

Additional aspects to the examination of the charters' demonstrative usage (ChLA I, II, CXVIII)

DOROTTYA PÁLFI^{1,2*} 

¹ ELTE Research Centre for Linguistics, Institute for Historical and Uralic Linguistics, Research Group for Latin Historical Linguistics and Dialectology, Budapest, Hungary

² ELTE Eötvös Loránd University, Doctoral School of Linguistics, Budapest, Hungary

Received: January 24, 2025 • Revised manuscript received: October 16, 2025 • Accepted: November 4, 2025

© 2025 The Author(s)



ABSTRACT

The present study examines the demonstrative use of the 8th century parchment charters related to the monastery of St. Gall (ChLA I, II, CXVIII). Its aim is to reassess the conclusions of the previous analysis (Pálfi 2023) which was based on a new approach: the simultaneous application of formulaic and linguistic methods. However, due to its methodological complexity, temporal factors and detailed textual proximity / distance marking in determiner selection were not thoroughly investigated. Thus, this study addresses this gap and provides additional evidence supporting the previous findings: the establishing force of *hic et nunc* deictic *ipse* and the linguistic environments that foreshadowed its emergence (anaphoric *ipse+supradictus+N* constructions).

KEYWORDS

formulas, 8th century charters, Late Latin demonstratives, proximal deictic *ipse*, temporal analysis, textual proximity/distance marking

The present study follows on the previous quantitative and qualitative analysis of the demonstrative usage in the 8th century Late Latin parchment charters related to the monastery of St. Gall (ChLA = *Chartae Latinae Antiquiores* I, II, CXVIII). In that study (Pálfi 2023), a new approach based on formulaic manifestation was introduced and applied along with the usual linguistic one. However, due to the homogeneous corpus encompassing only one century and the rather complex methodology, the temporal aspect and the textual distance marking of *ipse* had not been (fully) investigated. Therefore, the present paper's aim is to fill this gap.

* Corresponding author. E-mail: palfi.dorottya@nytud.elte.hu

The necessity of such an approach is threefold: 1) to analyse whether the linguistic developments observed in the previous study exhibit certain tendencies within the already limited time-span of the corpus; 2) to reassess the formulaic method and its conclusions from another aspect, especially the importance of determiner multiplications and additional adjectives / metalinguistic participles¹ in the evaluation of the data and finally, 3) to find additional evidence for the six identified deictic instances of *ipse*, i.e. to prove that the textual-situational deictic nature of *ipse* is foreshadowed by additional *supradictus* in anaphoric phrases. Thus, this paper examines three further formulas: 1) anaphoric *monasterium* (monastery),² 2) anaphoric *res* (property)³ and 3) deictic *charta* (charter).⁴

But before proceeding with the analysis, a summary of the grammaticalisation theories of *ipse*, then a brief outline of the previous study (its method and conclusions) is presented in sections 1 and 2. Then the linguistic background follows in section 3. In section 4, the cases in question are presented and analysed based on the preceding introductory parts. Section 5 includes the temporal analysis followed by a textual proximity scanning. Section 6 summarises the findings.

1. INTERPRETATIONS OF *IPSE* AND ITS GRAMMATICALISATION THEORIES

Late Latin demonstratives *ille* and *ipse* are usually investigated from the perspective of article development (Aebischer 1948; Selig 1992; Carlier & De Mulder 2010) since their derivatives emerged as the definite articles of Romance languages from Latin, a language without article. However, derivatives of *ille* are more widespread than those of *ipse* whose remnants can be found in Bealeiric / Costa Brava Catalan *es / sa*, in Logudorese Sard *su / sa* (Ledgeway 2012, 89).

But this was not always the case. Aebischer (1948) examining charters between the 8th and 12th century has even found phonetically redundant forms of *ipse* in Gascony, Languedoc, Catalonia (*sou, sa, sei, za*). He also notes that *ipse* was replaced with *ille* during the 10th–12th centuries in Catalonia and in Southern France leading possibly to the marginal frequency of today's *ipse* derived articles (Aebischer 1948, 191–193). During the evaluation of the data, he employs the term *articuloides* to describe their intermediary state: not full-fledged articles and already not strong demonstratives due to their brevity and first mention usages (Aebischer 1948, 182–183; 195–196). Löfstedt (1956, 64–66), as Aebischer did, also observes that the article-like frequency of *ipse* exceeds the frequency of *ille*. He also holds the view that

¹Sometimes, I will also use the words *supradictus* (aforementioned) or *praesens* (present) based on the formula's referential function to refer to these elements.

²Its general structure: (*ipse*)+(supradictus)+N (brackets signal optionality.) Translations and paraphrases are mine. They serve only an illustrative purpose, they have no argumentative role. Sometimes, the paraphrases from the charters are ungrammatical in English in order to reflect the redundancy of the texts.

³Its general structure: (*ipse*)+(supradictus)+N.

⁴Its general structure: (*hic*)+(iste)+(praesens)+N. The formulaic category *monasterium* serves to name the beneficiary of the document. However, it becomes the agent in the agreement modifying charters. The label *res* contains phrases about the donated / leased (im)movables. The formulas categorised as *charta* refer to the document or to the type of agreement. Cf. Pálfi (2023, 531–532). As the general structures suggest, only adnominal determiners are examined in this paper.

ipse seems to be on its way to develop into an article, nonetheless it has sometimes the same meaning as *idem*. Others also note that *ipse* is attested abundantly in Late Latin sources, yet the demonstrative *ille* serving as the main source for the Romance article appears with smaller frequency (Selig 1992, 134–138; Carlier & De Mulder 2010, 261). This problem is necessary to reflect on. It led several scholars to reach the conclusion that *ipse* could emerge as an article or an article-like determiner selected in competition with *ille* (Aebischer 1948; Selig 1992, 134–138). However, later researchers were more cautious to draw such conclusions. According to Adams (2013, 492–494, 806), *ipse* is employed in Late Latin texts where *idem* also appears. If *idem* is not considered a proto-article, *ipse* should not be categorised so either. Others hold the view that *ipse* after becoming an (exclusive) intensifier and an anaphoric (ic identity marker) serves as the origo of the articles stemming from it (Selig 1992, 154–155; Carlier & De Mulder 2010, 257–258; Bernstein, Ordoñez & Roca 2021, 15). However, it is not an unproblematic hypothesis since the grammaticalisation of *ipse* is an unusual one (Renzi 2000, 184). Therefore, Renzi asserts that intensifying *ipse* first turns into an anaphoric one that can evolve into definite articles, 3rd person pronouns (It. *esso*) and identity markers (It. *stesso*), but even to 2nd person deictics (Sp. *ese*). My problem with the concept that *ipse* is intensifying and anaphoric at the same time is that there are attestations of Classical Latin intensifying *ipse* usages where *ipse* modifies first mention nouns, therefore text-based (direct) anaphoric relations are hard to postulate or just in a very abstract way.⁵ In addition, Carlier & De Mulder (2010, 261–262) while arguing for an anaphoric-intensifying *ipse* also maintains that the feature of exclusive intensity is responsible for the maintenance of the anaphoric chain. However, the contrary can be proven sometimes (Pálfi 2023, 540).

Moreover, it is also problematic how one categorises the data. Should the noun marked by *ipse* just because it appeared in the text previously, be automatically considered anaphoric (and / or intensifying)? Every categorisation (including mine) depends on the researcher precisely and is impeded by the lack of native speakers. Therefore, what seems to be a functional overlap, can actually be a functional overlap or it can be the result of uncertainty between two (or more) possibilities, because of the status of (Late) Latin. Furthermore, as already stated, categorisation is also tightly intertwined with the lack of definitions considering the semantics / functions of demonstratives. And in this respect, I am not alone with my views (Hertzenberg 2015, 19–20; Stavinschi 2012, 73). Stavinschi (2012, 73) writes: “Semantic criteria is usually considered cursorily - dictionaries and grammars record only approximate glosses of very flexible usages.” I could not agree more.

