1-1-2004

On the pronominal inflection of the Germanic strong adjective

Thomas McFadden

On the pronominal inflection of the Germanic strong adjective

On the Pronominal Inflection of the Germanic Strong Adjective*

Thomas McFadden

1 The Situation and the Standard Explanation

It is generally agreed that, in Proto-Indo-European, adjectives were morphologically identical to nouns aside from being able to inflect for all three genders. However, by the earliest attested stages of the Germanic languages, two big changes have occurred. First, all normal adjectives can inflect, according to the syntactic environment, either as an *n*-stem (the so-called weak inflection) or as a vocalic stem (the so-called strong inflection). Second, the strong inflection has taken on pronominal endings in place of the original nominal ones. This paper is concerned with the second change, which left a distinctive pattern. One group of endings is clearly parallel in form to the demonstrative pronoun and distinct in form from the corresponding nouns, as in 1, a second group still looks like the nominal forms, as in 2, while a third group is ambiguous, because the relevant pronominal and nominal endings are themselves non-distinct, as in 3 (all examples from Gothic):[1]

(1) a. A s. m. *blindana* 'blind' like *þana* unlike *wulf* 'wolf'
     b. D s. mn. *blindamma* like *þamma* unlike *wulfa*
(2) a. N s. m. *blinds* like *wulfs* unlike *sa*
     b. N s. f. *u*-stem *þaursus* 'dry' like *handus* 'hand' unlike *so*
(3) a. NA p. f. *blindos* like *þos* **and** *gibos* 'gift'
     b. A p. m. *blindans* like *þans* **and** *wulfans*

Note then that some pronominal endings have spread to nominal declensions in other IE languages, e.g. *o*-stem N p. Lat. *-ī*, Gk. *-oi* in place of PIE

---

[1]I use the following abbreviations throughout: N(ominative), G(enitive), D(ative), A(ccusative), I(nstrumental); s.(ingular), p.(lural); m.(asculine), f.(eminine), n.(euter); Goth.(ic), O(ld) H(igh) G(erman), O(ld) E(nglish), O(ld) N(orse), O(ld) S(axon).

*-ōs, and that the pronominalization of the adjectives has apparently gone further in some Gmc. languages than others, given e.g. N s. mfn. OHG *blintēr, blintiu, blintaʒ* 'blind' beside OS *ald, ald, ald* 'old'. Therefore, the standard explanation since at least Sievers (1876) has been that the new pronominal endings spread analogically through the strong adjective declension by a sporadic and gradual process that went further in certain languages than others, but never to completion.[2] Exactly how and why this happened is unclear, but it is generally agreed that the so-called pronominal adjectives played some intermediary role (see e.g. von Kienle, 1969:209). This class included quantifiers and (at least in Germanic) possessives, which could be used either pronominally or adjectivally and which show evidence in several other Indo-European languages of having at least some pronominal inflection (e.g. Lat. *alius* 'other, another' with NA s. n. *aliud* like *istud* and *tōtus* 'all, whole' with G s. mfn. *tōtīus*, D s. mfn. *tōtī* like *istīus, istī*; Skt. *anya-* 'other' with NA s. n. *anyád* like *tád* and *éka-* 'one' with N p. m. *éke* like *té*). While this is a decent description of the attested facts of Germanic, it is lacking as a historical explanation. It does not make explicit the sequence of events or the role of the pronominal adjectives, and it makes no predictions, giving us no clue as to why pronominal endings should have been adopted in certain paradigm slots but not others. I will argue in this paper that we can do better.

