adjectival modifiers or relative clauses. The number of instances is summarized in table 1.

	<i>Ille</i> with nominals without modifiers	<i>Ille</i> with nominals with adjectival modifiers	<i>Ille</i> with nominals with a relative clause
<b>Part I</b>	14	15	44
<b>Part II</b>	11	7	20

Table 1. Full nominals with *ille* in *Itinerarium Egeriae*

The last type of the uses is the most common in the text (almost twice as common as the other two in the first part and on a par with the first two in the second). However, other usage of *ille*, while not abundant, also offers insights into what function *ille* has in the text.

A major part of usage of *ille* in the second part of *Itinerarium* is restricted to temporal expressions and nominals with the noun *locus* (81% of all cases). In such cases its usage is equivalent to the usage of *is* in classical Latin and elsewhere in the *Itinerarium*:

- (2) <...> *omnes illa hora noctu uadent in*  
 <...> everybody.NOM.PL this.ABL.SG hour.ABL.SG night.ABL.SG go.SBJV.3PL in  
*ecclesia* <...> (Itin. XXXIII.1)  
 church.ABL.SG  
 '<...> everybody goes to the church at **that hour** at night <...>'

However, in the first part there are instances where the usage of *ille* is closer to that of a definiteness marker:

- (3) <...> *in Charra* <...> *In ipsa autem*  
 <...> *in Charra*.ABL.SG *in* INTS *however*  
*civitatem* <...> *penitus nullum Christianum inveni* <...>.  
*city*.ACC.SG *entirely none*.ACC.SG *Christian*.ACC.SG *find*.PRF.1SG  
*Et quoniam episcopus illius civitatis valde*  
*and because bishop*.NOM.SG DEF *city*.GEN.SG *very*  
*instructus est de scripturis* <...> (Itin. XX.8–9)  
*instructed*.NOM.SG *be*.3SG *of scripture*.ABL.PL  
 ‘<...> *Charra* <...> *In the city* itself <...> *I found no Christian at all* <...> *And since*  
 the bishop of **the city** is well instructed in the Scriptures <...>.<sup>2</sup>

The mention of *civitas* in the nominal *illius civitatis* is definite due to the anaphoric relationship. The referent is first introduced with the proper noun *Charra* and is then picked up twice with the noun *civitas*. In the example (3), *illius* in the nominal *illius civitatis* does not imply a contrast with other possible referents of the nominal but rather reaffirms the already established reference. Hence the use of the true demonstrative is redundant in this case as it does not contribute to the successful grounding of the referent and this case performs functions as an articloid. A. Rosinas considers anaphoric tracking as one of the core functions of the articloid in the Baltic languages, but languages that have definite articles can use both the article and the demonstrative to perform this function. In such cases the choice between them is usually determined by accessibility: the demonstrative is chosen when the referent is highly accessible (Himmelmann 1996, 229). Even though such a use as in the example (3) allows the interpretation of *ille* both as an articloid and a demonstrative, *ille* tends to be used with referents of higher accessibility:

- (4) <...> *ibi* <...> *est* <...> *unus lapis ingens*  
 <...> *there be*.3SG *one*.NOM.SG *stone*.NOM.SG *huge*.NOM.SG  
*Thebeus, in quo sunt duae*  
*Theban*.NOM.SG *in which*.ABL.SG *be*.3PL *two*.GEN  
*statuae* <...> *ingentes* <...>. *Et est ibi*  
*statue*.NOM.PL *huge*.NOM.PL *and be*.3SG *there*  
*praeterea arbor sicomori* <...> *ipse nobis*  
*besides tree*.NOM.SG *sycamore*.GEN.SG *he.himself*.NOM.SG *we*.ACC  
*dixit nomen ipsius arboris, <...>, id est*  
*say*.PRF.3SG *name*.ACC.SG DEF *tree*.GEN.SG *this*.NOM.SG *be*.3SG  
*dendros alethiae* <...> *Ips*e <...> *retulit de*  
*tree*.NOM.SG *truth*.GEN.SG *he*.NOM.SG *tell*.PRF.3SG *of*

<sup>2</sup> Translations of the Latin text are made by the author of the article in consultancy with the translation made by McGowan and Bradshaw (2018).



*illas statuas, quas dixi, ut*  
 DEF statue.ACC.PL which.ACC.PL say.PRF.1SG CONJ  
*etiam et de illa arbore sicomori.* (Itin. VIII 2.5–8)  
 also and of DEF tree.ABL.SG sycamore.GEN.SG

‘<...> there is <...> a huge Theban stone, in which **two immense statues** have been carved <...> Besides there **is a sycamore tree** <...> he [the bishop] told us the name of **the tree**, <...> that is *dendros alethiae*<sup>3</sup> <...> *He <...> told everything about those statues that I mentioned, and also about the sycamore tree*’.