However, there is another approach how *ipse* could gain referential features. It enters the three-term demonstrative system of Latin encompassing *hic* (proximal, related to the 1st person / speaker), *iste* (medial, related to the 2nd person / hearer) and *ille* (distal, related to a 3rd person). While *hic* underwent weakening, *iste* succeeded in its role and became the proximal

⁵Sen. *De Prov.* I.6.8.1–4: *Omne tempus, omnis uos locus doceat quam facile sit renuntiare naturae et munus illi suum impingere; inter ipsa altaria et sollemnes sacrificantium ritus, dum optatur uita, mortem condiscite.* [Let every opportunity, every place teach you how easy it is to withdraw from nature and to force its gift against it; even among the altars and during the festive rites of the ones performing sacrifices, while you wish for life, learn death.] In this passage, Seneca ponders upon the necessity to condemn life’s commodities to feel unmoved and content when the time of death comes. Therefore, *ipse* modifies *altaria* (and *ritus*) to mark the most unexpected places and events destined to sustain health and prosperity where one can practice accommodation to the thought of death. Thus, *ipse* could be interpreted as an inclusive intensifier according to the categorisation of Bertocchi (2000). Cf. 3.4.

demonstrative (Tamás 1983, 114–115: It. *questa, quella*, Old Fr. *cist, cil*). Thus, the place of *iste* was taken over by *ipse* as the Portuguese (*este, esse, aquele*) and Spanish demonstrative system (*este, ese, aquel*) attest it (Harris 1978, 69–72). The latter view is supported by Stavinschi (2012) who evaluated the earliest 13th–14th century evidence of *quisso* (<ecce+ipse) of the Central-Southern Italo-Romance demonstrative system (*quisto, quisso, quillo*). Her analysis was based on the approach that deixis and anaphora are not mutually exclusive (Stavinschi 2012, 79). Exophora (extratextual reference) is deictic, but not anaphoric (D+, A–), endophora (intratextual reference) is anaphoric and non-deictic (D–, A+). Intensifiers are neither deictic, nor anaphoric (D–, A–). Apart from these three categories, a fourth, intermediary category can be supposed to entail both deixis and anaphora (D+, A+). In the light of this categorisation, Classical Latin *ipse* was an intensifier developing into a Late Latin anaphor that resulted in a second-person deictic in Southern Italian dialects (*chisso*), Spanish (*ese*) and Portuguese (*esse*). After analysing 13–14th century texts (Stavinschi 2012, 77–84), she finds the forerunners of these second-person deictics in cases in which anaphoric and deictic interpretations are also possible (D+, A+). In such dialogic cases (Stavinschi 2012, 84), person A (speaker) employs *chisso* to refer back (anaphora) to the words of the interlocutor (person B). Nonetheless, deictic interpretation is also possible, if *chisso* starts to signal that the referent is located within the speech of person B as opposed to the speech of person A. The cause behind this lies in subjectification, a term borrowed from Traugott (1989: 35: ‘meanings become increasingly based on the speaker’s subjective belief state / attitude toward the proposition’).

In sum, depending on which side of *ipse* is examined, the article development or the emergence of deictic elements, it influences which grammaticalisation hypothesis is given more accountability (Carlier & De Mulder 2010, 244 deem insufficient the hypothesis of Harris among other causes due to the lacking explanation how *ipse* developed into the definite article.) Another aspect resulting in the two different approaches is the diverging views on intensifying *ipse*. Some claim that intensifying *ipse* is a subcategory of the demonstrative function of *ipse* (Sornicola 2011, 287), others view *ipse* as an element capable of moulding anaphoric and intensifying functions into one over time (Selig 1992, 154–155; Carlier & De Mulder 2010, 257–258), while others define the intensifying function negatively, as the lack of deictic and anaphoric features in a spectrum of referentiality (Stavinschi 2012). One thing is certain: if *ipse* develops into a deictic element and not just into an article, the grammaticalisation of this element is not unidirectional at all: anaphors can evolve into deictics, not just into articles. Apart from the demonstrative system of Spanish and Portuguese, modern day Italian dialects serve also as a proof, where *ipse* derived proximal demonstratives can be found (Miola 2017, 137–143) that can even express (psychological) proximity (Cuneo in Renzi 2000, 197–199; Sornicola 2012, 349; Ledgeway 2015, 85; Benincà, Parry & Pescarini 2016, 197).

2. THE PREVIOUS ACCOUNT: INCORPORATING THE FORMULAIC METHOD (PÁLFI 2023)

In the previous study, the demonstratives / modifiers (*is, hic, iste, ille, ipse*) of the 8th century parchment charters of St. Gall were examined. The underlying hypothesis was that charters confer validity and effectiveness through their strict compositional style, through their formulas (Pálfi 2023, 525, 532). Therefore, formulas can only be altered when problems in understanding

arise and prevail. From that follows that normative formulas indicate past linguistic traits while anomalies, even if they are outliers yet appearing at least 3–4 times in the corpus, can be considered innovative features, manifestations of linguistic change.⁶ Consequently, linguistic observations were simultaneously contrasted with the compositional tradition, with the formulas. The latter approach was also introduced due to the hyper-formulaicity of the texts, the intra-formulaic differences manifested in determiner uses and the lack of interpretations in the literature when determiner multiplications were observed despite maintaining the same function.⁷ After analysing the formulas and their compositional realisations, the study applied an economic concept: the smallest formula size providing relevant data (in this case, containing determiners in some / all of its variants) was the origo of the investigation. As a result, categorisation and labelling relied on this observation in the cases of *monasterium* (monastery), *res* (property) and *charta* (charter) (Pálfi 2023, 531–532). For more detailed analyses, particularly to decipher difficult cases, larger formula sizes, sentences were considered to verify the same linguistic context (Pálfi 2023, 548–549: e.g. in the cases of deictic *ipse*). Positive data – i.e. determiner multiplications / accumulations⁸ within the same formula – were of highest value, while additional metalinguistic participles⁹ and spatio-temporal adjectives¹⁰ provided the second most important source for drawing conclusions. Substitution could only serve as a secondary explanation to support the existing interpretation. Absence of determiners from certain formula variants was noted without serving as an explanation.

For the present paper, three conclusions of the previous analysis should be highlighted before moving to section 3 (Pálfi 2023, 556–557):

1. The weakening of *hic* based on determiner multiplications and additional spatio-temporal adjectives (*praesens*) in the formulas labelled as *charta* acting as a textual and situational *hic et nunc* deictic¹¹ and in the formulas expressing temporal proximity: *ab (hac) die (praesenti)*.¹²

⁶In the previous study, two parts, the *pia causa* and the saint's description were analysed in detail (Pálfi 2023, 527–532). Due to the differences in word order and syntactic realisations, smaller syntactic phrases were considered as the smallest formula categories. Differences in the word order of the same longer formula support that charters of frequent contract types (donation, *precaria*, exchange) were not drawn up with the help of formularies, but by memory (Korkiakangas 2022, 11–18). Additional evidence can be saturated from the anaphoric duplications. In duplicated phrases, each scribe applies his own metalinguistic participle and nothing else. Only *superdictus* / *supradictus* are more widespread among the same scribes. (Not every scribe uses duplications, though.) Since *supradictus* etc. mainly occur in duplications, the question can be raised why a scribe starts to make small inventions in the text when determiner usage is concerned, but not elsewhere.

⁷For the lack of interpretation cf. Ciccarelli (2017, 190), when *ipse* is interpreted as having the same value as *supradictus* even if they appear in the same phrase together. Selig (1992, 40, 43, 46, 48, 51, 54, 62) lists multiplications but the horizon of her qualitative analysis is relatively broad, i.e. it covers more *corpora* leading to the rather comprehensive presentation of the results. Thus, multiplications fall outside the scope of her work.

⁸E.g. ChLA II 112.10: *contra hanc ista traditione* [against this this donation].

