FLORIAN SIEGL (Tartu)

A NOTE ON PERSONAL PRONOUNS IN ENETS AND NORTHERN SAMOYEDIC*

Abstract. Although it has long been known that Forest Enets borrowed two personal pronouns from its former neighbor Ket, this topic has remained comparatively unaddressed. As recent cross-linguistic research has shown, pronoun borrowing is typologically rare but not uncommon, though interestingly, the Forest Enets case differs radically from two other attested Eurasian examples, English and Romani in that other than personal pronouns, almost no other lexical borrowings from Yeniseian can be found. This article draws together earlier research on Northern Samoyedic pronominal systems and their unusual development in Enets and Nenets.

Keywords: Enets, Nenets, Yeniseian languages, pronouns, pronoun borrowing, language contact

Introduction

During his second journey, M. A. Castrén spent a short period of time among both Forest and Tundra Enetses in late 1846 and early 1847. In his diary Castrén (1856 : 279) mentioned, that both varieties were rather uniform: "Beide Mundarten schliessen sich der Tawgy-Sprache oder dem Awamschen Samojedischen an und weichen nur in einigen unwesentlichen Puncten von einander ab." On the other side he noted, that the Bai variety of Enets (= Forest Enets) had borrowed some elements from Ket: "Ausserdem scheint die Bai-Sprache einiges dem Jenissei-Ostjakischen entlehnt zu haben" (Castrén 1856 : 279).

Unfortunately, Castrén himself never published any concrete examples to support his assumption of Ket influence on Forest Enets.

Interestingly enough, Castrén left unexplained one major difference between Tundra and Forest Enets which is rather striking from both a

---

descriptive and historical perspective. In his comparative Samoyedic grammar Castrén presented personal pronouns for Enets (then known as Jenissei-Samojedisch) in one table, but did not explain his notational conventions concerning 2Sg and 3Sg forms (Castrén 1854 : 350—353):

Jenissei-Samojedisch

	Sg	Du	Pl
1P	*mod′i*	*mod′i'*	*mod′i'*
2P	*tod′i (û)*	*tod′i'*	*tod′i'*
3P	*ńîtoda, bû*	*ńîtodi'*	*ńîtodu'*

It was G. N. Prokof'jev (Прокофьев 1937 : 76) who first showed in print that the two Enets languages use different personal pronouns, Forest Enets 2Sg *ū*, 3Sg *вū*, Tundra Enets 2Sg *tod′i*, 3Sg *ńîtoda*, and that the Forest Enets pronouns resemble the same pronouns in Ket. This was then repeated by N. M. Tereščenko (Терещенко 1966 : 456) and by other researchers in subsequent literature which need not be reviewed here.

From a more general perspective, Nenets pronouns for 2nd person (further person is referred to with P) and 3P (both Tundra and Forest varieties) do not derive from Proto-Samoyedic/Uralic either, which leaves Nganasan as the only Northern Samoyedic language with a full set of personal pronouns derived from Proto-Samoyedic/Uralic.[1] The following tables give an overview of personal pronouns in Nenets and Nganasan:[2]

	Tundra Nenets			Forest Nenets			Nganasan		
	Sg	Du	Pl	Sg	Du	Pl	Sg	Du	Pl
1P	*мань*	*мани'*	*маня"*	*mań*	*maj"*	*mańa"*	*mənə*	*mi*	*myŋ*
2P	*пыдар*	*пыдари'*	*пыдара"*	*pi"t*	*pi"č*	*pi"ta"*	*tənə*	*tii*	*tyŋ*
3P	*пыда*	*пыди'*	*пыдо'*	*pi"ta*	*pi"č*	*pi"tuŋ*	*syty*	*syti*	*sytyŋ*

By adding the equivalent forms from both Enets varieties[3] one sees, that Tundra Enets resembles Nganasan much more, as with the exception of 3P, Tundra Enets is etymologically closer to Nganasan than to any other Northern Samoyedic language.

