Chapter 9: *Hic, Ille* and *Iste*

Chapter 9 covers the following: the nature of demonstrative pronouns, the formation of *hic, iste,* and *ille,* and special adjectives which decline like demonstrative pronouns. And at the end of the lesson, we'll review the vocabulary which you should memorize in this chapter.

There is one important rule to remember in this chapter: demonstrative pronouns and related forms have *-ius* in the genitive singular and *-i* in the dative singular.

Demonstrative pronouns. Demonstrative pronouns, like English words "this" and "that," point at something. They're often used as adjectives, for instance, "this book" or "that tree." In English, demonstrative pronouns take a different form in the plural ─ "this" becomes "these," and "that" becomes "those" ─ making them one of the few English adjective forms which are different in the singular and plural. Though they are at heart adjectives, because they so often stand alone, it's almost better to consider them pronouns.

A pronoun is a part of speech. It's usually a small word which represents and stands in place of a noun, for instance, "We were looking for a new house to buy and we found *it*." "It" represents and stands in place of the "new house." Pronouns are some of the most useful forms in language. They allow us not to have to repeat a noun every time we want to mention it. Consider the nursery rhyme about Old King Cole. What if it didn't have pronouns? It would go: "Old King Cole was a merry old soul, and a merry old soul was Old King Cole. Old King Cole called for Old King Cole's pipe. Old King Cole called for Old King Cole's bowl. Old King Cole called for Old King Cole's fiddlers three." The next thing Old King Cole needs to call for is some pronouns.

Demonstratives can function as pronouns as well as adjectives. So, for instance, you can say, "Let's move there. That's a good idea." In the second sentence the demonstrative form "that" functions as a pronoun, because it represents and stands in place of the idea of moving "there." So demonstratives can serve as either adjectives when they modify a noun, or pronouns when they stand alone. Here's one idea expressed both ways: "I like that thing," where "that" is an adjective modifying "thing" ─ or you can just say, "I like that," in which case "that" is a pronoun representing and standing in place of "that thing."

If you haven't seen this already for yourself, another way to look at this pronoun usage is that the demonstrative pronoun is serving as a substantive, that is, an adjective which functions as a noun. And do you remember where Latin substantives get their substance? That's right, from their gender. English pronouns are the only place where there's anything corresponding to that practice in our language. Our pronouns are, in fact, archaic forms retaining grammatical information which our nouns and adjectives have long lost, for instance:

- gender: "he," "she," "it";
- number: "I" vs. "we," "you" vs. "y'all," "he, she, or it" vs. "they"; and even …
- case: "he" is nominative, "his" is genitive, "him" is accusative; "she" is nominative, "her" is genitive and accusative; "it" is nominative and accusative, "its" genitive.

There's a fascinating detail here. Notice that "he" has an accusative form "him," "she" has an accusative form "her," but "it" does not have a distinctive accusative form. "It" serves as both

the nominative and accusative, and that's because neuter nominatives and accusatives are always the same. Just like Latin, English is an Indo-European language, so it inherited the same tendency Latin did. And that's why English doesn't have a special neuter accusative form like "item"? "iter"? *It*'s enough.

Our demonstratives retain archaic forms, too, with number, for instance, as we noted before: "this" vs. "these," "that" vs. "those." The distinction between the singular and plural forms is a relic of the way that English used to treat all adjectives, which raises an important principle, one you should know, that the more common a word, the more likely it is to exhibit irregular forms, for the very simple reason that common words are heard more often and thus can support irregularity. So, for instance, we English speakers hear "do," "does," "did," "done" every day, which means that verb can afford to be irregular, as can "have," "has," "had," but not verbs like "mitigate" or "incapacitate." They're simply not used enough to support irregularity. If "do" stopped being used so much, I guarantee you, it would quickly regularize and soon we'd be saying "he dooz it," "I do'ed it," and down there in Texas they like their steaks "well do'ed."