The example above shows two referents: *statae* and *arbor sicomori* repeated with *ille* in the last line. However, the referent of the nominal *arbor sicomori* is slightly more accessible due to the shorter span between the nominal and its antecedent. This might be the reason why the nominal *illas statuas* is further specified with a relative clause, which makes the referent of *illas statuas* more accessible to the reader. Therefore, if *ille* functions as an articloid in the example (4), it might not be on the grammaticalization path to the definite article yet and its usage is closer to the articloids of the Baltic languages than to the definite article as attested in early Romance texts. There are few cases where the usage of *ille* is close to that of the definite article and it can securely be treated as an articloid:

- (5) *Haec est autem vallis, in qua*  
 This.NOM.SG is moreover valley.NOM.SG in which.ABL.SG  
*factus est vitulus <...> Monstraverunt*  
 make.PTCP.PRF.PASS.NOM.SG be.3SG calf.NOM.SG show.PRF.3PL  
*etiam locum, ubi factus est*  
 also place.ACC.SG where make.PTCP.PRF.PASS.NOM.SG be.3SG  
*vitulus ille; <...> de quo loco*  
 calf.NOM.SG DEF from which.ABL.SG place.ABL.SG  
*sanctus Moyses vidit filios Israhel*  
 holy.NOM.SG Moses see.PRF.3SG son.ACC.PL Israel  
*habentes choros his diebus, qua*  
 have.PTCP.NOM.PL dance.ACC.PL this.ABL.PL day.ABL.PL which.ABL.SG  
*fecerant vitulum <...>* (Itin. II.2, Itin. V.3–4)  
 make.PRF.3PL calf.ACC.SG

‘This is the valley in which **the calf** was made <...> Then they showed us the place where **the calf** was made, <...> from that place holy Moses saw the children of Israel dancing in those days when they had made **the calf** <...>’

<sup>3</sup> Tree of truth.

The first mention of *vitulus* is a bare nominal. However, the referent is definite since the history of the calf is a well-known episode of the Old Testament and hence the reader can anchor the referent due to their knowledge of the Biblical context. The second mention of the same referent is used with *ille*, which does not contribute to the relationship between the referent and the cognitive ground. The nominal itself can establish this relationship, hence the function of *ille* is to inform the reader about the possibility to map the referent in the CDS rather than to contribute in any kind to this mapping. However, we must note that the third mention of the same referent is again a nominal without an articloid.

In addition to the usage described above, there are instances where *ille* is clearly used as a demonstrative:

- (6) *Hae autem civitates omnes, quas*  
 this.NOM.PL however city.NOM.PL all.NOM.PL which.ACC.PL  
*videbamus, <...> sanctus Moyses vel filii Israhel contra*  
 see.IPFV.1PL holy.NOM.SG Moses.NOM and son.NOM.PL Israel against  
*illas civitates pugnaverant <...> (Itin. XII.9)*  
 that.ACC.PL city.ACC.PL fight.PPRF.3PL

‘**All these cities** that we saw <...> holy Moses and the children of Israel fought against **those cities** <...>’

In the paragraph from which the example (6) is taken, the author lists a number of cities that were seen from an elevated point in the mountains. In the example, the first mention of *civitates* is definite due to immediate situation use. The second mention of *civitates* is a definite nominal due to anaphoric relationship with its first mention (*civitates omnes*). Nevertheless, *illas* in this case creates a contrast between the cities that the author saw at that moment and other referents to which the nominal could refer (there is more than one story about fighting against cities in the Old Testament) even if there is no explicit special contrast between the actual and other possible referents. Hence, the demonstrative meaning of *illas* is preserved here and its contribution is crucial to the successful anchoring of the referent.

Up to this point, the analysis of *ille* shows that it can have a variety of meanings ranging from that of the classical demonstrative to that of an articloid. I must note that *ille* was never used with first-mentioned referents. When *ille* is used with second-mention nominals that have adjectival modifiers or dependent relative clauses, its usage does not differ from that with nominals without modifiers. In these contexts, it can be either an articloid or a demonstrative:

- (7) <...> *et ecce occurrere dignatus est*  
 <...> and behold meet.INF deign.PTCP.PRF.PASS.NOM.SG be.3SG  
*sanctus presbyter* <...> *Cum ergo descendissemus,*  
 holy.NOM.SG presbyter.NOM.SG when so descend.SPJV.PPRF.1PL  
*ait nobis ille sanctus presbyter iam*  
 tell.PRF.3SG we.DAT DEF holy.NOM.SG presbyter.NOM.SG already  
*senior et de scripturis bene*  
 senior.NOM.SG and of scripture.ABL.PL well  
*instructus, id est qui ipsi loco*  
 educated.NOM.SG it.NOM.SG be.3SG who.NOM.SG INTS place.DAT.SG  
*praeerat ex monacho* <...> (Itin. XIV.1–2)  
 oversee.IPRV.3SG from monk.ABL.SG

‘<...> and **the holy presbyter** <...> [was] so kind as to meet us. So, when we descended, **the holy presbyter**, who was already old and well instructed in Scriptures, who oversaw this very place after being a monk, told us <...>’

The referent of *sanctus presbyter* is introduced without *ille*. Its second mention has additional information provided about the referent with simple modifiers and a relative clause. This information is not crucial for the successful grounding of the referent and *ille* also does not contribute to it since there is no choice between possible referents in the CDS that *ille* could help to clarify. Since the referent is highly available, the emphatic use of *ille* due to the stylistics of the text would be odd and hence the usage of an articloid is more plausible.

In some nominals that have relative clauses, the demonstrative meaning of *ille* is clearly recognizable and it is the relative clause that allows such an interpretation:

- (8) <...> *hora ergo quarta pervenimus in*  
 <...> hour.ABL.SG so fourth.ABL.SG reach.PRF.1PL in  
*summitatem illam montis Dei sancti*  
 summit.ACC.SG that.ACC.SG mountain.GEN.SG God.GEN.SG holy.GEN.SG  
*Sina, ubi data est lex* <...> (Itin. III.2)  
 Sinai where give.PTCP.PRF.PASS.NOM.SG be.3SG law.NOM.SG

‘<...> so, at fourth hour we reach **that summit** of the holy mountain of God, Sinai, where the Law was given’