	Tundra Enets			Forest Enets		
	Sg	Du	Pl	Sg	Du	Pl
1P	*моди*	*модини*	*модина"*	*mod′, mud′*	*mod′iń'*	*mod′na'*
2P	*тодди*	*тодиди*	*тодида"*	*u, uu*	*ud′i'*	*uda'*
3P	*ниитода*	*ниитоди*	*ниитоду*	*bu*	*bud′i'*	*budu'*

Most of the above-said is known in comparative-historical Samoyedology in one way or another and has been resumed by P. Hajdú (1983). The

---

[1] Southern-Samoyedic pronouns for 1P and 2P can be tracked back etymologically to Proto-Samoyedic/Proto-Uralic but Southern Samoyedic is excluded from this discussion. For some more etymological background I refer to Hajdú 1983 and Janhunen 1977.

[2] Data from Tundra Nenets derives from Терещенко 1965 : 891; Forest Nenets: Kaur Mägi (p.c); the Nganasan paradigm from Wagner-Nagy 2002 : 93 was altered slightly for typographical reasons.

[3] Tundra Enets data is from Лабанаускас 2002 : 18—19; Forest Enets data comes from my own fieldwork.

purpose of this paper is to review Hajdú's account of personal pronouns in Nenets and Enets (1983) and to focus on some peculiar details that are interesting from a wider typological perspective.

The first part of this paper, with some general comments on the history of personal pronouns in Northern Samoyedic, should be understood as a step towards a yet-to-be-written survey on the history and development of pronominal systems in Samoyedic which should enhance what has been said by E. Helimski (Хелимский 1982a : 88—93). Although Samoyedic pronouns have been addressed from a general comparative-historical Uralic perspective (e.g. UEW), little has been done concerning pronouns within Samoyedic,[4] as all existing evidence points to a solution which is indeed challenging for historical-comparative approaches.

The second part of this paper addresses the Forest Enets pronoun borrowing case in more detail, as its implications for the study of language contact from both an Uralic but also a general perspective has several peculiarities which have not received as much attention as it actually deserves.

2P and 3P pronouns in Enets and Nenets

As stated in the introduction, neither Forest Enets nor either Nenets varieties shares 2P and 3P pronouns with Nganasan, which uses form cognate from Proto-Samoyedic and beyond (Hajdú 1983 : 105).

From a synchronic perspective, Enets and to some extent Nenets pronouns have an unusual morphological structure: in Forest Enets, the singular pronouns serve as the unmarked base from which dual and plural are formed by suffixing the appropriate genitive possessive suffixes (Px).

Forest Enets pronouns	Forest Enets Px.Gen
mod'	*-ń*
u, uu	*-d*
bu	*-da*
mod'iń'	*-ń'*
ud'i'	*-d'i'*
bud'i'	*-d'i'*
mod'na'	*-na'*
uda'	*-da'*
budu'	*-du'*

This means that number on pronouns in Forest Enets is expressed by possessive suffixes and in this respect Forest Enets differs even from Nenets. As shown below in Tundra Nenets, Px from different cases are attached to the pronoun.[5]

---

[4] Besides Хелимский 1982 there is Janhunen 1977 on the reconstruction of pronouns within Samoyedic. A recent approach to the historical phonology and morphology of the Samoyedic languages by Mikola 2004 and its predecessor Mikola 1988 however exclude pronouns.
[5] If the Px is ambiguous between Px.Nom and Px.Gen, multiple forms are given. Px are cited from Терещенко 1965 : 880.

Tundra Nenets pronoun		Tundra Nenets Px	
1Sg	*мань*	–	
2Sg	*пыдар*	*-р*	(Px.Nom2Sg)
3Sg	*пыда*	*-да*	(Px.Nom3Sg, Px.Gen3Sg)
1Du	*мани'*	*-ни'*	(Px.Gen1Du)
2Du	*пыдари'*	*-ри'*	(Px.Nom2Du
3Du	*пыди'*	*-ди'*	(Px.Nom3Du, Px.Gen3Du)
1Pl	*маня"*	*-на"*	(Px.Gen1Pl)
2Pl	*пыдара"*	*-ра"*	(Px.Nom2Pl)
3Pl	*пыдо'*	*-до'*	(Px.Nom3Pl, Px.Gen3Pl)

The origin of 2P and 3P pronouns in Nenets

Already Castrén saw the etymological problems connected to pronominal stems in Samoyedic and tried to explain the origin of the Nenets pronouns which due to its shortness will be quoted fully:

"Im Jurakischen ist das Personalpronomen *puda* 'er', wahrscheinlich aus dem Türkischen *bû* mit Hülfe des Personalaffixes der dritten Person *da* [– – –] enstanden und aus *puda* hat sich ferner durch Hinzufügung des Affixes der zweiten Person *pudar* 'du', entwickelt" (Castrén 1853 : 342).

