

HITTITE *AMMUK* ‘ME’

FREDERIK KORTLANDT

In the Indo-European department of Leiden University, Alwin Kloekhorst has initiated a discussion on Hittite *ammuk* ‘me’. The central question is: where did the geminate come from? This has led me to reconsider the origin of the Indo-European personal pronouns against the background of my reconstruction of Indo-Uralic (2002: 221-225). For the historical data I may refer to Schmidt (1978).

On the basis of the Indo-European evidence, the personal pronouns can be reconstructed as follows (cf. Beekes 1995: 207-211, Cowgill 1965: 169f.):

Singular	1st	2nd	reflexive
nom.	*ʔeg-	*tu-	–
acc.	*ʔme	*tue	*sue
gen.	*ʔmene	*teue	*seue
abl.	*ʔmed	*tued	*sued
dat.	*ʔmighi	*tubhi	*subhi
loc.	*ʔmoi	*toi	*soi
poss.	*ʔmos	*tuos	*suos

Dual	1st	2nd
nom.	*ueʔ-	*iuʔ-
acc.	*nʔue	*uʔe
gen.	*noʔ	*uoʔ
abl.	*nʔued	*uʔed
dat.	*nʔuebhi	*uʔebhi
loc.	*nʔui	*uʔi

Plural	1st	2nd
nom.	*ue-	*iu-
acc.	*nsme	*usme
gen.	*nos	*uos
abl.	*nsmed	*usmed
dat.	*nsmei	*usmei
loc.	*nsmi	*usmi
poss.	*nsos	*usos

Here *ʔ stands for the glottal stop *H_l. The reconstruction of initial *ʔm- is based on Greek and Armenian. The reconstruction of the dative forms *ʔmighi, *tubhi, *subhi is based on Italic *mihei (cf. Oscan *sifei*), Sanskrit *túbhyam*, and the Balto-Slavic forms, which point to dat.-loc. *minoi, *tubhoi, *subhoi, e.g. Polish *mnie*, *tobie*, *sobie* (similarly in Czech and Old Russian, but *te-*, *se-* from the gen.-acc. form in South Slavic and modern Russian), East Baltic dial. *mu-* from *tu- (cf. Endzelin 1971: 187), Old Prussian *subs* ‘self’. While Sanskrit preserved the dual paradigms remarkably well, Greek evidently generalized full grade *noʔ-. The same generalization in the corresponding form *uoʔ- and the reanalysis of the pronominal stem as *w- may have provoked the replacement of the latter by *s-* < *tw- from the singular and subsequently by *sph-* on the basis of the dat.-inst. form *sphi*, which apparently replaced first *subhi on the model of loc. *soi and later *tubhi after dat.-loc. *soi* < *twoi. As a result, we find Greek *sph-* in the 2nd dual and 3rd plural forms.

The reconstructed accusatives *ʔme (or *mme), *tue (or *twe), *nʔue (or *nHwe), *uʔe (or *uwe), *nsme, *usme have given rise to different interpretations. It has been proposed that the distinction between *-me and *-ue reflects plural versus dual number (Cowgill 1965: 169), first versus second person (Katz 1998: 279), or a phonological split (Meyer 1997: 101–104). None of these proposals explains the actual distribution of the endings, in particular the short root vowel -u- in all case forms of Sanskrit *yuvám* ‘ye two’ and the fact that we never find *u twice in the same pronominal form. This strongly suggests that all instances of *u in the personal pronouns have a single origin.

For Indo-Uralic we can reconstruct the pronouns *mi ‘I’, *me ‘we’, *ti ‘thou’, *te ‘you’, demonstratives *e/i, *t-, *s-, reflexive *u/w, dual *-ki, plural *-t in heads and *-i in dependent forms, genitive *-n, case particles acc. *m, loc. *i, abl. *t, adessive *pi (cf. Collinder 1960: 237, 243, Kortlandt 2002 and 2004a), where acc. *m and abl. *t may represent earlier *me and *te. Sound laws which are relevant in the present context include IE *s < IU *ti (e.g. in nom.pl. *-es beside *-i and abl.sg. *-os beside *-d), IE *e < all IU vowels under the stress except word-final high vowels and zero grade elsewhere, then IE *o < *u (syllabic *w) in unstressed syllables, then IE *o < *e in cliticized forms, and the (Indo-Uralic) lenition of *p, *t, *k to *b(h), *d(h), *g(h) in weak syllables and word-finally (cf. Kortlandt 2002: 221f. and 2004b). The Indo-European thematic flexion was built on an ergative case form in *-os (cf. Beekes 1985: 191–195) which still functions as the gen.-abl. form of the consonant stems in the historical languages. The possessives in *-os thus represent the earlier ablative of the personal pronouns while the new ablative in *-ed is built on the accusative, like the locatives *nsmi and *usmi and the datives *nsmei and *usmei as well as the corresponding dual forms. This essentially reduces the problem of the stem formation to the nom. acc. gen. forms and to the dat. and loc. forms of the singular.

