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Borrowability of pronouns: evidence from Uralic

Rogier Blokland (Munich)

Abstract
In borrowability hierarchies pronouns usually occupy a relatively low position, i.e. they are assumed not to be borrowed very often. This is undoubtedly true, and therefore cases where it does occur may be of some interest with regard to the question what can be borrowed, and under what circumstances. Cases of borrowed non-personal pronouns are comparatively common, but personal pronouns are borrowed relatively rarely. Such instances can usually be divided into a number of categories, and they tend to occur mostly in languages where pronouns are open classes, in neighbouring languages with different clusivity strategies, in languages with avoidance styles, and in closely related languages. In a number of Uralic languages cases of borrowed pronouns are also found, though most of these do not come under any of the abovementioned categories. Borrowed personal pronouns occur in Enets, Komi-Zyryan and Komi-Permyak and in Voty. In these languages, however, the reasons for borrowing such pronouns are different: in Enets and Voty it was probably paradigmatic systematicity, whilst in the Komi cases it is most likely due to identity of various pronominal case forms.
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1. Introduction: the borrowing of pronouns
In linguistic literature the claim that personal pronouns are not easily borrowed is often encountered (e.g. Nichols – Peterson 1996: 337; Greenberg 1997: 89–90; Winford 2003: 51; Aikhenvald 2006: 185), and in borrowing hierarchies (e.g. Thomason – Kaufman 1988: 74–76; Thomason 2001: 70–71; Matras 2009: 157) they usually figure relatively low on the scale of borrowability. In recent literature the borrowing of personal pronouns has gained more attention (see eg. Thomason – Everett 2005 and Campbell – Poser 2008: 212–125), and attested cases of borrowed personal pronouns are usually divided into one of five groups: open classes (e.g. in South-East Asian languages), closely related

1 Parts of this paper were read at the 2011 Hamburg conference ‘Uralic Languages and Multilingualism: Contexts and Manifestations in a Language Family’. Cornelius Hasselblatt (Groningen), László Honti (Budapest), Petar Kehayov (Tartu/Regensburg), Gerson Klumpp (Munich) and Remco van Pareren (Groningen) have been generous in offering comments and help.
languages (e.g. in English from Scandinavian), cases of gap-filling (as e.g. when languages which do not make an inclusive/exclusive distinction in the 1\textsuperscript{st} person plural pronoun borrow a pronoun from a language that does; e.g. in Khoekhoe, cf. Siewierska – Bakker 2005: 164), paradigm reshaping under foreign influence (e.g. in Tucanoan, cf. Aikhenvald 2002: 64), and pronoun replacement in languages with avoidance styles (e.g. in Western Desert Language, cf. Blake 1991: 45).

It makes sense to make a distinction between cases occurring in languages such as those belonging to the Uralic, Altaic and Indo-European families, where personal pronouns form a closed class, and those belonging to e.g. many South-East Asian language families such as Tai-Kadai, Austronesian where personal pronouns are an open class, and often show no syntactical features which would permit us to classify them as different from nouns (cf. Goddard 2005: 19–22), and can accordingly be more profitably seen as forms of address. In such languages where social distinctions play important roles, kinship terms and other nouns are commonly used in addressing people and also for self-referral. E.g. in Thai a child addressing a teacher or older sibling might use the word niu (lit. ‘mouse’) to refer to itself (Goddard 2005: 20); words like ‘slave’ or ‘servant’ are often borrowed and used as deferential 1\textsuperscript{st} person forms: Sundanese abdi, borrowed from Arabic abd ‘slave’, Indonesian saya from Sanskrit sahaya ‘follower, slave’, and Japanese boku ‘manservant’ from Chinese (cf. Matras 2009: 205). They can variably be used as a 1\textsuperscript{st}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} or 3\textsuperscript{rd} person pronoun according to the situation, and in order to avoid pitfalls in choosing the wrong form when addressing people senior in age or status, speakers often avail themselves of loans from other languages; the fact that the pronoun class, if one can call it such, is open also means that loans are used in addition to the existing forms: they do not replace the native pronouns.

In most Eurasian languages however, such as the Uralic, Altaic and Indo-European languages, where personal pronouns form a closed paradigmatic system, borrowing is much less common as there is scarcely any motivation to do so. If it does occur, it is most likely to happen between relatively closely related languages: well-known examples from Indo-European include English (they, their and them from Old Norse; Howe 1996: 154–163), North Frisian (man one-3PSG.INDEF and sik oneself-3SG/PL.REFLEX from High/ Low German; Parker 1993: 123–127) and certain varieties of Low German (hum he-3SG.OBL.M and hör she-3SG.GEN/OBL.F, they-3PL.GEN.OBL from East Frisian; Reershemius 2004: 23), though some borrowing has also occurred among languages that are not especially closely related, e.g. Polabian has borrowed from Germanic (jai you-2PL.NOM borrowed from Middle Low German jî; Polański 1993: 798), and many varieties of (Indo-Iranian) Romani have borrowed both complete personal pronouns (e.g. Molise Romani lor
they-3PL.NOM from Italian loro they-3PL.NOM), as well as plural affixes which are only used to form plural pronoun forms (e.g. Hungarian Romani ov he-3SG.NOM ~ onk they-3PL.NOM, where the k-element in the plural form is borrowed from Hungarian, cf. Hungarian ŏ s/he-3SG.NOM ~ ŏk they-3PL.NOM; Matras 2009: 207). Jamaican English has solved the problem that standard English no longer distinguishes between the 2nd person singular and plural by borrowing ūnù you-2PL.NOM from Igbo (Cassidy – Le Page 2002: 457); the identity of the singular and plural 2nd persons in English has led to such colloquial 2nd person plural forms in English as you guys, ya’ll (United States), you mob (Australia) and you lot (United Kingdom).

In Altaic e.g. Turkish uses a number of borrowed non-pronominal elements of Perso-Arabic origin as pronouns, mostly in deferential and courtly language: e.g. bende ‘slave’ (< Pers. banda), furnished with the 2nd person plural possessive suffix -niz, was used in courtly language as bendeniz as ‘your slave, I’ (where the similarity to ben ‘I’ is purely coincidental; cf. Lewis 1984: 68); other borrowed elements used as personal pronouns include zat ‘person, individual’ (< Ar. āt), e.g. zatiniz person-2PL.PX ‘you, your person’ and taraf ‘side; party’ (< Ar. ātara), e.g. tarafiniz gönderdio ‘s/he came to you’ (lit. ‘s/he came to your side’; Kononov 1956: 175, 184). Karaim also does not use the 2nd person plural siz as a deferential singular, but has instead borrowed Hebrew kavod ‘honour’, inflected with 2nd and 3rd person pronoun suffixes -uzuj or -unuj; the resulting koduj (< kavoduj), kodujuz (< kavodujuz), kanuz (< kavodunuz) you-2PL.NOM are used as polite forms of address (Musaev 1977: 41), cf. Spanish usted ‘you-2SG (deferential)’ < vuestra merced and ustedes you-2PL (deferential)’ < vuestras mercedes ‘your honour’ (Penny 2002: 138). Gagauz uses žanabin(-iz) you-2SG.NOM (deferential) and žanabi(-si) s/he-3SG.NOM, sometimes also with the 2nd person plural or 3rd person singular personal suffix respectively (Pokrovskaya 1966: 119), ultimately a borrowing from Persian ġān ‘soul’ (Räsänen 1969: 123b).

2. Borrowed pronouns in Uralic

In the Uralic languages pronouns form a closed system as well, though pronouns, pronominal or other elements used as or in pronouns in the target languages are occasionally borrowed, mainly from Russian, Turkic or Scandinavian.2 The most common ones are those below (we have not aimed at giving examples of

Determiners (often also classified as pronouns) such as Russ. каждый (dial. ка́жной) ‘every, each’, всевый ‘anyone’ and всев ‘all’ are also commonly borrowed; e.g. Moksha Mordvin kazhej (Majtinskaja 1964: 47), Mansi kâšni (Kâlmán 1961: 177), Khanty kâšn-(Vértes 1967: 165), Veps šâkei (Kettunen 1943: 413), Udmurt šâjok (Karpova 1997: 64, 127), Mansi višak (Kâlmán 1961: 268), Komi всé (SSKDZ 346a), Selkup всé (Helinski 1983: 66); cf. also Mordvin E taki and M tag-kiyá ‘somebody’, E tag-mežë M tag-meža ‘something’ borrowed from Tat. tagi ‘another, again; besides; more’ (Bartens 1999: 117), but such forms will not be treated here. See Alvre (1975) for more examples.
all possible occurrences, exhaustive references, or commonly borrowed relative pronouns; dashes are used to separate the borrowed elements); the source elements are listed by origin.

2.1. Elements borrowed from Russian

2.1.1. Particles

The particle кое- ‘some-’, borrowed into Karelian (ken kajo ‘somebody’; ALFE: 435), Lude (e.g. kojo-kelлe ‘to some (people)’; Kujola 1944: 146a), Veps (e.g. kojo-ken ‘somebody’; Alvre 2002: 163), Vote (kojo mită ‘something’; Alvre 2002: 163) and Erzya and Moksha Mordvin (e.g. Е кой-ките M кой-кий ‘somebody’, Е кой-мёз, M кой-мёз ‘something’; Majtinskaja 1964: 36, 37; Bartens 1999: 117).

The particle -либо ’-one, -body’ has been borrowed into Tver Karelian (e.g. midă ľuwbo ‘something’; Alvre 2002: 162), Permyak Komi (e.g. kin-ľibo ‘somebody’; Batalova 1990: 104; Batalova 2002: 88). Partly due to the existence of the Russian conjunction либо ‘or’, in Olonets it has also been abstracted and used as a prefix (e.g. ľibo midă ‘something’; Alvre 2002: 163).

The negative (separable) particle ни- (cf. ни-кто ‘nobody’, ни-что ‘nothing’) has been borrowed as a negative (inseparable) prefix into Karelian (e.g. ни-мидă ‘nothing’; Alvre 2002: 163), Olonets (e.g. ни-кui ‘not at all’; Alvre 2002: 163), Lude (e.g. ni-middă ‘nothing’; Alvre 2002: 163), Veps (e.g. ни-ken ‘nobody’; Kettunen 1943: 417–419; Savijärvi 1986; Alvre 2002: 163), Vote (e.g. ni-ken ‘nobody’; Alvre 2002: 163), Skolt Saami (e.g. (ij) ni ķii ‘nobody’; Korhonen et al. 1973: 66), Akkala Saami (e.g. niki ‘nobody’; Zajkov 1987: 128), Kildin Saami (e.g. ni-kke ‘nobody’, ni-mi ‘nothing’; Kert 1971: 177; Rießler 2007: 237–238), Ter Saami (e.g. nie-ki ‘somebody’; Itkonen 1958: 280a), Udmurt (e.g. не-кин ‘nobody’; Keľmakov – Saarinen 1994: 119), Zyrian Komi (e.g. не-код ‘nobody’; Wichmann – Uotila 1942: 175a; Majtinskaja [1964: 84] and KESK [186–187] assume Uralic origin for this prefix), Permyak Komi (e.g. не-кин ‘nobody’; Rédei 1978: 194a), and Selkup (e.g. ni kuti ‘nobody’; Erdélyi 1970: 108b, 153ab). It also occurs as a suffix in Karelian (e.g. миtă-нi ‘with something’; Alvre 2002: 162), Lude (e.g. мiтă-нi ‘some kind of’; Gilojeva 2001: 43), Veps (e.g. mиt-нi ‘somebody’; Kettunen 1943: 419–420; Alvre 2002: 162), Ingrian (e.g. kel-ni ‘somebody (ADE)’; Alvre 2002: 162), and Vote (e.g. kaza-ni ‘somewhere’; Alvre 2002: 162; mиtă-ni ‘something’; Tsvetkov 2008: 54), though here it may have been borrowed from the Russian construction кто бы ни был ‘whoever it may be’, что бы ни был ‘whatever it may be’ (Gilojeva 2001: 43).

The particle -нибудь ‘-one, -body’ has been borrowed into Karelian (e.g. ken-нiбит ‘somebody’; Alvre 2002: 162), Lude (e.g. mитă-нiбит ‘somehow’; Alvre 2002: 162), and Vote (e.g. кaza-ni ‘somewhere’; Alvre 2002: 162; mиtă-ni ‘something’; Tsvetkov 2008: 54), though here it may have been borrowed from the Russian construction кто бы ни был ‘whoever it may be’, что бы ни был ‘whatever it may be’ (Gilojeva 2001: 43).
Ingrian (e.g. *mišů-nišut* ‘something’; Alvre 2002: 162), Võte (e.g. *tšen-nibuit* ‘somebody’; Ariste 1948: 68), Moksha Mordvin (e.g. *kodamă-năbut* ‘some kind of’; Majtinskaja 1964: 36), Zyrian Komi (e.g. *kin-ḫibud* ‘somebody’; SSKZD 155a), Permyak Komi (*kin-ńibud* ‘somebody’; Lytkin 1962: 241; Batalova 1990: 104) and Khanty (Vértes 1967: 162).

The post-positional particle -*mo* has been borrowed into Karelian (e.g. *ken-to* ‘somebody’; Giljoeva 2001: 42), Olonets (e.g. *mi-to* ‘something’; Giljoeva 2001: 42) and Permyak (e.g. *kin-to* ‘somebody’; Cypanov 1990: 59).

The particle *хоть* ‘any-’, forming indefinite pronouns (e.g. Russ. *хоть кто* ‘anyone’), has been borrowed into Karelian (e.g. *hot-miř* ‘whatever’; Alvre 2002: 162), Olonets (e.g. *hoz më* ‘whatever’; Alvre 2002: 162), Lúde (e.g. *hod më* ‘whatever’; Kujola 1944: 75b), Ingrian (e.g. *hot kuga* ‘somebody’; Porkka 1885: 87), Võte (e.g. *hot miltine* ‘whatever it is’; Alvre 2002: 162), Moksha Mordvin (e.g. *kati-kijé* ‘somebody’; Majtinskaja 1964: 39), Meadow Mari (e.g. *kořś kö* ‘anyone’; Majtinskaja 1964: 84, 85), Udmurt (e.g. *koř-kin* ‘anything’; Keľmakov – Saarinen 1994: 121) and Permyak Komi (e.g. *kët kën* ‘anybody’; Lytkin 1962: 243).

The emphatic particle -*же* is also widely borrowed, e.g. into Erzya and Moksha Mordvin (M *ńɛkş-ža* ‘these ones’, ʃak-َا- ‘the same’, ʃijak-že ‘in the same way’, ʃtama-že ‘the same’, ʃakắš-َا- ‘exactly the same way’; Majtinskaja 1964: 17).

### 2.1.2. Demonstrative pronoun

The genitive *того* of the demonstrative pronoun *тот* ‘that’ has been borrowed by the Lower Ínva, Oni and Hajduk dialects of Permyak (e.g. *too-së̆ sêt* ‘дай то самое’, oğ miša tao keđenj ‘рано, говорю, в этом году сеют’; Batalova 1975: 203). Batalova says its exact meaning is uncertain and claims it is a modal particle; the Russian translations, however, indicate that it functions as a demonstrative pronoun, where in the first example the Permyak 3rd person possessive accusative ending -*së* acts as a focalizer.

### 2.1.3. Conjunction

The (dialectal) conjunction *буе* ‘if’, borrowed into Erzya and Moksha Mordvin (E *kije-bu’i*; M *kijă-ha’di* ‘something’; Majtinskaja 1964: 37; Bartens 1999: 117).

### 2.1.4. Adjective ending

The adjective ending -*овь* (< -*овьй*) has been borrowed into Permyak as -*овьй*, where it is actively used in the formation of adjectives (e.g. *nu-ovьй* ‘wooden’, cf. *nu* ‘tree; wood’), but it also occurs in interrogative pronouns: *мый-овьй* ‘what kind’ (Batalova 1982: 131–132); cf. *мый* ‘what; what kind; how; why’.
2.2. Elements borrowed from Tatar

2.2.1. Particles

The particle ällä ‘some-’ (cf. Tat. ällä kajda ‘somewhere’, ällä kem ‘somebody’) has been borrowed into Meadow Mari (e.g. ala-kudo ‘some kind of’, ala-kušto ‘somewhere’; Majtinskaja 1964: 83); it has probably also been borrowed into Udmurt as a prefix in indefinite pronouns (e.g. olo-kin ‘somebody’; Csűcs 1990: 246); variants closer to the Tatar word occur in peripheral dialects, e.g. olo-kin; problematic is that Tatar /ä/ is usually not substituted with /o/ in Udmurt; one proposed solution suggests that a Common Udmurt prefix olo- (for which, however, there is no other etymology) was influenced by the Tatar form (Keľmakov – Saarinen 1994: 121). The Tatar etymology is accepted by Tarakanov (1975: 174, 180). It has also been suggested (Beke 1954: 121) that Mansi ele- (Southern), ā̆l- (Eastern), ar- (Western) in forms such as ele-nēr ‘irgendein’ (DEWOS 70) is of Tatar origin, but DEWOS rejects the Tatar etymology.

The particle hič ‘no; not at all’ has been borrowed into (Bashkortostani) Udmurt, where it functions as an extra emphatic negation prefix in indefinite pronouns (e.g. eš-nokin ‘nobody’ < nokin ‘nobody’; eš-nokije ‘no kind of’ < nokije ‘no kind of’; Csűcs 1990: 172; Keľmakov – Saarinen 1994: 120).

2.2.2. Interrogative pronoun

The distributive pronoun här ‘each’ has been borrowed into (Bashkortostani) Udmurt (e.g. ā̆r-kin ‘every’; Csűcs 1990: 169; Keľmakov – Saarinen 1994: 122) and Southern Mansi (e.g. ā̆r- ~ ā̆r-han ‘everybody’; Munkácsi – Kálmán 1986: 46b–47a) where it functions as a prefix. In Udmurt and Mansi it can also be used determinatively, and it has also been borrowed as a determiner into Erzya and Moksha Mordvin (e.g. E ĕ̆r-va M jă̆r, ā̆r ‘every’; Majtinskaja 1964: 46) and Mari (e.g. ār ‘every’; Gordée 1979: 125).

2.2.3. Interrogative pronoun

The interrogative pronoun ni ‘what; why’ has been borrowed into Eastern Mansi: nē ~ ni ~ ne ‘what, what kind’ (Munkácsi – Kálmán 1986: 334b–335a).

2.2.4. Clitic

The postpositional clitic -TEr (cf Tat. kem ‘who’ > kemder ‘somebody’) has been borrowed into eastern peripheral dialects of Udmurt (e.g. kin-djër ‘somebody’; Keľmakov–Saarinen 1994: 121).
2.2.5. Prefix
The prefix teläsä ‘w-ever you like’ has been borrowed into (Bashkortostani) Udmurt (e.g. tilasa-ķitįn ‘wherever, everywhere’; Keľmakov – Saarinen 1994: 121).

2.3. Elements borrowed from Chuvash

2.3.1. Particle
The particle kirek ‘any-‘ (cf. kam ‘who’ > kirek kam ta ‘anybody’, mĕn ‘what’ > kirek mĕn te ‘anything’) has been borrowed into Hill Mari (e.g. kerek-kă ‘anyone’; Savatkova 2002: 165) and Meadow Mari (e.g. kerek-kudo ‘any’, kerek-kušto ‘anywhere’; Majtinskaja 1964: 83).

2.3.2. Indefinite pronoun
The indefinite pronominal prefix ta has been borrowed in Erzya and Moksha Mordvin (e.g. E ta-koso ‘somewhere’; Majtinskaja 1964: 38) and Hill Mari (e.g. ta-jošă ‘somewhere’; Majtinskaja 1964: 84).

2.4. Elements borrowed from Swedish

2.4.1. Indefinite pronoun
The Swedish indefinite pronoun någon ‘some, any; somebody, anybody’ has been borrowed into (Malå) Ume Saami (e.g. naaga (n) ‘somebody’; Schlachter 1958: 98a).

2.5. Calques
There are also a number of calqued pronominal forms; these include South Estonian edikea ‘somebody’, an allegro form of ei tea kea ~ kes ‘I don’t know who’, probably calqued from Latv. nezkas ‘somebody, I don’t know who’ (Alvre 1975: 240), the result of univerbation of nezinu kas ‘I don’t know who’, occasionally still written separately as nez kas. Leivu Estonian has calqued Latvian abi divi ‘both’ as ke̮ik̀ me̮łèba ~ ke̮ik̀ me̮łèba kaṭš ‘tous deux’ (Niilus 1937: 72), but this is perhaps better classed as a determiner.

The Komi reflexive pronoun as, aś-, ač- ‘-self’ is used as a possessive pronoun in Old Komi due to the influence of Old Church Slavonic, e.g. Genesis 18:3:

(1) as ver-įd vij-ti i-n mun
   self servant-PX.2SG on-TRA no-IMPERF.IMP.NEG.2SG go-STEM
   ‘do not pass by your servant’ («не мини раба своего») (Rédei 1993: 54).
Use of the adjective *oma* ‘own’ as a reflexive possessive pronoun in Livonian, Estonian, Võõt, and Valdai and Djarža Karelian has been claimed to be due to Baltic (for southern Finnic) and Russian (for Karelian) influence (Nilsson 1988: 34; Stolz 1991: 56–58); e.g.:

Estonian

(2) \[ \text{ma lõe-n oma raamatu-t} \]

I read-PRS.1SG own book-PART

‘I’m reading my book.’ (p.k.)

Valdai Karelian

(3) \[ \text{eľ-ī-n omaŋ-ḱe peŗ-heŋ-ḱe} \]

live-PRT-1SG own-com family-com

‘I lived with my family.’ (Palmeos 1962: 47)

The Komi reciprocal compound *jorta-jort* ‘each other’ (KRS 223a), based on *jort* ‘friend’, is probably a calque of Russ. *друг-друга* ‘each other’, though in this reciprocal construction Russ. *друг* is a short form of *другой* ‘other’ and not of *друг* ‘friend’, as claimed by Heine & Kuteva (2002: 92–93), who mention a number of other languages where the concept ‘friend/comrade’ is used to create reciprocal markers (the two Russian words are, however, ultimately related).

The prefix *ok-* in (Bashkortostani) Udmurt indefinite pronouns (e.g. *ok-kin* ‘nobody’, cf. lit. Udm. *no-kin* ‘nobody’) is an allegro form of *odig* ‘one’; the construction is calqued on Tatar (or possibly, but less likely, Bashkir), where the prefix *ber-* in e.g. *berkem dä* ‘nobody’ is similarly derived from *ber* ‘one’ (Kel’makov – Saarinen 1994: 119–120).