2 A New Hypothesis

We must consider this problem in terms of the transition from the PIE morphological system with a two-way contrast between nouns and pronouns to the Gmc. system with a three-way contrast between nouns, pronouns and adjectives. It is reasonable to assume that, within the PIE system, the P-As would have followed the pronouns. Then, when the adjectives were cut loose from the nouns in (Pre-)Proto-Gmc. (perhaps when the strong-weak distinction was created), they would have been closest syntactically and semantically to these P-As, and thus it is reasonable to assume that they would have taken the P-As as their new morphological model. This is more or less the traditional view, but considering it in these terms provides clarity on some important points. First, the strong adjective inflection does not come directly from the prototyp-

---

[2]Some scholars have argued that this was the result of the suffixation of an actual pronoun onto the adjectives, as apparently happened in the Balto-Slavic definite adjective inflection. Sievers (1876) put this theory to rest for several decades with a series of arguments against it, and while Birkhan (1974) and Haudry (1981) have made recent attempts at a revival, the idea remains disfavored and will not be discussed further here.

ical pronouns (like the demonstrative) but rather from the P-As. Second, the P-As may have originally been completely pronominal as far as the morphology is concerned. Third, the creation of the new adjective class constitutes a real event in the history of these languages which shifted the model for inflection of the lexical items involved from the nouns to the P-As. It was thus not some general tendency with vague motivations, but a deep change in the system.

For the purposes of this paper, I propose the strongest possible hypothesis which is consistent with these preliminary considerations:

(4)   The Germanic strong adjectives adopted the inflection of the P-As *wholesale*, which itself was *fully* pronominal in origin.

Of course, this by no means follows from what I just said, but the intention is to start out high expectations and see just where we run into problems with the attested data. For the moment, note that there is some independent evidence that the strong inflection *is* the inflection of the P-As. Namely, the old P-As persist as a morphological class into the older Germanic languages, including e.g. Goth. *ains* 'one', *anþar* 'second, other' and *meins* 'my'. Crucially, their inflection is *identical* to that of the strong adjectives. Now, this could also be explained by assuming the opposite, that the P-As adopted their inflection from the strong adjectives, but this fails to explain why the P-As show only the strong inflection and not also the weak. The frequent attempts at a semantic explanation for this, based on the fact that weak inflection originally patterned with definiteness, do not work. While some P-As had inherently indefinite meaning and thus might be expected to show only strong inflection, most of them can also appear in definite contexts, e.g. Goth. *anþar* can mean either 'another' or 'the other, the second'.[3] Indeed, some, like the possessives, are almost exclusively definite. Thus the total lack of weak inflection in the P-As cannot originally be due to semantics. It is thus more plausible to assume that the inflection observed on the P-As is original to them, not the adjectives. In any case, the hypothesis laid out above is attractive simply because it gives us high expectations. It forces us to reconsider every form that does not appear to be pronominal in origin, and for each one either show that, contrary to appearances, it really is pronominal, or give an explanation of why it is not. As I will argue below, this yields some very good results.

---

[3]Jellinek (1926) gives the following examples of P-As showing strong inflection even with the demonstrative: "*ains*, z.B. *us leika þamma ainamma* K 12,12; *anþar* (z.B. *sa anþar, so anþara, þata anþar*); *swaleiks* (z.B. *sa swaleiks, þize swaleikaize*); *alls* (z.B. *þo manased alla*)."

3 An Examination of the Forms

The only way to test the hypothesis is to go through the forms one by one and see how it stands up. In the interest of clarity, I have organized the forms into four groups of increasing interest, i.e. increasing difficulty for the hypothesis, the clearest forms requiring only minimal discussion. I will present the data in tabular form and keep a highly informal running total of the number of forms accounted for, in order to make clear just how few end up being truly problematic.

3.1 Unambiguously Pronominal Forms

The first group of forms, given in Table 1, can only be pronominal, as the relevant nominal forms are clearly distinct. They are uncontroversially consistent with my hypothesis:[4]

Slot	St. Adj.	Dem. Pron.	Noun
NA s. n. (long)	blindata	þata	waurd
A s. m.	blindana	þana	wulf
G s. f.	blindaizos	þizos	gibos
D s. mn.	blindamma	þamma	wulfa/waurda
D s. f. (except Goth.)	OHG blinteru	dëru	gëbu
N p. m.	blindai	þai	wulfos
G p. mn.	blindaize	þize	wulfe/waurde
G p. f.	blindaizo	þizo	gibo
D p. mfn.	blindaim	þaim	wulfam/waurdam/ gibom