The same holds true for Latin pronouns ─ indeed, the similarities between ancient Rome and modern Texas are frightening ─ many Latin pronoun forms exhibit archaic elements because they were used so often. So, for instance, the genitive singular of many pronoun forms is *-ius*, an archaic form. Likewise an archaic dative singular *-i* ending is often seen. The neuter nominative and accusative singular of several pronouns ends with *-d*, another relic of Latin's linguistic past, as is the deictic marker, a very old and very widespread form found in Indo-European languages, a /k/ sound most often spelled with *-c*, appended to the end of a word to indicate that the speaker is pointing at something.

Bearing all these archaic forms in mind can help with memorizing what might seem otherwise very irregular forms. And so here it is, your first Latin demonstrative pronoun: *hic, haec, hoc*, which means "this" in the singular, "these" in the plural. Let's recite it together starting with the nominative singular masculine and going across the genders, as we did before with first/second-declension adjectives: *hic, haec, hoc; huius, huius, huius; huic, huic, huic; hunc, hanc, hoc; hōc, hac, hōc*. And now the plural: *hi, hae, haec; horum, harum, horum; his, his, his; hos, has, haec; his, his, his.* Need I importune you, as I always do, to recite these forms until they are seared into your brain like "over-do'ed" meat? Come on: *hic, haec, hoc; huius, huius, huius;…* That's right. Keep doing it.

Looking at *hic, haec, hoc* linguistically shows that it's not as irregular and unpredictable as it might seem on the surface. To begin with, the base is clearly *h-* to which have been added, for the most part, first- and second-declension endings ─ with, of course, one minor irregularity: *h-* changes into *hu-* in the genitive and dative singular ─ and the *-c* deictic marker we discussed above shows up quite regularly but in every instance except one in the singular. In general, the singular is more irregular than the plural, so you'll just have to memorize *hic, haec, hoc*.

But let's examine in detail the patterns that can help you with memorizing this form. For starters, the *-ius* genitive singular is the archaic form we mentioned above. It's an ending you'll see elsewhere among pronoun forms, as is the *-i-* imbedded in the dative singular form, *huic*, which ends with the deictic marker *-c*. *Hunc* is, arguably, not irregular at all. It begins with the expected

base *h-* to which is added *-um*, the second-declension accusative masculine singular ending, and onto the end of that is added the deictic marker *-c*, but because *-m* and *-c* are more easily pronounced as *-nc*, the form becomes *hunc*. Exactly the same process produces *hanc* in the feminine accusative singular which is, at heart, *h-* plus *-am* plus *-c*. The ablative singular is absolutely regular, if you understand that the *-c* at the end of all the forms is simply a deictic marker. But please make a note that the long mark on the masculine and neuter ablative singular forms *hōc* is mandatory. The macron distinguishes those forms from the nominative and accusative neuter singular forms *hoc*.

The plural is all but completely regular and predictable. It simply takes the base *h-* and adds first/second-declension plural endings, with only one minor irregularity. The neuter nominative and accusative plural forms use the deictic marker *-c* producing the form *haec*.

Closely related to but meaning the opposite of *hic* is *ille, illa, illud*, meaning "that" or "those." As a pronoun, it shares many features with *hic*. Here it is. Let's recite it together: *ille, illa, illud*; *illius, illius, illius*; *illi, illi, illi*; *illum, illam, illud*; *illo, illā, illo*. And in the plural, *illi, illae, illa*; *illorum, illarum, illorum*; *illis, illis, illis*; *illos, illas, illa*; *illis, illis, illis*. Just as with *hic*, the masculine nominative singular *ille* is irregular. And also just like *hic*, *ille* exhibits the *-ius* archaic genitive singular ending and the *-i* archaic dative singular ending. But note that unlike *hic*, nowhere does *ille* use the deictic marker *-c* ─ well, not in classical Latin ─ in earlier Latin it does. But *ille* does show an archaic form that *hic* lost, that is, *-d* in the neuter nominative and accusative singular, producing the form *illud*. Outside of that, all of the other forms of *ille, illa, illud* follow the regular pattern for first/second-declension adjectives, including the mandatory long mark in the ablative singular feminine which is exactly what you would expect of a first-declension form.

