

POLITE LITERATURE.

I.—*On the Personal Pronouns of the Assyrian and other Languages, especially Hebrew.* By the Rev. EDWARD HINCKS, D.D.

Read June 26, 1854.

1. **T**HE observations which I am about to make on the forms of the personal pronouns belonging to two great families of languages, the Hebræo-Assyrian and the Indo-European, and to the Egyptian language, which is referable to neither of these, were intended to form part of a paper on the Assyrian verb, which I have had in preparation for a considerable time.

2. The quantity of matter, however, which I have already collected in connexion with this subject, and to which I am making constant additions, is such as to render it impossible for me to prepare this paper for publication during the present session of the Academy. And, as what relates to the personal pronouns is complete in itself, I have deemed it expedient to detach it from the paper on the verb, and forward it at once.

3. A great deal has been written on the subject of these pronouns ; and if ingenuity and sound judgment could have elicited the truth respecting them from the data heretofore available, I am very sure that it would have been elicited; I believe, however, that the data in existence have been insufficient ; and accordingly, while I feel perfect confidence that I have attained to a correct view of the matter, I rest my convictions mainly on the evidence furnished by the newly discovered Assyrian forms.

4. In a paper which was read at the meeting of the British Association in 1852, I pointed out the identity of the latter part of the Assyrian *anáku*,* the

* In reading Assyrian words, the vowels should be sounded as in Italian, and the accented syllable marked.

equivalent of the Hebrew *anoki*, with the Greek and Latin *ego*; the final vowel of which is dropped in the Gothic and Lithuanian sub-families, as it is in the Coptic, and probably in the Phœnician; while the Sanskrit sub-family annexes a new syllable to the mutilated Lithuanian form.*

5. Two questions respecting this pronoun were unanswered in that paper. What is the nature of the syllable *an*, which commences it and all similar forms belonging to the first and second persons? and what the distinction between the two Hebrew forms belonging to the first person singular, *anoki* and *ani*? I am now prepared to answer these questions, and in answering them I shall be able to introduce all that I have to say respecting the other pronouns.

6. First then, as to the prefix *an*. I have discovered that it is a verbal theme; so that *anoki* is in fact the first person singular of a verb, of which *atta* and *attem* are the second person masculine, singular and plural. In the second person, the prominal termination is the same as what appears in verbs; but in the first the verb has *ti* and *nu*, while the pronoun has *oki* and *akhnu*. Looking, then, to the Hebrew alone, or (I may add) to it and the languages of the same family that have been heretofore known, there existed no good grounds for considering *an* to be a verb. It is possible that it may have been conjectured to be so; but I am not aware that it was.

7. The case is different in Assyrian. In that language the first person of the verb corresponding to the Hebrew *lamadti* would be *lamdáku*, the form of which is identical with that of *anáku*. *Lámadtí* would be in Assyrian the

* The changes in the latter part of the so-called pronoun of the first person singular in the junior members of the Hebræo-Assyrian family are very similar to those which have taken place in the Gothic and Lithuanian sub-families. The final vowel is retained in the Hebrew *anoki* and the Assyrian *anáku*, but in these only. The Phœnician ʾנכ was probably pronounced *anáki*; *anáh* was used in the Aramæan dialect, commonly called Chaldee; *aná* in the same language, and in Arabic. The Coptic forms were *anok* and *anak*; the ancient Egyptian was probably *anáka*. Let these forms, deprived of the initial *an*, which is common to them all, be compared with the Mæso-Gothic and Anglo-Saxon *ik*, the old German *ih*, the Icelandic *eg*, the Lithuanian *asz*, the old Prussian *as*, and the Slavonic *az*. The Zend form is *azēm*, the old Persian *adam*, and the Sanskrit *aham*. If we had only this pronoun to consider, it would be natural to suppose the final syllable in these last forms to represent the *u* at the end of the Assyrian word. This is, however, an inadmissible explanation of it, because the same syllable is attached to other pronouns, as in *twam* and *wayam*, where no such substitution could have taken place.

second person singular feminine, the masculine being *lámadtú*. These again correspond to *attí* and *attá*, which of course stand for *antí* and *antá*. Looking then to the Assyrian language, it is quite plain that *an* is a verbal root, and that the true subjective pronouns are *áku*, *ta*, and *ti*, corresponding to the Latin *ego* and *tu*.

