Finnisch-Ugrische Mitteilungen

Introduction
The first impression one has of this book is very favourable indeed. There are plenty of across-the-board books on the Scandinavian and Slavic languages, fewer on Baltic and Finnic, but a book like this, which not only affords an overview of the individual languages but also of their mutual contacts is wellcome indeed. It was thus with great anticipation that I started perusing these two beautifully printed volumes. The price, € 270, is, however, absurdly high, and probably places it out of reach of most people.

The title “Circum-Baltic Languages”, though not (yet) a current term, is more or less self-explanatory, as it refers to the languages spoken around the Baltic Sea. As Dahl and Koptjevskaja-Tamm say, it is difficult to delineate these languages, as how far from the coast should one go? Polish, Kashubian, German or Saami do not get any treatment whatsoever, and so the Circum-Baltic (henceforth: CB) area in the present volumes seems to be limited to the northern side of the Baltic, though strangely the book deals with the Romany of northern Russia, strictly speaking not a CB language.

As the subtitle “Typology and Contact” makes clear it is not intended to be a simple descriptive handbook of the languages spoken in the area, but goes beyond this to include contact situations and grammatical phenomena in a typological perspective. It thus intends to give an areal and typological overview of the CB languages, not easy to do with the number of languages involved. Inevitably choices had to be made, but these were not always felicitous. As much of the material on these languages is only available in lesser-known languages information on them is hard to obtain not only due to the language barrier but also often to the regrettable unavailability of published material outside the CB area. Germanic and Slavic languages are known well enough, and it is thus especially thrilling to see the other languages of the area get some international attention, even the very smallest like Livonian and Karaim.

The main aim as stated is “General typologists and specialists in Baltic, Finno-Ugric, Slavic and Germanic languages will all perceive the goals of the areal study of CB-languages differently. The present pair of volumes represents the first major attempt to reconcile those differences” (vol I, XVI).
It is of course impossible to satisfy all these specialists with two books, but maybe more care could have been taken with the unification of the text. One often gets the impression that the authors did not consult each other. Ethnonyms are spelt differently in different chapters and common phenomena, possibly of interest to the areal linguists and the typologists, are not pointed out.

The two volumes are divided into three parts: vol. I (Past and Present): “Survey of selected Circum-Baltic languages and language varieties”, “Early history of the Circum-Baltic languages” and “Contact phenomena in minor Circum-Baltic languages” and vol. II (Grammar and typology): “selected topics in the grammar of the Circum-Baltic languages”, “Typological perspectives” and a final lengthy “Synthesis”.

**Volume I**

In part I of the first volume the Baltic languages, Russian as spoken in the Baltics, Swedish and Finnic are described. These surveys are of varying quality: the chapters on Latvian and Lithuanian by Holvoet and Baluode (misprinted as “Halmode” on page XVII) are wonderfully concise overviews with extra emphasis on the dialects, much better than I have seen elsewhere. A single complaint is that often statements of the type “Endzelin writes”, “other explanations have been proposed” or “some dialects retain the genitive” occur, where I would have liked to see some more concrete information. One may object that in a general book like this one should not clutter up the text too much, but then again this is a specialised enough subject where such careful book-keeping is useful for further reference, as many of the possible readers (if not buyers) will be specialists in one or more of the language groups mentioned here. Overall though, these are excellent articles which mention foreign influence where likely (mostly Finnic, Holvoet and Baluode write “Baltic Finnic”, though Laakso has “Finnic” in her article, and this now seems to be accepted usage. Why did the editors not unify this?), neither do they shy away from touching on unsolved questions.

The article on Latvian (pp. 3–40) starts off with an overview of the peculiarities that separate Latvian from Lithuanian, its formation and substratal, adstratal and external influences. The phoneme system1 is succinctly described, with an excursion on the syllabic tones or accents, of which the standard language theoretically has three, but which actually have merged into two in most dialects. A detailed discussion of the three main dialect groups forms the main body of the article. Interesting is how strongly Finnic has influenced certain Tamian dialects, to the extent that gender has virtually disappeared. Not all Tamian peculiarities, however, can be ascribed to Finnic influence: use of the nominative or accusative with the quantifier daudz ‘much, many’

---

1 Holst (2001: 63) recently claimed that Latvian is a three-quantity language.
where literary Latvian has the partitive genitive, cannot be due to either Livonian or Estonian, unless one thinks of attributive agreement constructions like Est. päljus-NOMPL laevad-NOMPL ‘many boats’. In “deep” High Latvian we find an /ĩ/, a high centralized vowel similar to Russian ù and Polish y. As Laakso says in her article (p. 184) a higher mid vowel (ĩ) is also found in dialects of Karelian, Veps, Ingrian, Votian and Estonian. They are not always phonetically exactly the same as the Russian ù, but they are very close and these sounds are found only along the Russian-Finnic border, sometimes in Russian loanwords only (Valdai Karelian, Votic). It is also found in eastern Lithuanian (p. 60). As Holvoet and Baluode (p. 36) put it: “… the deep High Latvian dialects have achieved a short vowel system identical with the vowel system of the neighbouring Slavonic languages (Polish, Russian and Byelorussian).” A reference to Finnic and Baltic Romany (where it is also found: see Kochanowski 1963: 36) could have enlarged the picture. A similar case is High Latvian velarized /ɩ/ which sometimes occurs as vocalized /u/ (which occurs also in Lithuanian and Byelorussian). In Veps, the easternmost Finnic language, it is also commonly found, and this has been explained as influence from Russian (Tunkelo 1946: 437). The shift from /a/ to /o/ in High Latvian has also been ascribed to Slavic influence (Summent 1950: 41–42; Shevelov 1964: 387).

The article on Lithuanian and its dialects (pp. 41–79) is of equal usefulness. The build-up is slightly different to that of the Latvian one, with a section on adstrata, substrata and external influences. Phonemic inventory and prosodic features are briefly handled and give way to an extensive overview of the dialects. Finnic influence is much slighter in Lithuanian, though for example the series of local cases, often thought to be formed on the model of the Finnic local cases, are more common in Old Lithuanian and dialects than in Latvian. Slavic influence is stronger (Polish, Byelorussian and Russian) and Holvoet and Baluode do an admirable job in mentioning this where applicable.

For the chapters on Latvian and Lithuanian the titles “The Latvian language and its dialects”, “The Lithuanian language and its dialects” could have been more aptly named “The Latvian dialects” and “The Lithuanian dialects”, as there is hardly any information on the actual nuts and bolts of the language, unlike for example Laakso’s review of the Finnic languages.

Valerij Čekmonas is represented in the first volume with three articles on Russian in the CB area: the first one deals with urban Russian in Vilnius, Riga and Tallinn, though only in the 19th century, the second with rural dialects, and the third with CB features in the northwestern Russian dialect area.

2 Similarly, Ariste (1930: 367) mentions how due to Estonian influence Russ. /ə/ was replaced by /i/ in the poluvernik dialect of Russian in north-eastern Estonia.
The fact that Čekmonas (pp. 81–99) only describes the urban Russian of the 19th century and does not go further than 1897 (using data from the All-Russia census of that year) is a shame. It is necessarily based on written sources and these of course only rarely reflect the spoken language to any degree of accuracy. Čekmonas is of course well aware of this and has done his best to dig up newspaper articles and books where a description of e.g. Vilnius Russian as actually spoken is given, with its elements of Polish, Byelorussian and even Yiddish (Čekmonas: “Jewish”). Riga Russian is described less thoroughly (the many misprints and mistakes, cited literature not in the bibliography is here especially bothersome), Tallinn Russian is dashed off in less than two pages (cf. nearly nine for Vilnius Russian), though of course Russian indeed did have only a modest role in Tallinn in the 19th century.

Much new material has appeared now on the Russian spoken in the Baltics, and though the differences as compared to Russian spoken in Russia are often exaggerated, there is still plenty of material that could have been worth mentioning. After the break-up of the Soviet Union and the following decrease of the status of the Russian language research on urban Russian as spoken in the Baltic states has been in an upswing; a series with the title Язык диаспоры appears in Tartu, where specialists from all three Baltic countries regularly contribute articles on the new urban “diaspora” Russian. In this first article Čekmonas is too categorical: his claim that Russian was the main source of lexical loans for all the local autochthonous languages and dialects does not hold.

Čekmonas’ article on the Russian of the Old Believers in the Baltics (pp. 101–136) is very useful, though here there are very many typographical errors, ones that those not familiar at all with the CB languages may find hard to spot: Ijzaku > Isaku, Peipsijarve > Lake Peipsi, Finnish > Finnic, Vodish > Votian (as Laakso p. 182). Many of these are due to careless transliteration from Russian, but careful editing should have seen to these slip-ups.

Čekmonas gives a detailed sketch of the phonetic, morphological and syntactical peculiarities of the Old Believer dialects in the Baltics. These dialects originated mostly in the Pskov-Novgorod area. Because of their isolation they have not been influenced by the surrounding languages to any great degree; neither did the Old Believers have much contact with Russian itself: they had good contacts with Protestants and Catholics, but tended to avoid the Orthodox (p. 105). Registered as “foreigners” by the Tsarist censor they were even known due to their strange looks and aberrant Russian as чухны (a derogatory Russian term used for Estonians and other Finnic peoples) when selling produce in Leningrad (Berg 1999: 364). According to Čekmonas the language of the Old Believers in Lithuania started to lose its specific peculiarities after the Second World War, when their children started going to
state schools and mixed marriages increased. Čekmonas emphasises that the Polish of Latgalia has not been studied at all.