This interpretation was recast by T. Lehtisalo (1939)[6] who suggested the grammaticalization of the word *puda* 'body' which when followed by a Px functioned as a new pronoun.

As a third alternative, already as early as 1953, Hajdú hesitatingly thought of linking Tundra Nenets *puda* to Ket *bu*. In 1983, Hajdú re-addressed this topic in much more detail and his major points of argumentation will be resumed shortly. As the variation of shape of 2P and 3P personal pronouns in a variety of Tundra Nenets dialects show considerable variation (see tables in Hajdú 1983 : 110—111) he concludes, that this would speak against Lehtisalo's grammaticalization assumption. The missing link was to be found in Forest Nenets, whose 2Sg pronoun in the Eastern variety *pitae* and Western Forest variety *pita* could hardly be a reflex from the word for body *pixid*. Therefore he assumed, that the personal pronouns in Tundra Nenets were ultimately of Ket origin and were transferred via Forest Enets. In contrast to Forest Enets which took over the personal pronouns unchanged, Nenets would have affixed the Px for 3Sg *-da* to *bu* which then resulted in *puda/pyda*. Hajdú then assumed that Forest Enets borrowed the 2Sg pronoun *uu* from Ket, whereas Nenets reanalyzed *puda/pyda* as a new stem and by adding the 2Sg Nom.Px a new 2Sg pronoun *pydar* (etymologically *bu*-Px.3Sg-Px.2Sg).[7]

In light of fresh data on Forest Nenets, several phonetic features make Lehtisalo's attempt to explain the origin of Nenets 2P and 3P pronouns from the noun *pixid* 'body' much more plausible. In the Agan dialect of Forest Nenets, the 2Sg pronoun *pit* shows clear preaspiration *pi^xt* and the pre-aspirated element is also reflected in the recent orthography e.g. *пы'т*

---

[6] Originally earlier but in much more detail in an article from 1939 to which I refer.

[7] In this respect, P. Hajdú's account followed M. A. Castrén's original reanalysis proposal though with a different etymology.

2Sg, *пы'ч* 2Du, *пы'та"* 2Pl (Бармич, Вэлло 2002 : 117).[8] This makes it very likely, that these personal pronouns are contracted forms of the body lexeme *pixid*, as similar contractions are known from other examples e.g. *pū"ša* 'woman, old woman' from *puhu"ša ~ puhuša*.[9] As Hajdú (1983) did not have such dialectal data at his disposal nor was this documented by G. D. Verbov (Вербов 1973) or Lehtisalo (1956 : 342), Hajdú opted against this interpretation which now however seems to present more support for Lehtisalo's (1939) interpretation.

2P and 3P pronouns in Enets in different sources

Consulting Castrén's "Grammatik der samojedischen Sprachen" (1854), one is struck that he did not explain his notational conventions for the pronoun table: it is unclear why 2Sg *uu* appears in brackets but 3Sg *bu* does not. Castrén omits to tell that these stems also appear in the dual and plural, and come from a different dialect than the others. For convenience, his table on the pronominal paradigm of Enets is reproduced here again:

	Sg	Du	Pl
1P	*mod'i*	*mod'i'*	*mod'i'*
2P	*tod'i* (*û*)	*tod'i'*	*tod'i'*
3P	*n͡ît͡oda, bû*	*n͡ît͡odi'*	*n͡ît͡odu'*

New materials on Tundra Enets by K. Labanauskas gathered in 1974 show slightly different forms where 1P and 2P forms differ structurally from Castrén's forms as they, too, are now followed by possessive suffixes (Лабанаускас 2002 : 47):

	Tundra Enets (Лабанаускас 2002)			Tundra Enets (Castrén)		
	Sg	Du	Pl	Sg	Du	Pl
1P	*моди*	*модини*	*модина"*	*mod'i*	*mod'i'*	*mod'i'*
2P	*тоди*	*тодиди*	*тодида"*	*tod'i*	*tod'i'*	*tod'i'*
3P	*ниитода*	*ниитоди*	*ниитоду*	*n͡ît͡oda*	*n͡ît͡odi'*	*n͡ît͡odu'*

