

G. SCHWANTLER O. - DÉDET K. - REICHERT H. (Hrsg.).
LINGUISTICA ET PHILOLOGICA. Gedenkschrift für Björn Collinder
(1894-1983). Wien, Braumüller 1984 (Philologica Germanica, 6)

n. 65-112

On Personal Pronouns in the
Nostratic Languages

Aron B. DOLGOPOLSKY

Haifa

In the present study (which is intended to be a fragment of a tentative Nostratic comparative grammar) I am trying to reconstruct the original system of personal pronouns (in this paper Sg.1 and Sg.2 only) which underlies the later systems of personal pronouns and pronominal affixes in Semito-Hamitic (henceforth SH), Indo-European (IE), Kartvelian (K), Uralic (U), the altaic languages [Turkic (T), Mongolian (M), Tungusian (Tn), and Gilyak (Glk)], Chukchee-Kamchadal (ChK), Elamite (E), and Dravidian (D).

§1. Let us first make a synopsis of the personal pronouns and pronominal affixes of Sg.1 and Sg.2 in the daughter-languages (Table A).

The numbers in Table A refer to the following explanatory notes:

[1] IE *eǵH(-om) / *eǵoH (or *eǵeH^W) 'I' > OInd. aham, Avestan azóm, OPersian adam, Old Lithuanian eš, pSl (proto-slavic) *jazь, Greek ἐγώ, ἐγόν, Latin egō, Gothic ik, Hittite uk. According to Szemerényi EVS 199, the original form is *eǵ(h)om, which has been preserved in Indo-Iranian and Germanic, while *eǵō (represented in Greek and Latin) is a secondary variant, which is due to the influence of the verbal inflection (Sing.1) *-ō. According to Burrow Sk 85, Greek ἐγώ, Lat. egō < IE *eǵoH (an Ablautstufe of *eǵH-). On IE *ǵH (> reflexes of *ǵ in most languages, those of *ǵh in Indo-Iranian) see Burrow Sk ibid. IE *tū 'thou' > Avestan tū, Lithuanian tū, pSl *tī, Doric Greek tú, Attic Greek tú, Latin tū, Gothic þu; the Indo-Iranian form *tuwám (> OInd. tvam, Avestan tvam, Opers. tuvam) goes back to IE *tū with an enlargement *-am due to analogical influence of the reflex *eǵHom 'I' (> OInd. aham, etc.). The proto-Anatolian form *tī 'thou' is represented by Hittite tī-k (-k due to the influence either of uk 'I' or the accusative form tūk

E.

C.

辞典

- 91 上 秀雄 朝鮮での文字の展開
上 田正昭 編 日本古代文化の研究
文字
92 京都大学 小倉進平 博士著作集 I
93 金思煒
94 諸橋 徹次 大漢和辞典
95 佐伯 有清 研究史 廣開土王碑
96 藤堂 明保 漢字とその文化園
97 藤堂 明保 漢語と日本語
98 李弘植 州國史辞典
99 李進熙 廣開土王陵碑の研究
100 梁柱 東増訂 古歌研究

66 phic Luwian *zi* 'thou'. See Brugmann-Delbrück GVG 2.2:382-3, Brugmann KVG 410, Szemerényi EVS 195-9, YaAA 1:20.

[2] IE **mē* . **mē* 'me' (accus.) > OInd. *mā*, Greek *με* - *ἐμέ*, OIrish and Middle Welsh *-m-* (OIrish *ro-m-icc* 'he cured me', MWelsh *ry-m-goruc* 'he made me'), Old Polish *mie*, possibly Hittite *-mu*, Hier. Luwian *āmu* . *-mu* (*āmu* is extended to the nominative case as well). Palaic *-mu*. Side by side with this monomorphemic form, there are forms with case inflection and/or with additional deictic morphemes, such as accusative **mē-m* 'me' (with the accusative marker **-m*) > Vedic *mām* and Oslavonic *mę*, dative **mo-i* 'to me' > OInd. *mā*, Greek *μοι* ~ *ἐμοί*, Oslavonic *mí*, Olatin *mī*. IE **t(w)ē* 'thee' (accus.) is preserved in OInd. *tvā*, Attic Greek *τέ* OIrish *-t-*, MWelsh *-th-*, side by side with PIE (proto-IE) forms with case endings, such as accusative form **t(w)ē-m* 'thee' > OInd. *tvām*, Oslavonic *tę* and Lithuanian *tave* (< **tavę*). For further details see Brugmann KVG 410-1 (and the table after p. 412), Brugmann-Delbrück GVG 2.2:382-3, Szemerényi EVS 195-201, Lewis-Pedersen CCG §336, Klingheben OPG 209, Meriggi UXIYa 268.

[3] IE **mens* (pronoun of Sing.1, genitive case) > Avestan *mana*, Oslavonic *mene*, OLatin *manī(s)* and Lith. *manęs* (with the final *-s* by analogy with the nominal inflection), Gothic *meina* (contamination of dat. **mei* and genitive **mene*). See Brugmann KVG 412, Szemerényi EVS 197, Stang 249-251.

[4] The PIE possessive nominal suffixes **-mi* 'my' and **-t(i)* 'thy' ¹ have been preserved in Hittite *-mi-* and *-ti-* (e.g., in the accusative forms *xalugatalian-mi-n* 'legatum meum' and *xalugataliat-ti-n* 'legatum teum') See Friedrich HEB 1:§115.

[5] IE **-mi* (> Oind., Avestan, Lith., Hittite *-mi*, Greek *-μi*, Oslavonic *-mъ*, OLat., Gothic, *-m*) and **-si* (> OInd., Avestan, Lith. *-si*, Hittite *-ši*, Greek *-σι*, OLat., Gothic *-s*) are "primary endings", i.e. person-and-number markers of non-past tenses. IE **-m* (> Oind., Avestan, OLat. *-m*, Greek *-ν*, Hittite *-n*) and **-s* (> OInd., Avest., OLat., Gothic *-s*, Hittite *-š*) are "secondary endings" (person-and-number-markers of past tenses). The origin of the difference between "primary" and "secondary" endings is not clear. In view of the external comparison of IE **-mi*/**-m* and **-si*/**-s* I am inclined to assume that the vowel **i* is an integral part of the morphemes in question, and the difference is of accentual (prosodic) origin.

67 [6] By LIE (Late proto-Indo-European) I mean the common ancestor of all IE daughter-languages except Anatolian. The existence of LIE as a valid branch of IE is rather obvious (to mention only such important morphological innovations as the feminine gender and the perfect tense). LIE corresponds to Sturtevant's Indo-European, while PIE is Sturtevant's Indo-Hittite. LIE **-H^w* is a primary ending of Sing.1 of the thematic verbs (those with stem-final **e/o*). The thematic vowel + **-H^w* becomes *-ō* (Greek *φέρω*, Latin *ferō*, Gothic *baíra* 'I am carrying, I carry' OIrish abs. *bíru* and constr. *-bíur* < **bíurū* 'I carry', Gatha-Avestan *spāsýā*, 'specto', Lith. *nešū* 'I carry, am carrying'). The LIE ending **-H^w* is obviously connected with Hittite *-zi* (see [7]), but the details of the development remain obscure. LIE **-ei* (a primary ending of Sing.2) is very tentatively reconstructible from Lithuanian *-i* . *-ie-* (*neši* 'fers', reflexive *-ie-si*). Celtic **-i* (OIrish *bíri* 'fers') and Greek *-εις* (*-ς* by analogy with the secondary ending?). See Szemerényi EVS 218-9, Watkins CV 140, Watkins GIV 163-4, 212-4, Stang VGBS 405-7, Sturtevant CGHL.