In the paragraphs preceding the given example, the author explains that from far away Sinai appears to be a single mountain, however, once a traveler approaches the mountain, it becomes visible that it has several summits. Nevertheless, the whole mountain is

called the mountain of God. Hence, the nominal *summitatem illam* could have several referents, although the referent of this nominal has been introduced before. The referent of the nominal can be identified due to the information provided by the restrictive relative clause. From a typological perspective, *ille* in this position could be used either as a demonstrative or as a definiteness marker (cf. Hertzberg 2015, 340). However, since there is a contrast between possible referents (several summits of the same mountain) and this contrast includes a spatial distinction, the meaning of a demonstrative seems more plausible here. Since the style of the text is exact and precise, in this case, it further supports the ‘classical’ interpretation of *ille*. There are instances of similar usage with an anaphoric antecedent as well:

- (9) *Tunc videntes hoc Persae averterunt*  
 then see.PTCP.NOM.SG this.ACC.SG Persian.NOM.PL divert.PRF.3PL  
*ipsam aquam a civitate <...> statim hii*  
 DEF water.ACC.SG from city.abl.sg immediately this.NOM.PL  
*fontes, quos vides in eo*  
 spring.NOM.PL which.ACC.PL see.2SG in this.ABL.SG  
*loco, iusso Dei a semel*  
 place.ABL.SG order.PTCP.PRF.PASS.ABL.SG God.GEN.SG from at.once  
 eruperunt <...>. **Ille** autem **aqua**, quam  
 erupt.PRF.3SG that.NOM.SG however water.NOM.SG which.ACC.SG  
*Persae averterant <...>* (Itin. XIX 11.12–13)  
 Persian.NOM.PL divert.PPRF.3PL

‘Seeing this, the Persians then turned **the water** away from the city <...> immediately these springs, which you see in this place, at God’s will at once erupted <...>. However, **that water** which the Persian turned away <...>.’

In the example above, the author tells the story of how by the grace of God a spring erupted when the Persians, who had surrounded the city, diverted the water so that the inhabitants should die of thirst. The second mention of the referent ‘water’ has a relative clause that provides information for successful identification of the referent. However, since there is more than one possible referent for the nominal *illa aqua*, *ille* can be understood as maintaining its deictic force (or in Langacker’s terms directive force, Langacker 2008, 284) in this situation. In this case *illa* carries additional information to single out the referent and in this way contributes to the successful reference, and therefore it does not qualify as an articloid.

It must be noted, however, that the usage of *ille* with relative clauses has a grey zone where both the demonstrative and the grammatical meaning of definiteness marking can be justified. As noticed by several researchers (Renzi 1976, 29; Selig 1992, 165; Fruyt

2003, 109, Carlier & De Mulder 2010, 247), *ille* has little competition in the Late Latin corpus when used with first-mention nominals that have ‘[their] identity established by a relative clause’ (Carlier & De Mulder *ibid.*). Consider example (10):

- (10) *Aegyptum autem et Palaestinam et mare rubrum et mare illud Parthenicum quod mittit Alexandriam <...> videbamus <...>* (Itin. III.8)  
 Egypt.ACC but and Palestine.ACC and sea.ACC.SG red.ACC.SG and sea.ACC.SG this.ACC.SG Parthenian.ACC.SG that.ACC.SG lead.1PL Alexandria.ACC see.IPFV.1PL  
 ‘We saw <...> Egypt and Palestine and the Red Sea and **the Parthenian Sea**, that leads to Alexandria <...>.’

The nominal *mare illud Parthenicum* is a first-mention definite, and an example of larger situation use. The reader familiar with the Scriptures and their geography would successfully anchor the referent due to shared knowledge even without the relative clause. However, it is doubtful that situational definiteness alone would have triggered the use of *ille* since there are no other such examples in the *Itinerarium*. Also consider example (11):

- (11) *Nam duxit nos statim ad ecclesiam, quae est <...> in eo loco, ubi fuit domus sancti Abrahae <...>. Item dignatus est nos ducere ad puteum illum, unde portabat aquam sancta Rebecca.* (Itin. XX.3–4)  
 for bring.PRF.3SG we.ACC immediately to church.ACC.S which.NOM.SG be.3SG in this.ABL.SG place.ABL.SG where be.PRF.3SG house.NOM.SG holy.GEN.SG Abraham.GEN also gracious.NOM.SG be.3SG we.ACC bring.INF to well.ACC.SG DEF from.which bring.IPFV.3SG water.ACC.SG holy.NOM.SG Rebeca.NOM  
 ‘For he immediately led us to the church, which is <...> in that place where the house of holy Abraham was <...>. He also was gracious enough to lead us to **the well**, from which holy Rebeca carried water.’

The referent of the nominal *puteum illum* is introduced for the first time in the example above. Its successful grounding is ensured by the relative clause. However, in the example (11) the usage of *ille* differs from the use in the example (10) because the situation itself contributes to an unequivocal relationship between the referent and the cognitive ground. The Biblical story of Rebeca is well known and the since the author is visiting the city where it happened and mentions the house of Abraham, which was near the place

where it happened, no other famous well in that place would have come to the reader's mind since the well from which Rebeca carried water is by far the most prominent one. Therefore, *illum* in the example (11) does not admit of other referents and it does not have a contrastive meaning with other possible referents. And even the situational use alone would not account for the use of *ille* as in the example (10); since there is no such use in other contexts in the text, the lack of a deictic element would signify that it is used as an articloid. On the other hand, since from a typological perspective, demonstratives can be used with nominals having restrictive relative clauses, it could be the case that the usage of *ille* in examples (10) and (11) is stimulated by the style of the text<sup>4</sup>. Having in mind the frequency of *ille* in nominals with relative clauses, these ambivalent contexts could open the way for a rising number of articloids in Late Latin and as noted by Selig, could eventually lead to the grammaticalization of the definite article in Romance (Selig 1992, 169).