In Čekmonas’ third article (pp. 339–359) in this volume he deals with CB features in the Pskov-Novgorod dialect. This is in fact not one dialect but a group of dialects: the Novgorod dialect is characterised by źkañe, Pskov by akañe. The dialect of Gdov is a transitional dialect. When exactly the East Slavs arrived in this area is still a matter of debate, estimates range from the 6th century AD to the 9th. What is certain is that there were Finno-Ugric tribes there when the Slavs arrived; the substrate influence of the Finnic languages spoken by these now mostly assimilated peoples Čekmonas attempts to find in Novgorod-Pskov Russian. Cokañe (merger of č and c into c) and šokañe (mixing and alternation of soft and hard sibilants) are the main phonetic peculiarities that have been ascribed to Finnic influence. Interestingly, Čekmonas mentions that a similar phenomenon to šokañe occurs in northeastern Lithuania, which he claims cannot be due to Latvian influence, but could also be of Finnic origin. According to Kazys Morkūnas (in Ambrazas et al. 1999: 622–623), though, it is due to a Sengallian substrate. Čekmonas is well aware of the general attitude (still) prevailing in Russian linguistics that non-Russian and substrate influences are not generally evoked to explain unusual or odd forms and that a “Russian” or “Slavic” explanation is generally preferred, but he makes a likely case for a Finnic substrate being the cause of some of the particular features of these northwestern Russian dialects. Regrettably there are many typo’s and slip-ups in this chapter: the poluvcery (> Est. poluvertsik, puluvernik) did not live in the south-eastern Pečory (Est. Petseri) area, but in north-eastern Alutaguse; “Finnish” is used where “Finnic” is meant; there is no phoneme č in Estonian, there is no Stoßton in Estonian dialects, “Endzelins 1922” (“Endzelin” in the 1922 German-language Latvian grammar, but “Endzelins” in the 1951 Latvian-language edition) is not mentioned in the references etc.

Anne-Charlotte Rendahl’s article on Swedish dialects (pp. 137–177) is divided into three main sections: an overview of the standard divisions of the Swedish dialects, a more detailed sketch of the Trans-Baltic dialects (Swedish in Finland and Estonia) and lastly a review of characteristic features of the Swedish dialects. There is still little research on the syntax of Swedish dialects and Rendahl’s overview, to her regret, is based mainly on phonological and morphological descriptions. Rendahl suggests a new division of the Swedish dialects in Southern, Eastern, Western, Northern and Trans-Baltic. Northern dialects have been and still are in contact with Saami and Finnish, whilst practically all speakers of Swedish in Estonia left for Sweden during the Second World War. Rendahl’s useful description of the Trans-Baltic dialects makes hardly any mention of possible Finnish or Estonian influence. A candi-
date for Saami influence might be the use of adjective compounding instead of a noun phrase with an adjective attribute in Northern Swedish: *storphästen* 'the big horse'. According to Riedler (2000: 80–82) this may be the result of a Saami substrate.

Johanna Laakso’s chapter on the Finnic languages (pp. 179–212) is a model of conciseness and clarity. After a quick overview of the number of speakers (where her numbers are perhaps higher for the smaller languages than is the case) and the distribution she describes the salient features of these languages briefly put pithily, using examples from the smaller languages where appropriate; for many “Finnic” seems to be synonymous with “Finnish” (regrettably for certain other authors in the these volumes), and the fact that e.g. Yeps or Livonian, though closely related and in many ways similar, are not identical to Finnish is thankfully emphasized. Here again we see that there has been little co-operation between the authors of the various chapters: Laakso mentions the use of the plural for certain body parts or garments where a reference to the Koptjevskaja-Tamm’s and Wälchli’s case study of pluralia tantum in the second volume would have been logical. Luckily for us Laakso does not restrict herself to giving us a handbook-style overview of the languages but also brings up phenomena on which there is as yet no consensus: e.g. is there a fourth phonological quantity in Estonian, what is the origin of the indirect mood in Estonian and Livonian (< Baltic or v. v. ?); she also often notes what still needs to be done: more research on the influence of Saami and Komi on the northern Finnic languages; is the infrequent use of compound tenses in eastern Finnic languages due to Russian influence or is it an archaic feature? There are still many such questions, and Laakso, to our benefit, asks many of them.

