

TAMOTSU KOIZUMI (Shizuoka)

## THE OBJECTIVE CONJUGATION OF COMMON MORDVIN

(1) The objective conjugation, in which, differently from the subjective conjugation, the personal ending indicates person and number of the direct object as well as of the subject, is restricted only to Mordvin in the western group of the Fenno-Ugric languages, and yet it is characteristic of all the Ugric languages of the eastern group.

The objective conjugation in Mordvin is considered to be of comparatively later origin<sup>1</sup>, and the opposition between the subjective and the objective conjugation in Ugric and Samoyed does not seem to be capable of being traced back to Proto-Fenno-Ugric.<sup>2</sup>

D. V. Bubrich<sup>3</sup> tried to search for the prototype of the objective conjugation by means of an inductive and accurate procedure and, unfortunately, arrived at an unreasonable conclusion.

B. A. Serebrennikov has also dealt with the objective conjugation, analyzing the structure in too schematic and deductive a manner.<sup>4</sup>

Now I shall try to look into the development of the Mordvin verb conjugation, making a comparison between the Erza (= mdE) and Moksha (= mdM) dialects according to the phonetic laws established by H. Paasonen.<sup>5</sup>

The phonemic symbols are used in so far as no special instruction is provided.<sup>6</sup>

(2) The subjective conjugation:

Present	Erza	Moksha	
Sg. 1	— <i>palan</i>	<i>palan</i>	'I kiss'
2	<i>palat</i>	<i>palat</i>	'you kiss'
3	<i>pali</i>	<i>palaj</i>	'he, she kisses'
Pl. 1	<i>palatano</i>	<i>palatama</i>	'we kiss'
2	<i>palatado</i>	<i>palatada</i>	'you kiss'
3	<i>palit</i>	<i>palaxʹ</i>	'they kiss'

<sup>1</sup> Gy. Décsy, Einführung in die finnisch-ugrische Sprachwissenschaft, Wiesbaden 1965, p. 104.

<sup>2</sup> B. Collinder, Comparative Grammar of the Uralic Languages, Stockholm 1960, p. 244.

<sup>3</sup> Д. В. Бубрих, Историческая грамматика эрзянского языка, Саранск 1953.

<sup>4</sup> Б. А. Серебренников, Основные линии развития падежной и глагольной систем в уральских языках, Москва 1964, p. 137; Б. А. Серебренников, Историческая морфология мордовских языков, Москва 1967, pp. 169—209; B. A. Serebrennikov, Zu den Ursachen morphologischer Verworrenheit von Formen der objektiven Konjugation im Mordwinischen. — UAJb. 37 1966, pp. 65—69.

<sup>5</sup> H. Paasonen, Mordvinische lautlehre (= MSFOu XXII), Helsingfors 1903.

<sup>6</sup> For the sake of the uniformity and clarity of the text, the material is presented in a phonological transcription that is based on the Latin alphabet.

As for the 3rd p. sg. pres. mdE *pali* [= *pali*] and mdM *palaj*, the Moksha form leads us to presume the prototype *\*palaj*.<sup>7</sup> The same is true of the 3rd p. pl. mdE *palif* [= *palif*] and mdM *palaxʃt*. The phonetic change  $i < *aj$  is considered to have taken place in the Erza dialect in which the *\*j* palatalized *t*, while in Moksha it was devocalized to  $\chi$  in front of the voiceless *t*.

There are two ways of analyzing the final vowel of the 2nd p. pl. ending mdE *-do*, mdM *-da* found in the opposition between mdE *palatado* and mdE *palatada*. H. Paasonen supposed the non-initial vowel in the Erza dialect to have made such a progress as  $o < *u$  and  $e < *i$  respectively<sup>8</sup>, and D. V. Bubrich shared the same opinion.<sup>9</sup> On the other hand P. Ravila assumed the process  $u, o < *\bar{a}$ , and  $i, e < *\bar{o}$ <sup>10</sup>, which E. Itkonen supports<sup>11</sup>, together with a number of followers.

(3) The objective conjugation.

(a) The objects *him* and *them*.

To begin with, the plural subject form should be taken up in the present and preterite tenses. There is no difference between the forms indicating the 3rd p. sg. object *him* and those indicating the 3rd p. pl. object *them* in both tenses.