[7] The hypothesis on the pre-IE personal prefixes **H-* (Sing.1) and **t(H)⁻¹* (Sing.2) is based on internal reconstruction. Let us consider the paradigms of the LIE perfect tense, the Hittite *zi*-conjugation and the IE medium voice:
Medium voice:

PIE	LIE	OIndian	Avestan	Greek	Goth.	Hittite
	non-past ²	non-past	non-past	non-past	non-past	non-past
		past	past	past	past	past
Sing. 1 <i>*-Ho</i>	<i>*-ai<*-Hoi</i>	<i>-ā</i>	<i>-ā</i> past	<i>-μαι</i> past	<i>-da</i>	<i>-xa(xa)t(i)</i> past
Sing. 2 <i>*-tHV</i>	<i>*-soi³</i>	<i>-sē</i>	<i>-i</i>	<i>-i</i>	<i>-uāv</i>	<i>-xa(xa)t(i)</i>
	<i>*-th⁴s, *-so³</i>	<i>-thās</i>	<i>-sā</i>	<i>-oō</i>	<i>-za</i>	<i>-ta(ti)</i>
Sing. 3 <i>*-to</i>	<i>*-toi</i>	<i>-tā</i>	<i>-sa</i>	<i>-oō</i>	<i>-da</i>	<i>-tat(i)</i>
	<i>*-to</i>	<i>-ta</i>	<i>-ta</i>	<i>-to</i>		<i>-tat(i)</i>

PIE stative > LIE perfect tense:

	PIE stative	LIE perfect	OInd. perfect	Greek perfect	Gothic perf.
Sing. 1	*-He	*-Ha ^s , e.g. *woid-Ha 'I know'	vāda	Foṭōa	wait
Sing. 2	*-tHe	*-tHa, e.g. *woid-tHa 'you know'	vēttha	Foṭōa	waist
Sing. 3	*-e	*-e, e.g. *woid-e 'knows'	vāda	Foṭōe	wait

Now we may compare the PIE medium, the PIE stative (+ LIE perfect) and the Hittite xi-conjugation:

	PIE medium	PIE stative	Hittite xi-conjugation present)
Sing. 1	*-Ho	*-He	-xi
Sing. 2	*-tHV	*-tHe	-ti < *-tHi ⁶
Sing. 3	*-to	*-e	-i

In the paradigms the suffix of person precedes that of tense/aspect and voice. How are we to explain this rather unusual order of suffixes? From typology of languages of the world we learn that suffix-conjugated tenses usually go back to periphrastic (analytic) constructions of three different types:

- (a) Nomen verbale (i.e. verbal noun or verbal adjective) + a suffix-conjugated auxiliary verb. Examples: The future in French, Spanish and Italian (*cantare habeo* > French *chantera!*), the past tense in Polish (pSl *sypal̥ jesm̥ > Polish *spat̥em* 'I slept').
- (b) Nomen verbale + pronouns. Examples: the West Semitic perfect and the Akkadian permansive (WSem. *wašinta 'dormis' < *wašinV 'asleep' + *ta 'thou', Akkadian *šalmāku* 'valeo' < *šalimV 'valens' + *āku 'I').
- (c) Nomen verbale + a prefix-conjugated auxiliary verb. An Example: the Awngi (Central Cushitic) definite past tense: Sing. 1 *ḡepúyā* 'I bought' Sg. 2 *ḡewtúyu ā*, Sg. 3 m. *ḡewúya, Sg. 3 f. *ḡewtúyā, Pl. 1 *Bzewnúyā* < Sg. 1 *ḡeb -uya, Sg. 2 *ḡeb t-uya, Sg. 3 m. *ḡeb y-uya, Sg. 3 f. *ḡeb t-uya, etc. See Hetzron VSSA 12 ff.

The verbal paradigms with the person-maker in the world-final position go back to analytical constructions (a)

tense-or-voice marker are most likely to go back to a construction of the type (c), i.e. Nomen verbale + a prefix-conjugated auxiliary verb. Hence, the IE medium, the LIE perfect tense and the Hittite xi-conjugation point to underlying constructions with prefix-conjugated auxiliaries. Thus we come to the conclusion about the prefix *H- for Sg. 1 and *t(H)- for Sg. 2 (while the forms of Sg. 3 have either no prefix or a prefix xt-, going back to a demonstrative pronoun).

[8] The SH disjunct pronoun ("Nennform") *anī* 'I' has been preserved:

- (a) in Semitic as a self-standing Nennform-pronoun **anī* (> Hebrew *ʾanī*) with a secondary variant **anū* (> Arab. *ʾanā*, Ethiopian *ʾana* etc., probably due to analogy with Sg. 2 m. **anta* 'thou'), as well as an enclitic object pronoun **nī* 'me' (> Hebrew, Arabic, Aramaic, Ethiopian *-nī*, Akkadian *-ni*).
- (b) in Cushitic as a self-standing pronoun: Bedawye *anī*, *āne*, Bilin *ʾan*, Awngi *ān*, Somali *anī-ga*, *anī-gī*, Galla *ānā*, Saho *anū* (-u from the nominal inflection), Sidamo *ane*, pScush. **ānī* (Ehret SCP 283), as well as a subject pronoun: Somali *ān*, Galla *ānī*. See Dolgopolsky SF 210-1.

The SH pronoun **anāku* 'I' has been preserved as a self-standing pronoun in Semitic **anāku* (> Akkad. *anāku*, Hebrew *ʾanōkī*, Phoenician *ʾnk* ~ *ʾnky*, Ugaritic *ʾnVnkV*, Yaʿu-dic Aramaic *ʾnk*), in Eg. *ink* > Coptic ANOK and in pBerber *enakk* 'I' (Prasse MGT I-III:179).

The SH independent pronoun **ant(i)* 'thou' is represented in Cush.: Bilin *entī*, Awngi *entā*, Somali *adī-ga*, *adī-gī*, Galla *ātī*, Saho *atū* (-u from the nominal inflection), Sidamo *ate*, pCush. **āta* (Ehret SCP 282), etc (see Dolgopolsky SF 133-4). In Semitic there is a gender differentiation between **ant-a* 'thou' m. (> Akkad. *atta*, Hebrew *ʾattā*, Arabic *ʾanta*, etc.) and **ant-i* 'thou' f. (> Akkad. *attī*, Hebrew *ʾatte*, Arabic *ʾantī*, etc.), which is either a pSemitic innovation, probably due to the influence of the pronouns **ka* 'thee, thy' (m.) and **ki* 'thee, thy' (f.), or a SH archaism: **anta* m. < **an(i)-a* (with the masculine particle *-a, see [10], preserved in pS **anta* 'thou' m. and in pCush. *āta* 'thou' (a former masculine form, which has lost its gender meaning)

[9] In SH there is a special series of pronominal suffixes

used as subjects following nominal predicates. This construction (+ predicative form of nomina) has been preserved in Akkadian: Sg.1 *gašr-āku* 'I am strong', *gašr-āta* 'you (sg.m.) are strong', *gašr-ātī* 'you (sg.f.) are strong'. In other languages this construction (+ predicative form of nomina) has joined the verbal paradigm as a tense. This is the case with the W-Semitic stative + perfect, with the O.Eg. conjugation of the "pseudo-participle" and with the proto-Berber "parfait qualificatif":

- A. WS stative + perfect: Sg.1 stem + **-ku* (**mawīt-ku* 'I am dead' + 'I have died' > Eth. *mōtkū*), Sg.2 m.: stem + **-ta* (**mawīt-ta* 'mortuus es' > Hebrew *mattā*, Arab. *mitta*); Sg.2 f.: stem + **-tī* (**mawīt-tī* 'mortua es' > Hebrew *matte*, Arab. *mittī*);
- B. O.Eg. conjugation of the "pseudo-participle": Sg.1: stem + *kw ~ kj* (irx.kw ~ irx.kj 'I know'), Sg.2: stem + *tj* (irx.tj 'you know');
- C. Proto-Berber "parfait qualificatif": Sg.1 stem + **-ay* (> Kabyle stem + *-əy*, e.g. *mellitəy* 'I am white', Tahaggart stem + *-äy*), Sg.2: stem + **-ad* (> Kabyle stem + *-əḍ*, e.g. *mellitəḍ* 'you are white', Tahaggart stem + *-äd* or *t- + stem + -äd* with the facultative *t-* by analogy with the regular prefix-conjugation of verbs). See Djakonoff SHL 85-7, Edel AAG 269-287, Cohen SVS 22-3, Klingenberg PSK 230-1. Hanoteau EGT 195, Stumme HSchT 55, cp. Prasse MHT VI-VII:10-1, 193.7

The SH pronominal affixes in question may be reconstructed as **-āku* for Sg.1 (> Akkadian *-āku*, pWSem. **-ku* with loss of **ā* by analogy with the forms of other persons, Eg. *-kw ~ -kj*, proto-Berber **-ay*), **-t(i)* for Sg.2 (> Eg. *-tj*, pB **-ad*, pS **-ta* m. and **-tī* f.); the gender distinction in Semitic is either an innovation (due to analogy with **ka* 'thee, thy' m. and **ki* 'thee, thy' f.) or an archaic feature with **-ta* preserving the SH masculine-marker **-a* (discussed in [10])

The fact that these pronominal affixes (+ pronouns) are found within SH compound pronouns **an-āku* 'I' and **an-t(i)* 'thou' (see above [8]), which are not predicates, suggests that originally **-āku* and **-t(i)* could accompany a nomen (noun, adjective etc.), no matter the syntactic function of the latter, i.e. originally they function as an apposition to a nomen: **an-āku* and **an-t(i)* may have originally meant 'self I' and 'self thou' (cp. Italian *proprio io* and *proprio tu* or French *moi-même*; see below §2.6), and pS **šalim-āku* (> Akkadian *šalmāku* 'valeo, I am all right') may have the

etymological meaning 'valens ego, safe-and-sound I'. Later, when the nomen assumed the function of a predicate, its apposition (personal pronominal affix) became its subject: pS **šalim-āku* 'all right am I'.

[10] SH **ya* (pers.pron.Sg.1 in the oblique cases) have been preserved in Akkadian (*yā-tī* 'me' accus., and *yā-šim* 'to me') in pBerb. (suffix **-i/*-y* and prefix **i-/*y-*, both meaning 'me') and in Cushitic (Saho *yī, yo, yotte* 'me', Somali *i, Elmolo i-* 'me', Dasenech *yē*, Sidamo *-ē* 'me', Beḍawye *-ē-* in the compound suffix *-h-ē-b* 'me'). The Eg. enclitic pronoun *wj* (used as object of verbs, as well as in some other functions) suggests that this **ya* has resulted from reduction of earlier SH **uya* (cf. below [11]).

SH **ku* 'thee' is found in Akkadian *ku(w)ātī* (> *kātī* . *kāta*) 'thee' (accus.), (and) *ku(w)āšim* > *kāšim* 'to thee' and in Cushitic **ku* 'thee' > Saho *ku, kuo*, Somali *ku*, Elmolo *ki-* (preverb), Dasenech *kō*, Awngi *-ku* (verbal suffix), Iraqw *kō* 'thee' (analytic preverb), etc. Cp. Dolgopolsky SF 77-8, 260.

Side by side with **ku* (object pronoun of Sg.2 without gender distinction) there are special pronouns for masculine and feminine: **ka* 'thee' m., **ki* . **kVm* 'thee' f.

SH **k-a* 'thee' m. has been preserved in pS **ka* 'thee' m. (verbal suffix), pB **-ək* 'thee' m. (suffix), in Cushitic **ka* 'thee' m. (> Bilin *-kā* and Beḍawye *-hō-k(a)*, verbal suffixes), in Chadic **ka* 'thee' m. (> Hausa *ka*, Bolanchi *kā*, Mubi *ka*, etc., see Dolgopolsky EPC) and possibly in Eg. *kw* 'thee' m. (< **kV-w*; **-w* is a suffix, cp. Eg. *čw* (< **ki-w*) 'thee' f., Cush. **ki* 'thee' f. (> Bilin *-kī*, Beḍawye *-hō-k(i)*, verbal suffixes) and by Ch. **ki* 'thee' f. (> Hausa *kī*, Bolanchi *šī*, Mubi *kī*, etc., see Dolgopolsky EPC).

SH **k-Vm* 'thee' f. is found in pB **kam* 'thee' f. (Prasse MGT I-III:173) and in Ch. **kVm* id. (> Ngizim, Duway *kəm*, Bade *gəm*, Buduma *-gem*).

The feminine-marker **-i* in SH **k-i* is identical to pS **-ī* and Beḍawye *-i* as suffixes of fem.sg. in verbal forms of the 2nd person (imperative and indicative), e.g. Sg.2 f. imperative: Hebrew *šəb-ī* 'sit!' (f.sg.), Arab. *'ištis-ī* 'sit!' (f.sg.); Beḍawye *dīr-ī* 'kill!' (f.sg.). The masculine-marker **-a* in the pronoun **k-a* is identical to the marker of masc. sg. in the Beḍawye verbal forms of the 2nd pers.: *dīr-a* 'sit!' (m.sg.). Some tentative conclusions on the origin of these gender-markers may be drawn from analysis of their distribution. The fact that in the prefix-conjugated verbal forms of Sg.2 (such as Beḍawye *tī-hdy-a* 'thou [m.] art', *tī-hdy-i* thou [f.] art', Hebrew *tī-šmēc-ī*

'you [f.sg.] will hear') the gender-marker is separated from the person-marker (→ personal pronoun) suggests that the gender-marker cannot go back to personal pronouns or their attributes (appositions). What is important with the gender-markers *-ī (f.) and *-a (m) is (1) that they are used in Sg.2 forms only (cp. a Beḡawye paradigm of the past tense of the verb /dīr 'to kill': Sg.1 a-dīr, Sg.2 m. tī-dīr-a, Sg. 2 f. tī-dīr-t, Sg.3 m. t-dīr, Sg.3 f. tī-dīr, Pl.1 nī-dīr, etc.), (2) that they are always used as suffixes only, and (3) that they follow quite different parts of speech: verbs (both imperative and indicative), nouns, adjectives and pronouns. All these peculiarities of distribution are easily accounted for by an assumption that these gender-markers go back to adress words. Feminine-markers *-ī and *-a may go back to words meaning 'mother': cp. SH roots *Vv- 'mother' (> ECush. *āvy- 'mother' > Rendille ay-o, Boni āy-0', Galla āvy-o, Burju āvy-e, etc.; SCush *āyo . *yāyo 'mother' > Iraqw ayō, Burunge, Alagwa iyo, Asa yeyo, Dahalo ǰāǰo; Chadic *'ya 'mother' > Pero [WCh.] iyā, Mubi [ECh.] iyā, Hwona [CCh.] 'iya, WMargi [CCh.] 'iyā 'mother', etc.) and *Vm- . *mV 'mother' (> pS *'mm- . *'umm- 'mother'; Eg. mw.t 'mother'; Berber *m/mā 'mother' > Ait-Izdeg mma, Tahaggart, Tawelemdden, Ghadames, Tashelhit ma, etc.; Chadic: Ngizim māi, Kera āmā 'mother', Gwandara ama, Pa'anchi ama-tī, Kilba āmā, etc.). Cf. Black LEC 214, Cohen DRS 1:22-3, Ebert STK II:26, 103, Ehret SCP 317, Foucauld DTF 3:1134, Ghoubid Alojaly GTF 122, Jungraithmayr-Shimizu CLR 2:185, Kraft ChW I-III, Mercier VTAI 165, Sasse PEC 44, Schuh DN 109, Skinner NBL 32. The gender-marker in question bear some typical resemblance to English [s :] and [m], which may be regarded as gender-markers within the utterances ['je(s)s :] (Yes, sīr) and ['jesm] (Yes, mam).

[11] SH *Vya (> *-ya/*-ī) 'my' has been preserved as a suffix in Sem. *-ya/*-ī, pB *-ī/*-y 'my' (Prasse MGT I-III; 164), Eg. -j, Cush.: Iraqw -ǰ, Alagwa -ī, Burunge -ayī, Sidamo -'ya, Somali -(k/t)-ay, Galla -(k/t)-īyyā (-k- and -t- are gender-markers of the noun), Elmolo -au, -u, as well as in Chadic: Margi -áyū, Musgu -á, -ya, Hausa -a (for further details and analysis of the Ch. pronouns cf. Dolgopolsky EPC). The Sidamo morpheme -'ya 'my' suggests the reconstruction of a morpheme with an initial laryngeal (~ *Vya), cp. Eg. wj 'me, I' (presupposing *'uya see above [10]).

SH *ka 'thy' (masc. possessoris) > Sem. -ka id. (> Hebrew -kā 'thy' id., Arabic -ka id., etc.), Beḡawye -ka 'thy'm., WCh.: Hausa -ka 'thy'm., Bolanchi -ko id., etc.

SH *kī, 'thy' (fem. possessoris) > Sem. *-kī, Eg. -č, Beḡawye -kī, Haraso (ECush.) -āhī, Wch.: Hausa -kī, Bolanchi

-ī, Kulere -ky, She -ič, etc.

SH *kVm 'thy' (fem. possessoris) has been preserved in Berber (pB *-em. see Prasse MGT I-III:64) and in Central Chadic (e.g., Buduma -g'um). Cp. *kVm 'thee' f. [10].

The gender of the SH possessive pronoun *ku is more problematic. As can be seen from certain Cushitic and Chadic languages preserving gender differentiation in Sg.2 possessive suffixes (e.g. Haraso [ECush.] āhu 'thy' m. versus -āhī 'thy' fem. possessoris, Buduma [CCh.] -gu 'thy' m. versus -g'um 'thy' f.), *ku referred to the masculine gender. But the obvious etymological identity of this possessive *ku with the SH object pronoun *ku 'thee' (lacking gender differentiation) suggests that the association of the possessive ku with the masculine gender is secondary: it seems to have resulted from a semantic polarization, due to the presence of feminine possessives *kī and *kVm.

Eg. -k 'thy' m. (> Coptic -K) and pB *-ek 'thy' m. may go back both to *ka and to *ku.