### 3.2 *Ipse* in the *Itinerarium Egeriae*

We have seen that the analysis of *ille* in *Itinerarium* yields a spectrum of meanings. The interpretation of *ipse* is even more complex. Since *ipse* is the source of the definite article in Sardinian and Balearic dialects of Catalanian, its path of grammaticalization and status in late Latin has raised a problem to which researchers have proposed different solutions. In classical Latin *ipse* is used as an intensifier 'self' or 'very' or to emphasise the referent with the meaning 'very, precisely'. As for the meaning of *ipse* in late Latin, there is even less linguistic consensus than about the question of the articloid. According to Aebischer (1948, 201), *ille* and *ipse* were synonymous in late Latin and could be used interchangeably as articloids. Väänänen (1987, 49) and Hertenberg (2015, 336) favor the theory that *ipse* is used as a marker of anaphoricity. While Hertenberg rejects the idea that *ipse* could be used as an articloid, the numerous examples of anaphoric usage of *ipse* lead Nocentini to claim that such usage shows the 'first phase of evolution in late Latin towards the definite article of Romance' (Nocentini 1990, 147). Väänänen, Nocentini and Hertenberg all agree that there are instances where *ipse* is used with its classical meaning, but they argue that such usage is very restricted and statistically irrelevant<sup>5</sup> (Väänänen 1987, 49; Nocentini 1990, 145–146, Hertenberg 2015, 336). On the other hand, contrary to Hertenberg, Fruyt argues that *ipse* in the *Itinerarium Egeriae* is used primarily as an intensifier and has developed an additional meaning to express similarity. While not identical to *idem* 'the same', according to Fruyt, it is in complementary distri-

<sup>4</sup> In such cases, the only difference between demonstratives and articloids in the languages that do not have grammaticalized definiteness marking (like Lithuanian or Latvian) is prosodic. The demonstratives are accentuated and articloids are not, which is impossible to verify in the case of Late Latin.

<sup>5</sup> Twenty percent of all cases according to Väänänen and Nocentini, and 'few exceptions' according to Hertenberg.

bution with it to ‘reinforce the sense of identity’ (Fruyt 2003, 104). The development of *ipse* into a synonym of *idem* is doubtful in classical Latin, however it is possible at the time of the *Itinerarium Egeriae*, since otherwise it is difficult to explain its usage in the “classical way” (Pinkster 2015, 1163).

Another proposal to account for the semantic development of *ipse* was made by Harris. He claimed that the demonstrative system of classical Latin underwent a shift consisting in *iste* taking the place of *hic* as a proximal demonstrative, *ipse* taking the place of *iste* as the medial demonstrative and *ille* retaining its value as a distal demonstrative (Harris 1978, 69). Harris’s theory is based on the outcome in Romance language where Portuguese, Spanish and Catalan have developed three-term demonstrative systems. The theory according to which *ipse* passed through a demonstrative phase is attractive because from the typological perspective demonstratives (most commonly distal demonstratives) are the most common source of definite articles (Greenberg 1978, 61).

The variety of approaches that aim at explaining the usage of *ipse* in Late Latin shows that its meanings and functions are difficult to formulate. Furthermore, in some cases it can be interpreted in either way, as an anaphoric marker or intensifier for example (see also Pinkster 2015, 1163). Since the analysis of the status of *ipse* must consider the stylistic peculiarities of the *Itinerarium Egeriae*, the following analysis favours classical meanings of *ipse* where possible. To evaluate whether *ipse* acts as an articloid, I will assess whether its lexical meaning contributes to the successful establishment of the reference of the nominal or if its main function is definiteness marking (in which case it functions as an articloid). The number of nominals with *ipse* is summarized in table 2.

	<i>Ipse</i> with nominals without modifiers	<i>Ipse</i> with nominals with adjectival modifiers	<i>Ipse</i> with nominals with a relative clause
<b>Part I</b>	105	17	13
<b>Part II</b>	36	5	9

Table 2. Full nominals with *ipse* in *Itinerarium Egeriae*

As noted in previous research, *ipse* is often used with a second (or subsequent) mention of the same referent. However, in such cases the original intensifying meaning of *ipse* can often be inferred. Consider the examples (12) and (13):

- (12) *Habebat* <...> *forsitan quattuor milia totum per*  
 have.IPFV.3SG perhaps four mile.NOM.PL total.NOM.SG per  
*valle illa, quam dixi ingens.*  
 valley.ACC.SG DEF which.ACC.SG say.PRF.1SG huge.NOM.SG

*Vallis* *autem ipsa ingens est valde* <...>. (Itin. I.1–II.1)  
valley.NOM.SG however INTS huge.NOM.SG be.3SG very

‘<...> there were about four miles through **the valley** that was, as I said, huge. While **the valley itself** was huge <...>’

(13) <...> *et sic plecaremus nos ad*  
<...> and like.this approach.PRF.1PL we.NOM to

*montem Dei. Mons autem ipse per*  
mountain.ACC.SG God.GEN.SG mountain.NOM.SG however INTS through  
*giro quidem unus esse videtur* <...> (Itin. II.4)  
around.ACC.SG indeed one.NOM.SG be.INF seem.3SG

‘<...> and thus, we went to the **mountain of God**. **The mountain itself** appears singular from around’

While an intensifier might seem redundant here, the style of the *Itinerarium Egeriae* aims to be as specific as possible. This special style is especially prominent in the first part of the text, where such examples are much more common. In such cases, *ipse* preserves its classical meaning and therefore does not perform the function of an articloid. Even if in the examples above, the reader could successfully ground the referent without *ipse*, its intensifying meaning is still prominent and consequently it contributes to the successful reference rather than merely informing the reader that they can identify the referent due to unequivocal relationship to the cognitive ground.