Östen Dahl (pp. 215–235) comes with a new theory: the Common Nordic Hypothesis, which states that a “Proto-Nordic” (also known as Ancient Scandinavian) was spoken in most of Scandinavia practically up to the Viking age and from which the Scandinavian languages then descended, is wrong. Dahl assumes the opposite: Germanic-speaking peoples arrived in what is now northern Germany and in Denmark some 2000 years ago; whilst they slowly moved north into Scandinavia proper, assimilating any non-Germanic speakers there, their language split up and differentiated, but with the emergence of Denmark as a strong regional power (the role of the Målar provinces in Sweden was perhaps less important than previously assumed) the language of the local ruling class there spread and homogenized those now differentiated language(s). Only later did these then split up again into the present Scandinavian languages, whose differences are in fact still small. Dahl supports his claim by showing the unequal spread of runic inscriptions in southern Scandinavia.
Sometimes it seems as if the influence of the Baltic languages on Finnic is limited to the lexicon. There are many studies on Baltic loanwords in Finnic languages, and apart from some work on later Latvian influence on Livonian and South Estonian there has been no real research done, for two reasons, according to Lars-Gunnar Larsson in his article on Baltic influence on Finnic languages (pp. 237–253): there are few specialists with knowledge of both Baltic and Finnic languages, and the contacts of Baltic with Proto-Finnic go back more than 2000 years, before contacts of Finnic with Germanic and East Slavic. Baltic loanwords in Saami that show no traces of Finnic sound changes cannot have been borrowed via Finnic and were probably borrowed during a common source language of Saami and Finnic. On the other hand Larsson also suggests that Posti’s hypothesis of Baltic influence causing the Finnic ti > si shift is unlikely, as at least in Lithuanian the palatalization of ti, di to ti, d'i is no older than some 700 years. Larsson also attempts to show that syntactical influence is likely Finnic: if many loanwords indicate that there was very strong contact between Balts and Finnic-speakers (cf. Fin. morsian ‘bride’, reisi ‘thigh’, heimo ‘tribe’) then why claim that Baltic and Finnic syntactical similarities are due to chance? The similarity in form and function between the Finnish agent participle ending -ma and the Lithuanian present passive participle -mas (sg.nom.masc.) is also no coincidence according to Larsson: cf. Fin. isän ostama auto ~ Lith. tévo perkamas automobilis ‘the car bought by father’. The -mA participle ending in Finnish has cognates in other Uralic languages (where these cognate forms have a wider use and have often been influenced by Turkic languages) but in Mordvin too, contrary to Larsson’s claim; e.g. the so-called infinitive participle in -ma, though usually expressing necessity, does not always do so: Erzja Mordvin ejkakštnē peľema učitel’ničaś tosol’ child-PL.DEF.GEN fear-PP teacher-DEF there-be-PRET.SG3, ‘the teacher whom the children are afraid of, was there’ (Bartens 1999: 152). Larsson assumes that Baltic has influenced the Finnish form; why the -ma agential participle is restricted to Finnish and is not found in any other Finnic language is left unexplained. Larsson also calls the ma-participle the only true passive in Finnish, contrasting the pair Kalle ostaa auton Kalle-NOM buy-PRES.SG3 car-ACC.SG. ‘Kalle buys a car’ and Auto on Kallen ostama car-NOM.SG be-PRES.SG3 Kalle-GEN.SG buy-AG.PP ‘The car is bought by Kalle’. Not all of Larsson’s ideas are equally convincing, but he is of course

3 Larsson seems to be unaware that Schmalstieg (1980: 210) had the same idea more than twenty years ago: “Since the Finnish syntactic construction with -ma plus the genitive is limited to Baltic Finnic one might assume such constructions to reflect the influence of Indo-European Baltic on Finnic. On the other hand it could be argued that such constructions derive from Proto-Uralic and were lost in the other Uralic languages because they lacked the reinforcement of the parallel constructions in Indo-European.” Liukkonen (1994) also dedicated an article to the same subject.
right in saying that Baltic-Finnic contacts have been neglected in favour of Germanic- and Slavic-Finnic contacts. This is to be expected if one compares their intensity, but there is a dearth of scholars at home in both language groups.

In the eastern CB area Russian has influenced practically every language spoken there, some more (Karelian, Veps), some less (Livonian). Stefan Pugh’s brief article (pp. 257–270) focuses on Russian influence on the lexicon, phonology and morphology of Karelian. Pugh mentions the fact that Karelian and Veps have borrowed verbal prefixes from Russian and abstracted them, so that they can also sometimes occur in native verbs. In Veps one finds pere- and do-, in Karelian pere-: Veps do-panda ‘place as far as’, Karelian pere-katsella ‘look at or examine thoroughly’. These prefixes are, as in Russian, bound morphemes and thus unlike the Estonian verbal particles, which are free and must sometimes be placed separate from the verb as in German (on the model of which many Estonian verbal particles have been calqued). In a collection of Veps texts, however, there is a possible example from Šimgalv where the prefix is found behind the verb: poigaze ivan têgi do kuřikon ‘his son Ivan finished making the bat’ (Kettunen – Siro 1935: 105), cf. Russian доделать ‘to finish’.4

Russian verbs borrowed into Karelian are fully adapted and participate in derivational processes, but there is nothing unusual in this. More interesting is the fact that in borrowed verbs with prefixes it is the front-back colouration of the prefix vowel and not the vowel in the verb itself which determines the colouration of the desinential vowels: pere-živ-i-imō ‘we survive’ but u-id'i-u ‘s/he leaves’. /e/ and /i/ are generally neutral in Karelian, but compare dervi-i-i ‘burst’.