Table 1: Clearly Pronominal Forms

That constitutes 14 of the 32 forms of the strong adjectives.[5]

---

[4] I largely follow Streitberg (1920) in my classification, who distinguishes clearly pronominal, clearly nominal and ambiguous endings by using a distinct typeface for each in his tables. Table 1 contains the forms that he took to be clearly pronominal. I give each with the corresponding form of the demonstrative and an appropriate noun. I will generally give Gothic a-/$\bar{o}$-stem forms, citing the other languages and stem-classes only when they show a relevant difference.

[5] I counted as follows: 24 forms for 4 cases in 3 genders and 2 numbers, plus distinct u-stem forms in N s. mfn. and a distinct i-stem N s. f. form, plus doublets in the N s. mfn. and NA p. n. One could of course criticize this method on a number of points, but the count serves purely informal expostiory purposes and no deep significance is intended or should be inferred.

3.2 Clearly Ambiguous Forms

A second group of forms is uncontroversially ambiguous between being nominal and pronominal in origin. That is, they are identical to both the nominal and pronominal endings.[6]

Slot	St. Adj.	Dem. Pron.	Noun
G s. mn.	blindis	þis	wulfis/waurdis
NA p. f.	blindos	þos	gibos
A p. m.	blindans	þans	wulfans

Table 2: Clearly Ambiguous Forms

Forms of this type, though they do not force a pronominal analysis, are consistent with one and thus consistent with my hypothesis of a purely pronominal origin for the strong inflection. That is an additional 5 forms, for an interim total of 19 out of 32.

3.3 Forms which Appear to be Nominal, but are really Ambiguous

This subsection is dedicated to demonstrating that the vast majority of forms which have in the past been regarded as clearly nominal have been misanalyzed. Upon closer inspection, they turn out to be ambiguous, and are thus consistent with my hypothesis that the inflection was originally purely pronominal.

3.3.1 Forms in PIE *-ā and *-ām

The forms in Table 3 were recognized as ambiguous by Streitberg (1920), an assessment which should be uncontroversial. Nonetheless, some scholars have claimed them to be clearly nominal, and it will be instructive for the discussion of more difficult forms to see why this is.

Slot	St. Adj.	Dem. Pron.	Noun
N s. f.	blinda	so	giba
NA p. n.	blinda	þo	waurda
A s. f.	blinda	þo	giba

Table 3: Forms in PIE *-ā and *-ām

---

[6]While Streitberg (1920) correctly recognized that the N s. m., NA s. f., and NA p. n. are ambiguous, many scholars have regarded them as clearly nominal. Thus they warrant a more full discussion in the next subsection.

In the N s. f. and NA p. n. the adjectives agree in form with the nouns but not, at first glance, with the demonstrative pronoun. However, note that the PIE ending for both nouns and pronouns in these slots was $*-\bar{a}$ ($<*-eh_2$). The difference in outcomes is due of course to the fact that the Germanic Auslautgesetze treated the unstressed endings of adjectives and nouns differently than the monosyllabic demonstrative pronoun, specifically PIE $*-\bar{a}$ > Goth. $-a$ in final unstressed position, but PIE $*-\bar{a}$ > Goth. $-o$ in (potentially) stressed monosyllables.

This much is clear and uncontroversial, so why would anyone ever assume that the adjective endings here are unambiguously nominal? Apparently because OHG shows two variants in these slots, as shown in Table 4:

Slot	St. Adj. (short)	St. Adj. (long)	Dem. Pron.	Noun
N s. f.	blint	blintiu	diu	gëba
NA p. n.	blint	blintiu	diu	wort

Table 4: OHG Doublets

The long forms have clearly adopted their endings from the demonstrative pronoun, while the short forms go with the forms of the nouns.[7] If one assumes that the strong adjectives have a mixture of older nominal and newer pronominal endings, then given clearly pronominal endings like *blintiu* alternating with shorter endings like *blint*, it is reasonable to think that the latter are simply the old nominal ones. Indeed, this is the standard assumption in the OHG handbooks, where the endings are sometimes called nominal and pronominal instead of short and long (see e.g. Braune, 1975:216).