⁹E.g. ChLA I 61.8: *ad ipsum superius nominatum monastirium restituat* [to pay it for the / this / that previously named monastery].

¹⁰E.g. ChLA I 78.9: *haec presens epistula ... permaneat* [this present epistle should remain].

¹¹ChLA I 41.22: *sed hec presens carta firma et stabilis et incontaminata debeat perdurare*. [but this present charter should remain firm and stable and uncorrupted] ChLA I 58.8: *qui contra hanc vinditione ista venire temptaverit* [who attempts to go against this this sale].

¹²ChLA I 71.3: *ab hac die presenti* [from this present day on].

2. *Ipse* while serving as a general anaphor and enhancing the general anaphoricity of the weakened *id*,¹³ exhibits semantic instability¹⁴ in the formulas of *monasterium* and *res* when occurring together with *supradictus*.¹⁵
3. Additional data on deictic *ipse* in the formulas labelled as *charta* suggested that *ipse* is developing a semantic shade, a higher focussing property akin to proximal demonstratives like *hic*.¹⁶

Therefore, the main question of this study is whether *supradictus* can signal semantic instability not just logically, but diachronically. In this case, it should precede deictic *ipse* and ‘densify’/ accrue before *ipse* enters the formulas of *charta*. This question cannot be evaded since *hic*, *iste* and *praesens* do not duplicate with *ipse* in the formulas of *charta* and – as mentioned above – determiner accumulation in the maintenance of the same function provides the most significant evidence.

3. LINGUISTIC BACKGROUND

3.1. Inherent semantics (focussing force / value) of demonstratives

The previous study could detect determiner weakening / strengthening in phrases containing multiplications, if two determiners, a determiner accompanied by *supradictus* or *praesens* maintained the same referential function on the basis that the referring words emphasise the noun they accompany.¹⁷ If deixis and anaphora differ in terms of directing the attention of the addressee to the noun with a different degree of force, then, in a multiplied phrase, one of the referring expressions is weaker than the other. What is more, differences in demonstrative usage can sometimes be observed in the charters when textual proximity / distance is indicated (section 5.2). Therefore, it is reasonable to suppose that something primes a demonstrative to be able to fulfil certain roles while excludes it from other functions. This is exactly, what Garcia (1975, 65) calls deixis and describes as ‘a semantic substance ... the force with which the hearer is instructed to seek the referent’. She examined Spanish clitics and differentiated between high and low deixis instead of the traditional proximal / distal categorisation since the latter fails to account for usages lacking spatio-temporal dimension. Following her footsteps, Kirsner (1979)

¹³ChLA I 54.4: *hoc id ipsum faciat* [he shall do (precisely / this) this this]; ChLA CXVIII 27.11: *id ipsud faciat* [he shall do (precisely / this) this].

¹⁴In accordance with the linguistic background III.1–2, semantic instability is the oscillation of the inherent focussing value of demonstratives experienced by the language user. As a result, the uncertainty whether the semantically unstable demonstrative has the required focussing ability to be employed in the given referencing process, can lead to demonstrative duplications and / or additional elements of the same referential role to secure the fortunate reference resolution. In case of *ipse*, additional *supradictus* can signal that *ipse* is either weaker, or stronger than the anaphoric metalinguistic participle.

¹⁵ChLA I 79.3–6: *omnes res meas ... ad ipsam superdictam ecclesiam ... trado*; [I hand over all of my property to the / this / that aforementioned church] ChLA I 109.6: *ad ipsam superdictam raem legitime pertinent* [it pertains by law to the / this / that aforementioned property].

¹⁶Detailed example in section 4.

¹⁷Demonstratives, *praesens* and *supradictus* give higher focus to the noun they mark compared to its unmarked counterpart. Cf. III.3.

analysed the Dutch demonstrative system, while [Strauss \(2002\)](#) examined spoken American English, applying the terms *high / middle / low focus* for *this / that / it*. In these studies, the data were corpus-based and in the case of Strauss, the discourse was taped, sometimes even filmed, while stress and intonation were marked. The general conclusion is that demonstratives of high focus provide tighter link to the referent than demonstratives of low focus do. Precisely, the focussing force of the demonstratives determine their usages in spatio-temporal situations, too.

In this paper, I use the term focus, force, strength, value instead of deixis to avoid confusion with the categories of referential functions.

3.2. Referential force

Considering referential functions, deixis and anaphora differ in oral discourse, that is higher stress is applied in deixis and lower in anaphora ([Lyons 1977](#), 660–662; [Cornish 2010](#), 222–223). There are two major approaches regarding the nature of deixis and anaphora. One views them as distinct categories ([Halliday & Hassan 1976](#), 33, 50; [Diessel 1999](#), 93–114) and the other tries to reconcile the two, either emphasising that anaphora and deixis are two ends of the same scale ([Cornish 2010](#), 219–221)¹⁸ or arguing that both require the same, three-stage cognitive process ([Talmy 2020](#), 1–3: identifying the cues to the target, recognising the target while excluding alternatives and embedding the target into the context).

As for the present paper, it can be concluded from the oral evidence that demonstratives not only have inherent force, but that this force can be modified in accordance with the referential function fulfilled. However, there are instances when the inherent force of the demonstrative correlates with its function. This is evident when distance plays a role in the text and is manifested in the use of demonstratives. Such instances also indicate that anaphora does not function as a separate and homogeneous category, rather as a category established by determiners of varying force.

3.3. Focalising and emphatic values of determiners in [Selig \(1992\)](#)

In this section, I would like to show that the focussing potential of demonstratives are not new in the study of Latin demonstratives yet, it does raise some questions, since the problem which domain demonstrative focus should be assigned to was not resolved.

[Selig \(1992, 114–115\)](#) defines the semantics of determiners based on the following parametres: [+/-proximity], [+definiteness], [+identity]. Therefore, *hic* can be described as [+proximity], [+definiteness], *ille* as [-proximity], [+definiteness], *ipse* and *idem* as [+identity]. She views therefore grammaticalisation as a process where demonstratives lose their potential to express [+/-proximity], in case of *ipse* [+identity] and only express [+definiteness]. This feature-loss – according to her – is caused by the increased frequency of demonstratives in syntactic positions reserved for the definite article in languages employing definite article ([Selig 1992](#), 115–116). However, there is another aspect she also considers ([Selig 1992](#), 116), the focussing ability of determiners. She suggests that in Latin, the unmarked noun has no focalising ability, while *is*+N has focalising

¹⁸The fact that the same type of determiners sustain anaphoric and deictic roles enables to view anaphora and deixis not as separate but as overlapping categories.

potential, but less, than *hic/iste/ille/ipse+N*. Thus, she distinguishes between focalising potentials and apart from that, she also states that *is+N* is the unemphatic, while *hic/iste/ille/ipse+N* is the emphatic option. How emphasis relates to the focalising abilities is not explained. Nevertheless, she states that focalising abilities remain the same independently from the type of reference. Therefore, they seem to depend solely on the referring expression (just as emphasis). (It is also evident from the two focalising categories that the relation of *hic/iste/ille/ipse* is not clarified or rather Selig holds the view that the latter demonstratives have the same focussing value.) What was only stated is that focus is not a semantic feature. However, if her views are contrasted to the findings of Garcia, Kirsner and Strauss, one should assume that focalising ability and emphasis are semantic features. Therefore, they remain intact from referential functions.

This is why I apply the term ‘intrinsic semantics’ to label the focussing abilities (focussing values, forces) of demonstratives optionally resulting in [+/-proximity] and other, emotive etc. features of the demonstratives.