As Castrén spent less time among Enetses than among Nenetses and as F. A. Schiefner to a certain degree altered Castrén's manuscripts somewhat while preparing them for publication, I decided to consult Castrén's unpublished description of Tundra Enets ("Anteckningar öfver Chantaisko-karasinska dialecten") and the original manuscript on Enets which was used for compiling Castrén's comparative grammar ("Grammatikaliska anteckningar i Jeniseiska Samojed-dialecten").[10] In the manuscripts, a different picture prevails:

---

[8] As the other compiler I. A. Vello is a native Forest Nenets from the Pur dialect, it is safe to assume that these forms are representative for both the Agan and the Pur variety of Forest Nenets (Kaur Mägi, p.c.).

[9] Data is provided by Kaur Mägi, p.c.

[10] A copy of these manuscripts is located at the Department of Finno-Ugric Linguistics at the University of Helsinki as "Manuscripta Castreniana. Vol. XIV. Samoiedica. Jenisei-Samoiedica".

Anteckningar öfver Chantaisko-karasinska dialecten			Grammatikaliska anteckningar i Jeniseiska Samojed-dialecten		
Sg	Du	Pl	Sg	Du	Pl
1P *modji*	*modji* (*modjibi*)[11]	*modji'* (*modjiba*)	*mod'i*	*mod'i'*	*mod'i'*
2P *todje*	*todji* (*todjiri*)	*todji* (*todjiru'*)	*tod'i uu* B	*tod'i' uu*	*tod'i' uu* B
3P *njiitoda*,[12] *njiito'i*	*njiitodi*	*njiitodu*	*n̂îtoda bu* B	*n̂îtodi'*	*n̂îtodu' bu'* B[13]

As this table clearly shows, Castrén had also documented different forms for Tundra Enets, but these forms have hitherto remained unpublished. On the other hand, the Forest Enets forms which were published in brackets in his "Grammatik der samojedischen Sprachen" (1854) are marked as Forest Enets forms in the manuscript while they were not marked as such in the edition by Schiefner. Interestingly, in the manuscript Forest Enets pronouns were not marked for number by Px, something for which I currently have no explanation.

More on 2P and 3P singular pronoun stems in Enets

As already mentioned, the pronominal system of Tundra Enets differs from Forest Enets in that the pronoun stem for 2Sg is related to the reconstructed Proto-Samoyedic/Proto-Uralic stem, while the stem for 3P seems to be an innovation specific to Tundra Enets. While I am unable to propose an etymology, it appears that 3Sg *njiitoda* consists of at least two morphemes (perhaps even three morphemes as Castrén assumed) of which the last is clearly the possessive suffix for 3Sg.[14]

Turning to Forest Enets, scholars agree that the stems for 2P and 3P independent pronouns derive from Ket. As the description of Yeniseian has improved much in recent years it should be worthwhile to reexamine whether the donor language was really Ket or whether another Yeniseian language could be considered.

Ket and Yugh pronouns distinguish only singular and plural number categories. Concerning the morphology of personal pronouns, 1st and 2nd person pronouns are highly suppletive whereas third person pronouns are more morphologically regular as they mark plurality using one of Ket/Yugh nominal plural markers *-ŋ*.[15] The following table presenting personal pronouns in Ket and Yugh in the nominative case (Werner 1997a; 1997b):

---

[11] Castrén's alternative forms in brackets pose another set of problems which I currently can't explain.

[12] *njiitoda*, *njiitodi* and *njiitodu* are corrected forms in the manuscript: Castrén seemingly wrote *njiitada*, *njiitadi* and *njiitadu* first. The Nganasan form *sedje* for 3Sg is also presented in this Enets manuscript, but this form is crossed out and was replaced by *njiitoda* and the like.

[13] B = Bai dialect i.e. Forest Enets.

[14] A possible segmentation (based on a two-morpheme analysis) would be *njiitoda* = *njiito*-PX.NOM.3SG (based on Castrén's Px table on Tundra Enets (1854 : 295)).

[15] Judging from the relevant entries in H. Werner's comparative dictionary (2002), which also offers reconstructions of Proto-Yeniseian forms seems to be quite old.

	Ket		**Yugh**	
	Sg	**Pl**	**Sg**	**Pl**
1P	*at*	*ətn*	*at*/*ad*	*ətn*
2P	¹*u*[16]	*əkŋ*	¹*u*	*kəkŋ*
3P m	¹*bu*[17]		¹*bu*[19]	
3P f	¹*bu*	¹*bu·ŋ*[18]	¹*bu*	*bɛiŋ*[20]

When one now compares Ket with Forest Enets, one sees that only the singular pronouns match.

	Ket		**Forest Enets**		
	Sg	**Pl**	**Sg**	**Du**	**Pl**
1P	*at*	*ətn*	*mod′*, *mud′*	*mod′iń'*	*mod′na'*
2P	¹*u*	*əkŋ*	*u*, *uu*	*ud′i'*	*uda'*
3P	¹*bu* (m = f)	¹*bu·ŋ*	*bu*	*bud′i'*	*budu'*

This then means, that the borrowed stems *uu* and *bu* followed the same morphological pattern as the inherited 1Sg Forest Enets pronoun *mod′* which for non-singular reference is accompanied by dual and plural Px. This then means that singular pronouns are interpreted as the basic forms, which for number reference were followed by the Px for the relevant person/ number category. As pronouns in Nenets and Enets are highly suppletive, having different stems depending on morphosyntactic realization[21] one could assume that weak paradigmatic strength due to suppletive stems could attract foreign elements and made this category interesting for borrowing.

	Tundra Nenets	**Forest Nenets**
Nom	*мань*	*mod′*
Acc	(*мань*) *си”ми*	*šii”*
Loc	*нянани*	(*mod′*)*nonyń*

It is worth mentioning, that the personal pronoun paradigm in Nganasan shows decreased paradigmatic strength as the nominative personal pronouns have generalized and are nowadays used as genitive and accusative (Wagner-Nagy 2002 : 93).[22]

---

[16] As Ket and Yugh are tone languages, small initial numerals before the pronoun represent tone type (See Werner 1997a; 1997b; Vajda 2000 on tone in Yeniseian languages). I have not indicated the tone of all the pronouns and I will return to this in a moment.

[17] Although the forms for 3S masc. and 3S fem. are homonymous in the nominative case, they inflect differently in other cases (see Werner 1997a : 132—133).

[18] Gender for 3P pronouns in Ket is neutralized (Werner 1997a : 132—134).

[19] 3S masc and 3S fem are homonymous in Yugh too (see Werner 1997b : 94—95).

[20] As in Ket, gender for 3P pronouns in Yugh is neutralized Werner 1997a : 94—95.

[21] From a syntactic perspective Nenets and Enets pronouns show an interesting distribution as there are three different pronoun stems which perfectly match syntactic criteria. Nominal pronouns in S/A position differ morphologically from pronouns in P position which once again differ from pronoun-like elements in adjuncts which are usually analyzed as postpostions followed by Px.

[22] Concerning the status of genitive pronouns in Northern Samoyedic, the existence of them is still unclear to me. Although these are given by N. M. Tereščenko for both Nenets and Enets I was unable to elicit any genitive forms nor could I identify any in recorded and transcribed texts in Forest Enets.

Completing the argumentation, two remaining details need an expla-nation. First, as gender is not specified in Uralic and as gender in Ket/Yugh pronouns is not specified in the nominative either, the question of whether the 3Sg masculine or feminine pronouns were borrowed is inevitably of no importance.[23] As Forest Enets and Ket/Yugh pronouns for 2Sg and 3Sg are phonetically almost identical in the nominative and as Ket/Yugh pronouns in other cases have a slightly different form, it is safe to conclude that nominative forms were borrowed.

The second question concerns vowel length in Forest Enets 2Sg and 3Sg pronouns. During elicitation and also in older accounts of Forest Enets, vowel length in these pronouns varies. While it is still not clear to me whether the vowels under discussion are indeed short or long, there might be a another possible solution. As Ket/Yugh are tone languages and both Ket/Yugh pronouns are classified as having the first tone, the varying vowel length might be an output of trying to integrate a foreign element into Forest Enets with its nearest equivalent, in this case vowel length. According to E. Vajda (2000 : 2) the so-called first monosyllabic tone in Ket is char-acterized as follows: "The first monosyllabic tone begins high, remaining even or rising slightly in pitch throughout. Vowels pronounced with this tone are h a l f l o n g (my emphasis F.S.) and are articulated with a raised glottis and slight tongue root advancement. First tone vowels are neither pharyngealized, nor accompanied by a glottal stop. About 30% of all Ket monosyllabic words have this tone."

Whereas vowel length in Forest Enets is distinctive although its func-tional load is low, half long vowels are unknown and this might explain the vowel's realization as either short or long as no minimal pairs in this position are known.

Borrowed pronouns — some cross-linguistic evidence

Indefinite pronouns are known to be borrowed more easily than personal pronouns and concerning the former, this fact is well attested as Russian indefiniteness markers are adopted quite frequently in interrogative-based indefinite pronouns in Finnic and elsewhere (e.g. Alvre 2002; Haspelmath 1997 : 184—186). By contrast, borrowing of personal pronouns is still regarded as something highly unusual, though recent cross-linguistic surveys suggest, that this phenomenon is reasonably well documented outside of Eurasia (Thomason, Everett 2001; Siewierska 2004 : 274—277). Eurasia seems to be an exception as clear examples are restricted to English 'they' from Old Norse and several varieties of Romani, also in this case restricted to 3Pl pronouns (Matras 2002). Worthwile mentioning though not directly concerned with pronoun borrowing is the spread of the Dravidian inclusive/exclusive distinction into some neighboring Indo-Aryan languages (see references in Siewierska 2004 : 276).

---

[23] In contrast to Ket and Yugh, gender was differentiated in 3rd singular pronouns in the extinct Yeniseian language Kott (Werner 1997c). Surprisingly, Kott personal pronouns behaved morphologically regularly but phonetically Kott's forms for 2nd and 3rd person (2Sg *au* 3Sg masc *uju*, 3Sg fem *ujá*) are too far away from Forest Enets to be a possible source.

Forest Enets' borrowed pronouns and their wider implication

With Forest Enets as a third attested language in Eurasia which has borrowed personal pronouns from another language, there are some other peculiarities which must be mentioned which make this language interesting for researchers outside Uralic as well. Unlike English and Romani whose lexification from contact languages is well known, Forest Enets has apparently not more than a handful of loanwords from Yeniseian, most of which it shares with Tundra Nenets. Clear borrowings from Yeniseian into Forest Enets but absent from Tundra Nenets are not to be found in Хе-лимский 1982b, and my scanning of H. Werner's "Vergleichendes Wörter-buch der Jenissej-Sprachen" (2002) could not identify any new good candidates either. Conversely, clear Forest Enets loanwords in Ket could not be identified in Werner 2002. The implications of these findings for the study of language contact are obvious, but so far have not been addressed in Uralic Linguistics. It is known, that contact between Forest Enetses and Kets was not as long-lasting as between Selkup/Khanty and Ket, and any contact between the aforementioned broke up several centuries ago as both languages are nowadays separated by several hundred kilometers.[24] Hence it is surprising, that the only well-attested traces of this Forest Enets-Yeniseian contact are borrowed personal pronouns.[25] This fact must be emphasized as other Uralic languages, which have been in much longer contact with other languages (e.g. Komi with Russian, Finnic with different Germanic or Baltic languages), have borrowed extensively from their neighbors but no personal pronouns.

A critical re-assessment instead of a summary

The proposed argumentation which favors a pronoun borrowing scenario for Forest Enets and a regrammaticalization of the lexeme for body in Nenets is vulnerable to a wide array of possible criticism. Much of what has been said above assumes Lehtisalo's theory of the origin of Nenets pronouns, which is supported by new Forest Nenets data which argue strongly against Hajdú's explanation.

It must be admitted, that the known etymological problems which concern identical cells within the pronoun paradigm in two closely related languages remain suspicious, even if one accepts the proposal favored in this article and one might want to look for other explanations.[26]

From a cross-linguistic perspective the proposed scenario is unusual, in that Forest Enets is postulated to have borrowed pronouns from

---

[24] It is generally agreed, that Enetses are rather new settlers on the Taimyr, and in the 17th century they still resided more in the south and in the upper basin of the Taz (Долгих 1970 : карта 4; Хелимский 1980 : 128—129). These areas are close to Ket territories and this could have been the area where such contact or assimilation of Kets with Forest Enetses might have happened.