The problem is, *blintiu* does not actually fit into the same category as other clearly pronominal endings like, e.g. A sg. m. *blintan*, because there is nothing ike it to be found elsiewhere, even in the other West Germanic dialects. Consider N s. f., NA p. n. OS *ald* 'old', OE *hwatu* 'sharp', lacking the *-i-* of *blintiu*, and in fact corresponding by regular sound laws to the OHG short form *blint*. The *-i-* in the ending *-iu* reflects a German-specific form of the demonstrative pronoun (see e.g. von Kienle, 1969), so the form *blintiu* can only be a late innovation in (pre-)OHG and thus not part of the round of Germanic pronominalization that is at issue here. This means that there is no reason why OHG *blint*, like the corresponding Goth. *blinda*, could not be the reflex of a Gmc. pronominal ending, which was joined at a late stage by the

---

[7]The adjective form *blint* and the NA p. n. form *wort* preserve the historically expected outcome of PIE $*-\bar{o}$ in this position, while in the feminine nouns the accusative ending $-a < *-\bar{a}m$ has spread to the nominative, explaining why *gëba* does not seem to fit in here (Braune, 1975:192f.).

newer pronominal ending -*iu*.[8]

The A s. f. forms require little additional comment. Both the nouns and the pronouns had PIE *-*ām*, the regular reflex of which again varies in Gmc. depending stress and position. Here, however, matters are not obscured, because there is no innovative long ending in OHG. That makes 23 out of 32 forms accounted for thus far.

3.3.2 NA s. n. (including *i* and *u*-stems)

The increased clarity about the OHG long and short endings gained in the previous subsection comes in handy when we consider the NA s. n.:

Language	St. Adj. (short)	St. Adj. (long)	Dem. Pron.	Noun
Gothic	blind	blindata	thata	waurd
OHG	blint	blintaȝ	daȝ	wort

Table 5: NA s. n. in Gothic and OHG

Here again we find two variants in OHG, the longer, clearly pronominal *blintaȝ* and the shorter *blint*, which has the same null ending as the neuter noun *wort* and is generally regarded as nominal. Again, however, the short form is in reality ambiguous, and this time even Streitberg did not recognize it.[9] The PIE pronominal ending for this slot was *-*d*, well-preserved e.g. in Latin *illud*, *id*, *quid* etc. Note then that final coronals in unstressed syllables were lost in Gmc., e.g. PIE **dékm̥t* 'ten' > Goth. *taihun*, PIE them. opt. 3rd s. **bʰéroyt* (Skt. *bháret*) '(s)he would carry' > Goth. *baírai* (see e.g. Ringe, in progress; Brunner, 1965, §199 Anm. 4), and that short non-high vowels in final unstressed syllables were lost as well by the time of our earliest substantial attestations, e.g. PIE **pénkʷe* 'five' (in Skt. *páñca*, Greek *pénte*) > Goth. *fimf*, 1st s. perf. PIE **wóydh₂e* 'I know' (in Skt. *véda*, Greek *ôida*) > Goth. *wait*.[10] This means that PIE pronominal *-*od* would have eventually yielded

---

[8]The same goes potentially for the I s. mn. where it is preserved at all (OHG, OS, OE), although given the scant evidence on this paradigm slot and the great variation in the forms preserved, it is difficult to reach any strong conclusions.

[9]It was the recognition of the ambiguity of these particular forms that was central to Cowgill and Ringe's insight that the strong adjectives may be more pronominal than is usually thought.

[10]It is not entirely clear whether the vowels or the coronal consonants were lost first (see Ringe, in progressfor discussion of the question), but since non-high vowels were also lost in non-absolute final position (e.g. before -*s* in nouns like *wulfs*), it would be unproblematic if it preceded coronal deletion. Unfortunately, no forms in this slot are

-∅ in this position just as easily as nominal *-om, and Goth. *blind* is therefore ambiguous.

The question then is how to explain the longer ending. It cannot be a reflex of the original pronominal or nominal endings because these regularly became zero, and this time we cannot just say that it was a late innovation of one language, because it is reflected in OHG, Gothic and also ON (*spakt* 'gentle, wise'). The standard analysis of the Goth. form is that an enclitic particle *-ō or *-ōⁿ was at some point added to the regular ending. In fact, if we assume the non-nasalized variant, this will work for the OHG and ON forms as well, since final *-ō > ∅ in multisyllabic words in both.[11] In other words, we are again dealing with a doublet where the long ending is clearly pronominal and the short ending is ambiguous, but in this instance the doublet apparently goes all the way back to PGmc. The full alternation is preserved in both OHG and Gothic, and those dialects which do not preserve it disagree on which form they have retained (short OE *blind* and OS *ald* beside long ON *spakt*). This analysis is summed up in Table 6.

Proto-Gmc.	Goth.	OHG	OE	ON
*blinda-t	blind	blint	blind	–
*blinda-t-ō	blindata	blintaʒ	–	(spak)-t

Table 6: Outcomes of the Gmc. NA s. n. Doublet

This allows us a potential explanation for the second round of pronominal-ization in OHG discussed above. By pre-OHG, the N s. mf., NA sp. n. had become endingless, while all other forms in the paradigm had clear suffixes. Alone among these, the NA s. n. also had an alternate form with a non-null ending, which had, by regular sound change, become identical to the corresponding form of the demonstrative pronoun. This could then serve as the

---

attested in Runic Old Norse (Krause, 1971), which might have been expected to shed some light on the question.

[11] The form *-ōⁿ is frequently assumed for the particle because then we can say that it is the same one that shows up in the A s. m. Goth. *-ana*, OE *-one*, the latter form only being consistent with an originally nasalized vowel. This is a reasonable assumption if we are only concerned with Goth. and OE, but neither OHG *blintaʒ* nor ON *spakt* can be derived unproblematically from a PGmc. ending *-atōⁿ. In other words, a unified analysis of the particles on the NA s. n. and the A s. m. gets in the way of a unified analysis of the long forms in the NA s. n. Don Ringe, p.c., suggests a way out of this dilemma. If we assume that both particles were originally -ō, it is quite plausible that an -n (or perhaps nasalization on the vowel) would have been subsequently added in the A s. m., at least in the immediate ancestor of OE, recharacterizing the ending to bring it back into line with the form of every other non-neuter A s. form in the language.

basis for the analogy that created alternate forms for all the other endingless slots by importing forms directly from the demonstrative, which by this time had undergone some serious innovations:

(5)   daʒ : blintaʒ :: diu : X, where X = blintiu, etc.

Note that, though the examples given above were all drawn from the *a-/ō-* stems, the reasoning applies just as well to the *u*-stem adjectives, which have NA s. n. *hardu*. That makes 28 forms out of 32.

3.3.3 N s. m.

In spite of frequent claims to the contrary, the N s. m. is also ambiguous. It is clearly parallel to the nominal ending and equally clearly unlike the demonstrative pronoun. The *u*-stems, represented by Goth. *hardus* 'hard' have a form distinct from the *a*-stems.

St. Adj.	Dem. Pron.	Noun
blinds	sa	wulfs
hardus	sa	sunus

Table 7: N s. m.

This initially looks quite problematic for the hypothesis that all strong adjective endings were originally pronominal, and indeed, this is one of the main pieces of evidence in favor of the assumption of a hybrid origin for the inflection. However, the problem only arises if we assume that the source of pronominal endings should have been the demonstrative.[12]

If we assume as proposed here that the F-As were the source of the strong inflection, then forms like *blinds* are unexceptional. The former are all attested with reflexes of Gmc. *-az* < PIE *-os*. Of course, if my hypothesis is wrong, and the P-As as attested in Gmc. have taken their endings from the strong adjectives, then this would tell us nothing, so we must ask ourselves what the regular pronominal ending in this slot would have been at the relevant time, i.e. in late PIE or early Pre-Proto-Gmc. Endingless forms like that of the *so/to* demonstrative are the exception in IE, being found only with the

---

[12]In spite of explicitly noting that the P-As played an intermediary role in the pronominalization of the adjectives, many of the handbooks continue to assume that the demonstrative was centrally involved because of forms like OHG *blintiu* which can come from nowhere else. However, these are precisely the forms that are late language-specific innovations, and thus are irrelevant to our considerations for Proto-Gmc.

demonstrative and a few other scattered forms.[13] The only ending that shows up with any regularity in this slot is the *-s familiar from the nouns. Consider, e.g., demonstrative Lat. *is*, Goth. *is*, OHG *ër*; interrogative/indefinite late PIE *$k^w$is/k^wos* in Lat. *quis*, Greek *tis*, OHG *hwër*, Skt. *káḥ* and Goth. *ƕas*, relative PIE *Hyos* in Skt. *yáḥ*, Greek *hos*. These are the pronouns with the most regular, well-attested paradigms across the family, and their *-s is the only ending that could have been productive in the N s. m. in late PIE and early Gmc. Goth. *blinds* and its endingless counterparts in the other old Germanic languages can thus just as easily be pronominal as nominal. This was noted for the *a*-stems by Kluge (1913:208), and is implied by Streitberg (1920), but it applies just as well to the *u*-stems. As noted above, the actual N s. m. ending in PGmc. was of course not *-az, but *-z which, when added to a *u*-stem, correctly yields Goth. *hardus*. That makes 30 out of 32 forms consistent with my hypothesis.

3.4 Real Nominal Forms

Thus nearly all of the attested forms of the strong adjective inflection are either clearly pronominal or ambiguous between pronominal and nominal. However, there are a few stubborn forms that look like they must be nominal. If the hypothesis I adopted at the outset is to be maintained, namely that the strong inflection is purely pronominal in origin, then they must somehow be explained.

3.4.1 Language-specific Innovations

The first group are forms which are only nominal in one branch or language, and thus immediately have the look of post-PGmc. innovations.[14] Most of these are fairly clear and uncontroversial and merit only brief mention here. E.g. ON has *-er* in the N p. m., where the *-r* is clearly analogical from the nominal declension. That the ending was originally pronominal is however clear from the fact that the *-r* has been added to *-e*, a reflex of the pronominal

---

[13]For example, the N s. m. in (some of) the *i*-stem pronouns seems to have been an endingless full grade *-ey, reflected in Skt. *ayám* 'this' (with suffixed particle *-ám*) as well as Old Irish *cia* and Welsh *pwy* 'who' < *k^wey. However, these are relics of a much older system and have been eliminated nearly everywhere (including Gmc.!) at a very early date, replaced by forms in *-s.

[14]There is a series of other differences from one language to another as well as language-specific distinctions between nominal and adjectival inflection. However, since none of them are relevant to the question whether given endings are pronominal or nominal in origin, they will not be discussed further.

ending *-*ai* reflected in the other Gmc. languages. OS -*um* OE -*um* and ON -*om* in the D p. mfn. look nominal next to the clearly pronominal Goth. -aim OHG -ēm and are standardly taken to be an analogical innovation in these languages on the basis of the nouns[15] Finally, in the Goth. Skeireins, all 3 instances of the D p. f. on strong adjectives have the nominal form -*om*, but the more archaic Biblical Goth. preserves the pronominal ending -*aim* here. It is fairly clear that Streitberg (1920) was correct in taking this to be an innovation undertaken to distinguish the f. from the m. since the two were already distinct in every other paradigm slot in Goth.

The only example that is somewhat troubling is Goth. D sg. f. *blindai*, which is unambiguously nominal, having no trace of the *-*iz*- element found in the pronouns.

Lg.	St .Adj.	Dem. Pron.	Noun
Goth.	blindai	þizai	gibai
OHG	blinteru	dëru	gëbu

Table 8: D s. f.