Bartens (2000: 162) claims that the use of Permic reflexive pronouns as intensifiers is due to Turkic influence, but as such polysemy is common in many languages, including English (cf. König – Gast 2008: 8), this could also have been an independent development.

As can be seen from the above examples, most commonly borrowed are elements functioning as prefixes in indefinite pronouns; least common are interrogatives. This corroborates the hierarchy set up by Matras (2009: 161), where values interfering or affecting what he calls the ‘presupposition domain’, i.e.

---

3 In Uralic reciprocals based on ‘friend/comrade’ also occurs in Saamic; e.g. North Saami (see example), Inari Saami (Itkonen, E. 1986: 436) and Skolt Saami (Itkonen T.I. 1958: 170b):

\[ \text{mo-ai dqw’d-i goab’hág guo’i bma-me} \]

we-1DU know-PRES.1DU both comrades-ACC.PX.1DU

‘We (two) know each other.’ (Nielsen 1926: 145; orthography retained)

We assume, however, that the Komi example is a separate development calqued from Russian.
the set of items which the speaker and the hearer share knowledge of or which
the hearer is assumed or hoped to know, are more likely to be borrowed. Such
interference or impact creates a tension which can be resolved by bilingual or
multilingual speakers (who assume that their hearer knows the language/s too)
by borrowing. An indefinite pronoun does not specify the item which is the
theme of the conversation, leading to tension and thus to borrowing, whilst an
interrogative pronoun is used when the speaker presumes the hearer knows the
answer, and therefore there is no tension. It is therefore no coincidence that
there is, as far as we know, only one borrowing of an interrogative, namely
the Mansi borrowing of Tatar *ni* ‘what; why’, whilst there are numerous cases
of borrowed indefinite pronouns.

More unusual in languages with closed pronoun systems is the borrowing
of personal pronouns; in Uralic there are closed singular-plural or singular-
dual-plural systems with six or nine personal pronouns. Emphatic personal
pronouns are not commonly borrowed in Uralic presumably due to the availa-
bility of genuine Uralic emphatic personal pronouns or possessive suffixes, but
a number of Khanty varieties have borrowed the Russian emphatic personal
pronoun *сам* ‘self’: Ģerkal, Kazym *sam*, Ģerkal *säm* ‘selbst’, Ģerkal *säm jöftas
‘ist selbst gekommen’ (DEWOS 1338); Kazym *sam* ‘self’: *šiw sam* ‘him-/herself’ (Honti 1986: 73); Obdorsk *sam* ‘self’: *a sam mänl* ‘he himself went
out’ (Nikolaeva 1999: 36, 266), perhaps because especially in the northern
varieties the simple personal pronoun instead of the emphatic personal pronoun
is also used as an intensifier; such use is denoted solely through intonation (cf.
Honti 1986: 73). Borrowing of an intensifier could therefore be explained as
an attempt to highlight emphatic function. Russ. *сам* ‘self’ is also recorded
in Estonian, though only in the obsolete jocular expression *sam saks olema
’selbst Herr sein’ (Wiedemann 1893: 1002; Blokland 2009: 43); it is not part
of the Estonian pronominal system.

2.6. Code-switches
As opposed to borrowed pronouns which become members of the pronominal
system (to which we will turn below), there are also occasional examples of
borrowed personal pronouns in instances of code-switching:

2.6.1. Khanty
In texts recorded by Irina Nikolaeva in Katravož (Obdorsk) in 1990, a form
*nī*, borrowed from Russ. *onu* ‘they’, is found:
They became tired, they had been walking for a long time.’ (Nikolaeva 1999: 13)

As the subject is accessible from the verbal personal endings, the Russian loan она is in principle superfluous.

2.6.2. Komi

In an Iźva Komi epic song, recorded in Kolva in 1966 by Erik Vászolyi-Vasse, the following line occurs: ох ты аже, ох ты маме, дум усь верес саже мунны! ‘Oh my father, oh my mother, I decided to wed!’ (Vászolyi-Vasse – Lázár 2010: 96); the forms ох ты ‘oh you’ (< Russ. ох ты ‘oh you’), the Russian origin of which Vászolyi-Vasse already mentions (98), are instances of code-switching, and the Russian pronoun is not an element of the Iźva Komi personal pronoun system, unlike for example jeve in Komi varieties (see 3.2. below). This same personal pronoun possibly also occurs in a Letka Komi text recorded by Fokos-Fuchs in 1916: ох ти розбошний... ‘Oh, der Schuft (eig. Räuber)...’ (Fokos-Fuchs 1951: 66). Popov, Fokos-Fuch’s informant, claimed that this ти was an instance of Russ. ти ‘you’ (71), but Fokos-Fuchs, pointing out that here a 3rd person would be expected, and alluding to a previously occurring ак, ти казак ‘Ach, du Bursche!’ (54), where the expected Komi 2nd person singular personal pronoun occurs, assumes that the abovementioned ти is the Komi demonstrative pronoun ‘jener’, referring to Wichmann & Uotila (1942: 276b). However, Wichmann’s ти ‘jener’ is recorded only in Vyčegda and Sysola, and also does not occur in the dialect monograph on Luza-Letka (Žilina 1985), and so Russian origin is perhaps more probable.4

2.6.3. Mordvin

In Mordvin there is also an instance of a Russian personal pronoun used similarly to the Komi case above: ах, ти, полянай, седин колайнай ‘oh you, wife of mine, bewitcher of my heart’ (Juhász 1929: 299), where ах, ти ‘oh you’ is Russian and the remaining part of the phrase Mordvin, i.e. the Russian pronoun is here part of a code-switch and not part of the Mordvin pronominal system.

3. Borrowed personal pronouns in Uralic

In contrast to the relatively common cases of indefinite, calqued and code-switched pronouns, borrowed personal pronouns in Uralic replacing native

4 Genuine Permic те ‘you’ occurs e.g. in Zjuzdin Permyak ок те, милочка менам ‘ох ты, милочка моя’ (Nečaev 1930: 26).
pronouns are relatively rare, but at least in Enets, Khanty, Zyrian Komi, Perm-yak Komi and Vot a number of occurrences are found.\footnote{The Uralic languages are not always on the receiving end: the Udmurt 1st person and 2nd person personal pronouns mon and ton occur in varieties of colloquial Russian spoken in Izhevsk (Prokurovskaia 1990: 112), though they seem to be restricted to jocular use; Schönig (1995: 45) suggests the prothetic e- in Chuvash personal pronouns may have arisen due to Mari influence. Fedjuneva (2008: 147) also refers to possible Southern Finnic and/or Mari influence in the development of the Komi n-initial 3rd person plural pronouns. I intend to return to this at a later date.}

\section*{3.1. Enets}

Castrén (1854: 351–352), in his monumental grammar, noted that Enets has two different second (тоди, î, mod. тодди, y) and 3rd person singular pronouns (ни́тода, бу, mod. ни́тод, бу́). Prokof’yev (1937: 76) showed that the first forms are used in Tundra (Madu) Enets, the second ones in Forest (Bai) Enets, and that the forms used in Forest Enets show striking similarities with the corresponding Ket pronouns (cf. Ket у, ук ‘ты’, бу ‘он, она’; Krejnovič 1968: 461). Since then their Ket origin has generally been accepted, but the odd thing is that otherwise Ket influence on Enets (or, indeed, vice-versa) seems to be slight to nonexistent, even though Castrén (1856: 279), although regrettably without adducing any possible instantiations of such influence, claims otherwise. The only explanation so far has been put forward by Siegl (2008), who devoted an article to the Enets pronouns where he, having dutifully ploughed through Werner 2002, suggests that even though Enets has otherwise borrowed hardly anything else from Ket, the borrowing of the pronouns could be explained by the suppletion of pronominal stems in Nenets and Enets; compare e.g. the 1st person singular forms in Nenets (after Siegl 2008: 125):