The present forms with the object *him* and *them* (Erza):

Pl. 1	<i>kundasiñek</i>	'we catch him'	<i>kundasiñek</i>	'we catch them'
2	<i>kundasink</i>		<i>kundasink</i>	
3	<i>kundasiž</i>		<i>kundasiž</i>	

The preterite forms:

Pl. 1	<i>kundiñek</i>	'we caught him'	<i>kundiñek</i>	'we caught them'
2	<i>kundink</i>		<i>kundink</i>	
3	<i>kundiž</i>		<i>kundiž</i>	

These parallel forms are surely due to the former identity of the two object series *him* and *them* as D. V. Bubrich insisted.<sup>12</sup>

The singular subject forms (Erza):

Present	The object <i>him</i>		The object <i>them</i>	
Sg. 1	<i>kundasa</i>	'I catch him'	<i>kundasiñ</i>	'I catch them'
2	<i>kundasak</i>		<i>kundasiř</i>	
3	<i>kundasi</i>		<i>kundasiñže</i>	

Preterite

Sg. 1	<i>kundija</i>	<i>kundiñ</i>
2	<i>kundik</i>	<i>kundiř</i>
3	<i>kundiže</i>	<i>kundiñže</i>

<sup>7</sup> H. Paasonen, ML, pp. 83—85; Д. В. Бубрих, ИГЭЯ, р. 12.

<sup>8</sup> H. Paasonen, ML, pp. 88—91.

<sup>9</sup> Д. В. Бубрих, ИГЭЯ, pp. 8—11.

<sup>10</sup> P. Ravila, Über eine doppelte Vertretung des urfinnisch-wolgaischen *\*a* der niedersten Silbe im Mordwinischen. — FUF XX 1929, pp. 83—120.

<sup>11</sup> E. Itkonen, Zur Frage nach der Entwicklung des Vokalismus der ersten Silbe in den finnisch-ugrischen Sprachen, insbesondere im Mordwinischen. — FUF XXIX 1946, pp. 295—296.

<sup>12</sup> Д. В. Бубрих, ИГЭЯ, р. 103.



If the endings of the object them are compared with the possessive suffixes:

	Present	Preterite		The possessive suffixes indicating the plural objects possessed
Sg. 1	<i>kundasi-ń</i>	<i>kundi-ń</i>	Sg. 1	<i>kudo-n</i> 'houses-my'
2	<i>kundasi-t</i>	<i>kundi-t</i>	2	<i>kudo-t</i>
3	<i>kundasi-ńže</i>	<i>kundi-ńže</i>	3	<i>kudo-nzo</i>

each ending of both tenses is found to be in perfect agreement with the suffix of the plural objects possessed *-n*, *-t*, or *-nzo*, which, in a sense of plurality, came to be used to indicate the plural object them; this is obvious from the fact that the suffix *-že* in the preterite form *kundiže* indicating the singular object him corresponds to the 3rd p. sg. possessive ending *-zo* indicating the singular object possessed.

The object him:

	Present	Preterite		The possessive suffixes indicating the singular object possessed
Sg. 1	<i>kundasa</i>	<i>kundiĵa</i>	Sg. 1	<i>kudo-m</i> 'house-my'
2	<i>kundasak</i>	<i>kundiĵ</i>	2	<i>kudo-t</i>
3	<i>kundasi</i>	<i>kundiže</i>	3	<i>kudo-zo</i>

Except for the preterite suffix *-že*, the other endings have nothing to do with the possessive ones. This means that all of these suffixes are of earlier origin.

The 3rd p. pl. forms of the 3rd p. object in the objective conjugation are represented by the possessive suffix of the plural objects possessed. It is needless to think of such an analogy as D. V. Bubrich suggested:

<i>kundi</i>	:	<i>kundiń</i>	=	<i>kundiže</i>	:	x
I-him		I-them		he-him		he-them
		x	=	<i>kundińže</i>		(ИГЭЯ 105, 227)

In reference to the series of the 3rd p. object him in the Moksha objective conjugation:

	Present	Preterite
Pl. 1	<i>kundasak</i>	<i>kundak</i>
2	<i>kundasak</i>	<i>kundak</i>
3	<i>kundasak</i>	<i>kundak</i>

The object them:

	Present	Preterite
Pl. 1	<i>kundasak</i>	<i>kundak</i>
2	<i>kundasak</i>	<i>kundak</i>
3	<i>kundasak</i>	<i>kundak</i>

It is clear that the 3rd p. form was the basic stem, to which the element *-k* and *-t* were added in the first and the second person respectively:<sup>1</sup>

Pl. 1	* <i>kundasak-k</i>	>	<i>kundasak</i>	
2	* <i>kundasak-t</i>	>	<i>kundasak</i>	(cf. ИГЭЯ 226)

The following forms of the Moksha dialect are found in the paradigm by D. V. Bubrich:

The object them:

	Present	Preterite
Pl. 1	<i>kundasajñək</i>	<i>kundajñək</i>
2	<i>kundasajəñt</i>	<i>kundajəñt</i> (cf. ИГЭЯ 103)

Special attention must be paid to the fact that the suffix *-ñək*, and *-əñt* are added to the base form *kundasaj-* or *kundaj-*, which is found in the 1st and 2nd p. sg., too:

	Present	Preterite
Sg. 1	<i>kundasaj-ñe</i>	<i>kundaj-ñe</i>
2	<i>kundasaj-t</i>	<i>kundaj-t</i>

It deserves particular notice that the 3rd p. sg. of the present tense in the subjective conjugation and the present participle have the same form *kundaj*.

The 1st p. pl. ending *-nək* is found in the oblique forms of the possessive suffix: inessive form [*ʃsora-šə-nək*] 'sons-in-our' (MChr. 05).

The 2nd p. pl. ending *-nt* is used in the Moksha Middle Vad dialect:

Pl. 1	<i>šuma-sə-nək</i>	'tub- or tubs-in-our'
2	<i>šuma-sə-nt</i>	'tub- or tubs-in-your' (cf. Очерки II 347)

This dialect discriminates between the singular and plural objects possessed in the possessive suffix.

The singular possessor forms:

1st p.:	(a) the singular object possessed	<i>šuma-že</i>
	(b) plural	<i>šuma-ñe</i>
2nd p.:	(a) singular	<i>šuma-tše</i>
	(b) plural	<i>šuma-tñe</i>
3rd p.:	(a) singular	<i>šuma-ts</i>
	(b) plural	<i>šuma-ndza</i>

(Очерки II 344, 345)

They can be traced as follows:

<i>šuma-že</i>	<	* <i>šuma-n-žä</i>	<	* <i>šuma-m-sä</i>
<i>šuma-ñe</i>	<	* <i>šuma-n-ñä</i>	<	* <i>šuma-m-nä</i>
<i>šuma-tše</i>	<	* <i>šuma-t-šä</i>	<	* <i>šuma-t-sä</i>
<i>šuma-tñe</i>	<	* <i>šuma-t-ñä</i>	<	* <i>šuma-t-nä</i>
<i>šuma-ts</i>	<	* <i>šuma-t-sš</i>		
<i>šuma-ndza</i>	<	* <i>šuma-n-za</i>	<	* <i>šuma-n-sa</i>

As to the plural possessor forms:

1st p.:	(a) the singular object possessed	<i>šuma-ñəšk</i>
	(b) plural	<i>šuma-ñək</i>
2nd p.:	(a) singular	<i>šuma-ñdəšt</i>
	(b) plural	<i>šuma-ñte</i>
3rd p.		<i>šuma-sna</i>

(Очерки II 344, 345)



Their formation may be reconstructed as follows:<sup>13</sup>

<i>suma-ňəšk</i>	< * <i>suma-ňš-žšk</i>	< * <i>suma-ňš-šš-nšk</i>
	< * <i>suma-ňš-smšk</i>	
<i>suma-ňək</i>	< * <i>suma-ňš-ňšk</i>	< * <i>suma-ňš-nšk</i>
	< * <i>suma-ňš-nš-mšk</i>	
<i>suma-ňďəšt</i>	< * <i>suma-ňš-št</i>	< * <i>suma-ňš-s-tk</i>
	< * <i>suma-ňš-sš-tšk</i>	
<i>suma-ňte</i>	< * <i>suma-ňš-ňtš</i>	< * <i>suma-ňš-n-tk</i>
	< * <i>suma-ňš-nš-tšk</i>	
<i>suma-sna</i>	< * <i>suma-st-na</i>	

In my opinion, this distinction between the singular and plural objects possessed seems to be of so early origin that *suma-ňəšk* might be absorbed into *suma-ňək* or *suma-ňke*, and *suma-ňəšt* into *suma-ňte*. It would also appear that the element *-šk* in *suma-ňəšk* formerly indicated the 1st p. pl. and the element *-št* in *suma-ňəšt* the 2nd p. pl.

It is quite obvious that the 1st and 2nd p. pl. suffixes of the Erza objective conjugation were derived from the 1st and 2nd p. pl. possessive endings.

The objects *him* and *them* in Erza:

	Present	Preterite	The plural	possessor suffixes
Pl. 1	<i>kundasi-ňek</i>	<i>kundi-ňek</i>	<i>kudo-nok</i>	'house-our'
2	<i>kundasi-nk</i>	<i>kundi-nk</i>	<i>kudo-nk</i>	'house-your'
3	<i>kundasiž</i>	<i>kundiž</i>	<i>kudo-st</i>	'house-their'

In Moksha they are perhaps formed on the base of *kundasaz* and *kundaž*, influenced either by the final phoneme *-k* and *-t* of the possessive endings or by the final cluster *-šk* and *-št* of the extinguished possessive ones mentioned above.

The objects *him* and *them* in Moksha:

	Present	Preterite	The plural	possessor suffixes
Pl. 1	<i>kundasəšk</i>	<i>kundašk</i>	<i>suma-ňəšk</i>	'tub-our'
2	<i>kundasəšt</i>	<i>kundašt</i>	<i>suma-ňləšt</i>	'tub-your'
3	<i>kundasaz</i>	<i>kundaž</i>	<i>suma-sna</i>	'tub-their'

The plural underlying forms of the inflection indicating the objects *him* and *them* have proved to be *kundasaz* and *kundaž*.

B. A. Serebrennikov cannot convince me of the following transformation from the same prototype into four separate forms which do not contain any last common element \*[-təšk]:<sup>14</sup>

		Erza	Moksha
* <i>kunda-s-aj-təšk</i>	> present	<i>kundasink</i>	<i>kundasəšt</i>
	> preterite	<i>kundink</i>	<i>kundašt</i>

<sup>13</sup> Cf. H. Paasonen, ML, pp. 122—123, too.

<sup>14</sup> Б. А. Серебрянников, Историческая морфология мордовских языков, pp. 190, 197.

I cannot understand why none of the four derived forms have kept the original suffix.

The 1st and 2nd p. forms of the object *them* in Moksha:

	Present	Preterite
Sg. 1	<i>kundasajñe</i>	<i>kundajñe</i>
2	<i>kundasajf</i>	<i>kundajf</i>

It is quite evident that to *kundasaj-* and *kundaj-* is added the first person suffix *-ñe*, which originated from the first person possessive ending of the plural objects possessed *-ñe* (cf. *suma-ñe* 'tubs-my'; *suma-že* 'tub-my'), while the ending *-t* can apparently be traced back to the possessive oblique case of the singular object possessed (cf. *suma-sə-t* 'tub-in-your'). In the case of the final element *-t*, the distinction between singular and plural is neutralized in the standard Moksha Mordvin language.

	Present		Preterite	
The object	<i>him</i>	<i>them</i>	<i>him</i>	<i>them</i>
Sg. 1	<i>kundasaj</i>	<i>kundasajñe</i>	<i>kundaj</i>	<i>kundajñe</i>
2	<i>kundasak</i>	<i>kundasajf</i>	<i>kundajf</i>	<i>kundajf</i>

It is clear from the above comparison that the endings of the object *them* invaded the domain of the object *him* in the preterite tense, while they could not break into that of the present tense, and that *\*kundaj* can be abstracted as the preterite prototype.

The preterite underlying forms in the Erza dialect, on the other hand, are supposed to be as follows.

The 1st p. form of the object *him* *\*kundaj*

2nd p. *\*kundajk*

	Present		Preterite	
The object	<i>him</i>	<i>them</i>	<i>him</i>	<i>them</i>
Sg. 1	<i>kundasaj</i>	<i>kundasiñ</i>	<i>kundi</i>	<i>kundiñ</i>
2	<i>kundasak</i>	<i>kundasiñf</i>	<i>kundik</i>	<i>kundiñf</i>

The endings *-ñ* and *-t* of the object *them* originated from the possessive suffixes *-n* in *kudo-n* (houses-my) and *-t* in *kudo-t* (house- or houses-your) respectively, and the element *-ja* in *kundi* came into existence under the influence of the final *-a* in *kundasaj*, as D. V. Bubrich suggested, through the process *\*kundi-a* > *\*kundi*.<sup>15</sup>

The ending *-k* in *kundik* is derived from the imperative form (cf. *kundi!* 'catch him!'), since the same element is found in the Moksha imperative form *kundak*, from which it follows that *\*kundasaj* should be looked upon as the present prototype of the first and the second person and *\*kundaj* as the preterite.

The 3rd p. sg. preterite forms of the objects *him* and *them* in Erza:

Sg. 3 of *him*: *kundiže*  
Sg. 3 of *them*: *kundiñže*

The *-že* and *-ñže* may be traced back to the 3rd p. sg. possessive suffix (cf. *lišme-že* 'horse-his', *lišme-nže* 'horses-his').

<sup>15</sup> Д. В. Бубрих, ИГЭЯ, p. 104.



Those in Moksha:

Sg. 3 of him: *kundaže*  
Sg. 3 of them: *kundažeń*

The ending *-že* of the object *him* has, I dare say, the same origin as in Erza. As to *kundažeń*, there is a very strong possibility of D. V. Bubrich's analogy:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \textit{kundaj} & : & \textit{kundajńa} & = & \textit{kundažá} & : & x \\ \text{I-him} & & \text{I-them} & & \text{he-him} & & \text{he-them} \\ & & & & x = & \textit{kundažən(á)} & (\text{ИГЭЯ } 106) \end{array}$$

From what has been said above it should be concluded that the prototypes of the objects *him* and *them* took quite the same forms and have maintained a sharp distinction only between the singular and the plural form.

The prototypes of the inflection of the Objective objects *him* and *them*:

	Present		Preterite
Sg. 1, 2	* <i>kundasá</i>	Sg. 1, 2, 3	* <i>kundaj</i>
Pl. 1, 2, 3	* <i>kundasajz</i>	Pl. 1, 2, 3	* <i>kundajz</i>

(with the exception of the 3rd p. sg. form of the present tense *kundasi*, which will be treated of later).

(b) The objects *me* and *us*:

Erza	Present	Preterite
Sg. 2	<i>kundasamak</i>	<i>kundimik</i>
3	<i>kundasamam</i>	<i>kundimim</i>
Pl. 2	<i>kundasamiž</i>	<i>kundimiž</i>
3	<i>kundasamiž</i>	<i>kundimiž</i>

The element *-k* of the 2nd p. sg. has already been clarified, and the ending *-m* of the 3rd p. sg. is the index of the object *me* derived from the 1st p. sg. possessor suffix *-m* indicating a single object possessed (cf. *kudo-m* 'house-my').

Moksha	Present	Preterite
Sg. 2	<i>kundasamak</i>	<i>kundamajf</i>
3	<i>kundasamań</i>	<i>kundamań</i>
Pl. 2	<i>kundasamašt</i>	<i>kundamašt</i>
3	<i>kundasamaž</i>	<i>kundamaž</i>

The elements *-k* and *-št* have been made clear, and the ending *-ń* may be traceable to the oblique suffix *-n* of the first person possessor (cf. *suma-sə-n* 'tub-in-my').

Now the prototypes of the inflection of the object *me/us* in Common Mordvin may be set up as follows:

	Present	Preterite
Sg. 2	* <i>kundasama</i>	* <i>kundajmaj</i>
3	* <i>kundasama</i>	* <i>kundajmaj</i>
Pl. 2	* <i>kundasamajz</i>	* <i>kundajmajz</i>
3	* <i>kundasamajz</i>	* <i>kundajmajz</i>

It is plain enough that the present common stem *kundasá-* is based upon the 3rd p. sg. pres. form of the object *him/them* \**kundasá*. The

voiceless element *-s-* contained in this base proves the formation of this suffix to be of comparatively recent origin.

(c) The object *y o u*:

Erza	Present	Preterite
Sg. 1	<i>kundatan</i>	<i>kundiñiñ</i>
3	<i>kundatanzət</i>	<i>kundiñžiñ</i>
Pl. 1	<i>kundatadiž</i>	<i>kundiđiž</i>
3	<i>kundatadiž</i>	<i>kundiñiž</i>

The ending *-n* represents the 1st p., *-nza* the 3rd p., and *-t* the 2nd p. respectively. If all these elements are taken away from the sg. pres. forms, the common base *\*kundata* is left.

Moksha	Present	Preterite
Sg. 1	<i>kundatɛ</i>	<i>kundaxʃɛñ</i>
3	<i>kundatanza</i>	<i>kundañže</i>
Pl. 1	<i>kundatɛdɛž</i>	<i>kundadɛž</i>
3	<i>kundatɛdɛž</i>	<i>kundadɛž</i>

It may be that the 3rd p. pret. formant *-ñže* has developed from such a composition as *\*-j-nza*. If this final element *-nza* is removed from the 3rd p. pret. form, the underlying form *\*kundaj* can be obtained, and as the result of the removal of the 1st p. element *-n* and the 2nd p. element *-t* from the 1st p. pret. form, the common stem *\*kundaj-* may be separated. The perfect coincidence of this stem with the preterite form *\*kundaj* of the object *h i m* suggests that the preterite form of the object *y o u* still survives in the earliest stage of formation in the objective conjugation, and this form affords a most important clue for the clarification of the process through which all the other forms must have been constructed on the basis of the 3rd p. form of the object *h i m*.

By the same procedure the 3rd p. sg. pret. form *kundiñžiñ* in Erza can be analyzed into *\*kundaj-nzaj-t*, in which the final element *-t* indicates the 2nd p., in comparison with the present form *kundanzət*.

The prototypes of the object *y o u*:

	Present	Preterite
Sg. 1	<i>*kundata</i>	<i>*kundaj</i>
3	<i>*kundata</i>	<i>*kundaj</i>
Pl. 1	<i>*kundatadajz</i>	<i>*kundajdajz</i>
3	<i>*kundatadajz</i>	<i>*kundajdajz</i>

The palatalized *ɛ* contained in the 3rd p. pl. of Moksha was caused by the influence of the following element *d* which sprang from the cluster *jd*. The first person *t* was affected also by the preterite ending *-xʃ < \*-jt*.

(4) So it comes out that the present plural forms are analyzed into *\*kundata-dajz* and the preterite as *\*kundaj-dajz*, and it may be that the present plural forms of the object *m e/u s* are, in the same way, decomposed into *\*kundasa-majz* and the preterite into *\*kundaj-majz*. We may reasonably suppose that the stem *\*kundasa-* was transplanted from the present form of the object *h i m/t h e m* and *\*kundaj-* from the preterite form of the same object.



The endings *-dajz* and *-majz* are considered to have been formed on the analogy of the suffix *-sajz* in the present form of the object *him/them kunda-sajz*.

The ending *-ma* in the singular present form of the object *me/you \*kundasama* and *-ta* of the object *you \*kundata* function as the first person and the second person index respectively.

I can conclude from what has been said above that all the objective inflections of the present and preterite tense are based on the forms of the object *him/them*, and that since *kundasa* has developed from *\*kunda* + the 3rd p. ending *-sa*, all the present forms are founded on the basic stem *kunda*, and this present singular form *kundasa* brought forth the corresponding plural verb *kundasajz* under the influence of the preterite *\*kundajz*.

In consequence, the prototypes of the objective conjugation may safely be assumed as follows:

	Present	Preterite
Singular forms	<i>*kunda</i>	<i>*kundaj</i>
Plural form		<i>*kundajz</i>

(5) Traced back to the origin of *kundaj*, the element *-j* of *kundaj* may be easily identified with the preterite suffix, with the consequent result that Common Mordvin had two preterite forms of the 3rd p. sg.: (1) *\*kundaj*, (2) *\*kundaš*.

The former is found in the objective conjugation and the latter in the subjective, and these two preterite forms are believed to correspond to those of the first and the second conjugation in Cheremis: (1) *tolo* 'he came', (2) *kondəš* 'he carried'.

According to I. Galkin they may be reconstructed as follows: (1) *\*tolei*, (2) *\*kandaš*.<sup>16</sup>

It is quite sure that the subjective *kundaj* is identical with the participle *kundaj*, which can be traced back to the Uralic participle ending *\*-j*.<sup>17</sup>

While the two forms of the preterite tense made up the subject and the object conjugation system respectively, the original present form *\*kunda* began to organize the objective conjugation, and the present participle *\*kundaj* came to dominate over the subjective one, with the natural result that there came into being an opposition in the present tense conjugation: (1) *\*kunda*, (2) *\*kundaj*.

To the first stem, in the course of time, the pronoun with *s* was added<sup>18</sup>, so that the base of the object *him* was established: *\*kunda-sə̃* > *\*kundasa*.

The 3rd p. sg. form, however, under the influence of the corresponding form *\*kundaj* in the subjective conjugation, underwent another development: *\*kunda-sə̃-j* > *\*kundasij* > *\*kundasi*.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>16</sup> И. С. Галкин, Историческая грамматика марийского языка I, Йошкар-Ола 1964, pp. 116, 130, 131. The form *\*kandasi* given by I. Galkin has been modified into *kandaš* on E. Itkonen's instruction.

<sup>17</sup> J. Szinyei, Finnisch-ugrische Sprachwissenschaft, Berlin—Leipzig 1922, p. 80; T. Lehtisalo, Über die primären ururalischen Ableitungssuffixe (= MSFOu LXXII), Helsinki 1936, p. 63.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. B. Collinder, Fenno-Ugric Vocabulary, Stockholm 1955, pp. 56, 80—81.

<sup>19</sup> According to the suggestion of V. Hallap.

It is interesting to notice the correspondence of the above forms to the present verbs of the first and the second conjugation in Cheremis: (2) *konda*, (1) *toleš*. I. Galkin supposes them to be reconstructed as follows: (2) *\*kandava*, (1) *\*tolekše*.<sup>20</sup>

By a careful investigation of Mordvin verbs, it would be more reasonable to assume such a development from the present prototype without any ending as *\*kanda* > *konda*.

If the identity of the 3rd p. sg. suffix *-eš* of the first conjugation with the participle ending *-šā* in Cheremis<sup>21</sup> is to be recognized, it may be noticed that most of the 3rd p. sg. pres. forms in the Volga Fennic languages have been replaced by participles: that is, in Baltic Fennic by the participle *\*-pa*, in Mordvin by *\*-j*, and in Cheremis by *\*-šā*, and each of them may be traced to the Uralic origin *\*-p*, *\*-j*, and *\*-š*.<sup>22</sup>

The replacement of the 3rd p. sg. pres. forms by each different participle in Volga Fennic, moreover, suggests that the verb form standing for the 3rd p. sg. in Proto-Volga-Fennic must have been quite unstable, and that this ancient verb form was destined to be supplanted by some participle in the development of each language. Instability might be due to the verb form consisting of a simple bare stem without any ending; e. g. *\*kunda* in Mordvin, or *\*ko-ḍa* of the second conjugation in Cheremis, which shows the base form taken before the addition of a reflexive derivative suffix *-v* to it (*\*ko-ḍav*).<sup>23</sup>

According to this tendency, the Mordvin prototype *\*kunda*, which was replaced by *\*kundaj* in the subjective conjugation, came to systematize the objective inflectional construction on the basis of such a form as *kundasa* with a pronoun added to it.

Now that the participle *\*kundaj* usurped the place of the 3rd p. sg. pres. form, this newcomer, in turn, got into a danger of confusion with the 3rd p. sg. pret. form *\*kundaj*.

The preterite forms of Erza:

Sg. 1	<i>*kundajm</i> > <i>kundiñ</i>	Pl. 1	<i>*kundajmā</i> > <i>*kundiñe</i>
2	<i>*kundajt</i> > <i>kundiť</i>	2	<i>*kundajdā</i> > <i>kundiđe</i>
3	<i>*kundaj</i> <i>kundaś</i>	3	<i>*kundajz</i> <i>kundašť</i>

To avoid this confusion another preterite form with the suffix *-ś* might take the place of the old one, with the result that in the subjective conjugation only the 3rd p. forms possess the different final vowel *-a*. In Erza the suffix *\*-ñe* of the 1st p. pl. form was replaced by the possessive ending *-nok*, while the Moksha dialect has kept the old suffix (*kundañe*). The plural form *\*kundajz* corresponding to the singular *\*kundaj* in the objective conjugation was also expelled by the newly coined *kundašť* made up on the analogy of the singular form *kundaś*, constituting a nucleus in the plural

<sup>20</sup> И. С. Галкин, Историческая грамматика марийского языка I, pp. 115, 127, 128.

<sup>21</sup> Ö. Beke, Zur Geschichte der tscheremissischen Konjugation. — FUF XXII 1934, p. 125; E. Itkonen, Entwicklung des tscheremissischen Konjugationssystems. — MSFOu 125 1962, p. 107.

<sup>22</sup> J. Szinnyei, FUS, pp. 77, 80, 82; T. Lehtisalo, PUA, pp. 245, 252, 63, 188—202.

<sup>23</sup> E. Itkonen, Entwicklung des tscheremissischen Konjugationssystems, p. 106; И. С. Галкин, К вопросу о возникновении двух типов спряжения в марийском языке. — Вопросы финно-угорского языкознания, Москва—Ленинград 1962, pp. 172—173.



formation of the objective conjugation system, but where this plural preterite form *\*kundajz* comes from is an open question at present.<sup>24</sup> In this connection we cannot deny the possibility of the following development: *kundaž* < *\*kundajz* < *\*kundajzə* < *kundajzək*.