[25] Other possible examples for Forest Enets-Ket language contacts in morphosyntax are still uncertain and under investigation.

[26] As a possible parallel one should not forget, that Finnish *hän* and Estonian *tema* for 3Sg derive from different sources. While the grammaticalization of demonstratives as pronouns in a 3P context is cross-linguistically common, one should not forget, that both Finnish and Estonian are as closely related as Nenets to Enets.

Ket/Yeniseian without any other clear examples for heavy lexification in either direction. This would indeed be rare, but would apply to Nenets too if one assumed with Hajdú (1953) that Nenets *pyda*/*puda* were also borrowed from Ket directly and independently of Forest Enets.

Another option, less convincing from a comparative-historical perspective but nevertheless worth mentioning would assume a sudden unconditioned sound change which affected only personal pronouns making them accidentally look more similar to what are considered to be Ket borrowings in Enets or a body part pronoun in Nenets.[27]

Pronouns are high-frequency lexemes and tend to behave morphologically differently, being frequently suppletive in a cross-linguistic perspective. Even if personal pronouns might turn out to be high-frequency lexemes in Samoyedic,[28] one should nevertheless not overlook, that Nenets and Enets are pro-drop languages which show person agreement on the verb and can do fine without a personal pronoun at all.[29] And one must recall the Nganasan case where nominative pronouns were generalized and are nowadays used for genitive and accusative.

Whether Enets and Nenets inherited a full set of pronouns from Proto-Samoyedic and later abandoned 2P and 3P forms is a question outside the scope of this paper. As Uralic verbal endings are said to derive from pronouns and as the verbal endings in the Samoyedic subjective conjugation point to the same origin, one tentatively would assume the existence of pronouns in older stages of Enets and Nenets. Existing evidence suggest, that in a later stage, Enets acquired new pronouns for 2P and 3P from Ket whereas Nenets grammaticalized new 2P and 3P pronouns.

The unorthodox development in the Forest Enets case, borrowing of pronouns from Ket without heavy lexification must be considered unusual. In an Eurasian context, Forest Enets is unusual as this case of pronoun borrowing does not involve 3Pl pronouns as English or Romani. The impression one gets from cross-linguistics evidence shows that pronoun borrowing seems not to be restricted to a particular person (Thomason, Everett 2001). Although the Forest Enets scenario remains unusual, current historical-comparative methods and grammaticalization theory make this unusual scenario sound plausible. It remains to be seen, whether this analysis can withstand future investigations, though for this a detailed historical-comparative study of pronouns in Samoyedic is a necessary prerequisite — such a study has not yet been done.

Address:

Florian Siegl
University of Tartu
E-mail: florian.siegl@ut.ee

---

[27] As nothing comparable is attested, such a scenario is at best pure speculation.
[28] Such questions have apparently never been asked in Samoyedology so far.
[29] Pro-drop is typical and dominates in spontaneous Forest Enets speech and in this respect, Forest Enets differs from both Estonian and Finnish as it clearly allows also 3P pronouns to be dropped.

REFERENCES

A l v r e, P. 2002, Russische Lehnelemente in Indefinitpronomen und -adverbien der ostseefinnischen Sprachen. — LU XXXXVIII, 161—164.

C a s t r é n, M. A. 1854, Grammatik der samojedischen Sprachen, St. Petersburg.
 —— 1856, Reiseberichte und Briefe aus den Jahren 1845—1849, St. Petersburg.
 —— (n.d.), Anteckningar öfver Chantaisko-karasinska dialecten. — Manuscripta Castreniana. Vol. XIV. Samoiedica. Jenisei-Samoiedica (MS), 1—112.
 —— (n.d.), Grammatikaliska anteckningar i Jeniseiska Samojed-dialecten. — Manuscripta Castreniana. Vol. XIV. Sam oiedica. Jenisei-Samoiedica (MS), 113—191.

H a j d ú, P. 1953, Die ältesten Berührungen zwischen den Samojeden und den jenisseischen Völkern. — Acta Orientalia III, 73—101.
 —— 1983, Jurák *puda* 'ő', *pudar* 'te' és társai. — Symposium sæculare Societatis Fenno-Ugricae, Helsinki (MSFOu 185), 105—114.