3.4. Linguistic categorisation in the present study

While the linguistic background outlined in sections 3.1–2 are the basis of the following analysis, so anaphora and deixis are not considered mutually exclusive, I differentiate between referential functions, between deixis (exophoric reference), anaphora (endophoric (in)direct reference to a previously mentioned item) and cataphora (endophoric reference to a later mentioned entity). In terms of indirect anaphora, it is categorised according to Skrzypek, Piotrowska & Jaworski (2021), since their system distinguishes between more types of associative anaphora, not just meronymic (whole-part) and metonymic (contiguity based) ones to evaluate the broadest spectrum of usages. If the antecedent of an associative anaphora is not a distinct expression, the term non-nominal antecedent trigger is borrowed from Cornish (2010).

Furthermore, to evaluate the cases where the possible intensifying interpretation of *ipse* emerges, I rely on the work of Bertocchi (2000), who systematically analysed Classical Latin cases of intensifying *ipse* and reached a classification for this type of usage.¹⁹ Three categories were detected: exclusive, inclusive and another one expressing sufficient condition. *Ipse* provides focus in contrast to its periphery, i.e. its alternative elements holding true for the proposition. Exclusive *ipse* evokes that the only entity the proposition holds true is marked by *ipse*, therefore it can be paraphrased as ‘nobody, nothing other than x’ (Bertocchi 2000, 25–26). On the other hand, the entity marked by inclusive *ipse* is the most remarkable and the least expected in a positive context compared to the set of alternatives. Its paraphrases: ‘even x’, ‘x, too’ (Bertocchi 2000, 18–22). Finally, sufficient condition seems to be in between exclusion and inclusion inasmuch as it marks a rather low value entity sufficient for the proposition to hold true. Hence, stronger alternatives are not excluded. It is glossed as ‘only x’ (Bertocchi 2000, 26–27).

¹⁹ Another categorisation of intensifying *ipse* was proposed by Hertenberg (2015, 67–70). However, she did not contrast her categories to the Classical Latin *corpora* extensively, so I rely on Bertocchi (2000).

4. THE CASES OF FURTHER EXAMINATION

4.1. Deictic *ipse*

Ego in dei nomen Uiterichus ... trado res meas ... ad supradictum locum sanctum et monachis ibidem servientibus... (list of donated properties and the fee of usufruct) ... *Si quis vero ego aut heredes mei aut ulla opposita persona **contra hanc donationem istam** venire, agere, temptare vel inrumpere voluerit, solvat dublum tantum, **quantum in ipsa donatione insertum est**, et a fisco auri uncia una et argenti pondera duo, et nihilomenus **presens donatio istic** omni tempore firma et stabilis permaniat cum stipulatione subnixa.* (ChLA I 90.1–13)²⁰

[I, in God's name, Witerichus ... hand over my property ... to the aforementioned saint place and to the monks serving in the same place... (list of donated properties and the fee of usufruct) ... If someone, I or my heirs or an adversary person would like to go, act against this this donation, attack it or break it, he should pay the doubled amount of what in this / that donation was inserted, and (he should pay) to the treasury one ounce of gold and two pounds of silver, nevertheless, this present donation shall remain firm and stable with the attached stipulation.]

The example above represents formula variants of the label *charta* in bold. This formula is applied to name the document, the charter itself (*charta*, *chartula*) or the type of transaction (*donatio*, *concambium*, *precaria*). The syntagmatic formula containing duplicated referring words can be easily explained since the Romance outcome is known: *iste*-derivates survive, while *hic* almost entirely vanishes except for some traces of *hoc*.²¹ Therefore, the previous logical interpretation suggested that in textual and situational *hic et nunc* deictic formulas (referring to the physical charter and the text at the same time), *hic* undergoes weakening, while *iste* is adopting *hic et nunc* deictic features (Pálfi 2023, 546–549). (This developing aspect of *iste* can be seen in *presens donatio istic*, as well where *praesens* is necessary to secure the deictic nature of *istic*.)²²

The *ipse*-phrase in the *clausula poenalis* (penalty clause) cannot be interpreted so easily. First, the possibility of intensifying function should be ruled out.²³ Exclusive *ipse* would imply that the penalty (*poena*) can be set in documents other than the one describing the legal act, the agreeing parties and the (im)moveables involved. However, this hypothesis never occurs in the charters, so it can be discarded. Inclusive *ipse*, on the other hand, would suggest that the entity marked by

²⁰The text is also available in the Late Latin Database as LLDB; ChLA–1–90, lines 2–18. Differences between line numbers of the ChLA and LLDB-codes result from the fact that the editorial choice of text transcription in ChLA I–II was that line breaks of parchment documents are marked by vertical lines but are not numbered. Therefore, it was easier to give the line numbers of the transcribed text from the ChLA because they could be counted easier than the line breaks within the transcribed text. After the data started to be processed in the LLDB, the original line numbers of the charters were counted and given the default number.

²¹E.g. Tamás (1983: 115): Fr. *avec* (<*apud hoc*>); *ce* (<*ecce hoc*>).

²²Duplications serve only as a clue about the oscillations of the demonstrative's focussing force, so the interpretation depends on the Romance outcome and the increasing, decreasing ratios of the demonstratives (the topic of this study). The oscillations correspond to the uncertainty of the language user and are sometimes manifested in duplications (just as first mention occurrences are not compulsorily, but frequently among outliers). Therefore, in some cases, *hic* is stabilised by *iste*, in others, *iste* is reinforced by *praesens*. Cf. Pálfi 2023, 547–548.

²³When analysing intensifying cases, I always rely on the article of Bertocchi (2000) as stated in III.4.

ipse is part of a set of entities less remarkable than the one emphasised by *ipse*. As concluded from the previous argument, there is only one option for locating the *poena* in the St. Gall corpus and it is precisely in the document that describes the agreement. Therefore, the idea of inclusive *ipse* can also be refuted. Apart from the linguistic approach, formulas can also provide proof. In this case, not just the underlined syntagmatic phrase but its textual environment should be examined, i.e. the phrase comes directly after the *census* and it usually appears as *quantum cartula ista ... continet* (ChLA I 62.5: ‘how much this charter contains’). If this phrase expresses situational and textual *hic et nunc* deixis, then the phrase with *ipse* does so, as well.²⁴

Nevertheless, two contradictions can be raised. The first challenges the way the data are categorised. The first deictic formula can also be interpreted as an indirect anaphora with a non-nominal antecedent trigger, where the exact antecedent cannot be restricted to one word. In this case: *dono*, the agreeing parties, the donated properties altogether can be seen as constituents of a non-nominal antecedent trigger. However, *hic* is never accompanied by *iste* when anaphoric, but by *supradictus* or *idem*. Therefore, anaphoricity can be ruled out. Nevertheless, the other 5 cases of deictic *ipse*, which always appear in phrases describing the type of the agreement (*concambium*, *precaria*, *traditio*) but never with the word *charta*, also underline the ambiguous referential categories of these cases. And this is the point at which the linguistic background of referential functions comes into play to question the boundaries between anaphora and deixis.

The second objection can be raised on the basis of the absence of additional *ipse* accompanying *hic* in the deictic formulas of *charta* (**hic+ipse+N*) and the fact that *ipse* stabilises the anaphoric function of *id* referring back to the *census* (Pálfi 2023, 536–537). To refute it, only indirect evidence is available (apart from the temporal analysis in section 5.1). In the previous study, it was shown that only the demonstratives with the ability to express spatio-temporal proximity occur with additional *supradictus* when acting as anaphors, while the traditional distal demonstrative *ille* never appears in such constructions when anaphoric (**ille+supradictus+N*) (Pálfi 2023, 557).

Additional evidence can also support these conclusions. Even when appearing in cataphoric constructions (followed by a complementiser), *ipse* remains always anaphoric:

- (A) *et [pro istas res proservire volo annis singulis, ho est soledum unum]...proserviat ipsum servitium, quod superscriptum est*₁ (ChLA I 46.7–9)²⁵
[and for these assets I want to pay yearly, that is one solidus ... he shall pay this / that /the service, which is written above]

The phrase *ipsum servitium, quod superscriptum est* can be transformed into its more frequent form *ipsum superscriptum servitium* [this / that / the above written service]. This is also the form one encounters in the formulas *monasterium* or *res*. On the contrary, *ille* never occurs in such constructions, it remains purely cataphoric:

²⁴Since the formulas of *charta* (apart from the rigid *eam infringere voluerit*) are situationally and textually deictic, the same formulas employing *ipse* should be deictic, too. Formulas can actually help to combat the interpretational problems of the qualitative analysis that relies solely on linguistic categorisation. (For the detailed account: Pálfi 2023, 531–532, 546–549).

²⁵The whole text can be found in LLDB, LLDB–ChLA–1–46, lines 6–7.

- (B) *illas res, quas Uuigant in subter nominatis locis ad prefatum monasterium tradidit* (ChLA I 144.2–3)
[those assets, which Wigant gave to the aforementioned monastery in the above-mentioned places]

This observation is further supported by a certain type of error.

- (C) ... *dono ... ipsam salam <quae> colitur et omnia in ipsa villa* (ChLA I 59.3–4)²⁶
[I bestow this / that building <which> is habitable and everything in this / that estate]
- (D) ... *cunplacuit patrunis de ipsa ecclesia Uuitberto et Ratbodo ... ut ipsa rem <quam> Macanradus presbiter ibidem **conquisit**, eorum **tradedissit** (=eis traderet)* (ChLA I 70.3–4)²⁷
[the patrons of this / that / the (same) church came to an agreement with Witbertus and Ratbodus that it (= the church) shall give to them those assets <that> Macanradus presbyter collected in that same place]

In both cases, *ipse* is seemingly first-mention, however, the erroneous choice of demonstrative, selecting *ipse* instead of *ille* results in the omission of the relative pronoun. In both cases, the ‘correct’ version (i.e. according to the compositional structures of the St. Gall charters) would be:

- (C') *dono illam salam, quae colitur et omnia in ipsa villa*
- (D') *cunplacuit...ut illam rem, quam Macandradus presbyter ibidem **conquisivit**, eorum **tradedissit** (=eis traderet)*

The explanation lies in the fact that *ipse* is the default anaphor and strengthens even the weakened anaphoricity of *id* in the formulas of *census* (lease), while *ille* is the pivotal cataphor. And this is also the reason why additional *ipse* cannot be found in the deictic formulas of *charta* to compensate for the weakening force of *hic*. It would suggest anaphoric strengthening rather than deictic. Therefore, *ipse* can only be structurally cataphoric but functionally anaphoric. Thus, the only true cataphor in the corpus is *ille*. If *ille* is changed, the structure of the sentence is altered. This example illustrates the complex interrelations between text and referring devices. In these cases, the referring device ‘tailored’ the syntax.

4.2. Additional *supradictus* in anaphoric formulas

Now, let me turn to the second case in question: additional *supradictus* in the formulas of *monasterium* and *res*.

*...tradamus et transfundimus [(ad monasterium sancti Galloni)₁, qui est constructus in pago Harbonensi, ubi eius sacrus corpus requiescit]₂... hec omnia ex integro **ad ipsum suberius nominatum monasterium**₁₋₂ trado adque transfundo.* (ChLA II 114.1–2; 7)²⁸

²⁶Insertion (<...>) is by Béla Adamik. LLDB-text: LLDB–ChLA–1–59, lines 2–5.

²⁷My insertion.

²⁸Brackets are mine.

[we hand over and convey to the monastery of Saint Gall which is built in Arbongau where his holy body rests ... I hand over and convey everything as intact to this / that / the (same) above named monastery]

As it can be observed *ad ipsum suberius nominatum monasterium* [to the above-named monastery] is anaphoric because the determiner only appears in the second mention which also refutes the possibility of the exclusion and inclusion. The lack of first mention determiner excludes the deictic interpretation, too, since deictic determiners typically introduce new entities or new aspects of the existing ones. However, it remains unclear what the exact referent is. The phrase *ad monasterium sancti Galloni* (1) or the more extended second one (2)? Therefore, the phrase in bold can be interpreted as a direct or indirect anaphora, too.

The duplication also requires explanation. In the previous study (Pálfi 2023, 539–540, 548–549, 556–557), the final conclusion of the interpretation of these cases was that *ipse* does not weaken while accompanied by anaphoric *supradictus* but actually establishes higher focussing force similar to (the traditionally called) proximal demonstratives. This conclusion resulted from the evidence that 1) anaphoric *hic*, *iste* and *ipse* appeared together with *supradictus*, 2) the *hic et nunc* deictic *ipse* in situational-textual deictic formulas (*charta*) expressed spatio-temporal proximity, 3) in 5 out of 6 cases, the intensifying function of *ipse* could be ruled out and rendered redundant, as it was incompatible with the realm of the charters' legal and compositional traditions. Therefore, additional *supradictus* was interpreted as the sign of semantic instability (the oscillations of the determiners focussing force) appearing in phrases alongside the weakening *hic* or the strengthening *iste* and *ipse*. If that conclusion is correct, then in the temporal examination, phrases containing additional *supradictus* should increase in frequency before *ipse* enters situational and textual deictic formulas of *charta*.

5. TEMPORAL ANALYSIS

Before proceeding with the temporal analysis, I should address the methodical constraints applied during the analysis. All the formulas examined in the following subsections contain adnominal referring devices. Charters without (precise) dates were not considered, while the others were categorised by decade, with the exception of the last time-span covering 12 years. Charters with ambiguous dates that fall within the same time-span have been examined. The number of charters (=CH) and different scribes (=S) are also indicated in the tables.

5.1. The road to deictic *ipse*

Now, let me turn to the temporal aspects in the development of new functions and semantics.

Table 1 presents data on the deictic formulas regarding the charter or the type of the legal act. The use of *hic* rapidly decreases by around 26% in the 750s, followed by an increase in the use of *praesens* and multiplications. However, in the 760s, *hic* almost regains its original ratio (68,29%) at the expense of decreasing multiplications and disappearing *praesens*. On the other hand, the ratio of deictic *iste* grows slowly. After a relapse in linguistic change, *hic* starts to decline gradually from 68,29 to 61,40% and finally, to 45,68%. Meanwhile, *iste* increases slowly (21,95% → 27,16%) as do *praesens* (0% → 7,41%) and multiplications (21,95% → 27,16%). The decreasing ratio of *hic* and the growing ratio of *iste*, *praesens* and multiplications also support

Table 1. Temporal changes in the determiner use of the formula ‘charta’

Charta						
Time	hic	iste	praesens	duplex/triplex	ipse	Total
730–749 (Σ15) (5CH; 3S)	11	1	0	3	0	15
	73,33%	6,66%	0%	20%	0%	100%
750–759 (Σ19) (7CH; 3S)	9	1	2	7	0	19
	47,37%	5,26%	10,53%	36,84%	0%	100%
760–769 (Σ41) (15CH; 12S)	28	4	0	9	0	41
	68,29%	9,76%	0%	21,95%	0%	100%
770–779 (Σ57) (22CH; 12S)	35	9	1	12	0	57
	61,40%	15,79%	1,75%	21,05%	0%	100%
780–789 (Σ64) (23CH; 20S)	30	9	0	22	3	64
	46,88%	14,06%	0%	34,38%	4,69%	100%
790–801 (Σ81) (30CH; 21S)	37	13	6	22	3	81
	45,68%	16,05%	7,41%	27,16%	3,70%	100%
Total (Σ277) (102CH; 74S)	150	37	9	75	6	277

the conclusion of the previous study that the deictic force of *hic* is weakening while the proximal deictic value of *iste* is being established. The table also attests that deictic *ipse* only appears in the last two decades. But the question is whether its deictic function can be predicted from the determiner multiplications.

To answer this question, the data of Table 2 can be of help.