8. It is remarkable that in all the languages of the Indo-European family the subjective pronoun of the second person singular is common to both genders, while in all those of the Hebræo-Assyrian a distinction of gender exists.* From the resemblance in termination of *tu* to *áku*, it is probable that *it* was the more ancient form; and that the double form was a refinement, made by the one race after the other had separated from it. It is uncertain whether the old Egyptian had one or two forms for this pronoun. It was rarely used; and in Coptic it is altogether wanting.†

9. It is next to be considered what this verbal root *an* signifies. What would first occur to most persons would be that it was the *as* or *es* of the Indo-European languages; so that *anáku* would be equivalent to the Latin *sum*. Further examination will, however, prove that it must mean something more. The Assyrian inscriptions contain a sentence equivalent to *sum rex*; and this is not expressed by *sar anáku*, but by *sarráku*. *Anáku* is therefore something different from *sum*; and I take it to be *adsum*. This verbal prefix, it will be ob-

* In Latin and Doric Greek we have *tu*; other Greek, *su*; Gothic, Anglo-Saxon, and Icelandic, *thu*; old German, *du*; Lithuanian and Slavonic, *tu*; with the addition of *am*, we have the old Persian *tuwam*, the Zend *túm*, and the Sanskrit *twam*; all these are equally applicable to masculines and feminines. On the other hand, *atta*, and in Arabic *anta*, are addressed to males; *atti* and *att*, and in Arabic *anti*, to females.

† *Antok* will be explained hereafter. It is compounded of *anto* and *k*, not of *an* and *tok*. No comparison can, therefore, be made with propriety between this word and the Hebræo-Assyrian pronouns of the second person. In a few old Egyptian forms *tu* is used for the pronoun of the second person singular masculine. I do not recollect having met with these forms addressed to a female; and I can scarcely say whether I should expect *tu* or *ti*. On the one hand, there is the fact that the Egyptians had distinct affixes *k* and *t* for the second person singular masculine and feminine; but, on the other hand, it should be observed that the form *tu* is the Indo-European one of the common gender, not the Hebræo-Assyrian masculine. The plural affix of the second person is the same, to the eye at least, in both genders. It is not certain, however, that it was not pronounced *tun* when masculine, and *tin* when feminine; the short vowel, interposed between the consonants, not being expressed.

served, is in all the Hebræo-Assyrian languages confined to the pronouns of the first and second persons, the speaker and the persons spoken to, who are *present* to one another ; while the pronouns of the third person are used also to represent the remote demonstrative pronouns, *that* and *those*. It is a strong confirmation of this view, that the Assyrian preposition *ána*, which must have been originally an imperative or infinitive of this verb, denotes *to, for, at, on*.* It is the equivalent of the Hebrew *el*, or its abbreviation, the prefix *le*.†

10. What I have said sufficiently explains one of the two Hebrew forms for the first person singular, *anoki* ; the corresponding forms in the other Hebræo-Assyrian languages ; and the forms for the second person, masculine and feminine, singular and plural, in all these languages. It does not, however, explain the other Hebrew form, *ani*, nor the forms for the first person plural in the different languages. Of these I proceed to speak.

11. The connexion between *ani* and *anoki* has been treated of by many grammarians. Some have thought that the former word was a contraction of the latter ; while others have represented *anoki* as a compound, of which *ani* was the first part. I regard both these views as equally erroneous. I consider the original signification of the two forms to have been altogether different. I have shown that *anoki* was originally a verb “ I am here ;” and I entertain no doubt that *ani* is properly a noun, signifying “ my presence,” or “ my person.”

* It is my belief that the English preposition *on* (the same in Anglo-Saxon ; in Mæso-Gothic, and old German, and also in Greek, *ana*) is identical with the Assyrian *ána* ; as the English, Gothic, and Latin *in* is with the Assyrian *ina*, or, as it is sometimes written, *in*. In the Indo-European languages, *an* is found with a signification not very different from what I have assigned to the Hebræo-Assyrian *an* ; and I doubt not that they originally coincided. It is used for one of the cases of the demonstrative *this* in old Persian, Zend, and Sanskrit. The corresponding Assyrian pronoun is in the nominative masculine *annu*, with the second radical doubled. It is declined as a regular adjective. Now, although it is essential to a proper knowledge of Hebrew or Assyrian grammar to consider the roots as trilateral ; distinguishing those, for example, in which the second radical is an ommissible *u* or *i* from those in which it is the same as the third, there can be little doubt that if we go back to the early state of the language, which we must do when we compare Hebræo-Assyrian with Indo-European forms, we shall find the original root biliteral ; \aleph alone being the parent of both $\aleph\aleph$, whence the Assyrian demonstrative “ this,” and $\aleph\aleph$, whence the Assyrian preposition “ to.” The connexion between “ this ” and “ here ” is evident.

† The interchange of *l* and *n* in the Hebrew and Assyrian forms is analogous to what we meet in the Latin *alius* and *alter*, compared with the Sanskrit *anyah* and *antarah*.

12. In many contexts both these forms may be used indifferently; but there are some in which *ani* alone can be used with propriety. These are the cases where the pronoun, being otherwise expressed, is repeated for emphasis. Such are the expressions, *vaani hinmeni*, "and me, behold me;" *amarti ani*, "I said, I;" *bi ani*, "upon me, me."* According to my view of the matter, the literal translation would be, "and it is my person; behold me;" "I said; it is my person;" "upon me; it is my person;" *ani*, with the substantive verb understood, constituting a parenthetic sentence.