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{llll}
  & Tundra Nenets & Forest Nenets \\
Nom & мань & мод’ \\
Acc & (мань) си’ми & шй” \\
Loc & ияняни & (мод’)попу́й
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

According to Siegl, the ‘weak paradigmatic strength’ of the pronouns made it attractive for Forest Enets to replace its suppletive series with a non-suppletive one borrowed from Ket. Siegl (2008: 125) also mentions the case of Nganasan, where the paradigmatic systematicity of the nominative, genitive and accusative of the personal pronouns has been maximized by equating the last two with the nominative (cf. Tereščenko 1966: 427). In comparison with the other cases of pronoun borrowing in Uralic the Enets case is unusual as it is not limited to the replacement or addition of a 3rd person pronominal form. Hajdú (1990)
also derives Nenets тыда ‘s/he’ via Enets бу from Ket, but this etymology is rejected by Siegl (2008: 122–123).

3.4. Zyrian Komi and Permyak Komi
Perhaps the best known case of a borrowed personal pronoun in a Uralic language is the case of the Russian genitive/accusative его of the masculine 3rd person singular personal pronoun он ‘he’, borrowed into Upper Sysola Komi: 

jeve — jeve (Lytkin 1930: 42, 43; Lytkin 1955: 76, 77, 118; SSKZD 469, 471; Serebrennikov 1963: 193; Žilina 1975: 100–106; Honti 2003: 34; Fedjuneva 2008: 155, 382–383). According to Žilina (1975: 102), in the Upper Sysola dialect of Zyrian Komi jeve (Kobra subdialect of Upper Sysola) jeve occurs in only in oblique cases:

(5) jeve-lij panędaša-s ruč
  s/he-DAT meet-PRT.3SG  fox. NOM
  ‘He came upon a fox.’ («ему встретилась лиса») (Lytkin 1930: 42; 1955: 76)

(6) staruha  jej  śdo  jeve-lijś
old woman.NOM  meat.NOM  eat-PRS.3SG  s/he-ABL
  ‘The old woman eats his meat.’ («старуха его мясо ест») (Lytkin 1930: 43; Lytkin 1955: 77)

(7) kofta-is  jeve-len  nojm-ema  ńin
jacket-PX.3SG  s/he-GEN  wear-out-PERF.3SG  already
  ‘Her jacket was already worn out.’ («кофта у нее уже прохудилась») (Žilina 1975: 104)

(8) me  pę  jeve-lijś  ńinęm og
I.NOM  they say  s/he-ABL  nothing  no-PRS.1SG  verged
  disturb-STEM
  ‘They say I don’t disturb anything of hers.’ («я, говорит, у нее ничего не трогаю») (Žilina 1975: 104)

Fedjuneva (2008) is somewhat unclear on this issue: on page 156 she says that there is a nominative jeve — jeve in Upper Sysola, on page 382 she says there is not.
(9) \( \text{a te jeve̮-es e-n i} \)
but you.NOM s/he-ACC no-PRT.2SG even

\( \text{tubit?} \)
love-STEM

‘And you didn’t even love him?’ («а ты его и не любила?») (Žilina 1975: 104)

However, Žilina’s examples show that it is also used in postpositional constructions and possessive constructions (i.e. where standard Zyrian Komi usually uses the bare stem of the 3rd person singular personal pronoun \\( \text{сон} \)):

| (10) \( \text{jeve̮ ji̮-li̮ś} \) | \( N / \text{s/he.NOM top-ABL} \) |
| 'About him.' («о нем») (Žilina 1975: 106) |

| (11) \( \text{sija ńame̮d tuji̮n ol-e̮} \) | \( N / \text{s/he.NOM dawdler.NOM instead live-PRES.3SG} \) |
| \( \text{jeve̮ dini̮n} \) | \( N / \text{s/he.NOM near} \) |
| 'Living with him she suffers all kinds of humiliation.' («живя с ним, она терпит всякие унижения») (Žilina 1975: 145) |

| (12) \( \text{jeve̮ ďeńga vi̮l-e̮ ńe̮b-i} \) | \( N / \text{s/he.NOM money.NOM on-ILL buy-PRT.3SG} \) |
| 'Bought with his money.' («купил на его деньги») (Žilina 1975: 106) |

Apart from Lytkin (1955: 30), none of the above sources mention that this borrowed pronoun is also encountered in the Zjuzdin (or Upper Kama) dialect of Permyak, which is spoken in the Afanasjevsky district of the Kirov Oblast on the western border of the Perm Krai, and which is geographically relatively close to the Upper Sysola dialect area of Zyrian Komi. Zjuzdin Permyak is usually subsumed under Permyak, but it can be considered a link between Zyrian Komi and Permyak Komi, though they are now not contiguous (cf. Lytkin 1955: 29–30; Lytkin 1957: 60; Batalova 1975: 221–223; Tepljašina – Lytkin 1976: 114; Baker 1985: 14, 74, Sažina 2005: 227). To our knowledge the existence of this pronoun in Zjuzdin Permyak is first mentioned by Nečaev (1928: 21), though he does not point out its Russian origin; Lytkin (1955: 30) lists it as one of the characteristics shared by Zjuzdin Permyak and Upper Sysola Komi. In Zjuzdin Permyak the borrowed pronoun \( \text{jeve̮} \) occurs in the accusative as a direct object:
As these fragments show, in Zjuzdin Permyak the accusative form of jev̆ used is slightly different to that of the Upper Sysola Komi form, where the texts only show an accusative with the accusative marker -ės (see e.g. (9) above). In both Upper Sysola Komi and Zjuzdin Permyak the typical Komi/Permyak substitution of Russ. o with <ö> [e] (cf. Kalima 1911: 25–26) led to the problem of the identity of the final vowel with the normal pronominal accusative marker -ė, and the two varieties effected different solutions: in Upper Sysola Komi the general accusative marker -ės, originally used in nouns, has been added, resulting in jev̆ės ~ jev̆ės ~ jev̆ės (cf. Fedjuneva 2008: 382), whilst in Zjuzdin jev̆ seems to have been reanalyzed as jev̆-ė, with the final vowel as the pronominal accusative marker -ė. In principle this would mean that in Zjuzdin *jev̆ could have been used as a nominative, but this does not occur. A nominative jev̆ is listed by Fedjuneva (2008: 156) for Upper Sysola, though it is not found in texts in Žilina 1975 (or anywhere else), who notes only sija as a nominative 3rd person singular personal pronoun (1975: 102); Rédei (quoted in Honti 2003: 34) also claims that jev̆ cannot exist without a case suffix. In Nečaev’s texts the two other occurrences of a 3rd person singular personal pronoun are based on the Permic stem sí-: e.g. the stem in sí ultė ‘под ного’
or the genitive in ʂɨ-ɭŋ veŋ-i imẽŋ ‘у него было именье’ (1930: 23). Similarly, in Lytkin’s (1930: 42; 1955: 76) and Žilina’s (1975: 258–259) Upper Sysola texts from Kobra the only nominatives are based on the pronoun of Permic origin. Regrettably the paucity of texts in Zjuzdin Permyak does not allow us to obtain a more precise impression of the distribution and usage of jevɐ̈ and genuine Permic ɕɭ-, but Nečaev (1930: 21) informs us that for a direct object jevɐ̈ is used instead of stjɨ or stjɛ-s, and the instrumental jevɐ̈-n is more common than ɕɨ-ɛn or ɕɪ-ɛn.