Table 2 presents the highly *ipse*-specific and always anaphoric formulas labelled as *monasterium*. These formulas are used to name the beneficiary, that is the church or the monastery of St. Gall. If we expect that additional *supradictus* indicates the oscillating focussing force of *ipse* on its way towards the focussing value characteristic of proximal deictics enabling *hic et nunc* deixis, it should be hypothesised that additional *supradictus* accompanies *ipse* before it attains the force necessary to establish proximal deixis on its own. The first time span offers very little to conclude due to the small number of charters (2 charters from 2 scribes). However, the formula seems less *ipse*-specific compared to its later manifestations. The distribution of *ipse* remains steady over the decades (around 77%) apart from a slight decrease during the 780s, followed by an increase of around 5% in the 790s. In the 750s, mainly *ipse* and *supradictus* maintain the anaphoric chain. One occurrence of distance indicating *ille* is also observed. Although the prevalence of *ipse* remains unchanged in the 760s, the ratio of *supradictus* decreases significantly (Σ2; 15,38% → Σ1; 3,85%) by around 10%, at the expense of the increasing ratio of duplexes (Σ0; 0% → Σ5; 19,23%). This tendency continues during the 770s: *supradictus* disappears (Σ0; 0%), while *ipse* and duplexes (the latter: Σ9; 22,5%) act as anaphors. However, significant decrease of multiplications can be observed (780s: Σ2; 5,88%; 790s: Σ3; 3,57%), while *ipse* and *supradictus* remain relevant in the 780 and 790s. Remember that deictic *ipse* emerged

Table 2. Temporal changes in the determiner use of the formula 'monasterium'

Monasterium						
Time	<i>ipse</i>	<i>supradictus etc.</i>	<i>duplex</i>	<i>hic</i>	<i>ille</i>	Total
740-749 ($\Sigma 6$; 2CH; 2S)	3	0	1	1	1	6
	50%	0%	16,67%	16,67%	16,67%	100,00%
750-759 ($\Sigma 13$; 5CH; 5S)	10	2	0	0	1	13
	76,92%	15,38%	0%	0%	8%	100%
760-769 ($\Sigma 26$; 11CH; 9S)	20	1	5	0	0	26
	76,92%	3,85%	19,23%	0%	0%	100%
770-779 ($\Sigma 40$; 19CH; 10S)	31	0	9	0	0	40
	77,50%	0%	22,50%	0%	0%	100%
780-789 ($\Sigma 34$; 15CH; 13S)	25	7	2	0	0	34
	73,53%	20,59%	5,88%	0%	0%	100%
790-801 ($\Sigma 84$; 30CH; 21S)	66	14	3	0	1	84
	78,57%	16,67%	3,57%	0,00%	1,19%	100%
Total ($\Sigma 203$; 82CH; 56S)	155	24	20	1	3	203

in the 780s, close before its appearance, the growing prevalence of multiplications containing additional *supradictus* is attested.²⁹ I have suggested that before the realisation of deictic *ipse*, *ipse* should appear in multiplications in anaphoric instances to foreshadow its semantic instability. This hypothesis is further verified by these data.

5.2. Determiners and textual proximity / distance

In this subsection, textual proximity is investigated in the anaphoric formulas of *res*. First, this formula category and the challenges of its temporal analysis will be discussed followed by the connection of determiner use and textual proximity / distance.

There is another formula type in which anaphoric *ipse* is attested. The table of the formulas (see Table 3) regarding the property (labelled as *res*) is not easy to interpret. The main problem is that the label *res* is an umbrella category containing several formula variants that appear in different portions of the text. These variants refer to the property list that is usually at the beginning of the charter. Depending on whether the whole property or only parts of the property are referenced, distance also plays a role in the selection of appropriate nouns and their accompanying demonstratives. For this very reason, I will provide only some brief notes on the table of the formula *res*.

²⁹ Again, relapse in linguistic change can also be observed during the 770s in this case. Factors such as normativity can withhold change and this is especially true to legal texts.

Table 3. Temporal changes in the determiner use of the formula ‘res’

Res									
Tempus	<i>ipse</i>	<i>duplex</i>	<i>hic</i>	<i>supradictus</i>	<i>ille</i>	<i>iste</i>	<i>idem</i>	<i>is</i>	Total
740–749 (Σ7; 3CH; 3S)	2 (+1D)	3	0 (+2D)	1 (+3D)	1	0	0	0	7
	28,57%	42,86%	0%	14,29%	14,29%	0%	0%	0%	100%
750–759 (Σ14; 4CH; 3S)	7 (+2D)	2	0	0 (+2D)	1	4	0	0	14
	50%	14,29%	0%	0%	7,14%	28,57%	0%	0%	100%
760–769 (Σ21; 9CH; 7S)	19 (+1D)	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	21
	90,48%	5%	0%	0%	4,76%	0,00%	0%	0%	100%
770–779 (Σ38; 19CH; 10S)	27 (+1D)	2	0 (+1D)	0 (+1D)	8	0	1	0	38
	71,05%	5,26%	0,00%	0%	21,05%	0%	2,63%	0%	100%
780–789 (Σ42; 19CH; 18S)	28 (+3D)	6	0 (+2D)	0 (+6D)	8	0 (+1D)	0	0	42
	64,29%	14,29%	0%	0%	21,43%	0%	0%	0%	100%
790–801 (Σ74; 27CH; 21S)	57 (+2D)	5	0 (+2D)	4 (+4D)	5	0	2 (+1D)	1	74
	77,03%	6,75%	0%	5,41%	6,75%	0%	2,70%	1,35%	100%
Total (Σ196; 81CH; 55S)	140 (+10D)	19 (0D)	0 (+7D)	5 (+16D)	24 (0D)	4 (+1D)	3 (+1D)	1 (0D)	196 (+35D)

From Table 3, it can be concluded that *supradictus* mainly acts as a reinforcement determiner, since it predominantly occurs in duplexes (abbreviated as D in the table. Occurrences 0 (+2D) – as *hic* in the 740s – signal that there is no anaphoric *hic*+N attested in the text from the given period, but there are two duplications with *hic* such as *hic*+*supradictus*+N). Adnominal *hic* never appears alone, it is mainly accompanied by *supradictus*. The overwhelming amount of *ipse* can be misleading, as the most common phrase to retain (in)directly the property list is *ipsas res possideat/trado* etc.

In the previous study (Pálfi 2023, 543), the *ipse* specificity of the word *res* was observed, as well as its general anaphoricity independent of distance / proximity. However, when other parts of the property (*hoba*, *villa*, *mancipia* etc.) were mentioned, other determiners became more active in the maintenance of the anaphoric chain to reflect textual distance. Therefore, in order to render the formula of *res* analysable, the umbrella category should be further divided according to referents and the examination should focus on the other parts of the property.

As it can be seen from Table 4, *suus* and determiner *is* in the form of *eius* or *eorum* are excluded from the analysis, since as possessors, they establish successful reference, if the referent is in focus, so relative proximity can be found in their cases.³⁰

³⁰ChLA I 87.7 (LLDB–ChLA–1–87): *Ragynulfus et Hariratus cum omnes adpertenentias eorum* [Ragynulfus and Hariratus with their every appurtenance]; ChLA II 121.5: *Uuinidolf cum huaba sua, Ascolf cum huaba sua, Uuillihad cum huaba sua* [Winidolf with his socage, Ascolf with his socage, Willihad with his socage].

Table 4. Determiners in the formulas denoting other parts of the property

Determiners in the formulas denoting other parts of the property ³¹					
	<i>ipse</i>	<i>hic</i>	<i>iste</i>	<i>idem</i>	<i>ille</i>
Proximal	6	4 (4D)	5 (3D)	4 (1D)	0
Medial	5	2 (2D)	0	0	0
Distal	42 (5D)	1 (1D)	0	0	5
Total (Σ73)	52 (5D)	7 (7D)	5 (3D)	4 (1D)	5

In Table 4, three types of proximity are distinguished: proximal, medial and distal. When the referring expression appears immediately after the referent, it is proximal. If it is resumptive anaphoric, then it should appear immediately after the last element.³² In terms of medial proximity, a brief (about four words long) explanation is usually inserted between the referent and its anaphoric phrase.³³ Distal refers to anything further than medial.³⁴

³¹Duplications (=D) are part of the total, not additional information as in Table 3. For instance, proximal *hic* (4) only appears in duplications (4D).