The original non-attenuated meaning of *ipse* is particularly obvious when *ipse* is used with personal name. In the *Itinerarium Egeriae* there are four such instances:

(14) <...> *spelunca, ubi latuit sanctus Helias, in*  
<...> cave.NOM.SG where lie.3SG.PRF saint.NOM.SG Elijah.NOM.SG in

*hodie ibi ostenditur* <...> *ostenditur etiam ibi*  
today there show.PASS.3SG show.PASS.3SG also there

*altarium lapideum, quem posuit ipse*  
altar.NOM.SG stone.ADJ.NOM.SG which put.PRF.3SG INTS

*sanctus Helias ad offerendum*  
holy.NOM.SG Elijah.NOM.SG to offer.OBL.ACC.SG

*Deo.* (Itin. IV.2)

God.DAT.SG

‘<...> the cave where **holy Elijah** laid hidden is shown today in front of the door of the church that is there; the stone altar is also shown there, **holy Elijah himself** set it up as an offering to God.’



The nominal *ipse sanctus Helias* ‘holy Elijah’ is the third mention of the referent and the first one with *ipse*. Such examples have often led researchers to the conclusion that *ipse* is an operator of anaphoric relations (Aebischer 1948; Nocentini 1990). However, the interpretation according to which *ipse* is an intensifier that contributes to the successful grounding seems more plausible (see also Fruyt 2003; Adams 2013, 486; Hertenberg 2015, 22) and it the only possible interpretation if *ipse* in the example (14) acts as secondary predicate (cf. Pinkster 2015, 1150–64). As a classical intensifier, it marks a referent that is not expected in the given context or that the referent is pragmatically prominent in the given context (Siemund 2000, 128). The writer, as a pious woman, must be deeply impressed when she sees an artifact deposited by the holy man himself. Such usage is even more evident with the first-mentioned referents:

- (15) <...> *quem lapidem cum perdisco peruissent,*  
 <...> which.ACC.SG stone.ACC.SG when thoroughly uncover.SBJV.PPRF.3PL  
*invenerunt sculptum in coperculo ipsius*  
 find.PRF.3PL sculpted.ACC.SG in cover.ABL.SG INTS

*Iob.* (Itin. XVI.6)

*Iob*

‘<...> when they thoroughly uncovered that stone, they found the name sculpted on the cover of **Iob himself**’

Even though A. Rosinas claims that the articloïd in Lithuanian is frequently used with names (Rosinas 2009, 90), the usage of definite articles in such context in Romance languages is rare. Since other demonstratives are not used with proper nouns in the *Itinerarium Egeriae*, the assumption that *ipse* functions as a definiteness marker in the examples (14) and (15) would make its distribution much wider than that of other demonstratives in the text and even wider than the distribution of the definite article in Romance languages. Moreover, this would mean that Late Latin allows the usage of an articloïd in contexts where from the typological perspective fully grammaticalized definiteness markers are common (Greenberg 1978/1990, 255–277; Lyons 1999, 339). Therefore, *ipse* in such cases is also not an articloïd.

There are instances of usage of *ipse* in the *Itinerarium Egeriae* where its intensifying meaning is closer to the classical Latin ‘very’. Such usage is in accordance with the stylistic peculiarities of the text (see also (Adams 2013, 482; Maraval 1982, 53–54)). Consider the examples (16) and (17):

- (16) *Pervenimus ergo ad summitatem montis*  
 reach.PRF.1PL so to summit.ACC.SG mountain.GEN.SG  
*illius, ubi est nunc ecclesia non*  
 this.GEN where is now church.NOM.SG NEG

*grandis in ipsa summitate montis*  
big.NOM.SG in INTS summit.ABL.SG mountain.GEN.SG

*Nabau* (Itin. XII.1)

Nabau

‘Then we reached the summit of the mountain, where there is a small church now on **the very summit** of mountain Nabau’

(17) <...> *si vultis videre loca, quae*  
<...> if want.2PL see.INF place.NOM.PL which.NOM.PL  
*scripta sunt in libris Moysi,*  
write.PTCP.PRF.PASS.NOM.PL be.3PL in book.ABL.PL Moses.GEN

*accedite foras [h]ostium ecclesiae et de*  
come.IMP.2PL outside door.ACC.SG church.GEN.SG and of

*summitate ipsa* <...> *attendite et videte* <...>. (Itin. XII.3)  
summit.ABL.SG INT observe.IMP.2PL and see.IMP.2PL

‘<...> if you want to see the places that are written in the books of Moses, come outside of the door of the church, and from **the very summit** <...> observe and see <...>’

The referent in both examples is the same and is first introduced by a nominal without a determiner *ad summitatem*. Such usage is like the usage of *ille* in chapter 3.1 where I have argued that we can interpret *ille* as an articloid. However, in the examples above, it is possible to interpret *ipse* as having an intensifying meaning and therefore it contributes to the grounding of the referent rather than informing the reader that they can successfully anchor the referent to the cognitive ground. Since *ipse*, as an intensifier, specifies reference, its function does not come close to that of a definiteness marker and, in such cases, it does not function as an articloid.