Csató (pp. 271–283) treats a similar topic, syntactic code-copying in the Lithuanian or Troki (Lith. Trakai) dialect Karaim, a little-known Turkic language of the Kipchak branch spoken in Lithuania, Ukraine and formerly in the Crimea. In 1397 (1392 according to Karaite tradition) Jewish Karaites from the Crimea were settled in Trakai by the Lithuanian Grand Duke Vytautas. Hundreds of years of being surrounded by Slavic languages (Polish, Russian, Byelorussian) and Lithuanian has left many traces on the language, and it may profitably be compared to for example Gagauz, where Slavic influence (Bulgarian, Russian, Ukrainian) has also been very strong. Csató uses the concept of “code-copying”, where “elements of one code are copied and the copies inserted into another code”. As she admits this is just another term for “borrowing” or “interference” and I fail to see the benefits of using this term. The examples Csató gives from Karaim can all be described with other terms;

4 The example is uncertain because do could be a misprint for d'o ‘already’, though Šimgalv Veps would have go here and not d'o (SVJa 98).
maybe the only benefit of "code-copying" is that it is an umbrella expression that can be used for anything and everything, but if this is useful is another question. In her conclusion Csató mentions the syntactic convergence between Karaim and the dominant languages in the area, but there is in fact no convergence: Karaim has not influenced Polish, Russian or Lithuanian to any degree whatsoever.5

Yiddish, together with Romany and Karaim, is one of the younger languages in the area, and since the Second World War and the murder of most of its speakers it has had a very minimal role in the area. Neil Jacobs' contribution (pp. 285–311) is a compact but very informative overview of Yiddish in the eastern Baltic region. Jacobs takes us from Yiddish via Eastern Yiddish to the dialects spoken in the eastern Baltic such as zameter Yiddish, Stam-Litvish and Suvalker Yiddish, which are subsumed under North-Eastern Yiddish (NEY). The first half of the article is a general description of NEY. Most of the differences between Eastern Yiddish (EY) and NEY are due to internal developments, though for example the loss of the neuter gender is thought to be due to Lithuanian or Byelorussian influence. There are of course many loanwords from the local languages in NEY (and some from NEY in the local languages), but perhaps more interesting in the contact linguistic context are forms such as the Lithuanian Yiddish vašnijdik 'washing oneself', where the reflexive pronoun ziš is suffixed directly to the verb (cf. non-NEY vašndik ziš or ziž vašndik) under the influence of Lithuanian, where the reflexive particle is placed between the verb and the suffix. In Lithuanian Yiddish the Lithuanian suffix -s has been abstracted from loanwords and is a productive suffix in its own right: kamatsis 'cheapskate' (cf. standard Yiddish kantsn 'id.' ). Jacobs' comparison with a similar suffix in Swedish (Sw. kändis 'celebrity' < känd 'known') is confusing: as he admits in an endnote he does not know if Sw. -is and Lith. -ys are somehow related. It is anyhow unlikely. Jacobs emphasizes that more research needs to be done: though the influence of the local languages in the eastern CB area has never been as strong on Yiddish as that of Slavic, study of CB Yiddish can still offer us valuable insights.7

One may ask why the North Russian Romany dialect (NRRD) merits a chapter (pp. 313–337) in the book (author: Aleksandr Rusakov), as Russia is only in the widest sense part of the Circum-Baltic. Instead of this Romany dialect it would perhaps have been more pertinent to describe the extinct dialect of the Laiuse (Lajenge) Rom in Estonia, West-Baltic Romany spoken in

---

5 Unless at idiolect level.
6 Finnish has borrowed and abstracted -is from Swedish.
7 With thanks to R. Nieuweboer (Tallinn, Estonia) for comments on the Yiddish section.
northern Latvia and Estonia (the northern subdialect) and in southern Latvia (the southern subdialect), East-Baltic (spoken in eastern Latvia) and Finnish and Swedish Romany, instead of relegating them to a footnote (p. 334). Laiuse Romany* for example borrowed wholesale from Estonian, even the distinctive tri-length system was taken over (Ariste 1940: 13), just like West-Baltic Romany developed syllabic tones, probably triggered by Latvian (Ariste 1978: 6–7) and vowel harmony has spread from Finnish to Finnish Romany, though it has not fully adopted it yet (Granqvist 1999: 42). Laiuse Romany is not completely extinct as many believe, so there is no reason why it should not merit inclusion, but there is not even any mention of the more vibrant CB Romany languages, which have had close contact with the canonical CB languages: e.g. Latvian Romany borrowed verbal prefixes from Latvian (Ariste 1973)* much like Ukrainian Romany borrowed them from Ukrainian (Barannikov 1933: 100–101); Rusakov describes “the invasion of Russian verbal prefixes” in NRRD, but could have pointed out the fact that Livonian (de Sivers 1971), Latvian Romany (Ariste 1973) and Estonian dialect islands (Mägiste 1937: 78–81) have borrowed verbal prefixes from Latvian, and Veps from Russian (Mägiste 1937: 82–85). A comparison with Livonian could have been fruitful; in NRRD prefixed and simple forms may occur without difference in meaning: na dyjom ~ na ot-dyjom ‘I did not give’ (pp. 315–316), as in Livonian; compare un vana vel tämpõ õp tieda ku ta un sõnt pettõt ‘Und der Alte weiβ heute noch nicht, daß man ihn betrogen hatte’ with ni tõma iz tul ku tõma un piepjettõt ‘Nun kam er nicht, weil man ihn betrogen hatte’ (de Sivers 1971: 62).10

Volume II

Holvoet, co-author of the articles on Latvian and Lithuanian, also presents a comparison of the impersonals and passives in Baltic and Finnic (pp. 363–389). He shows that certain passive constructions in Latvian and Lithuanian are similar to Finnic constructions. Holvoet uses the term “impersonal” to mean a syntactic type with verbs that express person but with indefinite pronouns (or personal pronouns with indefinite reference) or zero subjects. A typical passive, on the other hand, would have “the promotion of the original object to subject, the shift of the original subject to the status of an optional agent phrase, and a reversal of the pattern of topicalization, with the promotion

of the object reflecting its top读后...”

of “impersonal” is a more appropriate claim that in Estonian the situation hold: most recently Viham (2002) both a passive and an impersonal morphological element: compare read-PAR with the passive lehead read-PAR (Vihman 2002: 2). The construction fulfills all the criteria construction. Once again we find the constructions may differ.

Holvoet also mentions the turn into the active paradigm: cf. colla ‘id.’. In the eastern Finnic langa in the 3rd person plural (cf. Fin. in Lakko in volume I, p. 189), this is for a southern Finnic language: Estonian: siid ‘ulgu’ lähiti liga pigs were wandering about free’ influence has also traditionally plural forms are also commonly räägivad speak-3PL-PRES ‘they

The Latvian passive is similar and Estonian. Holvoet pays part Latvian and Finnic: Latv. no leiv is compared to Est. sini, jaana is around the railway station, etc. Holvoet assumes that the Latvian Livonian has in turn mistranslated plural into a third person singular say, it is said’ and he ends up a properly analyzed without takin

The nominative object in certain šeinas grēbti need-PRES.3SG(hay’) is a well-known occurrence: are two major theories that atten is of Indo-European origin, wit influence; the other assumes a

8 Laiuse Romany is considered a Para-Romany language, i.e. Romany lexicon with grammar borrowed from the local language: cf. Laiuse Rom. romanistel sin tāved ‘Romany’s have children’, cf. Est. mustlastel on lapsed ‘id.’ (Bakker – van der Voort 1991: 28; after Ariste 1940: 14).

9 Fleetingly mentioned in Wâlchli’s article in a footnote.

10 Loss of verbal prefixes also occurs, e.g. in American Hungarian (Fenyvesi 1995: 44–48).

11 “...there does not seem to be s into a passive proper” (Holvoet, Vol.)
of the object reflecting its topicalization” (p. 364). Holvoet also thinks “impersonal” is a more appropriate term for the Finnic “passive”, though his claim that in Estonian the situation is basically similar to Finnish does not hold: most recently Vihman (2002) has emphasized again that Estonian has both a passive and an impersonal, though they both make use of the same morphological elements: compare the impersonal odio loetud be-3SG.IMPERF read-PAR with the passive lehed olid loetud paper-PL.NOM be-3PL.IMPERF read-PAR (Vihman 2002: 2). Thus, contrary to his claim, the Estonian construction fulfills all the criteria Holvoet specifies (p. 366) for a passive construction. Once again we find that Finnic is equated with Finnish, when in fact the constructions may differ substantially.

Holvoet also mentions the tendency of impersonal forms to be integrated into the active paradigm: cf. colloquial Fin. me tehdään ‘we do’ pro me teemme ‘id.’. In the eastern Finnic languages (Karelian, Veps) the impersonal is used in the 3rd person plural (cf. Fin. he ottavat ~ Kar. hūō otekah ‘they take’; see Laakso in volume I, p. 189), this is ascribed to Russian influence. Unusually for a southern Finnic language this also occurs in the Alutaguse dialect of Estonian: siad ’uiguul ’lahiti pig-NOM.PL wander-PASS.IMPERF loose ‘the pigs were wandering about free’ (Pajusalu et al. 2002: 112), but here Russian influence has also traditionally been strong. On the other hand third person plural forms are also commonly used in Finnic as impersonal forms (cf. Est. rāāgivad speak-3PL.PRES ‘they say’).

The Latvian passive is similar in many ways to the constructions in Finnish and Estonian. Holvoet pays particular attention to singular zero subjects in Latvian and Finnic: Latv. no ģejetes redz jūru ‘from here one can see the sea’ is compared to Est. siin. jaama ūmbruses, nāeb ohtui suuri lamakarju ‘Here, around the railway station, one can see great flocks of sheep in the evenings’. Holvoet assumes that the Latvian construction is borrowed from Finnic, and Livonian has in turn mistranslated an impersonally used Latvian third person plural into a third person singular with a zero subject: kītāb ‘s/he says; they say, it is said’ and he ends up stating that the Baltic constructions cannot be properly analyzed without taking Finnic into consideration.

The nominative object in certain impersonal constructions (cf. Lith. reikia šeinas grebti need-PRES.3SG hay-NOM rake-INF ‘It is necessary to rake the hay’) is a well-known occurrence in Finnic, North Russian and Baltic. There are two major theories that attempt to elucidate their origin: one claims that it is of Indo-European origin, with its retention perhaps occasioned by Finnic influence; the other assumes a syntactic borrowing from Finnic. Ambrazas

11 “…there does not seem to be a tendency in Finnic to develop the agentless passive into a passive proper” (Holvoet, Vol. II, 368).
(pp. 391–412) shows that subject function of the nominative in such constructions in Lithuanian points to the first theory being correct for its genesis, but goes on to suggest that these constructions were later re-analyzed due to Finnic influence, probably around the 5–7th centuries AD, when East Baltic tribes moved north to Finnic areas. Similarly use of the construction in North Russian is due to the assimilation of local Finnic tribes. Thus the two theories in fact supplement each other. Ambrazas also assumes the modus relativus, found in Estonian, Livonian and Latvian, is ultimately of Baltic origin, but he does not delve further into this question.

In volume I Rusakov described the use of borrowed verbal prefixes in Northeast Russian Romany in rendering aspect. Bernhard Wälchli’s article (pp. 413–441) is on the parallel development of verb particles in Latvian and Livonian. Baltic preverbs are bound to the verb, in Finnic the verb particles are not. In Finnic these particles are generally thought to be of foreign origin; for Finnish, Estonian and Livonian respectively Swedish, German and Latvian models can usually be found. In the eastern coast of the Baltic presence of verb particles and preverbs ranges from verb particles only (Estonian) via both verb particles and preverbs (Livonian, Latvian) to practically only preverbs (Lithuanian). In Latvian, Livonian and Estonian various nouns have been grammaticalized and now fulfil particle functions. Wälchli also assumes that the tendency of the southern Finnic languages to use verb particles is due to Baltic influence. Later German influence is then secondary. It can be claimed that these are often typologically common developments, but Wälchli tries to show that for many of these we can reasonably assume Latvian influence in Estonian or vice-versa. The development for example of ‘field’ to the.adv.

‘out’ is not uncommon (cf. Basque landa ‘field’ > ‘outside’; Heine – Kuteva 2001: 133), but Wälchli claims that it became the most common adverb for ‘out’ in Lithuanian (laukan, lauk, [laug]), Latvian (laukā), Estonian (välja, väljas) and Salis Livonian (vell, velen). He thinks this generalization suggest common development on the east coast of the Baltic, but the fact that Curonian Livonian does not take part and that in Votic väältä (cognate to Est. vältja and Liv. vell) ‘out’ is also the most common expression (Ariste 1948: 111) suggests that this is actually more common. The origin of the dative in Livonian, the only Finnic language to have one, is still unclear: Wälchli thinks it derives from both the Finnic genitive in -n and the essive in -na, but its lack of adjective-noun agreement makes Nevis’ (1988: 102) suggestion of identical origin with the Estonian terminative more likely. Lack of congruence in Salis-Livonian, where instead of the dative case the allative is used (Lucas 15:11 õud imil o’ kaks puoga one-GEN man-ALL be-IMPERF.3SG two-NOM son-PART ‘There was a man who had two sons’), also points to dative use of the

12 Found in Wiedemann 1861: 352.

allative being of recent origin, positing Wälchli’s article is marred by carelessness and wrong translations. Est.

Following Wälchli is Metsa’s (pp. 64–67) classification of aspect in Estonian from the beginnings of the language, noting that although its origin is Estonian, the major contact language (Swe.) the period of planned change in the 13th century caused a slight decrease. Will this eventually be less?

Thomas Stolz’s contribution (pp. 75–87) introduces a number of topics which are of interest to those who read the earlier authors in these volumes who are reader to the southern CB. This ‘incoherent’ to mean respectively the early stage in the postposition kanssa for the connective: työn kanssa ‘with the job’. Stolz mentions that the Emerphonologization of a postpositional process occurs or has occurred in Finnish (Korhonen 1982: 24) and has been more so is more similar to Estonian as a result of the many Finnish dialects. Usually fully adapted and is not subject to the (e.g. South Est. kilää ‘bath’ from Kukkosi Votic (lehmäkä ‘with father’) and Estonian (Lutske ‘kneading’), Latvian ‘kneading’ may occur with back-vowel -s wheels’). The Saami comitata cognate with the Finnic essive case which is grammaticalized from

13 In Finnish the comitative case is mostly used in intransitives, and

14 Mirrored in the Enets comitata form (Taulu 1966: 107) and the Basque kide ‘companion’ (Heine - Ka
allative being of recent origin, possibly due to Estonian influence. Regrettably Wäschlä’s article is marred by careless editing: I found some 15 typographical errors and wrong translations, Estonian and Finnish being mixed up and so forth.

Following Wäschlä is Metslang’s article (pp. 443–479) on the development of aspect in Estonian with the verbal particle ära. Metslang analyzes literary Estonian from the beginnings until the 1990s, and comes to the conclusion that although its origin is Estonian, use of the particle was strongly influenced by the major contact languages, German and Russian. Interestingly during the period of planned change in the 1920s and 1930s (some) Finnish influence caused a slight decrease. Will the same happen now, now that Russian influence is less?

Thomas Stolz’s contribution (pp. 591–612) deals with the use of the instrumental and comitative cases in CB languages (Stolz is one of the few authors in these volumes who include languages like Danish, German and Polish from the southern CB area). He uses the terms “coherent” and “incoherent” to mean respectively languages which display comitative-instrumental syncretism and those that to do not. E.g. German is coherent, as it uses the preposition mit in both cases: mit dem Mädchen ‘with the girl’ ~ mit Bleistift ‘with pencil’, whilst Finnish is incoherent, as it uses (mostly) the postposition kanssa for the comitative and the adessive case for the instrumental: yrtön kanssa ‘with the girl’ ~ liijykynällä ‘with pencil’.

Stolz mentions that the Estonian comitative -ga is the result of the morphologization of a postposition *kanssa (<kanssas 'people'-INESS). This process occurs or has occurred in most Finnic languages, and though standard Finnish has solely minun kanssani or kanssani for ‘with me’, spoken Finnish is more similar to Estonian with the form mun kaa ~ munkaa ‘id.’, as are many Finnish dialects. Usually this morphologized postposition is not yet fully adapted and is not subject to vowel harmony in those languages that have it (e.g. South Est. küläga7 ‘with a village’); exceptions seem to be Kukkosi Votic (lehmäkä ‘with a cow’) and some Finnish (Pyhtää isänkä ‘with father’) and Estonian (Lutsi kesvägä ‘with barley’) dialects, though in South Estonian the case form also occurs as -ge, without fully assimilating and -gä may occur with back-vowel words (Est. Võnnu vokkgä ‘with spinning-wheels’). The Saami comitative is unusual in that the singular marker -in, cognate with the Finnic essive, is not the same as the plural (marker: -guin), which is grammaticalized from the substantive guolmi ‘comrade’.14 The

13 In Finnish the comitative case in -ine is not very common, and the instrumental/instructive is used mostly in fossilized expressions (as in Estonian).
14 Mirrored in the Nenets comitative marker -ha (Ivanha 'with Ivan') from ha 'comrade' (Tauli 1966: 114) and the Basque comitative marker -ekin, which is assumed to derive from kide 'companion' (Heine – Kuteva 2001: 91–92).
grammaticalization of these postpositions and coherent use then undoubtedly led to the decline of the Finnic instrumental in -in and Finnish comitative in -ine. Stolz speculates that the postposition was at first probably used only to denote an accompaniment relationship between two human participants. The earliest Finnic written documents are regrettably too young to corroborate his claim; whilst the earliest Estonian text with kaas does indeed refer to a human (*bant ëw kas = isand su kaas; Kullamaa manuscript, 1524–32), the second oldest, only a couple of years younger, (Ametivanne I, 1535) already refers to a non-human object: *teyõe nyme kaes = teise nime kaas* (Ehasalu 1997: 60–61).

Of the sample Lithuanian is the only one which is mixed, that is, it has both coherent and incoherent constructions, but in fact this has happened in others too, and coherence seems to spreading from the Germanic languages to the more easterly Finnic, Baltic and Slavic ones. Three stylized maps of northeastern Europe show how coherence has slowly inched eastwards over time. Lithuanian, an example of how this change is taking place, is at the border of coherence and incoherence.

Koptjevskaja-Tamm & Wälchli (pp. 615–750) wrap up the second and final volume with a 135-page synthesis, which includes many new insights not found in individual articles. They come to the conclusion every reader must: the CB languages may have various things in common, but there is nothing which is not found in other languages, and there are only smaller micro-areas where the local languages have influenced each other: “Our guess is that intensive micro-contacts superimposed on each other sometimes create an impression of an overall macro-contact among the languages in the area, which has not necessarily been there” (p. 626).

**Final comment**

For a book of this calibre one would have expected more careful editorial work: there are just too many typographical mistakes, sloopy formulations, missing references, and articles with uncorrected English. This is of course especially regrettable in a work also aimed at non-specialists. One might object to my assiduous noting of these errors, but Dahl – Koptjevskaja-Tamm write in the introduction (XV) that typologists cannot be expected to have a knowledge of the “smaller” languages. If they are then forced to fall back on works such as the one under review it is of utmost importance that the examples in question are correct, lest far-reaching conclusions be formed using this material. A telling example is on page 367 (vol. II), where the difference between Finnish *naapuri kutsuttin illalliselle* ‘The neighbour was invited for

---

15 E.g. on page 378 the examples in (40) and (41) are Lithuanian and not Latvian, on page 423 *kädessä* is Finnish, not Estonian (= käs).
dinner’ and naapuri (sic!) ei kutsuttu illalliselle ‘The neighbour was not invited for dinner’ is explained. In the discussion about these passives the case form of naapuri ‘the neighbour’ is of crucial importance and in the second example it should of course be naapuria. Luckily, in this case the morpheme-by-morpheme translation does show that we are dealing here with a partitive and not a nominative. One also gets the feeling the authors did not consult each other much: whilst not mentioning the same phenomenon in another CB language might have been the particular author’s choice and is of course their good right, using different names for the same language is not acceptable. As these volumes are specifically meant for non-specialists, these mistakes may find their way into more general works if this accessible, English-language work is consulted. Reprinting the introduction from volume I in volume II also seems a senseless exercise, as any buyers will undoubtedly buy both volumes. Overall this is a useful work, but the quality of the articles varies greatly.
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