[12] SH *-mī and *-tī as verbal suffixes of Sg.1 and Sg.2 have been preserved in Highland East Cushitic, e.g. in Kambatta yom-mī 'sum', yon-tī 'es' (see Dolgopolsky PLOG 103-110, 112, cp. another opinion in Zaborski VC 106-119). Cp. *tī in SH *'an-tī 'tu' and *mī 'I' probably preserved in WCh. (Southern Bauchi: Lungi mī 'I', Zul āmī 'I' [possibly from *'an-mī?], see Dolgopolsky EPC).

[13] SH *V- (verbal prefix of Sg.1) > Sem. *V-, Cush. *tV- (> Beḡawye, Saho, Afar, Somali, Awngi V-, 'V-), pB zero-prefix *θ- < *a- in the form *θ-stem-āy, Sg.1 of verbs (Prasse MGT VI-VII:16).

SH *tV- (verbal prefix of the 2nd person) > Sem. *tV-, Cush. *tV- (> Beḡawye, Saho, Afar, Somali, Awngi tV-), pB *t- in the form *t-stem-ād, Sg.2 of verbs.

[14] Kartvelian *me(n) 'I, me' > OGeorgian me(n), G me, Megrelian ma, Laz ma(n). K *mī (apophonical variant of *me) > Svanian mī 'I'. See Klimov ĚSKYa 132, Illič-Svitič OS 1:153. The apophony *e (< *ye) / *i is a regular development of a pre-Kartv. *i (see Gemqrelize-Maçavariani SSAFE 175-379, Illič-Svitič GM, Dolgopolsky-Dibo-Zaliznyak VIS 89-90). K *sī 'thou' > Megr. sī, Laz sī(n), Svan. sī. A variant *swen is found (according to Illič-Svitič) in the compound *š(w)en (Sg.2 poss. and genitive) < *č-swen-; *č- is the pK marker of possessive and genitive in pronouns. See Klimov ĚSKYa 162-3, Illič-Svitič OS 1:6.

[15] K *m- 'me, to me' (verbal prefix) > OG, G, Svan. m-,

Megr., Laz *m-* (. *b-* . *p-* . *p-*). K **g-* 'thee, to thee' (verbal prefix) > OG, G, Laz *g-*, Megr. *g-* . *r-*, Svan. *ǰ-*.

[16] **h-* (verbal prefix of Sg.1 agentis) > OG *w-* (. *rw-?*⁸), G *v-*, Megr. *w-* (before vowels), *b-*, *p-* and *p-* (before consonants), Laz *w-*, *b-*, *p-*, *p-*, Svan. *rw-*, *w-*. See Mačavariani SKKS 71-73 (reconstruction of the pK phoneme **h*), Deeters KhV 25-27, cp. Klimov ĚSKYa 258 (his reconstruction of the Sg.1 prefix is **rw-*, since he does not distinguish between **x* and **h*).

K **h-* (agential prefix of Sg.2) > OG *x-* (in one dialect) and *h-* (in another one), G *θ-* . (rare) *x-*, (in dialects) *x-*, *h-*, Megr. . ., Laz *θ-*, Svan. *x-*, *θ-*. See Mačavariani SKKS 71-73, Deeters KhV 28-34, Klimov ĚSKYa 257.

[17] In Uralic the original forms of the nominative case of the pronouns are **mE*⁹ 'I' (> proto-Permian *mę* > Ziryene, Yažva Komi *me*; proto-Ostyak **mä*; proto-Vogul *äm* < *ä-mE*) and **tE*⁹ 'thou' (> proto-Permian **tę*, Hungarian *tő*). In the oblique cases stems with a **n-* suffix were used: Sg.1 **min-* . **mun-*, Sg.2 **tín-* . **tun-* . **tün-*. This distinction between stems has been preserved in a few languages only: Ziryene and Yažva-Komi (nom. *me*, oblique cases *men-*, nom. *te*, oblique cases *ten-*), EOstyak (e.g. Vakh nom. *mä*, obl. cases *män-*), Nostyak (e.g. Obdorsk *mä*, *män-*), Vogul (e.g. in the Konda dialect nom. *äm*, obl. *ämn-*, Tavda nom. *em*, obl. *emä'n* . *enä'm*). But usually the stems with **n-* were generalized and extended to the nominative case as well: 1) **minV* > Finnish *minä*, Cheremis W *mьñ* 'I', 2) **munV*, 'I' > proto-Lapp **mön*, Mordvin *mon*, proto-Samoyed **mьn*, 3) **tínV* . **tünV* 'thou' > Finnish *sinä*, Cheremis W *tьñ*, proto-Ostyak **nöñ* . **nöñ* (**t* > **n* by assimilation), proto-Vogul **nöñw* (> Tavda *näw*, *nüw*, Lower Konda and Upper Konda *näñ*, NVogul *nañ*, etc.), 4) **tunV*, 'thou' > proto-Lapp **tön*, Mordvin *ton*, proto-Samoyed *tьn*¹⁰.

The variation of vowels in the stems suggests levelling processes, probably an analogical influence of Sg.1 pronoun upon Sg.2 pronoun and/or viceversa. A plausible hypothesis is that the original form of the stems was **mi* for Sg.1 and **tü* for Sg.2. The stems of oblique cases go back to the forms of genitive (**mi-nu* and **tü-nu*, cp. Mong. Sg.1 genitive *minu* and Sg.2 genitive *cinu* < **tínu*), which were later generalized as stems for all oblique cases. The variant **tínV* (with **i* for the original **ü*) is due to analogy with **minV*. The variant **tunV* (from **tünü* due to vowel harmony) influenced the Sg.1 pronoun, hence the stem **munV*. Another factor responsible for the change **i* > **u* in **munV* is the labializing influence of **m*. Ostyak has preserved (in its **ö* in *nöñ* 'thou' > Vakh, Vasyugan *nöñ*, Tremyugan *nöñ*) the **ü* of

the stem **tünV*.

The original suffix vowel **u* of the genitive case forms **minu* . **munu* and **tínu* . **tunu*, comparable to that of Mong. *minu* and *cinu*, can be possibly found in the genitive forms of Finnish (*minu-n*, *sínu-n*), Estonian (*minu*, *sínu*) and Lapp (pL **mön*,⁸) > Kola Lapp *monē*, *mune*, *mon^a* - pL **mü* > *Nlapp mü*, *mu*, SLapp *muw*, pL **tön*,⁸) . **tü*¹¹.

See Collinder CG 308-10, Honti GOV 167, Illič-Svitčić OS 2:64-5, Itkonen OLV 17-18, Janhunen SW 86, 147, Janhunen UKS 14-5, Liimola WPP 20, MSzFE 3:621-2, Sammallahti LMS 32, 38, Szinnyei FUS 95, Vértes OP 191-215, 235-9, Wiklund EUL 280-4.

The Mordvin suffixes *-m-* 'me', *-t-* 'thee' and the Hung. suffix *-l-* 'thou' in the verbal forms of the so-called "objective conjugation" are not mentioned here as markers of pronominal object, since they cannot be traced back to pU as object pronouns. To my mind, the verbal forms in question may go back to periphrastic constructions of verbal nouns with pronominal possessive suffixes + auxiliary verbs, hence the pronominal morphemes in question go back to possessive pronominal suffixes. See Kövesi OK 96-106, Szinnyei FUS 131-3.

[18] According to P.Hajdú, the pU possessive suffixes are **-me* 'my' and **-te* 'thy' (Hajdú BUNY 69). The reconstruction of the vowel **e* here is open to discussion, hence I write it with half-brackets / (half-brackets of questionable reconstruction).

Proto-Uralic **-m(e)* > OFinnish *-mi* (*poikase-mi* 'mein Söhnchen'), Finnish (Iitti dial.), *-m* (< *-mi*), pLapp **-m₃* (> NLapp, Lule, ELapp *-m*, SLapp *-m₃*, *-m₃*), Mordvin (Erzá) *-m*, Cheremis *-m* . *-em*, pPermian (after Litkin) **-mV*, Ostyak *-m*, Vogul *-em* . *-um*, Hung. *-mV*, pSam. (Künnap) **-mV*. PU **-t(e)* > Finnish *-si* (OFinnish also *-ti*), pLapp **-t₃*, Mordvin, Cheremis *-t*, pPerm. *-tV*, pSam. (after Künnap) **-öV* . **-tV*. Cp. J.Mark's reconstruction of 1929: **-mV* (. **-wV*) for the 1st person, **-tV* (. **-öV*) for the 2nd person. See Collinder CG 299-301, Korhonen JLKH 236-7, 267-70, Künnap SUKF I:156-82, Mark PSUS (the whole paper), Mark SPUS 50-62, Szinnyei FUS 97-103, Teplyašina-Litkin PYa 149-50.