In addition to its classical intensifying meaning, *ipse* in the *Itinerarium Egeriae* develops additional meanings alongside those it had in Classical Latin. Many authors have noted that *ipse* can be used with the meaning of *idem* ‘same’ (Väänänen 1987, 49; Nocentini 1990, 145) or indicated that the development of *ipse* into a synonym of *idem* might have been underway at the time of *Itinerarium Egeriae* (Pinkster 2015, 1163). Fruyt subsumes this Late Latin usage under the term ‘expression of similarity’. According to Fruyt, in the *Itinerarium Egeriae* *ipse* together with *is* (neutral demonstrative), *idem* ‘same’ and *hic* ‘this’ can express various aspects of similarity (Fruyt 2003, 104).

The analysis of *Itinerarium Egeriae* examples shows that *ipse* with a meaning close to ‘same’ differs from *idem*, because *ipse* is used as an extension of its classical meaning ‘very, just, precisely’, thus meaning ‘exact’, ‘exactly the same’ etc. and, by extension

‘same’. Such usage of *ipse* is common when the author talks about Old Testament readings:

- (18) <...> *primum ibi fieret oratio, deinde*  
 <...> first.ADV there do.SBJV.3SG prayer.NOM.SG after  
*legeretur lectio ipsa de codice* <...> (Itin. X.7)  
 read.SBJV.IPFV.PASS.3SG reading.NOM.SG same from codex.ABL.SG  
 ‘<...> first a prayer was made there and then **the same place** read from the Old Testament <...>’

- (19) *Facta est ergo iuxte consuetudinem*  
 make.PTSP.PRF.PASS.NOM.SG be.3SG so according custom.ACC.SG  
*ibi oratio et lectio ipsa de libris*  
 there prayer.NOM.SG and reading.NOM.SG same from book.ABL.PL  
*Moysi lecta* <...> (Itin. XI.3)  
 Moses.GEN read.PTSP.PRF.PASS.NOM.SG  
 ‘So, a prayer was made according to custom and **the same place** read from the books of Moses <...>’

As we know from the text, there was a custom to say a prayer and read the appropriate part from the Scriptures after visiting a place which is mentioned there. *Ipse* cannot be used as a marker of anaphoricity since there is no antecedent to which it could refer. The usage of *ipse* here is related to the classical meaning ‘very, just, precisely’, but even having in mind the style of the text, emphasis alone as in Classical Latin seem to be redundant in these examples. Hence, the assertion of the identity of the referent (in a way that *idem* does) is a more persuasive function (cf. Fruyt 2003, 104). Nevertheless, there are examples of this type that are more ambivalent:

- (20) *Nam etiam ipsa die accessimus et ad*  
 for also same day.ABL.SG approach.PRF.1PL and to  
*Ceteros monachos valde sanctos* <...> (Itin. V.10)  
 other.ACC.PL monk.ACC.PL very saint.ACC.PL  
 ‘For we also approached on the **same day / that day / this very day** other very holy monks <...>’

While the nominal *die* ‘day’ is introduced for the first time in the sentence provided in the example, the author of the *Itinerarium Egeriae* continues her narrative about what happened on one particular day. Hence, *ipsa die* could refer to an inferred situation, to the referent that is evident in the given discourse. However, the interpretation where *ipse*

shows signs of semantic development towards the meaning ‘same’ is also possible as the translation shows. The example (21) is similar to the example (20) but the nominal in which *ipse* is used does not have an immediately available antecedent:

- (21) *Nam haec aqua <...> quam videtis in*  
 for this.NOM.SG water.NOM.SG which.ACC.SG see.2PL in  
*isto vico, de ipso fonte*  
 this.ABL village.ABL.SG from same.ABL.SG spring.ABL.SG  
*venit.* (Itin. XV.1)  
 come.3SG

‘For this water <...>, which you see in this village, flows from **the same spring.**’

While visiting a place near Salim, the author remembers that holy John baptized nearby, and the presbyter explains that the source of the water that they see at that moment comes from the spring where holy John had ministered. The referent of *ipso fonte* is definite due to the shared knowledge by the speaker and the author of the text and is first introduced in the given example. Even if the theme of holy John has been introduced before, it is difficult to analyze the nominal *ipso fonte* as a case of indirect anaphora. From a typological perspective also, the interpretation of ‘same’ in this case is preferable since the usage of definiteness markers with indirect anaphora, where the referent must be inferred from the situation, is characteristic of grammaticalized definite articles (Greenberg 1978/1990, 255–277; Lyons 1999, 339).

However, in the situation where the direct or indirect anaphora is not possible and *ipse* is not used as an intensifier, the meaning of ‘same’, ‘exactly the same’ is the most suitable interpretation. In the text there are nominals like this with and without relative clauses, which does not affect the intended usage of *ipse*:

- (22) <...> *adhuc nobis superabant milia tria*  
 <...> yet we.DAT to.be.above.IPRV.3SG mile.NOM.PL three.NOM  
 <...> *sed non ipsa parte exire*  
 <...> but NEG same.ABL.SG part.ABL.SG exit.INF  
*habebamus qua intraveramus <...>* (Itin. IV.5)  
 have.IPFV.1PL which.ABL.SG enter.PPRF.1PL

‘<...> to this point three miles remained <...> but we had to exit not on **the same side (exactly the same side)** where we entered <...>’

In the example above, we cannot translate *ipse* as itself, because this would yield a meaningless sentence. Since there is no antecedent, it is not a marker of anaphoricity. In such

context *ipse* could be used increasingly as, in Fruyt's terms, a marker of identity (Fruyt 2003, 104) and consequently develop meanings that are characteristic of Late Latin. The example (24) illustrates the same usage but with a nominal that does not have a relative clause:

- (23) *Nam duxit nos statim ad ecclesiam,*  
 for bring.PRF.3SG we.ACC immediately to church.ACC.SG  
*quae est foras civitatem in eo*  
 which.NOM.SG be.3SG outside city.ACC.SG in that.ABL.SG  
*loco, ubi fuit domus sancti*  
 place.ABL.SG where be.PRF.3SG house.NOM.SG holy.GEN.SG  
*Abrahae, id est in ipsis fundamentis*  
 Abraham.GEN it be.3SG in same.ABL.PL foundation.ABL.SG  
*et de ipso lapide* <...> (Itin. XX.3)  
 and from same.ABL.SG stone.ABL.PL

'For he brought us immediately to the church, which is outside the city in the place where the house of the holy Abraham was, which is **on the same foundations** and **from the same stones** <...>'

Up to this point my analysis is concurrent with the work of M. Fruyt (2003) and shows that *ipse* acts as a classical intensifier or exhibits signs of a shift towards the meaning of 'same', which is close to the use of *idem* in Classical Latin. Whether *ipse* functions as an intensifier or as a modifier with the meaning 'same', its lexical meaning is still present, and its main function is to contribute to successful reference by ensuring that the reader can unequivocally relate the referent to the cognitive ground and correctly map it within the current discourse space. In these cases, *ipse* does not perform the function of an articloid as a definiteness marker.

Nevertheless, there are instances in *Itinerarium Egeriae* where *ipse* functions as an articloid and show a tendency to grammaticalize as a definiteness marker. *Ipse* as an articloid can be found where its contribution to the successful reference is insignificant or null. First, there are cases where the author uses *ipse* repeatedly with the same referent as in the example below:

- (24) *Heroum autem civitas, <...>, nunc est*  
 Heroopolis.NOM however city.NOM.SG now be.3SG  
*come sed grandis, quod nos dicimus vicus*  
 village but big.NOM.SG that we.NOM say.1PL village.NOM.SG  
*Nam ipse vicus ecclesiam habet <...>.*  
 for this.NOM.SG village.NOM.SG church.ACC.SG have.3SG

*Nam ipse vicus nunc appellatur*  
 for DEF village.NOM.SG now call.PASS.3SG

*Hero* <...>. (Itin. VII.7–8)

Hero.NOM

‘The city of Heroopolis, however, <...> is now a *kome*<sup>6</sup>, but a large one, we call it **a village**. For **this village** has a church <...>. For **the village** is now called Hero <...>’

Even if *ipse* is used with the transitional meaning of ‘very same’ and ‘the same’, it does not provide additional information in the third mention of the nominal *vicus*. Such usage allows the bleaching of the semantic content of *ipse* in Late Latin and, through this loss, leads to its grammaticalization. Such articloid usage of *ipse* is possible with second-mention referents as well where the intensifier meaning of *ipse* is not possible and the above-mentioned Late Latin meaning of ‘same’ seems redundant:

(25) *Nam monticulum istum <...> huic civitati aquam ministrabat.*  
 for hill.NOM.SG this.NOM.SG this.DAT.SG city.DAT.SG water.ACC.SG provide.IPFV.3SG

*Tunc videntes hoc Persae averterunt*  
 then see.PTCP.ACC.PL this.ACC.SG Persian.NOM.PL divert.PRF.3PL

*ipsam aquam a civitate <...>* (Itin. XIX.11)

DEF water.ACC.PL from city.ABL.SG

‘For this hill <...> provided **water** for this city. Seeing this then the Persians diverted **this water** from the city’

In the example above, the intensifying meaning of *ipsam* is not possible and is an extension from the meaning that ensures identity. Even having in mind the style of the text, which allows the conservative meaning interpretation in other parts of this analysis, there is little here that *ipsam* could contribute to the successful grounding. However, such contexts where *ipse* is used as an articloid do not show any signs of its shift towards a medial demonstrative as indicated by Harris (Harris 1978, 69). According to the analysis of the usage of *ipse* in the *Itinerarium Egeriae*, its grammaticalization through the semantic bleaching ‘intensifier > very, exactly > same > above mention > known’ is more probable than through the demonstrative phase. The research based on a later corpus that does not show any sign of such replacement either (Carlier & De Mulder 2010, 242–243), further supports this theory. Thus, it is highly improbable that it would have taken place at the time when the *Itinerarium Egeriae* was written.

<sup>6</sup> A village, a settlement.

## Conclusions

The results of the analysis show that in the *Itinerarium* both *ille* and *ipse* have a spectrum of interrelated meanings. There are instances where *ille* is used as a demonstrative, especially when it contributes to the ground by providing spatial information about the referent. While its spatial contrast (near/far) is not always present, in such cases it nevertheless creates a contrast with other referents or evokes a group of referents, one of which is anchored due to the information provided by *ille*. In addition, *ille* is used as an articloid when information about the accessibility of the referent can be deduced as its main function. When the first-mentioned referent is introduced with a relative clause that provides a crucial piece of information needed to successfully anchor the referent, *ille* can be either a demonstrative or an articloid. Since these contexts are common in the *Itinerarium*, they can provide an opportunity for further grammaticalization of *ille* as a definiteness marker. However, in the *Itinerarium* *ille* functions as an articloid of textual ostension (typologically, like the articloid in Lithuanian) and does not show signs of usage in contexts that are usually reserved for definite articles.

In full nominals *ipse* is also used with the classical, intensifying meaning. However, there are cases where the meaning of *ipse* expresses identity confirmation, similar (but not identical) to the Classical Latin *idem*. Through this usage (and not through an intermediate demonstrative phase), *ipse* can be further grammaticalized as a definiteness marker. The results of the analysis suggest the following path of semantic change: ‘intensifier > very, exactly > same > above mention > known’, of which the first four meanings are attested in the *Itinerarium*.