Latin had another way of saying "that": *iste, ista, istud*. This pronoun shows stronger pointing than *ille*. It's more deictic than *ille* ─ it's "deicticer" ─ if that's a word. It's not. And when Italians of any century are pointing at something, it can never be good. So *iste, ista, istud* was often associated in ancient society with condemnation. The way my Latin teacher taught me to translate *iste* was to say, "that *grrr* man," So I pass on the tradition to you. *Iste* means "that *grrr-rrrRRRrrr!*" And note that *iste* declines in exactly the same way as *ille, illa, illud*, including the genitive singular *-ius* and dative singular *-i*, with which you should be familiar by now.

But those particular archaic endings are not restricted to *hic, ille* and *iste*. They also show up in a series of adjectives which often function as pronouns in Latin. These include *unus, alter, totus, ullus, solus, alius,* and *nullus*. I expect you to know both the meaning of these words and that they use *-ius* in the genitive singular and *-i* in the dative singular.

Let's end the grammar part of this lesson by addressing what may have occurred to some of you already: that demonstrative forms often serve as nouns, and when they do, just like substantive adjectives, they get their substance from their gender. For instance, *hic* can mean just "this" if it has a noun to modify, but it can also stand alone and mean "this man" if it doesn't. Likewise, *istius* can mean "of that *grrr* man/woman/thing," or it can even mean simply "his," "hers" or "its" as long as you understand the Romans' speaking is full of "deicticism," also not a word. *Illas* can mean "those women," or simply "them," in either case used in some sort of accusative

function. *Uni* can mean "to/for one man/woman/thing." Context will dictate which makes the best sense.

Now that we're done with the grammar for this chapter, let's look at the vocabulary.

The first word is *locus, loci,* m., meaning "place" or "passage in literature." It's a second-declension masculine noun ─ in the singular! In the plural it swings two ways. It can be masculine, *loci*, as you would expect from the singular, in which case it means "passages in literature," like a quote from Vergil or a song in the Bible. But it can also be neuter, *loca*, in which case it means "places" or "region" ─ singular! ─ a region is, after all, a collection of places. This is a very rare thing in Latin. Most words have one gender and one gender alone, which makes *locus* a fascinating artifact of an argument the Romans were having among themselves about the nature of this word ─ was it masculine or neuter? ─ a decision they had not yet arrived at in the Classical Age.

The next three words in the vocabulary list are *hic, ille* and *iste*. We've already talked about their formation. Let's talk about their meaning. While "this" is as close an approximate as English has to *hic* and "that" to *ille*, neither "this" nor "that" cover the meanings of *hic* and *ille* perfectly. For instance, English "this" almost always refers to something close and "that" something far away. While the same can hold true of *hic* and *ille* in Latin, it doesn't always. Sometimes *hic* can refer to a thing more distant and *ille* a thing closer, with one major exception where *hic* and *ille* conform exactly with English "this" and "that." When the Romans were referring to two things that had been mentioned earlier, they used *ille* ("that") to refer to the earlier one ─ it's further away ─ and *hic* ("this") to refer to the later one ─ it's closer. Thus *ille* can mean "the former," and *hic* "the latter."

The next word, *alter, altera, alterum*, means "the other." It's a first/second-declension adjective. This is the Latin word that gives us words like "alternate" or "alternative." Notice that those words have a connotation they've inherited from Latin: one of two, "**the** other," as opposed to "another," the Roman word for which is *alius, alia, aliud*, also a first/second-declension adjective. Just like "another," *alius* denotes something that is one out of three or more things, and while this word is not listed in the vocabulary, please add it to this vocabulary list. It's a basic and commonly used word in Latin. Wheelock cites it on page 42 immediately above the vocabulary.

And another thing! Take careful note of the genitive singular of *alius*. It's *alterius*, a form borrowed from *alter*. It should be **aliius* if you take the base *ali-* and add the archaic genitive singular ending *-ius*, but the Romans didn't like saying **aliius*. However, if they did the obvious and contracted it to *alius*, then there was no difference between the masculine nominative singular and the genitive singular forms. Lots of potential confusion there! So they reached over to this word's close cousin *alter* and borrowed its genitive singular, *alterius*, with the result that *alterius* can mean "of the other" or "of another," whichever the context demands. But this is the only form that causes this kind of confusion. Thus, all other forms of *alius* except the genitive singular use the base *ali-*, including the dative singular which, as expected of a form that serves as a pronoun often, exhibits the archaic ending *-i*, producing the form *alii*. Apparently confusion between the dative singular and the nominative plural masculine was not a problem.

The next word is *nullus, nulla, nullum,* meaning "no," "not any" or "none," another first/second-declension adjective. Please note that this word does **not** mean "not." It is **not** an adverb. It is an adjective. It does not modify verbs. It modifies nouns, as in "Yes. We have **no** bananas" vs. "We do **not** have bananas." Got it? Not "**not** bananas," "**no** bananas." Good, unless you like bananas.

The correlative of *ullus,* that is, its closely paired form, is *ullus, ulla, ullum* which is, like its twin, first/second declension. Please add this word also to your vocabulary.

The next word, *solus, sola, solum*, means "alone" or "the only." It's a first/second-declension adjective. You should note that it's part of a Latin idiom, a complex conjunction cluster, *non solum ... sed etiam,* which means "not only … but also."

The next word, *totus, tota, totum*, means "whole" or "entire," another first/second-declension adjective. Let's see if you've been listening to this lesson. What's the genitive singular of *totus*? Well, put a star on your forehead if you said *totius*.

The next word, *unus, una, unum*, means "one," "single," or "alone." It's yet another first/second-declension adjective. Here's an interesting question. What's the nominative plural masculine of this word? Trick question: how can you have the plural of the word "one?" Wait a second! No, it's not a trick question! Of course, you can have a plural of one. "Ones"! A perfectly fine word! "Here are the ones we like, and here are the ones we don't. Yar." [And now back to our regular commentator.] "Ones" means "multiple individuals." So, returning to my question, what's the nominative plural masculine of this word? Very good: *uni*. And *uni* would be identical to what form in the singular? Excellent! The dative singular. *Unus* is another of those pronoun forms that use *-ius* in the genitive singular and *-i* in the dative singular.

At the end of this vocabulary list are three small words. The first is *enim* meaning "for," "in fact" or "truly." It's a conjunction, and it's postpositive. Do you remember what that means? Yes! It tends to be the second word in a sentence. Please note this is not the same English word "for" that signals the dative case, as in "I did this for you," that is, "in your behalf." This is the English word "for" that links two sentences, as in "I made these recordings, **for** I hope that one day you learn to love Latin as much as I do."

The next word *in* we've already encountered and noted that it can take either an ablative or accusative object. If it takes the ablative, it means "in" or "on," and if it takes the accusative, it means "into" or "onto."

The final word in this vocabulary list is *nunc,* meaning "now." It's an adverb. Note the *-c* at the end of this word. It's yet another deictic marker suggesting that the Romans, when they said this word, tended to point as we do when we say, for example, "Memorize *hic, haec, hoc* ─ right now!" Could you hear me pointing?

So does the rule that was cited at the beginning of this chapter now make sense to you? If not, please review this presentation ─ right now! Or if so, please proceed to the next slide.

For the next class meeting please bring in a copy of the worksheet for Chapter 9. Here's a link to that worksheet.

And so concludes the presentation for Chapter 9.

Et illud est illud, O discipuli!