[19] PU **-m_{1V}* (verbal suffix(es) or postverbal subject pronoun(s)¹² of Sg.1) > Finnish *-n*, pLapp **-n* (> Lapp N *-m*), Mordvin *-n*, Cheremis *-m*, Votyak *-m*, Ostyak, Vogul *-m*, Hung. *-m*, pSam. (after Künnap) **-mV*, **-m*. PU **-t_{1V}* / **ö_{1V}* (verbal suffix(es) or postverbal pronoun(s)¹² of Sg.2) > Finnish *-t*, Mordvin, Cheremis *-t*, Hung. *-l* (< **-öV*), pSam. **-tV*, **-t₁₃*. The pLapp suffix of Sg.2 **-k* (> *-k*, *-h*, *-θ* in dialects of Lapp) goes back, according to Collinder, to **-k-ti* (**-k-t₃* .

76
suffix of present). See Collinder CG 308-9, Hajdú BUNY 140-4, Kerhonen JLKH 267-71, 285-7, Kunnap SUKF II:11-84, Szinyei FUS 128-9.

[20] PTurk *bI 'I' and *sI 'thou' have been preserved in Chuvash: *eBe* 'I' and *eze* 'thou'. The initial element *e-* probably goes back to an interjection, since it does not follow the regular sound laws: there is no pT vowel to become initial *e* in Chuvash (all words with initial *e* are either loanwords or interjections). In CT (= Common Turkic, the ancestor of all Turkic languages other than Bulghar and Chuvash) there was a levelling of stems within the declension paradigm, and the stems of oblique classes *mān Sg.1 and *sān Sg.2 were extended to the nominative case as well.

[21] PTurk. *mān- (. *bān?)¹⁴, the stem of oblique cases of the pronoun for Sg.1 > Chuvash *man-* id., CT *mān (. *bān?) 'I' (the generalized stem for all cases) > Old Turkic (8th cent. AD) *mān*, *mān-* or *men*, *men-*¹⁵ (in the inscriptions of Kül Tegin and Bilgä Qayan) . *bān*, *bān-* or *ben*, *ben-*¹⁵ (in the inscription of Toñuquq), OTurkic (9-12 cent. *mān*, *mān-* (*men*, *men-*) . *bān*, *bān-* (*ben*, *ben-*), Azerbaijani, Eastern Turki *mān*, *mān-*, Türkmen, Kazakh *men*, *men-*, Kazan Tatar *mīn*, *mīn-*, Turkish *ben*, *ben-*.

PTurk. *sān-¹⁵, stem of oblique cases of the pronoun of Sg.2 > Chuvash *san-* id., CT *sān, *sān-* > OTurkic *sān*, *sān-* . *sen*, *sen-* (generalized stem both for most oblique cases and for the nominative), Azerbaijani, ETurki *sān*, *sān-*, Türkmen, Turkish, Kazakh *sen*, *sen-* etc.

The vowel of these stems was not stable in OTurkic, the dative case having the form *maŋa* . *baŋa* 'to me', *saŋa* 'to you' (an obvious case of regressive vowel assimilation under the influence of the case ending *-qa). According to the reading of Gabain, Tekin, Teczan and Malov, the accusative forms in the Toñuquq inscription are to be read *bīnī* 'me' and *sīnī* 'thee'.¹⁶ If this reading is reliable, we may see here still another grade of vowel alternation. The question of priority might even arise: which of the two vowels - *ä* (*e*) or *i* - is primary, and which is due to the influence of some case ending(s)? Cp. A. von Gabain's opinion about the primarity of *i* in the pers. pronouns.

See Clauson ED 346, 831, Gabain ATG 91, Gabain PSK 132, Kononov GYaTRP 164-6, Malov PDP 61, Ščerbak OSM(I) 124¹⁷-7, Tekin GOT 138-9, Teczan UIS 92.

[22] Proto-Turkic *-m/*-Im 'my' > Chuvash *-m/-em/-əm* 'my', OTurkic *-m* (after vowels), *-im* / *-īm/-ūm/-um* (after consonants) and similar suffixes in other medieval and modern Turkish languages. The symbol *I* stands here for a high vo-

77
wel, alternating according to the rules of vowel harmony.

Proto-Turkic *-uɣ/*-ūg, (after vowels) *-ɣ/*-g 'thy' > Chuvash *-u/-ū*, Old Turkic *-uɣ/-ūg/-īɣ/ig*, (after vowels) *-ɣ/-g*, Azerbaijani (dialects) *-uɣ*, *-ɣ*, *-uw*, *-w* (*göz-uɣ-un* 'oculi tui', *baba-ɣ-ın* 'avi tui', *at-uw-ı* 'equus tuum') Chuvash *-u/-ū* may go back only to rounded allo-morphs *-uɣ/*-ūg, hence I am inclined to assume that the Old Turkish unrounded allomorphs *-īɣ/-ig* are secondary. They are due to labial harmony of vowels, which is a rather recent morphophonemic rule: according to T. Tekin, "in Orkhon Turkic the labial harmony is at its first stage of development" (Tekin GOT 63). Side by side with *-*(u)ɣ* / *-(ū)g*, a nasalized variant *-*(u/ū)ŋ* (. *-*(ī/ī)ŋ?*) exists. In Old Turkish we find both variants, in most other languages of the CT branch the *-*(V)ŋ*-suffix is the only one in use. According to J. Benzing (Benzing T 726-7), the nasalized variant is represented by the Chuvash optional allomorph *-ən-*, used in the oblique cases side by side with the regular *-u* (*-ū*): genitive *-ən-ən* 'of thy ...' side by side with the regular *-u-n*. If it is true, it suggests that Chuvash reflects the pT distribution: the *-*(V)ŋ*-suffix was originally used in the oblique cases only, and it may be conjectured that it resulted from nasalization of the suffix *-*(u)ɣ*/*-*(ū)g* by the adjacent genitive ending **-n*. See Caferoğlu-Doerfer A 302, Kononov GYaTRP 148, Levitskaya IFČYA (on the Chuvash reflexes of pT vowels and on the origin of Chuvash *u* and *ū*), Levitskaya IMČYA 14-15, Ščerbak OSM(I) 73, Širaliev VL 44-5, Tekin GOT 122-4.

[23] Proto-Turkic Sg.1 *-m (> Chuvash *-n*, Old Turkic *-m*, as well as *-m* in Middle Turkic and New Turkic languages) and Sg.2 *-ŋ ~ *ɣ/g*, Turkish, Azerbaijani, Karaim *-n*, Türkmen, Qazaq, Kazan Tatar, Qumıq, Altai Turkic, Tuva, Yakut *-ŋ*) are used as verbal suffixes with the *-dI/-tI*-Perfect (Old Turkic *ala-dī-m* 'I took', *ala-dī-ŋ* 'you took'), as well as with some other verbal forms, such as the Conditional (*ala-sa-m* 'I should take')¹⁷.

The sentence-final pronouns *mān 'I' and *sān 'thou' are used in the languages of CT origin with nominal predicates and with several verbal tenses (going back to nomina verbalia). In Old Turkic, some Middle Turkic languages (Karakhanid, Chagatay, Old Osman-Turkish, etc.) and in Tuva these pronouns still remain separate words (e.g. OTurkic *qıryız oylı mān* 'I am descendant of Qıryız' *bān anča ter mān* 'I say as follows', lit. 'ego sic dicens ego', *ötädäi sän* 'you will die', lit. 'moriturus tu', Tuva *ažiläčän men* 'I am a worker', lit. 'moriturus tu', Tuva *ažiläčän men* 'I am a worker', *ažiläčän sen* 'you are a worker', *ažiläčär kiži men* 'I work', lit. 'working man I', *nomčän men* 'I read', *nomčän sen* 'you read', *nomčup tur men* 'I read', *nomčup olur men* 'I

am reading', etc.), while in most New Turkic languages these pronouns have become suffixes agglutinated to the predicate nomen or verb, e.g. Qazaq *muyallım-mın* 'I am a teacher', *bala-sın* 'you are a child', *ala-mın* 'I am taking', *ala-sın* 'you (sg.) are taking', etc. In some New Turkic languages the suffix *-mVn* has been reduced to *-(V)m* (probably under the influence of the verbal personal suffix *-Vm*): Turkish *rum-um* 'I am Greek', *oğlun-um* 'I am your son', *evdey-im* 'I am at home', *gidiyor-um* 'I am going away', Crimea Tatar *oğa-m* 'I am a teacher', *ala-m* 'I am taking', Kazan Tatar *ala-m* 'I am taking' (cp. *ala-sın* 'you are taking'). As should be expected, the sentence-final pronouns **mān*, **sān* and their reflexes are found in the languages of the CT branch only. These pronouns can be traced to CT, but not to pT, since in pT the nominative forms **mān* and **sān* did not exist yet (see [20]). Instead, we should expect pT nominatives **bī* and **sī* in this function in pT. Indeed, traces of this usage are found in Chuvash, namely in verbal forms going back to participial and gerundial constructions (participle + pronoun and gerund + pronouns as nominal predicates), such as future *pīr̄-p* 'I shall go', *pələ-p* 'I shall say' from participium necessitatis (futuri) with **-yu/*-gū(> -s/-e)* + pronoun **bī (> -p)*¹⁸. See Benzing T 740, 747, Isxakov-Pal'mbax FTYa 351-4, Kononov GYaTRP 169-70, Levitskaya IMČYa 64-5, Pritsak HTF 153, Ščerbak OSM(G) 24-40, Tekin GOT 138-9, 187-97.

[24] Proto-Mongolian **bī* 'I' > MM (= Middle Mongolian), WrM (= Written Mongolian) *khalka*, Moghol *bī*, Monguor *bu*, Dagur *bi*.

Præ-Mong. **tī* > pM (= proto-Mong.) *či* 'thou' > MM, Kalkha. Monguor *či*, WrM *ci*, Dagur *ši*.

[25] PM **mīnu* (genitive of the pronoun of Sg.1) > MM *minu*, *minī*, WrM *minu*, Dagur *minī*, Monguor *muni*, Kalkha *minī*, Kalmuck *min̄*, *minē*.

Pre-M **tīnu* > pM *čīnu* (genitive of the pronoun of Sg.2) > WrM *čīnu*, MM *čīnu*, *čīnī*, Dagur *šīnī*, Monguor *čīnī*, Kalkha *čīnī*, Kalmuck *čīn̄*.

[26] Proto-Mong. accusative **nama-yī* 'me' (> MM *namai*, *namayī*, WrM *namayī*, Dagur *namūī*, Moghol *namci*. Buryat *namā(yi)*, etc.) is formed with the regular nominal accusative ending **-yī* from **nama-*, which is a Mongolian stem for oblique cases of 'I' (ablative pM **nama-ča*, Instrumentalis **nama-βar*, etc., see Poppe IMCS 212). In MM ("Muqaddimat-al-'Adab", 14th cent.) a form *mina-yī* 'me' (accus.) is attested.

PM **čīma-yī* 'thee' (> MM *čīma(y)ī*, WrM *čīmayī*, Dagur

šamai, Monguor *čīmi*, Buryat *šamā(yi)*, etc.) is formed with the nominal accusative-marker **-yī* from **čīma-*, which is a pM stem for oblique cases (cp. ablative **čīma-ča*, Instrumentalis **čīma-βar*).

In view of external comparison, we suggest that **čīma-* as a stem for oblique cases is a generalization of an accusative form *čīma* < **tīma* < **tī* + *ma* (**tī* 'thou' + accusative marker **ma*). In the oblique stem **nama-* we may see a generalization of an accusative form **na-ma*. The origin of **na-* is not clear. According to Ramstedt ÖMP 7 and Poppe IMCS 21, **nama* is from **nīma* < **mīma*, i.e. the original pronominal stem was **mī-*. Another possible hypothesis is that **na-* goes back to the pronoun **nV* 'we' (1 pl. excl.), comparable to Gilyak *nē-n*, *nī-n* 'we' excl. (*n* . -*n* is a plural marker), Kartvelian **n-* 'we' excl., SH **n-* (1 pl. excl.). IE **n-* (1 pl.), as well as possibly to Dravidian **nām* 'we' incl. (**-m* is pl. marker).

MM *minayī* 'me' (acc.) is formed with *-yī* (accusative ending) from the stem *mīn-* (going back to the pM genitive form **mīnu*, see [25]).

[27] In Old Mongolian (unattested language underlying the tradition of WrM) and in MM there is a construction Noun + Genitive of Personal Pronouns: **aqa minu* 'my elder brother', lit. 'frater mei', **aqa čīnu* 'thy elder brother'. In most modern Mongolian languages such postnominal pronouns "lost their stress, became enclitics, and ultimately became endings" (Poppe IMCS 221): Dagur *-mīn̄*, *-mīī* 'my', *-šīn̄*, *-šīī* 'thy', Moghol *-mīnī*, *-mīn̄*, *-mīnī*, *-mī* 'my', *-čīnī*, *-čī* 'thy', Kalkha *m̄n̄* 'my', *-č̄n̄* 'thy', Kalmuck *-mē*, *-m̄* 'my', *-č̄n̄* 'thy'.

[28] The pM pronouns (nominative case **mī* 'I' and **čī* 'thou') can be used in sentence-final (post-predicative) position as subjects of verbal and nominal predicates: MM ("Secret History of the Mongols") *oyisulaqda'a bī* 'ich bin ungebraucht worden', *oktekūi mortei čī* 'you (sg.) must obtain'. In some modern Mongolian languages these pronouns have become personal endings of predicates: Kalmuck Sg.1 *-w*, Sg.2 *-č(̄)* (*bī youna-w* 'I am going', *bī kommunistw* 'I am communist', *bī end-w* 'I am here', *čī youna-č* 'you are going', *čī kommunist-č* 'you are a communist', *čī gert-č* 'you are at home'), Buryat Sg.1 *-b*, Sg.2 *-š*, Moghol Sg.1 *-bī*, Sg.2 *-čī*, Dagur Sg.1 *bi*, Sg.2 *-ši*. See Poppe BS 113-4, Poppe MM 101, Posch K 223-4, Sanžeev GKYa 83-4, 99-100, Sanžeev SGMYa(G) 82-93, WeiersSM 124, cp. Poppe IMCS 250-1.

[29] Proto-Tungusian **bī* 'I' > Ewenki, Negidal, Solon, Orochi, Ude, Ulcha, Manchu *bī*, Lamut *bī*, Gold *mī* (*m-*

instead of *b-* under the influence of *mín-*, the stem of the oblique cases, see [30]).

PTn **sí* 'thou' > Ewenki, Negidal, Orochi, Ude, Ulcha, Gold, Manchu *sí*, Solon *ší*, Lamut *hí* . *hī*.

See Benzing TS 107, Cincius SF 259, 270-1, SSTMYa 1:79, 2:72-3.

[30] The stems of the oblique cases in pTn are **mín-* for Sg.1 (> *mín-* in all Tungusian languages) and **sín-* for Sg.2 (> Ewenki, Negidal, Orochi, Ude, Ulcha, Gold, Manchu *sín-*, Solon *šin-*, Lamut *hín-*). This is obviously a generalization based on the genitive forms **míni* (> Solon and Ussuri Gold *míni* 'my', Negidal, Ulcha, Orok, Lamut E *mín* 'my', Manchu *míni* 'my', gen. of 'I') and **síni* (> Solon *šíni*, Ussuri Gold *síni* 'thy', Negidal, Ulcha, Orok *sín* 'thy', Lamut E *hín* 'thy', Manchu *síni* 'thy', gen. of 'thou'¹⁹ See Benzing TS 109, Boycova KLÉYa 83-7, Cincius SF 259, 270-1, Cincius OGÉYa 129-43, Kolesnikova-Konstantinova NYa 116, Novikova ÉYa 92-5, Paškov MYa 30-1, Petrova OYa 180-1, Petrova YaO 66-7, Sem BD 56, Sunik NYa 133-8, Sunik OlyA 159-60.

[31] In most Tungusian languages the postnominal pronouns **mí* 'my' and **sí* 'thy' have become suffixes. Their phonetic shape in these languages depends on the stem-final phoneme. PTung. **mí* 'my' has yielded Ewenki *-w* . *-f* . *wí* . *fí*, Solon *-bí*, Negidal *-w* . *-bí*, Lamut *-w* . *-u* . *-bu*, Orochi *-yí* . *-wí* . *-bí*, Ude *-í* . *-bí*, Ulcha and Gold *-í* . *-bí*; final **-n* of the noun + **bí* have yielded Ewenki *-mí* . *-m*, Negidal *m-*, Orochi *-mí*, Ude *-í* . *-mí*, Ulcha and Gold *-mbí*. PTn **sí* 'thy' > Ewenki *-s* . *š* . *-lí* *-rí* . (after stem-final *n*) *-ní*, Solon *-ší* . *-š* . *-ší*, Negidal *-s(i)*, Orochi *-sí* . *-hí*, Ude *-hí*, Ulcha *-sí* . *-tí*, Gold *-sí*. See Benzing TS 110-1, Cincius SF 273-3.