## Sources

Itin. – *Journal de voyage (itinéraire) et lettre sur la bienheureuse Égérie*. Manuel-C Diaz Y Diaz, Pierre Maraval, Égérie, Valerius Du Bierzo Saint, eds. Paris: Éditions du Cerf. 1982.

## Bibliography

- Adams, John N. 2013. *Social Variation and the Latin Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Aebischer, Paul. 1948. Contribution à la protohistoire des articles *ille* et *ipse* dans les langues romanes. *Cultura neolatina* 8, 181–203.
- Bakker, Stéphanie J. 2009. *The Noun Phrase in Ancient Greek: A Functional Analysis of the Order and Articulation of NP Constituents in Herodotus*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Carlier, Anne and de Mulder, Walter. 2010. The emergence of the definite article: *ille* in competition with *ipse* in Late Latin. *Subjectification, Intersubjectification and*

- Grammaticalization*. Kristin Davidse, Lieven Vandelanotte and Hubert Cuyckens, eds. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter Mouton. 241–276.
- Dickey, Stephen M. 2015. Outline of a comparative analysis of the development of the imperfective general-factual in Slavic. *Die Welt der Slaven* 56. München, Berlin, Washington/D.C.: Otto Sagner. 179–195.
- Epstein, Richard. 1993. The definite article: early stages of development. *Historical Linguistics*. Jaap van Marle, ed. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 111–134.
- Fraurud, Kari. 1990. Definiteness and the Processing of Noun Phrases in Natural Discourse. *Journal of Semantics* 7, 395–433.
- Fruyt, Michèle. 2003. Anaphore, cataphore et déixis dans l’Itinerarium d’Égérie. *Latin vulgaire / Latin tardif VI: Actes du VIe colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif, Helsinki, 29 août – 2 septembre 2000*. Martti Leiwo, Heikki Solin, Hilla Halla-aho, eds. Hildesheim: Olms-Weidmann. 99–119.
- Greenberg, J. H., 1978/1990. How Does a Language Acquire Gender Markers. *On Language. Selected Writings of Joseph H. Greenberg*. Keith Denning & Suzanne Kemmer, eds. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press. 241–271.
- Harris, Martin. 1978. *The Evolution of French Syntax: a comparative approach*. London: Longman.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2001. The European linguistic area: Standard Average European. *Language Typology and Language Universals*. Martin Haspelmath, Ekkehard König, Wolfgang Raible, Wulf Oesterreicher, eds. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. 1492–1509.
- Hawkins, John A. 1978. *Definiteness and Indefiniteness: A Study in Reference and Grammaticality Prediction*. London: Croon Helm.
- Herzenberg, Mari Johanne Bordal. 2015. *Third Person Reference in Late Latin*. Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter.
- Himmelman, Nicolaus P. 1996. Demonstratives in Narrative Discourse: A Taxonomy of Universal Uses. *Studies in Anaphora*. Barbara A. Fox, ed. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 205–255.
- Hofmann, J. B., 1965/1972. *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*. München: Beck.
- Lambrecht, Knud. 1994. *Information structure and sentence form*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 2000. *Grammar and Conceptualization*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 2001. Discourse in Cognitive Grammar. *Cognitive Linguistics* 12, 143–188.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 2008. *Cognitive Grammar. A Basic Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Löfstedt, Einar. 1911. *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.



- Lyons, Christopher. 1999. *Definiteness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Maraval, Pierre. 1982. *Journal de voyage (itinéraire) et lettre sur la bienheureuse Égérie*. Manuel-C Diaz Y Diaz, Pierre Maraval, Égérie, Valerius Du Bierzo Saint, eds. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.
- Marti, Roland. 2012. (Un)articulated definiteness. Nominal determination in Sorbian: Moving from an articleless language to a language with articles? *STUF – Language Typology and Universals* 65(3), 296–316.
- McGowan Anne, Paul F. Bradshaw. 2018. *The Pilgrimage of Egeria. A New Translation of the Itinerarium Egeriae with Introduction and commentary*. Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press Academic.
- Menge, Hermann. 1953/1990. *Repetitorium der Lateinischen Syntax und Stilistik*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Nocentini, Alberto. 1990. L'uso dei dimostrativi nella Peregrinatio Egeriae e la genesi dell'articolo romanzo. *Atti del convegno internazionale sulla Peregrinatio Egeriae*. 137–158.
- Pinkster, Harm. 2015. *The Oxford Latin Syntax: Volume 1: The Simple Clause*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Prinz, Otto. 1960. *Itinerarium Egeriae (Peregrinatio Aetherae)*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Renzi, Lorenzo. 1976. Grammatica e storia dell'articolo italiano. *Studi di grammatica italiana* 5, 5–42.
- Rosinas, Albertas. 2009. *Baltų kalbų įvardžių semantinė ir morfologinė struktūra*. [Semantic and morphological structure of demonstratives in Baltic languages]. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.
- Russell, Bertrand. 1905. On Denoting. *Mind* 14(56), 479–493.
- Selig, Maria. 1992. *Die Entwicklung der Nominaldeterminanten im Spätlatein. Romanischer Sprachwandel und lateinische Schriftlichkeit*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Siemund, Peter. 2000. *Intensifiers in English and German: a comparison*. London: Routledge.
- Väänänen, Veikko. 1987. *Le Journal-Épître d'Égérie (Itinerarium Egeriae): Étude linguistique*. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.