It is hard to know what to make of this form, because *all* of the other languages have clearly pronominal forms with reflexes of the *-*z*-, as exemplified by OHG *blinteru* in Table 8. We could reconstruct a pronominal ending for PGmc. on the basis of the majority of the languages, assuming the Goth. form to be an analogical innovation. But Gothic is, of course, the oldest and generally most conservative of the Gmc. languages, and it is not clear how the shift from pronominal *-*izai* to nominal -*ai* would have been motivated in this case. The opposite analogical change, from nominal to pronominal in all the other languages, would have brought this slot into line with the rest of the paradigm and thus would be fairly plausible. But of course then we would have to ask why pronominalization failed in the first place in this one form. At the moment I know no clear way to decide between these two scenarios. If the purely nominal ending were general in all the Gmc. languages, this would be cause to doubt my hypothesis, but given the variation, nothing conclusive can be said.

3.4.2 N sg. f. *i*- and *u*-stems

This brings us to the toughest forms for my hypothesis, the N s. f. of the *i*- and *u*-stems. These forms, given in Table 9, are the only ones for which all the evidence we have points towards a nominal origin.

---

[15]It could also be that Gmc. *-*ai*- has become -*u/o*- before -*m* in unstressed syllables in these languages by sound change. Other clear evidence for or against such a change which could not itself reflect the workings of analogy does not seem to be avaiable.

Stem class	St. Adj.	Dem. Pron.	Noun
u-stems	hardus	so	handus
i-stems	hrains	so	qēns

Table 9: N s. f. *u*- and *i*-stems

Both inflection classes show an -*s* ending, which is in agreement with the nominal paradigms, but completely unknown to the feminine pronouns, a rather grave situation for my hypothesis. It should be noted that both forms are restricted entirely to Gothic, as in the other languages the old *u*- and *i*-stem adjectives have moved into more productive stem classes (primarily the *ja-/jō*-stems).

We must ask ourselves, as with the N s. m. above, what we would have expected as the N s. f. pronominal *u*- and *i*-stem endings. Note that there are no *u*- or *i*-stem P-As, all of them being *a-/ō*- or *ja-/jō*- stems. Thus there is no obvious answer to the question of what these forms should have looked like from what I have taken to be the ultimate source of pronominal inflection on the adjectives. In fact, there are no *u*-stem pronouns in Gmc. whatsoever, the only pronominal *u*-stem within IE apparently being the *$k^w u$*- which is attested exclusively in adverbs and conjunctions, e.g. Vedic *kútra* 'whither'. So there was *no* model for pronominal inflection in *u*-stems. Now PIE and Gmc. did have some *i*-stem pronouns, so we must consider how they would have looked here. The interrogative/indefinite *$k^w i$*- apparently did not distinguish f. from m. having *$k^w is$* for both, e.g. Gk. *tis*, Lat. *quis*, OHG *hwër*.[16] For the PIE demonstrative *$\acute{k}i$*- OE *hēo* 'she' seems to reflect something like *$\acute{k}i+eh_2$*, that is, the thematic feminine ending tacked onto the *i-stem*. The same thing seems to be indicated for another demonstrative stem PIE *i*- in the Latin form *ea*, apparently reflecting PIE *ej-eh_2*, but a more archaic looking form PIE *ih_2* appears in Skt. *iyám* (with the same suffixed particle as in *ayám*). Goth. *sī* and Old Irish *sī*, both 'she', seem to reflect the same formation in an *i*-stem version (arisen through contamination?) of the *s*- demonstrative. In all likelihood, then, the oldest N s. f. ending for *i*-stem pronouns was *-ih_2*, which however had a tendency to be replaced by reflexes of the more productive feminine suffix *-eh_2* added to the stem.

What would this have yielded in Gmc. then? We can guess that the *u*-stems, having no model of their own, would have followed the *i*-stems given the general affinity between the two classes. The older ending *-ih_2*, if it had hung on productively in Gmc. (i.e. beyond the isolated example of Goth. *sī*) would presumably have yielded *-$\bar{\imath}$* with corresponding *-$\bar{u}$*. If instead the

---

[16]As noted above, there may have been an earlier form *$k^w ey$* for this pronoun, but it seems to have been eliminated by *$k^w is$* vel sim. by PGmc.

thematized forms had become dominant, we would expect them to yield something like Goth. *-i/-ja* and *-wa* if they had been syllabified like the *jō/wō*-stems or perhaps something like *-ia* and *-ua* if syllabified differently, possibly with variation conditioned by the weight of the stem. No matter which of these was chosen and how it developed, the outcome would have been a situation completely unique within Goth., where the adjective ending would be like neither the nominal ending *-us/-s* nor the pronominal form *so*.[17] Such isolated endings would have been prone to analogy, and the only model available for analogy at this point would have been the nouns with their *-us* and *-s*. The alternative, which the other languages seem to have taken, was to give up entirely on the *u*- and *i*-stem-classes in the adjectives, moving the relevant lexical items to more productive inflectional classes.[18] While the details here are rather hypothetical, the point is that the only endings in the strong adjective paradigm that really look like they must be nominal are precisely the ones where the pronominal inflection would have yielded something entirely exceptional. My analysis of the N s. f. *u*- and *i*-stem endings is thus that the attested forms have been taken from the nominal paradigm, but only after the creation of the strong inflection, when the original pronominal forms became too exceptional to maintain. That makes 32 out of 32.

4 Conclusions

The hypothesis adopted above yields good results then. While the arguments I have made for some of the individual forms cannot be said to be overwhelming, the overall result is that a completely pronominal origin for the inflection is in fact plausible. As this hypothesis is much simpler and more regular than the traditional story of sporadic and incomplete analogy, it thus deserves serious consideration. In a more immediate sense, it can guide investigation into why the pronominalization of the strong adjectives happened in the first place.

References

Birkhan, Helmut. 1974.   Das germanische starke Adjektiv.   In *Strukturen und Interpretationen: Studien zur deutschen Philologie gewidmet Blanka Horacek zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Fritz Peter Knapp Alfred Ebenauer and Peter Krämer, 1–24. Stuttgart: Wilhelm Braumüller Universitäts-Verlagsbuchhandlung.

[17]In other cases with Goth. adj. *-a* next to pron. *-o*, the nominal ending is also *-a*.

[18]Of course they may have first gone through a stage like that attested in Gothic.

Braune, Wilhelm. 1975. *Althochdeutsche Grammatik.* Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag. 13. Auflage, bearbeitet von Hans Eggers.

Brunner, Karl. 1965. *Altenglische Grammatik.* Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag. Dritte, neubearbeitete Auflage nach der angelsächsischen Grammatik von Eduard Sievers.

Haudry, J. 1981. Les deux flexions de l'adjectif germanique. *Bulletins de la Société de linguistique de Paris* 76:191–200.

Jellinek, Max Hermann. 1926. *Geschichte der gotischen Sprache.* Grundriss der germanischen Philologie, herausgegeben von Hermann Paul. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co.

von Kienle, Richard. 1969. *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre des Deutschen.* Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Kluge, Friedrich. 1913. *Urgermanisch.* Grundriss der germanischen Philologie, herausgegeben von Hermann Paul, Band 2. Strassburg: Verlag von Karl J. Trübner.

Krause, Wolfgang. 1971. *Die Sprache der urnordischen Runeninschriften.* Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.

Ringe, Don. in progress. A linguistic history of English. Part I: From PIE to PGmc.

Sievers, Eduard. 1876. Kleine Beiträge zur deutschen Grammatik III. Die starke Adjectivdeclination. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 2:98–124.

Sihler, Andrew. 1995. *New comparative grammar of Greek and Latin.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Streitberg, Wilhelm. 1920. *Gotisches Elementarbuch..* Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung. Fünfte und sechste neubearbeitete Auflage.

Department of Linguistics
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6305
tmcfadde@ling.upenn.edu