³²ChLA II 162.1: *Ego Rodulfus dono in villa, que dicitur Hohunstati, quicquid in ipsa curte visus sum habere*; [I, Rodolfus bestow what is in the village which is called Hohunstati, whatever I seem to possess in this / that village] ChLA II 146.2-4: *Convenit nos ... ut illas res, quas nobis Peratholdus comis tradidit in Munioluingas et quas nobis tradidit Ata quaedam matrona in Sedorf, ut haec idem loca Perahtoldo pro beneficio in censum prestare deberemus* [we agreed that those assets in Mundelfingen which Peratholdus handed over to us and <those> in Seedorf which Ata, a certain matron handed over to us that we shall lend these same assets to Perahtoldus as a benefice]; ChLA II 115.2-4 (LLDB-ChLA-2-115): *ut aliquas res nostras, qui sunt in pago Egauinsse in villa, que dicitur Slat, seu et in Mulinusa vel in Hegingas eciam et in Uuitertingas necnon et in Uualasingas vel in Gundihinhinhoua eciam et in Usa, quicquid in ista loca superius nominata tibi in precaria prestare deberimus* [that some of our assets which are in Hegau, in the village which is called Schlatt, and in Mühlhausen and in Ehingen and also in Weiterdingen and also in Welschingen and in Gundihinhinhoua and also in Hausen, whatever is in these above mentioned places, I shall lend you in precaria].

³³ChLA II 112.4-5 (LLDB-ChLA-2-112): *que dicitur Sytynga marca, in pago Bertoldesbara, quicquid ibidem in ipsa marca Sitynga* [which is called March Seitingen, in the county Berchtoldsbaar, whatever is in the same place, in this / that March Seitingen]; ChLA II 138.2-4 (LLDB-ChLA-2-138): *Et hoc est, quod dono in pago, qui vocatur Perahtoldipara, in vico nuncupante Uurmmeringa, quicquid ibidem visus sum habere; id est ... (short property list) ... et una hoba in villa, quae vocatur Conninga, cum omnibus ad eam pertinentibus vel quicquid ab his duobus denominatis locis aspicientibus mei alodis esse dinoscitur* [And this, what I donate, is in the county which is called Berchtoldsbaar, in the village named as Wurmlingen, whatever I seem to possess in the same place, that is ... (short property list) ... and a socage in the village which is called Gunningen with everything pertaining to it and whatever of these two places belonging (to me) is known to be my alodium].

³⁴ChLA I 80.3-4; 7-8 (LLDB-ChLA-1-80): *quidquid ego visus fui habere in villa, qui vocatur Uuobolgingas ... (list of property) ... quidquid mihi genitor meus in ipsam villam superdictam Obolgingas dereliqid* [whatever I seemed to possess in the village which is named as Worblingen ... (list of property) ... whatever my father ceded to me in this / that / the (same) aforementioned village, Worblingen]; ChLA I 97.2-3; 7: *hoc est, quod dono in pago Bertoltipara in loco, qui dicitur Buchilesperc, id est ... (property list in lines 4, 5, 6) ... de illa terra ad alia terra ipsius sancti Galli transire voluerit* [this, what I bestow is in the county Berchtoldsbaar, in the place Bickelsberg, that is ... (property list in lines 4, 5, 6) ... if he would like to travel from that land to another land of Saint Gall]; ChLA II 159.5-9: *four lines of place names ... haec omnia et ex integro, tam de paternico meo quam et de maternico vel mea adquisitione et viro meo Landoaldo in his locis supernominatis* [(four lines of place names) ... (I hand over) all of these and intactly as from my paternal as from my maternal inheritance and from my acquired possession and (my possession) from my husband, Landoaldus in these above-mentioned places].

What can be observed from the table? In terms of *ipse*, its general anaphoricity is evident, as it appears in proximal, medial and distal instances. Proximal and distal *ipse* can be found in the document regardless of the time the charter was drawn, although proximal *ipse* is less frequent. Medial *ipse* only occurs in the 780 and 790s. Almost one fifth of distal *ipse* is accompanied by *supradictus* which correlates roughly with the ratio of duplexes in the formulas of *monasterium*, around 10%. The duplicated instances foreshadow the struggle of *ipse* to express distance precisely, suggesting instability in its deictic force.

In terms of *hic*, all proximal, medial and distal occurrences appear in duplications, mainly with *supradictus* and in one instance, with *idem*. If these results are contrasted with the ratios of duplications and the emerging *iste* in deictic formulas (Table 1), the weakening of anaphoric and deictic *hic* can be concluded.

Iste with its relatively few occurrences, mainly appears in multiplications with *supradictus* and is always close to the referent. These data and the fact that *iste* can reinforce the deictic force of *hic* in deictic phrases expressing spatio-temporal proximity, suggest the strengthening proximal deictic force of *iste*.

Regarding *ille*, although, with significantly fewer occurrences, it appears far from the referent. It is clear that *ipse* is similar to *hic* and *iste* not only in its tendency to appear in multiplications, but to *hic* in that both cover all distances. However, when contrasted with *ille*, it is clear that *ille* acts as a distance marker, not as a general anaphor.

What should be made of *idem*? *Idem* with only three instances is always proximal. However, its rarity does not indicate its weakening, rather it can only be concluded that it was not part of the compositional tradition for a longer period, since it appears only in 779, then in the 790s.

Finally, to recapitulate what could be learnt of *ipse*, Table 4 directly reveals its general anaphoricity. However, it also suggests that *ipse*, as a distance marker, undergoes weakening, since multiplications occur only in distal instances.

6. CONCLUSIONS

The aim of this study was to investigate further the charters of St. Gall (ChLA I–II, CXVIII) and reassess the outcomes of the previous analysis based on a new method, the simultaneous application of formulaic and linguistic analysis. The first question addressed was whether the interpretation of anaphoric duplicated phrases (*ipse*+*supradictus*+*N*) had been correct, whether they signal the semantic instability of *ipse* developing *hic et nunc* deictic focussing force. If so, deictic *ipse* should be preceded by these duplications in time. In section 5.1, this tendency, the growing ratio of *ipse*+*supradictus*+*N* was detected in the anaphoric formula labelled as *monasterium* before *hic et nunc* deictic *ipse* entered the proximal situational and textual deictic formulas, *charta*. If the interpretation is correct, then the outcomes are similar to the result of Stavinschi (2012) inasmuch as anaphors can develop into deictics. However, due to the formulas of the St. Gall corpus, further analysis on the proximal uses of *ipse* is impossible: the charters are composed in a monologic style and apart from a few charters,³⁵ no second-person verbs, pronouns are employed. Therefore, the connection, whether *ipse* is the new medial

³⁵Charters employing second-person verbs, pronouns: ChLA I 40; I 58; II 115; II 128; II 150; II 165.

term instead of *iste* in the ternary demonstrative system or *iste* and *ipse* rival for the position of the weak *hic* in a binary system, cannot be concluded with complete certainty.

The second problem to analyse was whether textual proximity / distance is manifested in the formulas (section 5.2). For that reason, the *ipse*-specific formula regarding the property (*res*) was weakened, only the phrases naming parts of the property were taken into account due to the *ipse*-specificity of the word, *res*. Considering its quantity and its proximal, medial and distal instances, *ipse* remained the general anaphor, although, duplications occurred only in distal instances, while proximal and medial cases emerged after 772 signalling *ipse*'s weakening force of distance marking and its emerging new inherent semantics. In contrast, *hic* as a proximal, medial and distal distance marker, was always accompanied by another referring expression signalling its general weakening and pointing in the direction of its disappearance. *Ille* was interpreted as a distance marker, since all of the phrases containing *ille* expressed textual distance. *Idem* only with three tokens, reappeared in the charter composition as a proximal referencing device even accompanying *hic*.