The reason for the borrowing of a personal pronoun from Russian into Upper Sysola Komi and Zjuzdin Permyak is unlikely to be related to the fact that in all Komi varieties the direct object can also be in the nominative and the resulting potential identity of the subject and direct object, because this usually does not apply to pronouns. Comrie (1975: 10) claims that all Uralic languages distinguish nominative from accusative in pronouns, but this is not strictly true: in the Middle Sysola dialect of Zyrian Komi two (stjɛ ~ stjɛ) of the five possible accusative forms of the 3rd person singular personal pronoun are identical to the nominative (Fedjuneva 2008: 382). Middle Sysola borders on Upper Sysola, and it is theoretically possible that identity of the nominative and accusative also obtained in Upper Sysola, an ambiguity which could have been resolved through the borrowing of a Russian pronoun for the direct object (as there was no such similarity between nominative and accusative forms of the 1st or 2nd person singular pronouns there was also no need to borrow replacements for these pronouns, nor indeed, for plural personal pronouns). This, however, remains a hypothesis without any proof. As Zjuzdin Permyak and Upper Sysola Komi, the only Uralic varieties which have borrowed Russian ęën, are now separated by a smallish strip of territory but were formerly in close contact (cf. Baker 1985: 14), it is improbable that the borrowing of the Russian pronoun took place independently in the two varieties, notwithstanding Zjuzdin’s divergent remodeling of it.

3.3. Vote

3.3.1. Western Vote

Vote consists of four main dialects (Western Vote, Eastern Vote, Krevinian, and Kukkuzi), of which the last three are extinct; Western Vote probably has fewer than 10 native speakers. The origin of Vote has not yet been clarified to everyone’s satisfaction: though it is generally considered to be a ‘southern’

7We have seen above that Nganasan does not differentiate among any cases in personal pronouns, and in Kamas (KW 142) the form of the direct object is not always different from other oblique forms of the personal pronouns; in Estonian the nominative and the genitive (which may be used as an object case) of the 3rd person singular and the 1st and 2nd person plural of the personal pronouns are identical.
Finnic language, it also evinces a number of features typical of the ‘eastern’ Finnic languages such as Karelian and its dialects, and Veps: e.g. the so-called 1st or eastern genitive plural which goes back to a genitive plural suffix with one plural marker (*-δ-en; cf. western Finnish kalain < *kala-δ-en fish-GEN.PL) instead of the 2nd or western type which derives from a genitive plural suffix with two plural markers (*-i-δ-en; cf. eastern Finnish kalojen, Vote kalojê < *kala-i-δ-en fish-GEN.PL), the e- in the negative imperative verb elä- /älä- ‘do not’ (both occur in Vote), and the 1st and 2nd person plural pronouns mõ and tô (cf. western Finnish me, te, eastern Finnish myö, työ). Vote has therefore often been characterized as a mixed language (Sjögren 1833: 34; Kettunen 1957: 127; Kettunen 1960: 231; Salo 1997: 384); Itkonen (1983: 214, 216), choosing his words more carefully, writes that Vote is basically a ‘western’ Finnic language in the formation of which the ‘eastern’ group has also played a role. Lauerma (1993a), however, has shown that all eastern elements in Vote may be either independent innovations (the 1st genitive plural) or borrowings (the negative imperative and the 1st and 2nd person plural personal pronouns), and he assumes that the 3rd person singular and plural pronoun forms (tämä ‘s/he’ and nämä – nâmö – nâvö ‘they’) in Vote are genuine ‘southern’ elements, positing that the 1st and 2nd person plural pronouns mõ and tô are evidence of early influence from ‘eastern’ Finnic languages, varieties of which have been spoken in Ingrir since at least the 11th century when the forebears of the Ingririans arrived from around Lake Ladoga. As already mentioned above, in all varieties of Vote except Kukkuzi, to which we will turn later, there is a dichotomy between on the one hand the 1st and 2nd person pronouns, which are typical of the eastern Finnic languages, and the 3rd person pronouns, which are similar to those found in the southern Finnic languages Estonian and Livonian, on the other. Below follows an overview of the personal pronouns in the nominative in all varieties of Vote:

| Table 1. Western Vote, Kattila (Ahlqvist 1856: 43) |
|---|---|
| **Singular** | **Plural** |
| 1 | miä | mõ |
| 2 | siä | tô |
| 3 | tämä | nämä |

| Table 2. Western Vote, Kattila (Ariste 1948: 60) |
|---|---|
| **Singular** | **Plural** |
| 1 | miä | mõ – mű |
| 2 | siä | tô – tű |
| 3 | tämä | nämä – nâmö – nâvö |
Table 3. Eastern Vote, Mahu (Kettunen 1986: 78, 82, 89, 122, 146, 147; VKS 3: 399; 6: 353)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>miä</td>
<td>mȫ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>siä</td>
<td>tȫ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>tämä</td>
<td>nāvāp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Krevinian (Winkler 1997: 262–263)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>mie</td>
<td>me – met – mōt*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>sie – se</td>
<td>sōt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>tämä ~ tām</td>
<td>nāve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison of the Kattila (Western Vote) pronouns as recorded by Ahlqvist (1856) and Ariste (1948) show that 20th century Kattila Vote has gained alternative forms of the 1st and 2nd person plural pronouns with higher vowels; here it is difficult to say whether Kattila has actually borrowed the pronouns with the higher vowel from a variety of Ingrian (see Table 5 below; less common variants in brackets) or simply phonetically adapted its own pronouns to Ingrian ones.

Table 5. Ingrian (Porkka 1885: 78–79; Laanest 1986: 119)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>miä</td>
<td>mō ~ mū (– mōi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>siä</td>
<td>tō ~ tū (– tōi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>hā ~ hān</td>
<td>hō ~ hū (– hōi ~ hōn ~ hōt)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kettunen (1930: 132; 1960: 59) proposes that it is the raising itself in Eastern Vote which is due to Ingrian influence; that this raise from ŏ to ū occurs in Western Vote too can be seen in the texts from Jegēperä in e.g. Kettunen & Posti 1932, and we can therefore also handily accept Lauerma’s aforementioned suggestion that the ‘easternness’ of the 1st and 2nd person plural pronouns is simply due to language contact without the need to postulate the existence of a ‘mixed’ language.

3.3.2. Kukkuzi Vote

Another problem is posed by the fourth variety of Vote, Kukkuzi Vote, formerly spoken to the southwest of the main Vote area (cf. e.g. the map in Kettunen 1930: 206). Kukkuzi is generally seen as the most divergent of Vote varieties, and the two main characteristics which separate it from Western and Eastern Vote varieties are the lack of typically Vote affricatization of initial k-anterior

\* The final -t in the Krevinian 1st person plural forms met and mōt is a secondary plural marker; the initial s- in the 2nd person plural sōt is the result of analogy with the 2nd person singular sie (cf. Winkler 1997: 263).
to front vowels (cf. Votic čäsi ‘hand’ ~ Kukkuži käsi ‘id.’), and the existence of ‘non-southern’ 3rd person personal pronouns:


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>miä</td>
<td>mü</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>siä</td>
<td>tśū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>hän ~ hän</td>
<td>hū</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The preservation of k- in Kukkuži has been thought to be due to its isolation from the other Votic areas (Posti 1958: 8), and two explanations have been posited for the existence of the non-southern 3rd person personal pronouns: Kukkuži borrowed them from Ingrian (e.g. VKS I: 271), or Kukkuži is originally a ‘northern’ variety of Finnic which has been strongly influenced by Votic (e.g. Viitso 1998: 99). Suhonen claims (1985: 140) that Laanest in his monograph on Ingrian dialects (Laanest 1966) declares Kukkuži to be an Ingrian dialect, but, as Ariste (1957: 119) mentions, there has been a language shift from Ingrianized Votic to Ingrian in Kukkuži, and Laanest records Kukkuži as a bilingual Votic-Ingrian village (p. 6): when he mentions ‘Kukkuži’ (p. 15) he is referring to the (Lower Luga) Ingrian spoken there at present and not to the Votic variety strongly influenced by Ingrian (and probably Lower Luga Finnish), which is now, however, probably no longer spoken (cf. Adler 1966: 118; cf. Suhonen 1985 for an enumeration and comparison of the Ingrian and Votic elements in Kukkuži).

The borrowing of the ‘non-southern’ 3rd person personal pronouns from Ingrian is in fact the most likely explanation, for two reasons: first, the Votic personal pronoun system (excluding Kukkuži) in any event contains both southern and non-southern elements (as pointed out again recently by Lauerma 1993: 49), and second, it can be shown that borrowing of 3rd person personal pronouns is common in Votic, as it is also at present occurring in e.g. the Jegēperä variety of Western Votic. Tsvetkov recorded the following typical Votic system in the 1920s:

Table 7. Western Votic, Jegēperä (Tsvetkov 2008: 54–55)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>miä</td>
<td>mü</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>siä</td>
<td>tüü</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>tāmā¹⁰</td>
<td>nāmād</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁹ "Kukkosi Votic was originally a North Fennic dialect that was first influenced by Votic proper and later by Lower Luga Ingrian." Viitso does not claim with so many words that hän and hū are native pronouns in Kukkuži, but it would fit with his postulation that it is originally a North Finnic variety.

¹⁰ Votic tāmā is also used as a demonstrative pronoun (cf. VKS 6: 340)
However, Agranat (2007: 80–81), in her grammar of Western Võte, the material of which was recorded between 1995 and 2006, notes two slightly different pronominal systems for Luuditsa and for Jegëperä:

Table 8. Western Võte, Luuditsa (Agranat 2008: 80–81)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>miä</td>
<td>müü</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>siä</td>
<td>tüü</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3 | tämä     | nämä    ~ nämäd

Table 9. Western Võte, Jegëperä (Agranat 2008: 80–81)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>miä</td>
<td>müü</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>siä</td>
<td>tüü</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>tämä</td>
<td>hüü</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen that a significant change has occurred in the Western Võte variety of Jegëperä: the Võte 3rd person plural pronoun has been replaced by the Ingrian 3rd person plural personal pronoun hüü, though the Võte 3rd person singular pronoun tämä has been retained. Heinsoo & Kuusk (2002: 118) state that this is the situation now obtaining in Jegëperä, and according to Agranat’s pronoun table, this system is typical for Jegëperä only, but in actual fact this change is not restricted to Jegëperä; though Agranat’s table does not show it, in her texts (a number of which can also be found in Agranat 2008 with interlinear glosses) from Luuditsa (2007: 172, 173, 176, 177, 181) the Ingrian variants hüü (nominative) and heil (adessive) occur (with no instances of the genuine Võte 3rd person plural pronoun), e.g.:

(17) a  hei-ł    õll-ti    üvā-t  
      but  they-ADE  be-IMPERS.PRT  good-NOM.PL
hüü  linna-ssǝ
they.NOM  city-ELA
‘But they had good (ones) – they were from the city.’ (Agranat 2007: 177)

A number of the texts were recorded from the Jegëperä-born Zinaida Saveljeva, resident in Luuditsa, and whose Ingrianisms could therefore be explained by her place of birth, but hüü also occurs in texts from the Luuditsa-born Tatjana Prokopenko. Kettunen (1945: 255) already refers to the many Ingrianisms in Luuditsa Võte. Heinsoo & Kuusk and Agranat state that only the (borrowed) 3rd person plural personal pronoun hüü is used in Jegëperä (and in Luuditsa too, as we have seen), but the 3rd person singular personal pronoun hän (< Ingrian hän ‘s/he’) is also found in a number of Western Võte texts. The earliest
occurrence seems to be in a text collected by Julius Mägiste in 1943, where both types of 3rd person singular personal pronoun, tämä (southern Finnic) and hän (non-southern Finnic), occur in the speech of an informant from Jeggeperä (the transcription has been slightly simplified):

\[(18)\] sis tämä tetš-i takáz adđë-n\(^{11}\)
then s/he make-PRT.3SG again fence-GEN

‘Then he made a new fence again.’ («Dann errichtete er wieder einen (neuen) Zaun») (Mägiste 1959: 166)

\[(19)\] hän-l ank-o sūāme-z niku mato
s/he-ADE begin-PRT.3SG heart-INE as snake
pur-rë̮ bite-INF

‘it felt as if a snake was biting his heart’ («... fing (es) in seinem [ihm] Herz an, gleich einer Schlange zu beissen») (Mägiste 1959: 166)

\[(20)\] hän sîz ott-i püsû
s/he then take-PRT.3SG gun-GEN

‘he then took the gun ...’ («er nahm die Flinte ...») (Mägiste 1959: 166)

The Ingrian borrowing hän only occurs a couple of times, with Vote tämä being much more common, and there seems to be no specific reason why hän is chosen in the examples above. As the following extract shows, both pronouns may even occur in two consecutive sentences:

\[(21)\] ja tuš-tù hän-l tšüsü-mâ ettì men-nâ
and come-PASS.PRT s/he-ABL.ask-ILL that go-INF

tôv-vâ natkë̮ vällâ no tämä ngvvo
bring-INF skin out well s/he advise.PRT.3SG
kuza këhtâ on karu
where place be.PRS.3SG bear

‘... and they came to ask him to go and bring the skin. Well, he told them where the bear was.’ («... und kamen, (um sich) bei [von] ihm zu erkundigen [fragen], um das Fell (des Bären) holen zu gehen [man geht, man holt weg]. Er belehrte sie [gab den Rat], also, an [im] welcher Stelle der Bär liege [ist]») (Mägiste 1959: 169)

\(^{11}\) The form adđë-n here is unclear; the final –n is not Vote. The expected Jeggeperä genitive would be adā (cf. VKS 1: 85).
As both hän and tämä refer to the same person there can be no question of different referential properties. It is possible that this is a sporadic occurrence in the speech of Mägiste’s informant Ivan Borisov\(^{12}\), but it is not restricted to him, as hän can also be found in a text recorded by Heinsoo & Kuusk in 1995 from an informant whose Vote was supposed to be very good:

\((22)\)  
\[
\text{hän on vađđa} \\
\text{s/he be,prs.3sg Vote} \\
\text{‘She is Vote.’ (Heinsoo – Kuusk 2002: 114)}
\]

The borrowed pronoun hän also occurs in a text of an informant recorded by Heinsoo & Kuusk (2005: passim), whose Vote, however, was very strongly influenced by Ingrian (so much that Heinsoo & Kuusk suggest she basically speaks ‘Finnic’). In this informant’s Vote, hän dominates, though tämä also occurs occasionally:

\((23)\)  
\[
\text{sōrok vaśmom godū hän tul-i kottī} \\
\text{forty eight year s/he come-prt.3sg home,ill} \\
\text{‘She came home in 1948.’ (Heinsoo – Kuusk 2005: 76)}
\]

This sentence is a good illustration of why Heinsoo & Kuusk consider the informant’s speech ‘Finnic’, as it contains no specifically Vote elements: the year is in Russian, the pronoun is Ingrian, the verb form can be Vote, Ingrian, Finnish or Estonian, and the adverb is Ingrian. This is followed in the narrative by the following sentence:

\((24)\)  
\[
\text{tämä el-i rohkēp kümmē āstaik-ā} \\
\text{s/he live-prt.3sg more ten year-part} \\
\text{‘She lived another ten years.’ (Heinsoo – Kuusk 2005: 76)}
\]

Here the pronoun is Vote, the verb Ingrian (though the informant can also have simply substituted e for typically Vote ĝ, which she does regularly, making it identical to the Ingrian form; cf. Heinsoo – Kuusk 2005: 70), the cardinal Vote but with the typically Vote affricatization of initial k- anterior to front vowels eliminated through Ingrian influence (cf. Ingr. kümmenän, Vote tšümmē ‘ten’), rohkēp seems to be a Vote adaptation (in the comparative) of Ingr. rohkia ‘bold;

\(^{12}\) Ivan Borisov, who was 62 when Mägiste interviewed him in 1943, is the father of Aleksandr Ivanovič Borisov, born in Jegēperä in 1931, whom Ariste claimed to speak ‘Solikolla Ingrian with Vote elements’ (2005: 56), though ‘good Vote’ when he met him 24 years later (2005: 133). See Heinsoo & Kuusk (2002) for a sample of Aleksandr Borisov’s Vote as recorded in 1995.
more’ (itself a partial calque from Est. rohkem ‘more’; Nirvi 1971: 484b), and the attribute of the cardinal is Vote.

Recent Vote texts seem to show that hän is most likely an occasional Ingrianism used by good speakers of Vote, only occurring as the main 3rd person singular personal pronoun in the language of the informant recorded by Heinsoo & Kuusk mentioned above whose heavily Ingrianized Vote is well on the way to becoming Ingrian with some Vote influence, and that only hüü has become an integral element of the Western Vote pronominal system. Though the genuine Vote personal pronouns still prevail in relatively recent texts from Jeggeperä (e.g. Mägiste 1959: passim; Ariste 1974: passim; Heinsoo 2005: 227), the very latest (admittedly not very plentiful) material from Jeggeperä (Heinsoo – Kuusk 2005; Agranat 2007) and Luuditsa (Agranat 2007) show that the original Vote 3rd person plural personal pronoun nämä ~ nämäd seems to have been displaced by the borrowed Ingrian pronoun hüü. It is often said that the Finnic people of Ingría in general did not learn each other’s language, as they were so similar this was not necessary (e.g. Kettunen 1945: 237; Ariste 1957: 122), but it is also a well-known fact that many speakers mix(ed) their varieties (cf. e.g. Kettunen 1945: 204, 227–228; Ariste 1960: 206-207; Ariste 1968; Ariste 1980: 209; Heinsoo 2005: 233; Heinsoo 2006), where especially most, if not all, varieties of Vote were under strong Ingrian influence (cf. e.g. Kettunen 1945: 204, 237, 244, 255; Talve (1990: 63) notes it specifically for Jeggeperä in 1942, and it can be exemplified by the above extract from Heinsoo & Kuusk. In addition to the general Ingrianization of many Vote varieties, facilitated by their close genetic relationship and typological similarity, a possible reason for the adoption of Ingrian hüü as a replacement for Vote nämä ~ nämäd is paradigmatic systematicity in the plural pronoun series: müü, tüü, nämä ~ nämäd > müü, tüü, hüü. For the singular pronouns this was perhaps not as necessary, as the phonetic shape of Ingrian hän ~ hän ~ hâ is not especially similar to the 1st and 2nd person singular pronouns miä and siä. With regard to the replacement of nämä ~ nämäd with hüü, not only would the paradigmatic systematicity within the Vote pronominal system itself increase, but borrowing would also bring about a concomitant reduction in memory load, caused by the need to operate in at least three (Russian is also spoken by all Votes, often Finnish and/or Estonia too) linguistic systems, through convergence of the Vote and Ingrian pronominal systems.

For the record it must be mentioned that the Vote 3rd person singular pronoun tămä ‘s/he’ is recorded once in the aberrant Kukkuzi variety (where hän is the only 3rd person singular pronoun), but this occurs in a sentence where

13 The 3rd person pronoun hän also occurs once in a text recorded in 1901 by Vihtori Alava in Kattila (Alava 1909: 49; cf. also VKS 1: 271), but it occurs only in the introduction to a song, and so it is probably a sporadic Ingrianism.
the informant repeats the (non-native) interviewer’s question in (Western) Vote, and as soon as the informant needs to refer a 3rd person again she uses the Kukkuzi form *hän*, and *tämä* is therefore probably not part of her personal pronoun system:

**Interviewer:**

(25)  
\[ \text{tämä } e-b \quad \text{näh-nū?} \]  
\text{s/he no-PRES.3SG see-PERF.ACT.PART}  
‘She couldn’t see?’ (Ariste 1977: 136)

**Informant:**

(26)  
\[ \text{tämä } B \quad \text{näh-nūD}, \quad \text{miä } ēz \]  
\text{s/he no-PRES.3SG see-PERF.ACT.PART I front}  
\text{johsū pan-i-n}  
\text{a } \text{hän } jālēs \text{ pan-i}  
\text{run.IIL put-PRT-1SG but s/he after run-PRT.3SG}  
\text{johsū}  
\text{run.IIL}  
‘She couldn’t see, I started running, but she started to run after me’  
(Ariste 1977: 136)

4. Conclusions

The Uralic languages spoken in Russia have borrowed a large number of pronouns or pronominal elements, mostly from Russian, but also from Turkic languages or from related Uralic languages. It was mentioned that in Uralic, as in most other Eurasian languages, pronouns form a closed class, but within this class some are more closed than others: e.g. demonstrative or interrogative pronouns can be relatively easily added to, whilst personal and possessive pronouns are the most ‘closed’. As the above examples show, however, even these subclasses can borrow, though the Enets, Komi/Permyak and Vote cases are, however, all different: paradigmatic systematicity was probably the driving force behind the Enets and Vote cases, though the actual language contact situations could not have been more different. As the Enets example show, there does not necessarily need to be extensive and intense language contact, as it borrowed its pronouns and basically nothing else from Ket, a language with which it had only slight contact. In Vote the reason for borrowing was most likely the same, but here the donor language was one with which Vote has been in very close contact and which is genetically closely related and typologically similar; Kettunen (1909: 107–108) already pointed out that speakers of such closely related languages readily borrow from each other. Pressure from the pronominal paradigm played no role in the cases of Upper Sysola Komi or Zjuzdin Permyak, where the reason for borrowing Russian *eco* is perhaps due
to a possible identity of the nominative and accusative of the 3rd person per-
sonal pronoun, and though the actual borrowing in both Upper Sysola Komi or
Zjuzdin Permyak undoubtedly goes back to when these two varieties were in
close contact, their adaptation of it diverged.

In the Permic varieties and Võte the Russian pronouns have been borrowed
relatively recently, which is evinced both by the fact that only the 3rd person
pronoun has been borrowed (the singular in Komi and Permyak and the plural
in Võte) and that the genuine pronoun also still occurs. In Forest Enets the Ket
pronouns have probably been borrowed earlier, as pronouns for two persons
(3rd person and 2nd person singular) have been borrowed, which in addition
have completely supplanted the genuine pronouns.

Abbreviations:

ABL ablative
ACC accusative
ADE adessive
COM comitative
DAT dative
DU dual
ELA elative
F feminine
FUT future
GEN genitive
ILL illative
IMP imperative
IMPERS impersonal
IMPERF imperfect
INDEF indefinite
INE inessive
INF infinitive
INSTR instrumental
LOC locative
M masculine
NEG negation/negative
NOM nominative
OBL oblique
PART partitive
PERF perfect
PL plural
PX possessive suffix
PRS present
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