Santeri Junttila, ed., *Contacts between the Baltic and Finnic Languages.* (Uralica Helsingiensia, 7.) Helsinki: Finno-Ugrian Society, 2015. 300 pp.
ISBN 978-952-5667-67-7

Reviewed by Johanna Laakso, Universität Wien

The old Indo-European loanword strata in Finnic have been the subject of intensive research, especially since Vilhelm Thomsen's (1890) groundbreaking work. Both the Finnic languages and their Baltic and Germanic neighbours are well researched and documented, and their respective proto-languages are reconstructible in great detail. Both the Baltic and the Germanic stratum in Proto-Finnic are also very rich and bear witness to intensive language contacts. Therefore, not only the mechanisms of borrowing, adaptation and substitution, but also the sociolinguistic and ethno-cultural aspects of these prehistoric interethnic contact situations have interested many researchers—also because of their central role in research on national prehistories.

At the same time, however, research on Finno-Baltic language contact has been seriously hampered by lack of communication, as only a few linguists know both Finn(o-Ugric) and Baltic languages or have contacts to both Finno-Ugristic and Baltological research communities. Furthermore, both Finno-Ugristics and Baltologists have suffered from certain national biases; many central research results have only been published in national languages, while sometimes less well-founded ideas, published in a more accessible language, have been widely read and quoted by "outsider" linguists unable to assess their validity (Mańczak's (1990) hypothesis of a Uralic substratum in Proto-Baltic—see below—is one of the best examples.) Now it is to be hoped that times are changing. This edited volume both summarizes some central results of the national research traditions, addressing their achievements and problems, and presents new approaches to some individual issues.

The editor has recently published an important work on etymological research into old Baltic loanwords in Finnic and, on a more general level, on assessing the accumulation of knowledge in the history of etymology (Junttila 2015). In the first article of this volume (pp. 12–37), 'Proto-Finnic loanwords in the Baltic languages?', he surveys the other side of the language-contact situation. Thomsen in his time had found no

evidence of Finnic loanwords in Baltic beyond fairly recent Livonian and Estonian borrowings in Latvian, part of which had even spread to Samogitian (Low Lithuanian). Despite this skepticism, numerous researchers have since then presented a number of more or less speculative etymologies. Paul Ariste, the most influential Finno-Ugricist in post-World War II Soviet Estonia, managed to add to the confusion with his obscure hints at possible but unresearched Finnic loans in Baltic, while many Finnish linguists in the era of "disfavour of loanword research" (Junttila 2015, 20–21) throughout most of the 20th century were eager to find Finno-Ugric etymologies for all Finnic-Baltic etyma for which no Indo-European origin had been unequivocally proven. The situation was further worsened by Bednarczuk's widely-quoted articles in the 1970s (Bednarczuk 1976; 1977), in which a Finno-Ugric origin was proposed for almost fifty Baltic or Balto-Slavic words. As Junttila shows in his article, most of these etymologies are fatally flawed. This is often due to Bednarczuk's lacking expertise in Finno-Ugric, but in some cases, there are also fundamental problems with the Baltic reconstructions themselves. After a critical analysis, only five possible old Finn(o-Ugr)ic borrowings in Baltic remain: Lith. *kadagỹs* 'juniper', *salà* 'island', *šẽškas* 'polecat', *šikšnà* 'belt, leather', and Latv. *cimds* 'glove' (in which the sequence *-mT-* instead of Late Proto-Finnic *-nt-* indicates an early reconstruction level on the Finno-Ugric side). Only one of them seems to have a wider distribution in Uralic: the 'polecat', Finnish dial. *häähkä* with some suggested cognates up to Samoyedic, denoting diverse mustelids (polecat, European mink, otter). The others, and possibly the 'polecat' as well, should rather be interpreted as either Baltic loanwords in Finnic or parallel borrowings from an unknown (Palaeo-European?) source.

The question of early Finno-Ugric influence on Baltic is also addressed by Jan Henrik Holst ('On the theory of a Uralic substratum in Baltic', pp. 151–173). The author seems to have a predilection for bold and blunt statements: he seems convinced or at least tempted to believe that Thracian was essentially a Southern Baltic language, or that North African influences explain at least part of the characteristics of Insular Celtic. Furthermore, while criticizing the hypothesis of the Uralic substratal origins for the lack of the number distinction in Baltic 3rd-person forms, he draws the hasty conclusion that the lack of number distinction in Estonian *on* be.3SG/3PL might be due to Baltic influence—this is contradicted by Estonian dialects, in particular, South (Võro) Estonian (*om* be.3SG ~

ommaq be.3PL). Despite these details which might arouse some suspicions in a critical reader, the main tenets of the article are easy to agree with: Mańczak's hypothesis that there was a Uralic substratum in Proto-Baltic (and that this substratum caused the split of Balto-Slavic) does not hold, and its arguments can be refuted one by one. The loss of the neuter gender in East Baltic has taken place in many other IE languages, too (and a Uralic substratum would rather cause a complete loss of gender, as in the Tamian dialects of Latvian). The Lithuanian local cases and the markers of evidentiality in Southern Finnic represent developments far more recent than Proto-Baltic. The Lithuanian numerals 11–19 ending in *-lika* (from *likti* 'remain, leave') rather parallel the Germanic *eleven* and *twelve* (also reflecting the verb 'leave') than the Finnic *-toista/-teist* etc. ('of the second (ten)'). The Lithuanian imperative suffix *-k* is similar to the Finnic **-k,* but this single similarity may be coincidental. Similarly, the proposed Uralic etymologies for Baltic hydronyms are questionable, and Bednarczuk's Uralic etymology for the Baltic word for 'amber' has already received devastating criticism in Junttila's article in this volume. The Baltic doublet lexemes with voiced/voiceless stops (e.g. Lith. *blekai/plekai*) may be due to later contacts with Livonian or Livonian-substrate dialects of Latvian. The use of the genitive in language designations (as in *lietuvių kalba* "the language of Lithuanians") also occurs in Finnic, but there, the genitive singular is used. Finally, Holst argues that the lack of singular/plural distinction in Baltic 3rd-person verb forms can be explained as an extension of the collective-like syntactic behaviour of IE neuter plurals. To sum up, the idea of a Uralic substratum in Proto-Baltic is completely unfounded (whereas there really is strong evidence of a more recent Finnic substratum in Latvian).

Laimute Balode's article 'Criteria for identifying possible Finnicisms in Latvian toponymy' (pp. 49–73) is an attempt to systematize the seemingly chaotic diversity of purported Finnic elements in Latvian place names. The author convincingly argues that Finnic toponyms or elements can best be identified by way of lexical criteria, and that "secondary Finnicisms", that is, toponyms derived in Latvian from lexemes which are borrowed from Finnic, should be kept apart from Finnic-origin toponyms in the proper sense. Morphological criteria are more problematic than lexical ones, and sadly enough, as no regular phonological patterns in the adaptation of Finnic loans into Latvian have been identified yet, very little can be stated about the history and chronology of the Finnic-origin toponyms.

Of the Finnic language varieties, the only one surviving until our days which is clearly marked by more recent contacts with Baltic (i.e. Latvian) is Livonian. Riho Grünthal's 'Livonian at the crossroads of language contacts' (pp. 97–150) is an informative survey of the history of Livonian and its contacts with the other languages of the region, so rich in details which illustrate the sociolinguistic contexts of language contact that the reader at some points may have difficulties in following the logic of the text. Nevertheless, this knowledgeable article is a must-read for any linguist interested in the evolution and sociohistory of the Southern Finnic language varieties.

Alongside these surveys or analyses of wider issues, the book also includes articles with a more narrow scope but central relevance for the study of Finnic-Baltic contacts. Petri Kallio (pp. 38–48) analyses a single etymology (presented in passing by the late Jorma Koivulehto), the name of the river Gauja (in Latvia), borrowed into (Southern) Finnic as *Koiva*. The metathesis *-uj-* > *-jw-* indicates an early borrowing and raises interesting questions concerning the expansion of Finnic to present-day Northern Latvia in the first centuries AD. On the Indo-European side, the name can be reconstructed (following Wolfgang Schmid) as **ǵʰou-iH-eh$_2$* 'the pouring one', with a somewhat unexpected *g* reflex. Thus, Kallio ends up speculating about an early IE *centum* substrate dialect which might also have been the source of the oldest, so-called Pre-Germanic loanwords in Finnic.

A morphosyntactic feature often mentioned as an example of areal or contact-induced developments in the Circum-Baltic region is the correspondence of the Finnic partitive and the Baltic partitive genitive in constructions expressing indefinite amount or number (Lith. *ateina svečių* [GEN.PL], Fin. *vieraita* [PART.PL] *tulee* '(some) guests come') or "indefiniteness" in an existential sentence. In her article (pp. 174–204), Marja Leinonen compares existential sentences in Finnish literary texts and their Lithuanian translations. Her data indicate that the Lithuanian partitive genitive expresses a more strict quantificational indefiniteness ("not all") in contrast to the more open semantics of the Finnish partitive ("not necessarily all"). From a diachronic perspective, the conclusion—that despite the similar semantic potential and possible common roots of the phenomenon, the Finnish partitive plays a central and even expanding role in syntax, while in Lithuanian the use of the partitive genitive is more marginal and shrinking—seems plausible. This finding contrasts interestingly with

Leinonen's initial statement that Lithuanian and Finnish as the "presumed most archaic representatives of the Baltic linguistic continuum" would offer the best point of comparison.

A related issue is investigated by Maija Tervola (pp. 205–245), also on the basis of comparisons between Finnish literary texts and their Lithuanian translations. The Finnic partitive also corresponds to the Lithuanian genitive as the case of a non-total object, as in *Söin omenaa* [PART] / *Aš pavalgiau obuolio* [GEN] 'I ate some of the apple'. Despite this basic similarity, there are numerous differences between the systems; these are already relatively well known, but Tervola's study points out and illustrates them in more detail. (For instance, both in Lithuanian and in Finnish, genitive/partitive objects occur in negated clauses, but in Lithuanian only standard negation triggers the genitive, whereas in Finnish the use of the partitive is obligatory also in connection with semantic negation, for example, in the sentence 'They refused to marry *him*'.) As in Leinonen's article, it becomes evident that the role of the partitive-genitive in Lithuanian is more marginal and restricted, and the genitive as object case seems to be giving way to the accusative. Tervola also reflects on the attempts to explain the development of the Finnic partitive objects by Baltic influence. The question whether this contact-induced development in Finnic represented "intervention" or "convergence" remains open.

Merlijn de Smit (pp. 246–271) explores the history of the "agented participles" in Finnic and Baltic. Both language groups know passive participle constructions with genitive agents (Finnish ***isän*** *rakentama talo* ~ Estonian ***isa*** *ehitatud maja* ~ Latvian ***tēva*** *celtā māja* 'the house built by the father', lit. "father's built house"), and in both language groups the participles are built with phonologically similar suffixes (Finnic **-mA-*, **-(t)tU,* Baltic **-mo, *-to*). Although the suffixes themselves are ancient and rather inherited on both sides than borrowed in either direction, their phonological similarity may have played a role in the process which led to the emergence of agented **-(t)tU* participles in Finnic—unlike the all-Uralic **-mA* participles, they are a Finnic innovation—and, more generally, the evolution of active/passive diathesis in Finnic may have been influenced by Baltic or Balto-Slavic.

In the last article of the volume, Outi Duvallon and Hélène de Penanros (pp. 272–299) apply A. Culioli's "Theory of Enunciative and Predicative Operations" to Finnish and Lithuanian data. They analyse the uses of 'from' elements—the Finnish case endings *-tA* (partitive, historically:

"separative") and *-stA* (elative, historically containing the partitive/separative ending), and the Lithuanian prefix or preposition *iš*. The semantics of these elements is often brought back to a concrete "movement away from" component, from which the more abstract or grammaticalized uses can be derived. Instead of this, the authors argue for a model with a "Semantic Form", an abstract device which describes the relation between two entities and the "relator", viz. *-(t)A* or *iš*. Understanding the profit or relevance of this model is somewhat challenging: to put it bluntly, the point seems to be that instead of locational and spatial relationships, semantic properties should be described in terms of part-whole relations.

While the article by Duvallon and de Penanros, without any obvious connection to the Finnic-Baltic language contacts, seems a little out of place, I must finally confess that the contribution by Pauls Balodis (pp. 74–96) was for me the most baffling one in this otherwise very interesting and informative book. Balodis examines Latvian surnames of Finnic origin, on the basis of data collected from the telephone directory of the city of Rīga. Beyond the fairly obvious conclusion that part of these names belong to persons of Estonian or Finnish extraction while others are formed from toponyms or other Latvian words of Finnic origin, it is very difficult to understand the motivation or the relevance of this article.

Despite the slight heterogeneity and some very minor stylistic issues (the book left the creeping suspicion that some articles would have profited from a more careful English language revision), this volume deserves to be recommended to all readers interested in the history of Finnic-Baltic language contacts or even the history of the Finnic and Baltic languages in general. It serves as a very helpful introduction to some central issues—about which outdated and erroneous information is still being circulated. Moreover, it makes the reader wish that some day, an up-to-date and more exhaustive survey of the history of Finnic-Baltic contacts might appear.

Joanna Laakso
Universität Wien
Institut für Europäische und Vergleichende Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft
Abteilung Finno-Ugristik
Spitalgasse 2-4 Hof 7, A-1090 Wien, Austria
johanna.laakso@univie.ac.at

References

Bednarczuk, Leszek. 1976. Zapożyczenia ugrofińskie w językach bałtosłowiańskich. *Acta Baltico-Slavica* 9, 39–64.

Bednarczuk, Leszek. 1977. Etnolingvistiniai santykiai priešistorinėje Šiaurės rytų Europoje. *Baltistica* II priedas, 7–14.

Junttila, Santeri. 2015. *Tiedon kumuloituminen ja trendit lainasanatutkimuksessa: kantasuomen balttilaislainojen tutkimushistoria* [The Accumulation of Information and Tendencies in the Study of Loanwords. The Research History of Baltic Loans in Proto-Finnic]. PhD thesis, University of Helsinki. Helsinki: University of Helsinki. http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-951-51-1842-4

Mańczak, Witold. 1990. La communauté balto-slave a-t-elle existé? *Baltistica* 26, 29–38.

Thomsen, Vilhelm. 1890. *Beröringer mellem de finske og de baltiske (litauisk-lettiske) sprog: en sproghistorisk undersøgelse*. København: Blanco Lunos.