Here the question arises: how did the apparently simple and transparent pronominal system of Indo-Uralic develop into the much more complicated and opaque Indo-European system? The answer to this question lies primarily in the assibilation of **ti* to **si* and the rise of ablaut which reduced all non-final vowels to **e* under the stress and zero grade elsewhere. As a result, we expect the following outcome:

Independent	stressed	unstressed	Indo-Uralic
‘I, me’	*mi, *me-	*m-	*mi
‘myself’	*mu, *me-	*m-	*mu
‘we, us’	*me, *me-	*m-	*me
‘thou, thee’	*si, *se-	*s-	*ti
‘yourself’	*tu, *te-	*t-	*tu
‘ye, you’	*te, *te-	*t-	*te

Dependent	stressed	unstressed	Indo-Uralic
‘I, me’	*men	*mn-	*min
‘myself’	*men	*mn-	*mun
‘we, us’	*men	*mn-	*men
‘thou, thee’	*sen	*sn-	*tin
‘yourself’	*ten	*tn-	*tun
‘ye, you’	*ten	*tn-	*ten

It is clear that this system could not be maintained. Moreover, the stem form **s-* < **ti* for the second person interfered with the Indo-Uralic demonstrative **s-*, which is preserved in the Indo-European anaphoric pronoun **so*. The large-scale homophony was eliminated by the use of deictic **?e* ‘this’ for the first person singular and **ue* ‘self’ for a person who is contrasted with another (third) person and by the suffixation of **-? < *-ki* for the dual and **-i*, later **-s < *-ti* for the plural. This resulted in such forms as **?me* ‘this-me’, **tue* ‘thee-self’, **sue* ‘him-self’ (cf. Kortlandt 2002: 225), also **ue?*, **uei* ‘(our)selves’ in contrast with outsiders (inclusive meaning) versus **(m)ne?*, **(m)nes* ‘ours’ in contrast with your people (exclusive meaning), **ue?*, **ues* ‘yours’ in contrast with other people, then **u?e* ‘you two’ in contrast with them and **n?ue* ‘we two’ in contrast with both you and them. These forms must have existed at an early stage already because the *o*-vocalism of **no?*, **nos*, **uo?*, **uos* originated in their use as clitics and we find the corresponding zero grade in acc.pl. **nsme*, **usme*, where **-me* can hardly be anything else than the full grade IU case particle **me*. On the other hand, the forms **teue* and **seue* show the continued existence of **te*, **se*, **ue* as separate words at the stage when full grade **e* in unstressed syllables became possible.

Now we turn to the case endings. It appears that gen. **men* ‘me’ was remodeled to **mene* on the basis of **teue* and **seue*. Contrary to my earlier view (2002: 223),

I now think that dat. **mighi* represents original **mibhi* with dissimilation of the labial articulation because I cannot otherwise explain the differentiation from **tubhi* and **subhi*. These forms seem to preserve IU **mi* ‘I’, **tu* ‘thou-self’, and **pi* ‘at’. There is no reason to assume an initial laryngeal in **mighi* and **mene* if these directly continue IU nom. **mi* and gen. **min*. Indeed, the laryngeal may have been limited to acc. **?me*, loc. **?moi*, and poss. **?mos*, where it is preserved in Greek. It was evidently introduced at an early stage from the nominative **?eg-*, which contains the deictic element **?e-* ‘this’ and the emphatic particle **g(e)* which is also found in acc. Greek *emége*, Gothic *mik*, Hittite *ammuk*.

The absence of **-u-* in the locatives **toi* and **soi* suggests to me that we have **o < *u* rather than **o < *e* here, while the form **?moi* can easily be analogical. Hittite appears to have preserved the original IU pronoun **ti* (with restored **t-*) in nom. *zik* ‘thou’, as opposed to **tu* ‘thou-self’ in the other IE languages. On the other hand, nom. *uk* ‘I’ seems to reflect **?e-u-* ‘this-self’, which is not found elsewhere, similarly *ammuk* ‘me’ beside *tuk* ‘thee’. The latter form may have originated from generalization of the zero grade in **tu-g(e)*, which suggests the possibility that **?me-g(e)* and **?u-g(e)* were conflated into **?m-?u-g(e)*, yielding *ammuk*.

REFERENCES

- Beekes, Robert S.P.
 1985 *The origins of the Indo-European nominal inflection* (Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft).
 1995 *Comparative Indo-European linguistics* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins).
- Collinder, Björn
 1960 *Comparative grammar of the Uralic languages* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell).
- Cowgill, Warren
 1965 Evidence in Greek. *Evidence for laryngeals* (The Hague: Mouton), 142-180.
- Endzelin, Jan
 1971 *Comparative phonology and morphology of the Baltic languages* (The Hague: Mouton).
- Katz, Joshua T.
 1998 Archaische keltische Personalpronomina aus indogermanischer Sicht. *Sprache und Kultur der Indogermanen* (Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft), 265-291.
- Kortlandt, Frederik
 2002 The Indo-Uralic verb. *Finno-Ugrians and Indo-Europeans: Linguistic and literary contacts* (Maastricht: Shaker), 217-227. Electronic edition: www.kortlandt.nl/publications
 2004a Nivkh as a Uralo-Siberian language. *Per aspera ad asteriscos* [Fs. Rasmussen] (Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft), 285-289.
 2004b Indo-Uralic consonant gradation. *Etymologie, Entlehnungen und Entwicklungen* [Fs. Koivulehto] (Helsinki: Société Néophilologique), 163-170.

- Meyer, Denise P.
1997 Greek pronouns in *sph-* and the PIE personal pronominal system. *Historische Sprachforschung* 110, 93-108.
- Schmidt, Gernot
1978 *Stammbildung und Flexion der indogermanischen Personalpronomina* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz).