

E. P. HAMP

***PRONOUN + CLITIC**

A. Valeckienė has presented, *Baltistica* XV(2), 1979, 130–134, an interesting set of pronominal forms, and has made it clear that complexes with *-g-* and *-d-* are not to be connected with the element **god̥*¹. The synchronic status and immediate historical source of these complexes should however be made clear in each case. Some of these are compounds, probably from unified phrases: *tó-tieko*, *ta-vienā-to-s*, *pirmo-te*. Some appear to be conglomerates of old correlatives: *ta-jà*, *teīpo-ja*, *tieka-ja*. In many instances enclitics are involved: *an-g(i)*, *i-čia*, *jà-b*, *jei-bè*, *jó-g*. Some surely arise from suffixal derivation: *tōl(ei)*². Some formations are not yet clear: *anta*, *bet(a)*, *anot(e)*, *ana-và*.

The set of pronominals *tadà*, *kadà*, etc. cannot contain a second pronominal stem **do-*. First of all, the final dental element must syntactically represent an old clitic locative adverbial used as a temporal, as I have argued (*Zeitschrift für Balkanologie*). And as I have also pointed out, Slavic **t̥g-d'ǎ*, **k̥g-d'ǎ* cannot go back earlier than late Common Slavic since the law of open syllables would have then eliminated the cluster **gd*. The Slavic forms thus all arise from **to-gó*, **to-d'ǎ* and **k̥g-d'ǎ*. Moreover, we cannot have original **-d-* here because W. Winter's formulation would then require a preceding vowel lengthening. Therefore, we must start from **to-dhā* and **ku-dhā*. The comparison with Sanskrit *tadā*, *yadā* is not vitiated, because the **dh* could readily have been extracted from **k̥gde* 'where' (or, equivalently, the short vocalism conserved by the parallel formation). Baltic *kadà* has of course generalized the **o* vocalism proper to **to-* and **jo-*. The inflexions represented by *tadōs*, *tadì*, *tadan-gi*, *tadaĩ* must be later Baltic elaborations formed on the rich preserved case system.

Slavic *t̥gda* is therefore not properly compared with Latv. *tagad* or Lith. *tà-gatės*, etc.

¹ For a comparative account of Slavic *god̥* see my discussion *Revue roumaine de linguistique* 18, 1973, 337 ff.

² Cf. BSL 68, 1973, 90–1.

We therefore reconstruct the series:

	<i>*to-dǎ</i>	<i>ku-dǎ</i>	<i>ku-dhe</i>	
>	<i>*to-dǎ</i>	<i>ku-dhǎ</i>	<i>ku-dhe</i>	
>	<i>*to-dhǎ</i>	<i>ku-dhǎ</i>	<i>ku-dhe,</i>	<i>ku-r, OPr. qu-ei</i>
>	<i>*ta-dǎ</i>	<i>ka-dǎ</i>		<i>ku-r</i>
>	<i>*ta-d'ǎ</i>	<i>ka-d'ǎ</i>		<i>k-uř → kit-uř</i>
				Latv. <i>t-ùr,</i> etc.
→	<i>tad-ōs,</i>	<i>tad-añ,</i>	OPr. <i>kadan, kadángi</i>	
>	Lith. <i>ta-dà,</i>	<i>tad</i>	<i>ka-dà,</i>	<i>kad</i> (with allegro shortening).

In Indo-European the paradigmatic match of **ku*³ 'where' was **i* 'here'⁴, and certainly not a form compounded with **to-*. Indeed a matching inflected form of the latter should be **tei* > Latv. *tiē* 'there' (or perhaps *teī* 'there') and OPr. *tei-nu* 'now'; the archaic zero-ending locative⁵ **te* would yield Lith. *te* 'here (you are!), take it'⁶, Latv. *te* 'here'. IE **te* was presumably deictic, while **i* was predominantly anaphoric.

It is already seen that I do not associate the *-de* of Lat. *in-de* and *un-de* with *-δε* etc., but rather with the *-de* < **-dhe* of Slavic *kъde*. On the enclitic elements Lat. *-dem,* *-dam* see my remarks *Studia classica* 17, 1977, 147–8. Even though Greek *-δε* and its congeners carried deixis, they cannot be syntactically related to the pronouns under discussion. Though some pronouns are notable conveyors of deixis, the process of pronominalization is an entirely different function⁷.

As I expatiate at length elsewhere, I believe that the *-dъ* of Slavic **nadъ,* **perdъ,* **zadъ* has an entirely different origin from the elements here under discussion. It will be seen that I regard most of Pokorny IEW 181–3 as largely outdated and originally uncritical.

I have stated above that I do not believe the element **-go* to be directly involved as a suffix in the formation of Slavic *tъgda*. However because of the non-lengthening of preceding vowels in Baltic and Slavic, any relation here is more likely

³ See my analysis *Studia Celtica* 10/11, 1975/6, 59–69, esp. 66; *Italic and Romance: Linguistic Studies in Honor of Ernst Pulgram* (ed. H. J. Izzo), Amsterdam, 1980, 69–73, esp. 71 (and addenda appearing in *AJP*); and references there given, as well as an article on Lat. *ut* appearing in *Glotta*.

⁴ See my analysis of *yrà*, *IJSLP* 17, 1974, 7–8; of Lat. *inde*, *AJP* 97, 1976, 20–1; and also footnote 3.

⁵ *IF* 75, 1970, 105–6.

⁶ We may in fact have here an archaic entire IE sentence preserved.

⁷ In the nature of pronominalization, we do not normally expect compounds with multiple pronouns; where reductions of phrases or agglomerates of correlatives result we should be able to account in detail for the intervening syntaxes which have brought about the juxtaposition.

with Sanskrit *gh/h* than with Greek γ etc. For the Baltic enclitics in *-g-* one should consult the penetrating remarks of the late lamented Chr. S. Stang, *Norwegian Journal of Linguistics* 30, 1976, 127–31, on which I have commented *Baltistica* XIV (2), 1978, 110–1.

The analysis of *andai* ‘recently’ by Valeckienė as *añ-dai* is a valuable addition to the set represented by *tadà*. It may be that the base here is that of *antras* ‘second’. The circumflex of *añ-* is informative in confirming that we have $d < *dh$ here. For the reasons already referred to, the *-g-* of Russ. *onogdá* does not bear a direct relation here.

Regarding *idant*, I would refer to my attempt to explain the internal Baltic form and syntax of this and allied elements, *Baltistica* IX (1), 1973, 49–50.