[32] In individual Tungusian languages the postpredicative subject pronouns **mí* 'I' and **sí* 'thou' have become personal endings. Their phonetic shape depends on the final phoneme of the tense suffix. Thus, after a vowel pTn **mí* 'I' > Ewenki, Negidal *-w*, Solon *-wí*, Lamut *-ĕ*, Ude *-ī*, Ulcha *-í*, Gold *-wa*, pTn **sí* 'thou' > Ewenki, Negidal, Lamut *-s*, Solon *-š*, Orochi, Ulcha, Gold *-sí*, Ude *-hí*, while **-n bí* (**-n* of the tense suffix + **bí*) yields Ewenki, Negidal, Lamut *-m*, Solon, Ude *-mí*, Gold *-mbí*, and **-n sí* (**-n* of the tense suffix + **sí*) > Ewenki *-nní*, Solon *-ndí*, Lamut *-nrtí*, Ude *-hí*, Orochi *-cí*, Gold *-cí*. In Manchu the verb has no person-markers, although some traces of them (such as Sg.3 *genembi-ní* 'goes') are attested in Manchu texts. See Benzing TS 129-42, Cincius SF 276-82.

[33] The absolute forms of the Gilyak pronouns of Sg.1 and Sg.2 are *ńí* 'I' and *íhí* 'thou'. They are used in different syntactic functions, including that of a subject.

The pronominal prefixes (*ń-* and *íh-*) of a noun have the meaning of possessive pronouns: Amur Gilyak *ń-zaqo* 'my knife', *íh-saqo* 'thy knife'. If a similar prefix precedes the verb, it is direct object: Amur Gilyak *íhí ń-zad* 'tu me cecidisti', *ńí íh-sad* 'ego te cecidi'. Traces of genitive forms *ńín* (genitive of 'I') and *íhín* (genitive of 'thou') appear to be found in constructions with postpositions (former nouns): Amur Gilyak *ńín íhze* 'on me' (+ *'my surface'), *íhín íhze* 'on thee'. See Austerlitz GP 102-9, Krey-novič NYa 204-7, Panfilov GNYa 1:222-237, Savel'ev LM 223-244.

[34] PChK (proto-Chukchee-Kamchadal) **ge-m* . **gem-HV* 'I' (disjunct pronoun) > WKamchadal (Napana subdialect) *kemma*, (Sedankino subdialect) *kma*, EKamchadal **kemmV* (recorded as *kymma*, *kúmma*, *кин*, *кунь*²⁰) ~ **kemhV* (recorded as *kymha*²¹), SKamchadal **kem* (*кин*) . **kemma* (*кымма*, *kemma*, *кemma* . **kemzV* (*koncha*), pChKor. (= proto-Chukchee-Koryak) **yem* . **yem-níV* (> **yemmV*) > Chukchee *yem*, Chawchuwen (Standard Koryak) *yemmo*, Alyutor *yemma*, Kerek *-um*, *umju*.

PChK **ge-ó* . **ge-ó-HV* (**óH*) > pChKor. **tt?* 'thou' (disjunct pronoun) > WKamchadal (Napana) *kəzza*, (Sedankino) *kza*, EKamchadal **kəžžV* (recorded as *ккже*, *ккзэ*, *kyschscha*, *küşsha*²¹) ~ **kəžhV* (*kyschha*), SKamch. **kəž* (*ккж*, *ккз*, *kysch*) ~ *kəžžV* (*kyschscha*), pChKor. *yettV* . (?) **yəó* > Chukchee *yət*, *yər*²², Chawchuwen *yəčči*, Alyutor *yetta*.

See Sjören K, Sjören SK, Bogoraz Ch 719-723, Bogoraz LRS 42, Golovastikov-Dolgopolsky RČKK 27-28, Krašeninnikov OZK, Moll SD 209-210, Radliński SNKL II, III, Skorik ČKYa 238, Skorik ČYa 260, Skorik KYa 320, Stebnický IYa 88, Volodin IYa 169-170, Žukova AYa 300-301, Žukova GKYa 188-189.

It is obvious that in the disjunct pronoun **ge-m(-HV)* 'I' and **ge-ó(-HV)* 'thou' the first element **ge-* is a marker of Sg. (cp. **ge-m* 'I' and **xmuóV* 'we'. **ge-ó* 'thou' and **xtuóV* 'ye') and probably of "disjunctness", while the persons are marked by **m* (1 pers.) and **ó* (2 pers.). The suffix **-HV* [which is very tentatively reconstructed on the evidence of Kamchadal (E,S) **-AV* . *-rV* (recorded as *-ha*, *-cha*), Kerek *-nu* (< **-HV* by assimilation with the preceding *m*) and the gemination of the preceding consonant in Chawchuwen, Alyutor and Kamchadal] appears to be a marker of the absolute case, since it is not present in the oblique cases of the pronouns.

Pronominal stems without **ge-* are found in WKamch.: *-mín* 'me' (verbal suffix: *ančp-mín* 'you taught me', see

Volodin IYa 223-237), as well as seemingly in B.Dybowski's records of SKamch. (на 'to me', си 'thee, to thee') and EKamch. (тыя 'thou'). But since Dybowski was not a professional linguist and had no practical knowledge of Kamchadal (according to Volodin IYa 13), his records (unless confirmed by other sources) are to be approached with extreme caution. WKamch. -mín 'me' /and Dybowski's SKamch. на 'to me') may be compared to pChK *m(ə)-, prefix of Sg.1 /subject) of the cohortative mood: Chukchee mə-čeyv-ək 'let me go!', Chawchuwen mə-le-k 'let me go!', Alyutor mə-witat-ək 'let me work!', Kerek mə-čihya-k 'let me sleep!', WKamch. м-нукічен 'let me eat!'. See Bogoraz Ch 738-740, Skorik ČYa 262-4, Skorik KYa 323, 327-9, Volodin IYa 220, 232-4, Žukova AYa 302-4, Žukova GKYa 240-6, Radliński SNLK II, III.

[35] The possessive pronouns (+ the genitive case of the personal pronouns) of Sg.1 and Sg.2 are pChK *gə-mn-Vn 'my' [> Chukchee, Chawchuwen, Alyutor yəmnin, Kerek umni, WKamch. (Napana) kəman, (Sedankino) kəman] and pChK *gə-n-Vn (from *gə-ən-Vn?) 'thy' [> Chukchee, Chawchuwen yəntn, Alyutor yəntna, Kerek həntna-, WKamch (Napana) knin, (Sedankino) knen (see Moll SD 210), EKamch. (Dybowski) книн, SKamch. knin (Krašeninnikov: книн)]. It is interesting to note that other oblique cases of the personal pronouns are often formed by adding case endings to the stem of the genitive *gəmn- (Sg.1) or *gən- (Sg.2): Chukchee instrumental-ergative yəmn-an 'by me', yən-an 'by thee', locative yən-, ək 'in thee', dative yən-əkə 'to thee', WKamch. (Napana) locative kn-ink 'in thee', dative-directive kn-anke 'to thee', etc.

[36] In the Elamite texts (from the Middle Elamite (=ME) and Late Elamite (=LE) periods) the independent pronouns of Sg.1 and Sg.2 are u 'I' and nu 'thou'. According to I.Djkonoff, u 'I' < *hu. The reconstruction *hu is based on comparison with the verbal subject suffix ME -h 'I' (> LE -š), as well as on the existence of a regular phonetic change h > š in the history of Elamite. In the postnominal position the pronoun assumes the function of a possessive ('my'): takki-me u-me 'my life', att-u-re 'my father', petur-u-ri 'my enemy' (-me, re and -ri are class markers of the corresponding nomina possessa). See Reiner EL 89-90, 102-3, Djakonoff YaDPA 105, Paper RAE 93-7.

[37] On the forms un (< *hun) 'me' and nun 'thee' see Reiner EL 89, Djakonoff YaDPA 106.

[38] The postnominal suffixes -k 'I' and -t 'thou' have the meaning of an apposition (+ subject of a subordinate predi-

cate): sunki-k 'I the king', huttan-k 'faciens ego' + 'me faciente', huttan-t 'te faciente', halpin-t 'when thou art dead' ('mortuus tu' + 'te mortuo'). If the nomen (noun, adjective, participle, etc.) functions as predicate, its pronominal suffix becomes its subject: u ... sunki-k 'I am king', hutta-k 'I made' (literally 'сделавший я'), hutta-t 'you (sg.) made'. See Reiner EL 77, 84-5, 94-5, 99-105, Djakonoff YaDPA 100-5.

[39] ME -h LE (Royal Achaemenid Elamite) -š 'I' and ME, LE -t(i) 'thou' are used as subject-markers of verbs and participles. See Reiner EL 75-6, 94, 98-9, 104-5, Djakonoff YaDPA 100-5, Paper RAE 41-4. According to Djakonoff YaDPA, ME -h is from *hu.