The two analyses have strengthened the conclusions of the previous study and verified the method applied there (Pálfi 2023). Nevertheless, a few constraints of the methods in section 5 should be spelled out. In the diachronic analysis, some charters without dates of issue or with imprecise dates exceeding the stated intervals could not be taken account which led to the loss of some data. While textual distance analysis brought some interesting results (i.e. the distance indication of *ille*), it weakened the pool of *hic*, *iste*, *idem* and *ille* rendering the analysis almost impossible. The latter method is also very corpus-specific, textual distance indication cannot be detected everywhere. All in all, I think that the verification of the previous results was necessary to get a clearer picture on the direction of the changes.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT / FUNDING

The present paper was prepared within the framework of the HORIZON-ERC-2022-ADG project no. 101098102 entitled Digital Latin Dialectology (DiLaDi): Tracing Linguistic Variation in the Light of Ancient and Early Medieval Sources (see: <http://lldb.elte.hu/>). Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Council. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to my sister, Orsolya Pálfi for proofreading this study. Any errors remaining are my fault.

REFERENCES

- ChLA I. = Albert Bruckner and Robert Marichal (eds.). 1954. Chartae Latinae Antiquiores. Facsimile edition of the Latin charters prior to the ninth century. Part I. Basle, Olten & Lausanne: St.Gall. Urs Graf Verlag.

- ChLA II. = Albert Bruckner and Robert Marichal (eds.). 1956. *Chartae Latinae Antiquiores*. Facsimile edition of the Latin charters prior to the ninth century. Part II. Zürich, Olten & Lausanne: St.Gall. Urs Graf Verlag.
- ChLA CXVIII. = Cavallo Guglielmo and Nicolaj Giovanna (eds.). 2019. *Chartae Latinae Antiquiores*. Facsimile edition of the Latin charters. 2nd series. Ninth century. Part CXVIII. Addenda II. Dietikon & Zürich: Urs Graf Verlag.
- Adams, James Noel. 2013. The definite article and demonstrative pronouns. In J. N. Adams (ed.) *Social variation and the Latin language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 482–527.
- Aebischer, Paul. 1948. Contribution à la protohistoire des articles *ille* et *ipse* dans les langues romanes. *Cultura Neolatina* 8. 181–203.
- Benincà, Paola, Mair Parry and Diego Pescarini. 2016. The dialects of northern Italy. In A. Ledgeway and M. Maiden (eds.) *The Oxford guide to the romance languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 185–205.
- Bernstein, Judy, Francisco Ordoñez and Francesc Roca. 2021. Emphatic elements and the development of definite articles. Evidence for a layered DP in early Romance. *Journal of Historical Syntax* 5. Art. 22. 1–32.
- Bertocchi, Alessandra. 2000. *Ipse* as an intensifier. *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 5(1). 15–30.
- Carlier, Anne and Walter De Mulder. 2010. The emergence of the definite article: *Ille* in competition with *ipse* in Late Latin. In K. Davidse, L. Vandelanotte and H. Cuyckens (eds.) *Subjectification, intersubjectification and grammaticalization*. Berlin & New York, NY: Mouton de Gruyter. 241–275.
- Ciccarelli, Rossana. 2017. I dimostrativi. Tra norma e uso. In R. Sornicola, E. D’Argenio and P. Greco (eds.) *Sistemi, norme, scritture. La lingua delle più antiche carte cavensi*. Napoli: Giannini Editore. 175–202.
- Cornish, Francis. 2010. Anaphora: Text-based or discourse-dependent? Functionalist vs. formalist accounts. *Functions of Language* 17(2). 207–241.
- De Prov.* = Seneca. Moral essays with an English translation of John. W. Basore, Ph. D. in three volumes. London: William Heinemann.
- Diessel, Holger. 1999. Pragmatic use. In H. Diessel (ed.) *Typological studies in language* 42. *Demonstratives: form, functions and grammaticalization*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 93–114.
- Garcia, Erica C. 1975. The role of theory in linguistic analysis: the Spanish pronoun system. Amsterdam: North Holland Publishing Company.
- Halliday, Michael Alexander Kirkwood and Ruqaiya Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Harris, Martin. 1978. *The evolution of French syntax: a comparative approach*. London: Longman.
- Hertzenberg, Mari Johanne Bordal. 2015. Third person reference in Late Latin. *Demonstratives, definite articles and personal pronouns in the Itinerarium Egeriae*. Berlin & Boston, MA: De Gruyter.
- Kirsner, Robert S. 1979. Deixis in discourse: An exploratory quantitative study of the modern Dutch demonstrative adjectives. In T. Givón (ed.) *Syntax and semantics: Discourse and syntax*, Vol. 12. New York, NY: Academic Press. 355–375.
- Korkiakangas, Timo. 2022. From memory or formulary: How were medieval documentary formulae reproduced? *Mirator* 22(1). 4–24.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2012. Configurationality and the rise of functional structure. In *From Latin to Romance. Morphosyntactic typology and change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 81–180.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2015. Varieties in Italy 1. In Jungbluth and Da Milano (eds.) *Manual of deixis in Romance languages*. Berlin & Boston, MA: De Gruyter. 75–113.
- LLDB=Late Latin Database= www.lldb.elte.hu (Accessed October 25, 2025).
- Löfstedt, Einar. 1956. *Philologische Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae*. Uppsala.

- Lyons, John. 1977. Deixis, space and time. In J. Lyons (ed.) *Semantics*, Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 636–724.
- Miola, Emanuela. 2017. The position of Piedmontese on the Romance grammaticalization cline. *Folia Linguistica* 51(1). 133–167.
- Pálfi, Dorottya. 2023. Demonstratives in the charters of St. Gall. *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 63(4). 525–559.
- Renzi, Lorenzo. 2000. Storia di IPSE (con un'appendice di Marco Cuneo: Esiti di IPSUM nei dialetti liguri). In J. Herman, A. Marinetti con la collab and L. Mondin (eds.) *La preistoria dell'italiano*. Atti della Tavola Rotonda di Linguistica, Storica Università Ca' Foscari di Venezia, 11–13 giugno 1998. Niemeyer. Tübingen.
- Selig, Maria. 1992. *Die Entwicklung der Nominaldeterminanten im Spätlatein*. Tübingen: Günter Narr Verlag.
- Skrzypek, Dominika, Alicja Piotrowska and Rafał Jaworski. 2021. Reference in discourse and models of article grammaticalization. In D. Skrzypek, A. Piotrowska and R. Jaworski (eds.) *The diachrony of definiteness in North Germanic*. Leiden: Brill. 12–69.
- Sornicola, Rosanna. 2011. Per la storia dei dimostrativi romanzi: i tipi neutri [tso], [so], [ço], [tʃo] e la diacronia dei dimostrativi latini. *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 127. 220–314.
- Sornicola, Rosanna. 2012. Multifunzionalità di *ipse* in latino e polimorfismo degli esiti romanzi. In B. Frédérique, M.-K. Lhommé and D. Vallat (éds.) *Latin vulgaire – latin tardif IX*. Actes du IXe colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif, Lyon 2-6 septembre 2009. Lyon: Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée Jean Pouilloux. 347–362.
- Stavinschi, Alexandra. 2012. On the development of the Romance demonstrative systems. Historical remarks and theoretical conclusions. *Diachronica* 29(1). 72–97.
- Strauss, Susan. 2002. *This, that and it* in spoken American English: A demonstrative system of gradient focus. *Language Sciences* 24(2). 131–152.
- Talmy, Leonard. 2020. Targeting in language. Unifying deixis and anaphora. *Frontiers in Psychology* 11. 1–14.
- Tamás, Lajos. 1983. *Einführung in die historisch-vergleichende romanische Sprache*. Würzburg: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1989. On the rise of epistemic meanings in English: An example of subjectification in semantic change. *Language* 65. 31–55.