H a s p e l m a t h, M. 1997, Indefinite Pronouns, Oxford (Oxford Studies in Typology and Linguistic Theory).

J a n h u n e n, J. 1977, Samojedischer Wortschatz, Helsinki (Castrenianumin toimitteita 17).

L e h t i s a l o, T. 1939, Eräästä ostjakkisamojedin refleksiivipronominista. — Vir., 113—115.
 —— 1956, Juraksamojedisches Wörterbuch, Helsinki (LSFU XIII).

M a t r a s, Y. 2002, Romani. A Linguistic Introduction, Cambridge.

M i k o l a, T. 1988, Geschichte der samojedischen Sprachen. — The Uralic Languages. Description, History and Foreign Influences, Leiden—New York—København—Köln, 219—263.
 —— 2004, Studien zur Geschichte der samojedischen Sprachen, Szeged (Studia Uralo-Altaica 45).

S i e w i e r s k a, A. 2004, Person, Cambridge (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics).

T h o m a s o n, S. G.,   E v e r e t t, D. L. 2001, Pronoun Borrowing. — Proceedings of the 27th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, Berkeley, 301—315

V a j d a, E. 2000, Ket Prosodic Phonology, München (Languages of the World 15).

W a g n e r - N a g y, B. 2002, Alaktan. — Chrestomathia Nganasanica, Szeged (Studia Uralo-Altaica. Supplementum 10), 71—126.

W e r n e r, H. 1997a, Die ketische Sprache, Wiesbaden (Tunguso-Sibirica 3).
 —— 1997b, Das Jugische (Sym-Ketische), Wiesbaden (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 50).
 —— 1997c, Abriss der kottischen Grammatik, Wiesbaden (Tunguso-Sibirica 4).
 —— 2002, Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der Jenissej-Sprachen I—III, Wiesbaden.

В е р б о в Г. Д. 1973, Диалект лесных ненцев. — Самодийский сборник, Новосибирск.

Д о л г и х Б. О. 1970, Очерки по этнической истории ненцев и энцев, Москва.

Б а р м и ч М. Я., В э л л о И. А. 2002, Словарь ненецко-русский и русско-ненецкий (лесной диалект). 2-е издание, Санкт-Петербург.

Л а б а н а у с к а с К. И. 2002, Отдельные записи по грамматике диалекта маду, сделанные в пос. Воронцово 1973—1974 гг. — Родное слово. Энецкие песни, сказки, исторические предания, традиционные рассказы, мифы, Санкт-Петербург, 40—62.

П р о к о ф ь е в Г. Н. 1937, Энецкий (енисейско-самоедский) диалект. — Языки и письменность народов Севера. Ч. 1, Ленинград, 75—90.

Т е р е щ е н к о Н. М. 1965, Краткий грамматический очерк ненецкого языка. — Ненецко-русский словарь, Москва, 860—942.
 —— 1966, Энецкий язык. — Языки народов СССР. Т. 3. Финно-угорские и самодийские языки, Москва, 438—457.

Х е л и м с к и й Е. А. 1980, Этимологические заметки по энецкой ономастике. — СФУ XVII, 119—130.
 —— 1982а, Древнейшие венгерско-самодийские языковые параллели, Москва.
 —— 1982б, Keto-Uralica. — Кетский сборник, Ленинград, 238—250.

Florian Siegl

ФЛОРИАН ЗИГЛ (Тарту)

ЗАМЕТКИ ОБ ЭНЕЦКИХ И СЕВЕРОСАМОДИЙСКИХ ЛИЧНЫХ МЕСТОИМЕНИЯХ

Хотя уже давно известно, что лесной диалект энецкого языка заимствовал из кетского языка, ареально когда-то соседствовавшего с ним, два личных местоимения, до сих пор этот факт подробно не рассматривался. Как показало исследование межъязыковых отношений, заимствование местоимений — типологически редкое явление, но не исключительное. Все же энецкий случай интересным образом принципиально отличается от остальных подобных случаев, поскольку в языке лесных энцев, кроме этих двух местоимений, заимствованных из енисейских языков местоимений нет, да в настоящее время и вообще нет ни одного лексического заимствования из енисейских языков.

В статье обобщаются результаты исследований северосамодийской системы местоимений и анализируются необычные случаи развития этой системы в энецком и ненецком языках.