13. What first led me to take this view was my observing a similar phraseology in Assyrian. Xerxes says, in one of the Persepolitan inscriptions of the third kind, which are in a language almost identical with the Assyrian, "King Darius, *ábua, áttua*, my father, mine;" literally, "the father of me; it is my person." In the Behistun inscription Darius says, "eight kings *ina lib jiriya, áttua*, among my family, mine," literally, "among the family of me; it is my person." We have here *áttua*, which from its form must be a nominative, occurring after a noun in the genitive, exactly as it did in the preceding sentence after a noun in the nominative. This proves that it is not in apposition to that noun, but must constitute a parenthetic sentence; which it may do, and can only do, with the substantive verb understood.

14. Now, on examining this *áttua* (which is here used precisely as the Hebrew *ani* is used in the phrases that I have quoted) I find that it is an equivalent form of the same root. *Ani* consists of the indeclinable noun *an*, and the affix *i*; *áttua* (for *ántua*, as *attú* for *antú*) consists of *ant*, the feminine form of *an*, with *u*, forming the nominative, and *a* the possessive affix of the first person.† The Assyrians were much more careful than the Hebrews to give the feminine termination to abstract verbal nouns; and they even annexed it to nouns which were not abstract, but had in some degree the form of such. Thus, in place of the Hebrew *iris*, "earth," they used *irsit*, or, as I prefer writing it, *irchit*; in place of *bahar*, "a sea, or great water," they used *bahrat* or *bahrit*,

* These three expressions occur Gen. i. 17; Eccl. ii. 1; and 1 Sam. xxv. 24. The French *moi* exactly corresponds to *ani* when thus used.

† The exact Hebrew equivalent of the Assyrian *áttua* would be *atti* for *anti*. This is not used as a separate pronoun; but it may perhaps explain the form *lamadti* for the first person singular of the verb, which has completely superseded *lamdoki*.

whence the genitive singular *bahr̄ti*. The feminine form of *an* was, however, not confined to the Assyrians. It was used to form all the Coptic and old Egyptian pronouns of the second and third persons : *antok*, "thy person;" *antov*, "his person;" *antos*, "her person;" *antōten*, "your persons;" where the ancient and the more recent language agree ; as well as those other forms in which they differ. It is my belief that in these Egyptian forms, the short vowel in the second syllable marks the singular, and the long vowel the plural; but on this point I would not be positive. The Behistun inscription has *áttunú* for "our persons," which differs from *áttua* only in the affix.

15. I cannot speak with confidence as to the analysis of the pronoun of the first person plural, not having yet met with it in its Assyrian form. I conjecture, however, that the Hebrew *anakhnu* consists of the same verbal root which commences *anoki*, a noun signifying "a society, or company," and the possessive affix, *nu*, "our." It would thus literally represent, "Here is our company." The Arabic form *nakhnu*, which is also occasionally met with in Hebrew, is a contraction of this. The *akhnu* of some Syrian dialects may be a further contraction of the same ; or it may be, "our company," simply, without the verb. In support of this conjecture, I observe that the Arabic and Chaldee root *akha* actually signifies "to connect;" and that the only Egyptian pronoun of the first person plural, which has yet (so far, at least, as I am aware) been discovered, is a noun with affix, "our body;" the word implying a union of members, and the compound being consequently very similar in its meaning to *akh-nu*, interpreted as it is interpreted by me.

16. I have already said that the pronouns of the third person are also used to express the remote demonstratives *that* and *those*. They are for the singular in Assyrian *súhu*, contracted *sú*, and *síhi*, contracted *sí*; in Hebrew *hú*, *hí*, in Arabic *húa*, *hía*. The resemblance of these to the Greek *ho*, *hí*, the Mæso-Gothic *sa*, *só*, the old Persian *huwa* or *hú* in the masculine, not found in the feminine, the Zend *ho*, *há*, and the Sanskrit *sa*, *sá*, has been already noticed by many. It is indeed quite obvious. In the plural the resemblance is less close; the plural forms being derived from the singular ones according to the genius of the different languages. I need only state that the Assyrian forms are *sunu* and *sina*; the Hebrew, *him* or *himma* and *hinna*; and the Arabic *hum* and *hunna*.

17. The Assyrian pronouns of the third person are not attached to verbal roots in the same manner as those of the first and second are. The forms corresponding to *lamad*, *lamēda*, *lamēdu*, would be *lamád*,* *lamdát*, *lamdú*, and *lamdá*; the Assyrian distinguishing the gender in the third person plural; as the Arabic and Syriac do, but the Hebrew does not. The Assyrian tense of which I am speaking is used to denote *state*, or continued or habitual action. Transient action, whether past, present, or future, is denoted by some tense, the persons of which have the preformatives of what is called the Hebrew future. There are four such tenses in each conjugation.

10th June, 1854.

* Or *lamíd*; both are used, and, as it appears to me, indiscriminately.