Suppose the final plural formative *-k* in the third person suffix *\*-z.k* had disappeared as A. Klemm suggested,<sup>25</sup> there would have been an exact parallelism between the other plural personal endings: mdM *kundamε* < *\*kundajmək* and *kundaε* < *kundajdək*, in which case it is pretty hard to explain the apocope of the final vowel only in the 3rd p. form *\*kundajz* < *\*kundajzə*.

It cannot also be denied that the ending *-ž* of the past participle has some connection with the final suffix of the plural preterite form *\*kundajz* in the objective conjugation, and this participle is often used in Erza:  *sazorom avardež saš* 'my sister came crying'.

The participial construction might constitute a most important factor in the appearance of the objective conjugation, which is supposed to have been impersonal at the beginning and to have a personal suffix added later. This trace still survives in a part of the plural forms.

Upon the basis of these two forms *\*kunda* and *\*kundaj* may be constructed all the complicated system of the objective inflection.

(6) Inferring from *kannoin* 'I carried' in Finnish and *kandsin* in Estonian the coexistence of the two preterite forms ending in *-j* and *-s* in the Volga Fennic period is fairly certain.

In Cheremis the two forms of the preterite tense were split into the first and the second conjugation, while in Mordvin they branched off into the subjective and objective conjugation. In Baltic Fennic, however, both of them have ceased to exist. In the present tense the 3rd p. form has been replaced by a present participle in each language.

Finally the present writer wishes to express heartfelt thanks to E. Itkonen and V. Hallap for their kind comments and suggestions concerning the content of this paper.

### Abbreviations

**FUS** — J. Szinyei, *Finnisch-ugrische Sprachwissenschaft*, Berlin—Leipzig 1922; **MChr.** — H. Paasonen, *Mordwinische chrestomathie mit glossar und grammatikalischem abriß*, Helsinki 1909; **ML** — H. Paasonen, *Mordvinische lautlehre* (= MSFOu XXII), Helsingfors 1903; **PUA** — T. Lehtisalo, *Über die primären uralischen ableitungssuffixe* (= MSFOu LXXII), Helsinki 1936; **ИГЭЯ** — Д. В. Бубрих, *Историческая грамматика эрзянского языка*, Саранск 1953; **Очерки II** — С. З. Деваев, *Средне-вадский диалект мокша-мордовского языка*. — *Очерки мордовских диалектов II*, Саранск 1963.

<sup>24</sup> Б. А. Серебrenников, *Историческая морфология мордовских языков*, p. 181.

<sup>25</sup> A. Klemm, *A mordvin tárgyaz igeragozás*. — *NyK XLVI 1923—1927*, p. 197.

ТАМОТСУ КОИЗУМИ (Сидзуока)

ОБЪЕКТНОЕ СПРЯЖЕНИЕ В МОРДОВСКОМ ПРАЯЗЫКЕ

Как известно, мордовские языки имеют две сложные системы спряжения — объектное и субъектное спряжения. При помощи индуктивного анализа можно показать, что все формы объектного спряжения сложились на основе форм объекта егo/и x. При этом в объектном спряжении исходной формой объекта 3-го лица в настоящем времени можно считать формы типа \*kunda, а в прошедшем времени — формы типа \*kundaj. В настоящем времени формы типа \*kunda потеряли свою прежнюю функцию, были заменены в этой функции причастиями настоящего времени типа \*kundaj и легли в основу системы объектного спряжения. В прошедшем времени формы типа \*kundaj были вытеснены из сферы субъектного в сферу объектного спряжения, причем в функции 3-го лица субъектного спряжения их заменили формы с окончанием -s.

1. М. С. Галай, Историческая грамматика марийского языка, т. 1, pp. 115, 127, 128.  
 2. O. Beke, Zur Geschichte der tatarischen Konjugation. — PUF XXII 1934, p. 135.  
 3. E. Tikkanen, Entwicklung der tscheremissischen Konjugationssysteme. — MSFOU 123 1932, p. 107.  
 4. J. Smolnyei, FUS, pp. 77, 80, 82; T. Lehtinen, PUA, pp. 246, 252, 55.  
 5. E. Tikkanen, Entwicklung der tscheremissischen Konjugationssysteme. — MSFOU 123 1932, p. 107.  
 6. A. Kienm, A moravia nyelv (morozs) — NYK XLIV 1932—1933, p. 107.