[40] PD (= proto-Dravidian) *yān 'I' (stem of the oblique cases *yañ-) > Old Tamil yān / eñ-, Malayam nān (. nān) / en-, Old Kannada ān / en-, Tulu yānu . yēnu / en-, Telugu ānu, Kolami, Parji ān / an-, Kurux, Malto ān / eng-. PD *nī(n) (abs. case) / *nīm- (oblique cases) 'thou' > OTamil nī / nīn-, Malayam nī / nīn-, OKannada nīn / nīn-, Kolami nīv / in-, Parji in / in-, kurux, Malto nīn / nīng-. The alternation of long and short vowels results from morphophonemic rules in PD. See Zvelebil CDM 1:40-4, Zvelebil CDPH 35-6, 128, Andronov DL 68-74, Burrow-Emeneau DED 247 (no. 3051), 353 (no. 4234), Shanmugam DN 176-80, 186-8, Andronov SGDYa 250-60.

[41] In Dravidian there are grammatical forms called "pronominal nouns" or "personal nouns", i.e. nomina (nouns, adjectives, etc.) with suffixed pronominal appositions: Tamil nall-ēn 'bonus ego', nall-āy 'bonus tu', nall-ēm 'boni nos', Classical Kannada ollīō-en 'bonus ego', ollīō-ay 'bonus tu', Malto maḥ-en 'child I' maḥ-e 'child thou', maḥ-em 'children we (excl.)' (cp. a similar construction in E). If in Early Dravidian a nomen was used as predicate, its pronominal suffix was reinterpreted as its subject, and if in addition the nomen was a verbal noun or verbal adjective (+ participle, gerund), the whole construction became a finite verbal form: Malto baḥ-in 'I am beating' (+ caedens ego), baḥ-im 'we are beating' (+ 'caedentes nos'). Therefore verbs have personal endings, which are etymologically identical to the pronominal suffixes of the "pronominalized nouns".

The suffix of Sg.1 is *-ēn/*-eñ > Old Tamil -ēn, Old Kannada -eñ, Parji -en, Gondi -ēnā, Konda -a, Pengo -a, Kul -enu, Kurux -aṅ, Malto -en. I am almost sure about its etymological identity with *yān 'I' (see [40]).

The suffix of Sg.2 is *-ī (as reconstructed by Andro-

nov) or *-dy . *-t (as reconstructed by Subrahmanyam) > Old Tamil -Vy . -ī, Old Kannada -ay, Gondi -ī, Pengo -ay, Kui -ī, Kurux -ay, Malto -e. In Parji and Gadaba (Central Dravidian) there is another suffix of Sg.2: Parji -Vṛ (used both in "pronominalized nouns" and in verbs), Gadaba -Vṛ (only in verbs). The suffix -Vṛ . -Vṛ (having no clear pD etymology) bears a striking resemblance (both in its phonetic shape and in its very peculiar syntactic use) to Elamite -t (see [38]).

In Brahui the verbal ending of Sg.2 subjecti is -s(a). J. Bloch's hypothesis about the borrowing of this ending from Endo-Aryan (Bloch GSDL 53) cannot be accepted for typological reasons: borrowing of personal endings of verbs is practically unknown in the languages of the world. Neither can I accept Andronov's etymology (Brahui -s < *-yī, see Andronov SGDYa 352), since it is not supported by known laws of Dravidian historical phonology. I am much more disposed to accept an alternative hypothesis formulated by Andronov: "... The possibility is not excluded that at least some of these endings [Brahui verbal endings -r of Sg.1, -s of Sg.2 and -k of Sg.3] are traces of an ancient system of personal endings of the Dravidian verb, which preceded the development of the modern system" (Andronov YaB 107).

See Andronov SGDYy 283-4, 346-9, 351-3, 362-4, Subrahmanyam DVM 397-400, 405-6, 409-10, Zvelebil CDM 1:47-52, Zvelebil CDP 71-2 (on the development of pD *-ay).

§2. The forms of the daughter-languages enumerated in §1 (and summarized in Table A) may be explained as going back to a number of proto-nostratic (pN) pronouns and non-pronominal words:

1. *mi 'I', 'me', 'my' > IE *-mi / *-m (verbal suffixes) 'I', *mē . *me 'me', *-mi (nominal suffix) 'my' / K *mi, *me(n) 'I', *m- (verbal prefix) 'me, to me' / U mE 'I' *-m(V) (verbal suffix) 'I', *-m(e) (nominal suffix) 'my' / pT *bi (or *-bi) 'I', *-m (verbal suffix) 'I', *-m (nominal suffix) 'my' / pT *bi (or *-bi) 'I', *-m (verbal suffix) 'I', *-m (nominal suffix) 'my' / M *bi 'I' (as an independent pronoun and as a postverbal subject pronoun / Tn *bi 'I' (as an independent pronoun and as a postverbal subject pronoun), postnominal *bi 'my' / ChK *ga-m, *gemHV 'I' (with *ga- being a marker of independent pronouns, and the tentatively reconstructed *-HV being a suffix of the absolute case), *m(e)-, verbal prefix Sg.1 (agent) of the cohortative mood, WKamch. -mīŋ 'me' / Etruscan mi 'I', 'me' (see Pallotino E 359, Pfiffig ES 103-4) / probably SH *m(i) 'I' (verbal suffix of Sg.1 in Highland East Cuchitic and independent pronoun in the Southern Bauchi subgroup of Chadic,

as well as the first component of *m-un 'we' in proto-Chadic, [*-un] being a plural-marker, see Dolgopolsky EPC).

We can see that *mi is used as an independent pronoun 'I', as a subject pronoun of Sg.1 (in a postpredictive position), as an object pronoun of Sg.1 (originally in preverbal position) and as a possessive of Sg.1 (in postnominal position).

It is used with case postpositions as well: pN *mi nu (with the genitive-marker *nu) > pM *mīnu 'mei, meus' (genitive of the pronoun 'I' / pTn *mīni id. / IE *mene (genitive of 'I') / ChK *ga-mn-Vn (genitive of 'I'). This genitive form was used as a stem for other oblique cases of the paradigm of 'I': U *mīn- . *mun- / pT *mān- . *man- . (?) *mīn- (with the vowel influenced by that of the case ending / pTn *mīn- / Etruscan mīni 'me'. In Ct the extended stem *mān- was generalized for the whole declension paradigm (including nominative), whence CT *mān 'I'. The same process occurred in the Finno-Permian and the Samoyed branches of Uralic (Finno-Permian *mīnV. *mun(V) 'I', Samoyed мән 'I'). In T, M and Tn the initial *m changed into *n, which is probably a regular phonetic change (nasal harmony of consonants): the initial *m changes to *b in monosyllabic words with a final vowel (see Illič-Svitīč OS 2:65), while in the presence of another nasal consonant the initial *m is preserved, whence pT *mān- (oblique stem of the pronoun 'I'), pM mīnu 'my', pTn *mīni 'my', *mīn- (oblique stem of the pronoun *bi 'I'). For the further details see Illič-Svitīč OS 2:63-6.

2. *hoyV 'by me' (agent, (?) 'my' > SH *uyV > Eg. wj, enclitic pronoun of Sg.1 ('me' etc.) and *ya, *-ya/*-ī 'me' in Sem., Berber, Cush, Chadic, SH *Vya 'my' (> Highland ECush. *-ya, Lowland ECush. *ya, Sem. postnominal *ya > *-ya/*-ī 'my', Berber *-y/*-ī, Eg. -j 'my'), SH *V-, verbal prefix of Sg.1 subject (> Sem., Cush. *V-, pB *g-), the second element in SH *an-ī 'I' / pre-IE *H-, agentive verbal prefix of Sg.1 (> *H-, verbal presuffix of Sg.1 in the paradigms of the medium (middle voice), in those of the LIE perfect and of the Hittite zī-conjugation, see §1[7]), as well as LIE *-H^m, verbal suffix of Sg.1 / K *hw-, agentive verbal prefix of Sg.1 / Elamite *hu > u 'I', 'my', -h (verbal subject marker of Sg.1) / pD *yān 'I', obl. cases stem *yan. The vowel of the first syllable of the pN pronoun must have been labial (hence Eg. wj, Kartvelian *hw-, Elamite *hu > u, LIE *-H^m); it is to be reconstructed as *o, since pN *u or *ū would have yielded pIE *u-diphthongs or *u (see Dolgopolsky PIEV). The initial consonant of the pronoun must have been laryngeal (denoted here as *H). The pronoun *HoyV is restricted to the following syntactic usages:

