



HELSINGIN YLIOPISTO
HELSINGFORS UNIVERSITET
UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

Baltic Languages and White Nights

Contacts between Baltic and Uralic languages

International Conference

University of Helsinki, 11–12 June 2012

Programme

Abstracts

Participants

Conference Programme

Monday 11 June

Registration 9.30 – 10.00. Metsätalo - Forsthuset, Unioninkatu - Unionsgatan 40, III Floor.

Plenary session 10.00 – 17.00, Room 8, III Floor. Moderated by Santeri Junttila and Laimute Balode.

10:00 Arto Mustajoki, University of Helsinki. Opening of the conference.

10:15 Santeri Junttila, University of Helsinki: *The contacts between Proto-Finnic and Baltic: do we know anything Thomsen did not?*

10:45 Riho Grünthal, University of Helsinki: *Livonian at the cross-roads of language contacts*

11:15 Anna Daugaviete, Saint Petersburg State University: *The development of unstressed syllables in Latvian: Lithuanian and Baltic-Finnic parallels*

11:45 Tea and coffee

12:00 Karl Pajusalu, University of Helsinki: *On phonology of the Salaca Livonian language*

12:30 Laimute Balode, University of Helsinki/ University of Latvia: *Criteria for determining of possible Finno-Ugrisms in Latvian toponymy*

13:00 Lunch

14:30 Pauls Balodis, Latvian Language Institute: *Surnames of Finno-Ugric origin in Latvia*

15:00 Pēteris Vanags, Stockholm University/ University of Latvia: *Latvian and Estonian names for traditional feast days of the Christian church: Common history and sources*

15:30 Tea and coffee

16:00 Adam Hyllested, University of Copenhagen: *The origins of Finnish aika 'time' and aita 'fence': Germanic, Baltic, or Slavic?*

16:30 Janne Saarikivi, University of Helsinki: *On the stratigraphy of borrowings in Finnic. Reconsidering the Slavic and Baltic borrowings.*

17.30–19.30 Reception at the Embassy of the Republic of Lithuania, Rauhankatu - Fredsgatan 13 A

Tuesday 12 June

Section I. The presentations in Latvian and Lithuanian. 12.00–15.00, Room 22, IV Floor. Moderated by Laimute Balode and Aurelija Kaškelevičienė.

12:00 Ilga Jansone, Latvian Language Institute: *Par dažiem somugrismiēm Ērģemes draudzes vietvārdos*

12:30 Ojārs Bušs, Latvian Lang. Institute: *Latv. Ozolsala un šī onīma atbilstmes lietuviešu, igauņu, somu valodā, tostarp teorētiskās onomastikas skatījumā*

13:00 Lunch

14:00 Marius Smetona, University of Vilnius: *Gyvačių eufemizmai lietuvių kalboje*

14:30 Anželika Smetonienė, University of Vilnius: *Kai kurių XVI–XVII a. LDK tekstų skolintų veiksmažodžių šaltinių patikslinimas*

Section II. Morphosyntax. 9.30–17.00, Room 4, III Floor. Moderated by Marja Leinonen and Riho Grünthal.

9:30 Peter Arkadiev, Moscow State University: *“External prefixes” in Lithuanian: A typological rarum*

10:00 Héléne de Penanros, INALCO, Paris: *Preverbs, prepositions and cases in Finnish and in Lithuanian*

10:30 Marja Leinonen, University of Helsinki: *Lithuanian genitive vs. Finnish partitive in existential sentences*

11:00 Maija Tervola, University of Tampere: *Comparing the object case alternation in Finnish and Lithuanian*

11:30 Tea and coffee

12:00 Sturla Berg-Olsen, Oslo University: *On the fringes of a category: Speech-act datives in Latvian*

12:30 Natalia Perkova, Russian Academy of Sciences (Saint-Petersburg): *On companion-oriented comitative constructions in Latvian and Estonian*

13:00 Lunch

14:00 Merlijn de Smit, Stockholm University: *Finnic active-passive diathesis and Baltic contacts*

14:30 Valgerdur Bjarnadóttir, Stockholm University: *Oblique anticausatives in Lithuanian*

15:00 Ilze Lokmane, Andra Kalnača, University of Latvia: *Morphosyntax and modal semantics of Latvian verb vajadzēt ‘to need’*

15:30 Tea and coffee

16:00 Helle Metslang, University of Tartu - Karl Pajusalu, University of Helsinki: *Evidentiality in Livonian*

16:30 Jan Henrik Holst, University of Hamburg: *On the theory of a Uralic substratum in Baltic*

18.00 Conference dinner

THE CONTACTS BETWEEN PROTO-FINNIC AND BALTIC:
DO WE KNOW ANYTHING THOMSEN DID NOT?

SANTERI JUNTILA

The oldest contacts between Baltic and Finnic languages were first defined in the studies of the famous Danish linguist Vilhelm Thomsen in 1869 and 1890. Thomsen not only started the systematic research of the loanword layers of Finnic but also introduced the diachronic dimension into Fenno-Ugrian studies in general. Thomsen's method was based on the Neogrammarian requirement to rely exclusively on regular sound correspondences.

Thomsen also was the first scholar to reconstruct a chronological succession of Fenno-Ugrian language contacts based on the distribution of borrowings. He proved the Baltic loanwords of Finnic much older than the great mass of Latvian borrowings in Livonian and evidenced a prehistoric change in the geographical distribution of Finnic after the Baltic contacts. Thomsen timed the Finnic-Baltic contacts before the Finnic-Germanic ones but after the contacts between Aryan and Finno-Ugric languages.

The third criterion of etymologic research, meaning, was also mapped by Thomsen, who arranged the Baltic loanwords in semantic groups to make a picture of the historical and cultural context of the contacts. Thomsen also corrected some earlier researchers' mistake of not distinguishing the origin of an item and its name by pointing out words like 'neck' or 'daughter' among the Baltic loans. The first scholar to consistently root out this *argumentum ad ignorantiam nominis* from the field of loanword studies was Thomsen's disciple in Finland, Emil Nestor Setälä. Unfortunately, Setälä's warnings have often been forgotten in the later contact studies up to our time.

Compared to Thomsen, modern linguists have many times larger collections of lexical material of not only Finnic and Baltic but especially of Sámi, Mordvin and Mari languages to use. Still, the amount of credible Baltic etymologies has not even doubled since 1890. Several attempts by Thomsen's followers up to our days have been made to find Proto-Finnic traces in the Baltic lexicon, but no convincing results have been reached so far. This supports Thomsen's view, that the borrowings have flown one-way.

The first significant methodological innovation in historical linguistics after the Neogrammarian method was the development of diachronic phonology as a structuralistic tool. The Structuralist approach of Jorma Koivulehto started a revolution in the studies of Finnic language contacts in the 1970's. Koivulehto managed to demonstrate that the Finnic-Germanic

contacts started at least as early as the Finnic-Baltic ones, and both of them were preceded by an even older, West Indo-European stratum of borrowings to Finnic or Western Finno-Ugric.

In Thomsen's days, the researchers of contact linguistics were exclusively interested in loanwords. This changed quite slowly. The 19th century concepts of substrate and superstrate were introduced to Finnic research by Lauri Posti in 1953. He suggested Baltic and Germanic superstrate influence behind the main phonological changes of Proto-Finnic. However, Posti's ideas are not undeniable, as lately pointed out by Petri Kallio. Some claims of a Finnic substrate influence in Proto-Baltic or Proto-Balto-Slavic phonology have been superficially motivated and proven false (see Häkkinen 2006). It appears evident that the concepts of substrate and superstrate do not suffice in defining the characteristics of a language contact.

The first researcher who mentioned the similarities in some Baltic and Finnic syntactic structures was Jooseppi Julius Mikkola in 1930. Unlike the lexical borrowings and the phonological resemblances, these parallels have been studied mostly by Baltologists and not Fenno-Ugricists, since they have most often been interpreted as Finnic influence in the Baltic languages. However, most of this research has not given sufficient results, when no methods of quantitative typology have been used. Syntactic material from other languages of the world is still being collected and organised, which causes a need to re-evaluate the Baltic and Finnic material.

A contact induced change tends to affect more than just one subsystem of a language. "A language is much more likely to have undergone either a whole range of contact-induced typological changes in its various subsystems or none" (Thomason 2001: 5). As already mentioned, there are no Finnic traces in the common Baltic or East Baltic vocabulary or phonology. Some traits of Lithuanian morphology have been connected to Finno-Ugric origin, but these suggestions have not been critically evaluated yet. This casts some doubts on the claims of Finnic influence on Baltic syntax.

Several place names of the Finnic speaking area have been proposed a Baltic origin since Eemil Aukusti Tunkelo in 1899. None of these etymologies is convincing. All Finnic toponyms in Lithuania, East Prussia and Poland proposed by several Indo-Europeanists are at least as dubious. In Latvia, the Finnic (Livonian) place names do not occur outside the Finnic area traceable in medieval historic sources. On the other hand, the study of Baltic hydronyms in Russian and Belarus areas started somewhat after Thomsen,

and several scholars since Kazimieras Būga have operated with this data when searching for the location of the Finnic-Baltic contacts.

Last but not least, new disciplines of prehistory have arisen after Thomsen's time, of which archaeology should be mentioned here. Genetics is still just a promising new branch, whereas its predecessor in the field, physical anthropology has been seriously questioned as a science.

We must be cautious when applying extra-linguistic arguments to defining essentially linguistic concepts like past ethnicities. This is evident when looking at the research history of Finnic-Baltic contacts. Thomsen dated the Finnic-Baltic contacts very recent (about 200 BC to 800 AD) since he had practically no archaeological data available. His successors moved the dating earlier based on findings showing continuity of settlement in Finland since the first centuries AD. In the course of the 20th century, new findings stretched the archaeological continuity further and further in the past, and the linguists struggled to get their chronology to match the earlier and earlier datings. In around 2000, the discussion had reached Ice Age, and only after that the majority linguists have started to accept that no archaeological continuity can be sufficient to prove an ethnic continuity. This means a return to historical linguistics as practised by Thomsen, an autonomous discipline applying discoveries brought by other historical sciences but not slavishly adapting to their schemes.

Būga, Kazimieras 1924: Šis-tas iš lietuvių ir indoeuropiečių senovės. – *Tauta ir Žodis* II knygos. 98–110.

Häkkinen, Jaakko 2006: Uralilaisen kantakielen tutkiminen – *Tieteessä tapahtuu* 1 / 2006.

Kallio, Petri 2000: Posti's superstrate theory at the threshold of a new millennium. – Johanna Laakso (ed.): *Facing Finnic. Some challenges to historical and contact linguistics*. Castrenianumin toimitteita 59. Helsinki. 80–99.

Koivulehto, Jorma 1983: Seit wann leben die Urfinnen im Ostseeraum? – Juha Janhunen & Anneli Peräniitty & Seppo Suhonen (eds.): *Symposium saeculare Societatis Fenno-Ugricae*. MSFOu 185: 135–57.

Mikkola, Jooseppi Julius 1930 = Mikola, Joz: Vecākie sakari somu un baltu valodu starpā. – *Izglītības Ministrijas Mēnesraksts* 1930. g. 436–46.

Posti, Lauri 1953–54: From Pre-Finnic to Late Proto-Finnic. – *FUF* 31: 1–91.

Setälä, Emil Nestor 1891: Vilh. Thomsenin tutkimukset suomalaisen kielihistorian alalla – *Valvoja* 11: 459–71.

----- 1900: *I. N. Smirnows untersuchungen über die ostfinnen. Ein gutachten, an die Kaiserl. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Petersburg angegeben.* JSFOu XVII, 4. Helsingfors.

Thomason, Sarah 2001: Contact-induced typological change. – Martin Haspelmath & Ekkehard König & Wulf Oesterreicher & Wolfgang Raible (eds.): *Language typology and language universals: An international handbook* (Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter). 1640–1648.

Thomsen, Vilhelm 1869: *Den gotiske sprogklasses indflydelse på den finske. En sproghistorisk undersøgelse.* København: Den Gyldendalske boghandel.

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

Tunkelo, Eemil Aukusti 1899: Mistä nimi *Häme?* – *Virittäjä* 3: 97–107.

LIVONIAN AT THE CROSS-ROADS OF LANGUAGE CONTACTS

RIHO GRÜNTAL

Livonian, the southern-most Finnic language that gradually silenced down during 20th century, was documented in two geographical areas, namely the northern coast of Courland and the eastern coast of the Gulf of Riga in the historical Livonia. The Livonian language became extinct in the latter territory already in the 19th century whereas the sociohistorical context and size of the Livonian community in Courland is much better known. The documenting of that variety took place parallel with accelerating language shift and cultural change.

In our paper we focus on multilingualism in the evidence of published Livonian narrative and folklore texts and data drawn from Livonian villages of North Courland. As oral inheritance in general, spoken language represented in the published texts actually embeds multiple layers, not merely cultural but also historical. In the case of Livonian the most transparent foreign influence comes from Latvian and German, the first one as the language of Latvian society, the latter one as the language of German landlords that owned the Livonian territories and kept the economical and political power in their hands. The influence is predominantly lexical, although the extensive bilingualism of the last Livonian generations has had grammatical influence as well. There never was extensive literacy in

Livonian in the shadow of German manors and Latvian schools and Livonian, to a very large extent, remained a mainly spoken language until the end of 20th century.

A less transparent foreign transfer comes from Estonian another Finnic variety closely related with Livonian that has a much longer literary tradition and documentation of language history. Due to the common genetic heritage, it is not always possible to point out the differences between, for instance, shared and borrowed vocabulary in Estonian and Livonian. The variance of language contacts in Livonian demonstrated the difference between contacts of typologically and genetically different languages, such as Livonian and German, and languages with a shared historical background, such as Livonian and Estonian.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF UNSTRESSED SYLLABLES IN LATVIAN: LITHUANIAN AND BALTIC-FINNIC PARALLELS

ANNA DAUGAVIETE

Two types of quantitative changes can be postulated for unstressed syllables in Latvian and its dialects.

1. Shortening of long vowels and diphthongs and loss of short vowels in final syllables, for the most part, endings (Endzelīns 1951: 77–85). The process is shared by all Latvian dialects.

- (1) a. **vīras* > *vīrs* 'husband' (nom.sg.)
 **auga* > *aug* 'grow' (prs.3)
 b. **galvās* > *galvas* 'head' (gen.sg./nom.pl.)
 **augā* > *auga* 'grow' (pst.3)

In Lithuanian, Leskien's law yields a similar outcome, but its scope is restricted to long acute syllables (Zinkevičius 1980: 105–8).

- (2) **galvā* > *galvà* 'head' (nom.sg.)

Only some of Lithuanian dialects undergo shortening of circumflex syllables and loss of short syllables, as a result of a later change (Zinkevičius 1966: 115–21). Nevertheless, the process is different from Latvian in that all endings are unstressed in Latvian, whereas in Lithuanian many endings may have stress and thus be immune to the reduction. (The dot above the line traditionally stands for length in the Lithuanian examples.)

- (3) *vī-ras* > *vī-rs* 'male; husband' (nom.sg.). Standard Lithuanian *výras*.
gálva-s > *gálvas* 'head' (nom.pl.) Standard Lithuanian *gálvos*
galvā-s > *galvō-s* 'head' (gen.sg.) Standard Lithuanian *galvōs*
rañka-s > *rañkas* 'hand' (gen.sg.) Standard Lithuanian *rañkos*

Endings that never receive stress are more likely to undergo vowel reduction, but it is also possible for an ending to have a stressed and an unstressed variant with long vowels under stress and short vowels without stress. The choice between the variants depends on the accentual paradigm of the word. (However, short vowels are never lost if the ending has a stressed variant.) In some dialects vowel shortening occurs even in stressed endings.

2. Shortening of long vowels and diphthongs and loss of short vowels in both final and non-final syllables (endings and affixes). This type of unstressed syllables reduction is present in the so-called Livonian dialect of Latvian where it overlaps the earlier reduction in endings (Rudzīte 1964: 169–170, 176–177).

- (4) (**rankās* >) *ruokas* > *ruoks* 'hand' (gen.sg./nom.pl.)
 (**lielākas* >) *lielāks* > *lielaks* 'bigger' (nom.sg.m.)
 (**giedādamas* >) *ziedādams* > *zieddams* 'sing' (cvb.nom.sg.m.)

The later change can be seen as the continuation of the processes, found in such Baltic-Finnic languages as Estonian and Livonian (Kettunen 1938: XXVI–XXVIII; Viitso 2003: 183–4, 186–8).

- (5) Finnish *aukosta*, Estonian *august*, Livonian *oukst* 'hole' (ela.sg.)
 Finnish *liiviläiset*, Estonian *liivlased*, Livonian *livlist* 'Livonians'

The parallels in Lithuanian dialects are either marginal, as in the case of syncope, or represent a different type of quantitative change, involving such shortening of unstressed syllables that is accompanied by lengthening of stressed syllables.

Distinguishing between these two types of quantitative changes shows that Latvian, as a whole, maintains the Baltic tendencies, and it is only the Livonian dialect that shares common innovations with the neighbouring Baltic-Finnic languages.

Endzelīns, Jānis 1951: *Latviešu valodas gramatika*. Rīga: Latvijas Valsts izdevniecība.

- Kettunen, Lauri 1938: *Livisches Wörterbuch mit grammatischer Einleitung*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Rudzīte, Marta 1964: *Latviešu dialektoloģija*. Rīga: Latvijas Valsts izdevniecība.
- Viitso, Tiit–Rein 2003: Rise and development of the Estonian language – Erelt, Mati (ed.) *Estonian Language*. Tallinn: Estonian Academy Publishers. 130–229.
- Zinkevičius, Zigmas 1966: *Lietuvių dialektologija*. Vilnius: Mintis.
- Zinkevičius, Zigmas 1980: *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika*. I. Įvadas. *Istorinė fonetika. Daiktavardžių linksniavimas*. Vilnius: Mokslas.

ON PHONOLOGY OF THE SALACA LIVONIAN LANGUAGE KARL PAJUSALU

The language material of Salaca Livonian is the main data source of the Vidzeme Livonian language. The last Vidzeme Livonians lived in the vicinity of the river Salaca and Svētupe and along the Gulf of Riga in the area of the ancient Metsepole County. The data about the language were recorded from the mid-17th century to the mid-19th century (see Winkler 1994, 1999; Winkler, Pajusalu 2009; Pajusalu 2009, 2011).

The historical data about Salaca Livonian is rather comprehensive. This data with supporting evidence from Courland Livonian and the neighbouring Estonian sub-dialects makes it possible to fix the main structure of the Salaca Livonian language. The paper will focus on the sound system of Salaca Livonian.

The development of Courland and Salaca Livonian was influenced by various contacts with Baltic, Germanic, and neighbouring Estonian dialects. Courland Livonian shares a number of common features with the insular dialect of Estonian (see Ariste 1954). The Salaca Livonian data do not reveal so many similarities with the insular dialect; there is a bigger similarity with the western dialects of southern Estonian; also several influences of Latvian and other contact languages can be followed. The preserved sources provide a rather large picture of the phonetic structure of Salaca Livonian, with regard to both word prosody and phonemes.

The data of Salaca Livonian reveals many prosodic innovations which are typical for the southern Finnic group, such as the opposition of the long and overlong quantities and related morphophonological quantity alternation, foot isochrony, and the extensive vowel losses in unstressed non-initial

syllables. Unfortunately, it is now hard to determine whether quantity distinctions were accompanied by tone opposition.

It is impossible to provide a direct answer to the question about the broken tone; however, taking into account the spelling peculiarities of some forms, Eberhard Winkel (2010) has answered in the affirmative; e.g. Salaca Livonian has no *h*; in those cases where *h* was marked between consonants, it apparently denotes a stød.

The vowel system of Salaca Livonian has also some peculiar features. For example, emergence of the illabial central vowel *õ* is a remarkable distinction of southern Finnic. This sound occurs in North and South Estonian, Votic, and Courland Livonian. However, in the Salaca Livonian dialects similarly to the western dialect of Courland Livonian, the central vowel has obviously become labialized, it is marked by *ü ~ y*, e.g. *süna ~ syna* 'word', c.f. Estonian *sõna*, Courland Livonian *sõnā*.

In Salaca Livonian the main special features of consonant systems are the occurrence of palatal plosive *k'* (cf. Latvian *k̟*), e.g. *k'ula* 'village' (Est *küla*, Cour Liv *kilā*), and voiced affricates, mainly in Latvian loanwords, e.g. *dzerul* 'cranberry' (Lat *dzērvene*), *džuokžed* 'gums' (Lat *žuoklis*). They are emerged by the Latvian influence (cf. Suhonen 1973).

The sound system of Salaca Livonian is generally similar to the southern Finnic languages, but it has some remarkable peculiarities which are influenced by the language contact with Latvian and other neighbouring Indo-European languages.

Ariste, Paul 1954: K voprosu o razvitii livskogo jazyka – *Trudy instituta jazykoznanija AN SSR IV*. Moskva. 254–307.

Pajusalu, Karl 2009: Concerning Salaca Livonian as a southern Finnic dialect. – *Pa somugru pēdām Baltijas jūras krastā*. Rīga. 42–48.

Pajusalu, Karl 2011: Salatsi liivi keel. – *Liivlased. Ajalugu, keel ja kultuur*. Tallinn. 219–229.

Suhonen, Seppo 1973: *Die jungen lettischen Lehnwörter im Livischen*. Helsinki.

Winkler, Eberhard 1994: *Salis-livische Sprachmaterialien*. München.

----- 1999: *Ältere Livische Sprachmaterialien*. München.

----- 2010: Katketooni märkimisest vanades läänemeresoome allikates. – *Väikesed keeled mitmekeelses ühiskonnas*. Publications of Võro Institute 24. Võru. 68–78.

Winkler, Eberhard & Pajusalu, Karl 2009: *Salis-livisches Wörterbuch*. Tallinn.

CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING OF POSSIBLE FINNO-UGRISMS IN LATVIAN TOPONYMY

LAIMUTE BALODE

There are rather many studies on the borrowings from Finno-Ugric languages on appellative level as well as on onomastic level of Latvian language (see bibliography in Balode, Bušs 2007). To determine all the possible Finno-Ugrisms in Latvian toponymy, should start with the criteria that indicate the potential borrowed name.

All criteria could be divided into: lexical, phonetic and morphological.

Lexical borrowings usually first of all draw attention as a "foreign body" in Latvian language system. They are names that have entered the Latvian toponymics from Livonian and Estonian language (*Aga* river, *Agas valks* rivulet: Liv. *agùD* 'needles', Est. *hagu* 'Reisig'; *Kalekaura ezers* lake: Est. *kala-kauri* 'Polartaucher', *Soka ezers* lake: Est. *sokk* 'buck'). Also toponyms made from Estonian dialectal forms: *Ainass* river: Est. dial. *hain* 'hay'.

Clear parallels between the place names of Latvian and Estonian or Finnish place names allow more certain identification of potential borrowing: *Emeru valks* brook: Livonian *āmār* 'dark; twilight' (cf. Finn. *hämärä* 'idem'), cf. also Est. village-name *Āmari*.

Of course, there are so-called relative Finno-Ugrisms, resp., Latvian toponyms which coined from Latvian appellatives which on their turn are Finno-Ugrisms (*Kangarezers* lake: Latv. appellative (Finno-Ugrism) *kangars* 'ein Hügelzung', *Ķīvvalks* brook, *Pekas* home-stead). Such toponyms also „give signals" about Finno-Ugric roots.

Generally accepted phonetic „signs" of Finno-Ugrisms are considered to be diphthongs *-oi-*, *-ui-* (*Loibas*, *Suima*, *Tuimi*, *Uikas*), also rare cluster of sounds *-or-* (*Porka*). Sometimes it could be also consonant *ķ* preserved in the position before front vowels – especially in the areas inhabited by Livonians or in the Northern part of Latvia (*Ķeldas ezers*, *Ķeņģupīte*, *Ķepu upe*, *Ķibupe*, *Ķidurga*); also foreign consonant *h*, which is rare in Latvian toponymy (comes across only in loan words and loan names).

The greatest uncertainty arises searching morphological criteria of potential Finno-Ugrisms. In several studies such signs are considered toponymical endings *-aži*, *-uži*, *-īži* (connected with Livonian form *-sile* or *-sele*; see Endzelīns DI III-2, 93): *Ādaži*, *Aijaži*, *Kuiviži*, *Limbaži*, *Lugaži*, *Ropaži*.

There has to be mentioned separately compound toponyms (limnonyms) with the second part *-(j)eris*, *-(j)ēris* or *-(j)ieris* < Liv. *jōra* (*jāru*), Est. *jārv* 'lake'

(*Dūneris, Gulbēris, Ninieris, Sīveris, Spicieris*) and compound oikonyms with the second component *-kila, -kile, -kule* < Liv., Est. *kūla* 'village' (*Iķšķīle, Matkule*).

Many analysed Latvian place names demonstrate both phonetic and lexical criteria of Finno-Ugrisms (*Ķepu upe* river, *Poikas* village). The most credible Finno-Ugrisms can be considered the place-names, which combine at least two (or even all three) of the criteria mentioned above.

The credibility of borrowings becomes stronger if the localization of the object is in the territory of Livonian language or it is near the border with Estonia, as well as if there are clear parallels in Finno-Ugric onomastic material (e. g., *Ērģeme* river and inhabited place near Estonian boarder; Kagaine calls it as boomerang borrowing (Kagaine 2004, 103)).

The most hypothetical are phonetic criteria, less hypothetical – morphological (though possible suffix homonymy), but relatively more credible – lexical criteria (although sometimes, no doubt, they can be misleading). However, there are many dubious cases when several possible explanations of the origin of the toponym are available.

Balode, Laimute & Bušs, Ojārs 2007: On Latvian Toponyms of Finno-Ugrian Origin – Ritva-Liisa Pitkänen & Janne Saarikivi (eds.): *Onomastica Uralica. Borrowing of Place Names in the Uralian Languages*. Debrecen–Helsinki. 27-44. With bibliography.

Endzelīns, Jānis 1971–1982: *Darbu Izlase* 1–4. Rīga.

Kagaine, Elga 2004: *Baltijas jūras somu valodu lokālie aizguvumi Ziemeļrietumvidzemes izloksnēs*. Rīga: Latvijas Universitātes Latviešu valodas institūts.

LATVIAN AND ESTONIAN NAMES FOR TRADITIONAL FEAST DAYS OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH: COMMON HISTORY AND SOURCES

PĒTERIS VANAGS

The ancestors of Latvians and Estonians became acquainted with Christianity in the 9th century both from the West and the East. The Western influence came first to Courland in the 9th century and to the Northwest Estonia. The missions from the East started in the beginning of the 11th century after the Christianising of Russia. The main support bases for the Russian influence were Veliki Novgorod, Pskov and Polatsk. The influence of the mission is seen starting from this time in the burial traditions in both East Latvian and Estonian tribes. The Eastern influence can be seen also in language. The Latvian language gained the majority of its names for different religious and Christian notions from Old Russian, e.g. *baznīca* 'church', *grēks* 'sin', *krusts* 'cross' etc. The impact of Old Russian on Estonian in the Christian terminology is less noticeable, e.g. *raamat* 'book', *rist* 'cross', *pagan* 'pagan' etc.

Estonians felt the influence also from the Scandinavian sources e.g. *jõulud* 'Christmas', *kirk* 'church', possibly also *munk* 'monk', *picker* (now *peeker* from MLG) 'chalice'. The last two words are common also in Latvian – *mūks*, *biķeris*.

The main impact of Christianity in both Latvian and Estonian territories started with the expansion of the German Order at the end of the 12th century. These lands became a part of the newly established Livonian confederation under a strong German and Catholic influence. Starting from this time the main Christian traditions of Latvians and Estonians were established. The Christian discourse of the Latvian and Estonian languages developed after the Reformation in the 16th century. The Christian vocabulary grew under the influence of German. There is a group of lexical loans in both languages, e.g. Latvian *elle* 'hell', *bikts* 'confession', and several words of Greek or Eastern origin, e.g. *evanģēlijs* – *evanģēlium* 'gospel', *eņģelis* – *engel* 'angel', *amen* – *amen*. The bulk of the loans nevertheless were not lexical loans, but loan translations, loan creations and semantic loans, e.g. Latvian *baznīckungs* 'priest', *augšāmcelšanās* 'resurrection', Estonian *kirikuisand*, *ülestõusmine* etc.

In course of these centuries the vocabulary of the names for traditional church feasts arose. It developed under the same influences as the whole Christian discourse. The earliest recordings of the feast names in Latvian and

Estonian are attested in the sources of the 16th-17th centuries, i.e. after the Reformation. Nevertheless the material shows its previous history and is a source of questions.

There is a group of names for the days of Saints which are formally and semantically equal for both Latvian and Estonian, only the form of the name can differ, e.g. *Andræia dena* - *Andrekse pääw*, *Thoma dena* - *Toma pääw*, *Bartulu dena* - *Partli pääw*.

The next group of names are loan translations from the possible German (or Latin) source, e.g. *Treju Kungo Deena* – *Kolm Kunninga pehw*, *Christi debbessu braukszena* - *Kristusse taewaminnemisse pühha*, *Śwetschu Deen[a]* - *Küünla pehw*.

Some names can have a common Old Russian source (but a Latin source can't be totally excluded), e.g. *Leela Zettur=deena* - *suur nelja pääw*, *Leela Peekdeena* - *suur rede*.

There are also several names of the feasts that have a different origin, e.g. *Leel=deena* (from ORuss *velik denj*) - *Leehawotme Põha* 'Easter', *Śwehtkõs tahs Śwehtas Triädibas* (probably a translation of ORuss *Troica*) - *kolm=aino Jummalala pühha* (probably a translation of Germ *dreieiniger Gott*) 'Trinity'.

There are also names whose origins are still unclear. Thus, Latv *Pupuļo=deena* 'Palm Sunday' is a translation of ORuss *verbnaja nedelja*, but the origin of Est *Urba pehw* is less clear. The most striking parallel in Latvian and Estonian are traditional names for Christmas and Whitsunday: Latv *Seemas=swähtki* – Est *Talweste Põha* 'Winter feast'; Latv *Wassara=swähtki* – Est *Suiwaste Põha* 'Summer feast', which do not yet have a clear explanation.

THE ORIGINS OF FINNISH *AIKA* AND *AITA* – BALTIC, GERMANIC, OR SLAVIC?

ADAM HYLLESTED

This paper addresses the fate of the Proto-Baltic diphthong **ei* in Baltic loanwords in Balto-Fennic, in particular the possibility suggested by Liukkonen (1999: 18-19) that Balto-Fennic **aika* ‘time’ (Fi. *aika*) may be a rendering of Baltic **eigā* ‘course (of events)’ (Lith. *eigà*), an old derivative of the verb *eīti* ‘to go’.

Proto-Baltic **ei* seems to be regularly retained as Balto-Fennic **ei* which only later develops into *ai* in South Estonian and Livonian. A late development of initial **e-* to **a-* (not only when it forms part of diphthongs) is furthermore known from Lithuanian (cf. dial. *aīgis*), but not from Baltic as such, and since cognates of *aika* are found all over Balto-Fennic, the word must be a very old borrowing.

Liukkonen justifiably characterizes the traditional etymology deriving *aika* from Germanic **aiwa-* ‘time’ as phonetically impossible: Germanic *-w-* would not be rendered as Balto-Fennic **-k-*. However, it has been overlooked that Germanic possesses a related derivative, Proto-Germanic **ajuki-*, albeit an adjective meaning ‘eternal’, which can be reconstructed on the basis of Old English *ēce* and Gothic *ajuk-* in *ajukdūps* ‘eternity’. As already mentioned in a different context by Weiss (1994: 134-135), **ajuki-* could formally be based on an old thematic noun **ajuka-*. This noun may well be the source of Fennic **aika* with loss of the medial *-u-* by influence from the adverb *aina* ‘always’ (which has a different origin).

We would expect the Germanic noun not only to have meant ‘eternity’, but also ‘life, age’, a double meaning detectable from comparison with other Indo-European languages. The Fennic meaning may in any case have been affected by contamination with the inherited lexeme *ikä* ‘age; life; lifetime’, as has been suggested to me by Michael Fortescue (p.c.).

However, another possibility seems to be at least equally promising:

Finnish *aita* ‘hedge, fence’, with attested cognates in all Balto-Fennic languages but Livonian, is of a similar structure. Koivulehto (1973 [withdrawn in the 1999 version]) suggested that *aita* reflects Proto-Germanic **aiþa-* ‘oath’ (cf. Greek ἔρκος ‘fence, hedge’ ~ ὄρκος ‘oath’). The common semantic denominator would then be ‘delimitation, restriction’. But at the same time, *aika* and *aita* form a curious double pair with Slavic **větv* ‘council; oath’ (cf. also Lith. *vietà* ‘place’) and **vĕkŭ* ‘time’. Possible reasons for this remarkable state of affairs will be presented in the paper.

- Liukkonen, Kari 1999: *Baltisches im Finnischen*. SUST 235. Helsinki.
- Koivulehto, Jorma 1973: Germanisch-Finnische Lehnbeziehungen III – *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 74: 561–609 [reprinted with postscriptum in 1999 in *Verba Mutuata*. Helsinki: SUST 237. 83–120].
- Weiss, Michael 1994: Life everlasting: Latin *iūgis* 'everflowing', Greek ὑγιής 'healthy', Gothic *ajukdūps* 'eternity' and Avestan *yauuaējī* 'living forever' – *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 55: 131-156.

ON THE STRATIGRAPHY OF BORROWINGS IN FINNIC.

RECONSIDERING THE SLAVIC AND BALTIC BORROWINGS.

JANNE SAARIKIVI

My presentation is a discussion paper on defining the layers of Baltic and Slavic borrowings in the Finnic languages. It is a well known fact that the Slavic and Baltic languages, with all likelihood, derive from a common ancestor. However, it has been a traditional assumption of the etymologists working on Finnic languages that the Baltic and Slavic borrowings represent two distinct layers.

This assumption can be called into question in the light of borrowings deriving from Pre-Slavic (Koivulehto 2007).

Further, many borrowings that traditionally have been considered as Baltic can, in the light of the phonematic characteristics of the Old Novgorod vernacular, also be analysed as Slavic borrowings. This is especially the case of some borrowings that have not undergone the second, or even the first palatalization. Already Mikkola (1894) hinted at the possible existence of such borrowings (Fi. *kimalainen, ies*), and it seems to be possible to present new cases representing similar characteristics

.I will also present some cases of Germanic borrowings that can, in the light of semantic and distributional criteria, also be considered as Baltic. On the basis of such examples, partly new, partly reinterpreted cases of borrowings, it will be argued, that the so-called old Baltic borrowings in the Finnic languages derive from archaic IE language forms that, in addition to the Baltic lexical features, also shared some vocabulary that is present in subsequent Slavic and other IE languages.

This hints to the possibility that the Baltic and Slavic layers of borrowings in Finnic do not present two clearly distinct layers, but rather point to a continuous borrowing from Balto-Slavic, some dialects of which developed in to the Slavic proper.

PAR DAŽIEM SOMUGRISMIEM ĒRĢEMES DRAUDZES VIETVĀRDOS

ILGA JANSONE

Ērģemes draudze atrodas teritorijā, kur vēl vidējā dzelzs laikmetā dominēja Baltijas jūras somu iedzīvotāji, bet šobrīd draudzes ziemeļu robeža sakrīt ar Latvijas un Igaunijas valsts robežu.

Vēsturiskā atrašanās vieta ir bijusi par pamatu tam, ka vairākiem apdzīvoto vietu nosaukumiem iespējams rast somugrisku cilmi. Tas ir bijušais pils un muižas apzīmējums *Ērģeme*, kas šobrīd sakrīt ar draudzes nosaukumu, kā arī muižu nosaukumi *Kārķi*, *Pedele*, *Turna*.

Ērģeme (Ermis) – nosaukums radies pirms 1323. gada. Tā pamatā ir saliktenis *Härgmäe*, kas veidots no ig. *härg* 'vērsis' (Wiedemann 1973, 72–73) un *mägi*, ģen. *mäe* 'kalns, virsotne' (Wiedemann 1973, 583–584). *Latviešu konversācijas vārdnīcā* (LKV IV, 8118. sl.) minētais saistījums ar vakas īpašnieku Ermesu (*Ermes*) vārdu nav korekts, jo pēc vēstures avotiem Ermesi (*Ermes*, *Ergemeß*, *Armeß* un *Ermiß*) īpašumus Ērģemes draudzes teritorijā ieguvuši tikai 1456. gadā. Iespējams, sākot ar 15. gs. otro pusi, iedzīvotāju priekšstatos šīs cilmes ir saplūdušas. Par labu somugriskajai cilmei runā arī tas, ka sākotnējos šī vārda fiksējumos parasti ir *g* burts, piemēram, 1422 – *Ergemes*, *Ergemys*; 1438 – *Argemes*; 1462 – *Ergemesz*; 1463 – *Ergemis*; 1496 – *Ergamis*. Ērģemē sastopamais analogais upes nosaukums *Ērģeme*, *Ērģemes upe* (Rikandas augšteces nosaukums) ir sekundārs; uz to norāda nosaukuma otrais komponents ig. ģen. *mäe* 'kalns'.

Kārķi (Karkell) – pirmās ziņas kopš 1625. gada. Iespējams, vietvārda *Kārķi* pamatā ir ig. *kärk* (*kark*) 'paaugstināta vieta purvā, purva sala, paaugstinājums' vai ig *kärk* 'grants, grants pamats' (Wiedemann 1973, 248). Abi iespējamie cilmes skaidrojumi ir semantiski piemēroti muižas atrašanās vietai.

Pedele (Pedeln) – pēc nepārbaudītām ziņām nosaukums zināms kopš 1286. gada; drošas ziņas vismaz kopš 1638. gada. Ojārs Bušs uzskata par iespējamu saistījumu ar ig. *pedajas* 'priede' (LVV 2003, 246).

Turna (Turnenhof) – pirmās ziņas kopš 1625. gada. Igaņu vietvārdu *Türna* (1826) etimoloģizējis igauņu vietvārdu pētnieks Valdeks Palls (*Valdek Pall*). Viņš (Pall I, 254) to saista ar vienu no homonīmiem *türn* ar divām nozīmēm 'liela dzīsla uz dzīvnieku kakla' un *türna-pü* 'parastais pabērzs, vilkābeles' (Wiedemann 1973, 1238). Tomēr saistījums ar pirmo nozīmi liekas maz ticams, bet otra nozīme, pēc J. F. Vīdemaņa (*Ferdinand Johann Wiedemann*) dotumiem, ir tikai savienojumā ar ig. *puu* 'koks'. Tai pašā laikā

varētu pievērst uzmanību arī otrajam homonīmam ig. *túr'n* 'purva bērzs, kropla priede' (Wiedemann 1973, 1238), kas ietver norādi uz daudz izplatītākiem augiem. Tādā gadījumā semantiski Pedeles un Turnas nosaukumi būtu cieši saistīti un attiektos uz floras semantikas vietvārdiem.

Arī Omuļu muižas nosaukumam iespējams rast somugriskas paralēles.

Omuļi (*Homeln*) – drošas ziņas kopš 1463. gada. sastopams arī analogs upes nosaukums. Daļēji noraidot Omuļu muižas vārda hidronīmisku izcelsmi, to, sekojot A. Bīlenšteina paraugam, varētu saistīt ar ig. *humal*, *humalas* 'apiņi' (Wiedemann 1973, 1251), līb. *umal* 'apiņi' (Kettunen 1938, 451). Nevar izslēgt arī iespējamo ģermānisko cilmi, kas varētu būt saistīta ar viduslejasvācu *homele*, *hummel* 'kamene' (Schiller, Lübben II, 292). Pieņemot šo samērā ticamo hipotēzi, Omuļu muižas rašanās laiks varētu būt saistīts ar vāciešu kundzību Livonijā, bet upes posms, kas nosaukts par *Omuļupi*, varētu būt radies no muižas nosaukuma.

Starp 17.–19. gs. mājvārdiem somugrismu ir krietni mazāk. Var minēt tikai atsevišķus vārdus, ko J. Endzelīns ir saistījis ar igauņu apelatīviem vai vietvārdiem:

Kappist (Kapusts) 1638; *Kappust* 1811, *Kalne Kappust* 1826, *Leies Kappuft* 1811, *Leijes Kappuft* 1826; Lvv I (2), 49 *kapusts* z *Ērgemē* : ig. *kapust* 'kāposts'?

Ahrne 1811, *Ahrne* 1826; Lvv I (1), 70 *āriņi* z *Kārķos* : ig. *Aarna*

Leies Kuckre 1811, *Leies Kukker* 1826, *Kalne Kuckre* 1811, *Kalne Kukker* 1826, Lvv I (2), 165 : *kukris* z *Ērgemē* : ig. *Kukruse* c.?

Leies Kuftul 1811, *Leies Kuftul* 1826, *Kalne Kuftul* 1811, *Kalne Kuftul* 1826; Lvv I (2), 183 *kustuļi* z *Kārķos*: ig. *Kustja-Haibu* c.

Lambe 1811, *Lambe* 1826, Lvv I (2), 254 *lambas* z *Ērgemē* : ig. *Lamba* c. un *Lambi* c.

Pēt (Pāši) 1638; *Mais Paafch* 1811, *Saute Paafch* 1811, *Pahfche* 1826; Lvv 2003, 232–233 *Pāši* z *Ērgemē* : ig. *paas* 'kaļķakmens'?

Igauņu cilmes muižas nosaukumu samērā lielais īpatsvars varētu būt pamatots ar iedzīvotāju etnisko sastāvu laikā, kad radās šīs apdzīvotās vietas, par kuru neatņemamu sastāvdaļu vairāku gadsimtu garumā kļuva muižas. Mājvārdi varētu būt radušies daudz vēlākā laikā, kad Baltijas jūras somu tautību ietekme bija mazāka.

LATV. OZOLSALA UN ŠĪ ONĪMA ATBILSMES LIETUVIEŠU, IGAUŅU, SOMU
VALODĀ, TOSTARP TEORĒTISKĀS ONOMASTIKAS SKATĪJUMĀ

OJĀRS BUSS

Latv. *Ozolsala* (izr. *Uozuolsala* [ar dialektāliem variantiem], etimoloģiskā nozīme angl. 'oak island', Austrumlatvijā arī angl. 'oak village') Latvijas onomastikonā pārstāvēta ar apm. 25 Latviešu valodas institūta vietvārdu kartotēkā atrodamiem vietvārdiem (bez tam fiksēti apm. 10 mājvārdi daudzskaitļa formā *Ozolsalas* un apm. 10 vārkopnosaukumu *Ozolu sala*). Kaut gan abiem saliktā vietvārda pamatkomponentiem atbilst latviešu kopvalodas pamatfonda vārdi (*ozols, sala*), tomēr attiecīgie vietvārdi nav izplatīti visā Latvijā, tiem raksturīga nepārprotama areālā specifika: tie fiksēti tikai Latvijas austrumu un centrālajā daļā, savukārt Rietumvidzemē un Kurzemē nav pamanīts neviens aplūkojamā tipa vietvārds. Latviešu kopvalodā ģeogrāfiskās nomenklatūras vārda *sala* pamatnozīme ir 'samērā neliela sauszemes daļa, ko no visām pusēm ierobežo ūdens', tomēr tikai 2 no minētajiem 25 toponīmiskajiem saliktniem un 1 vārdkopnosaukums apzīmē salu ūdenī (upē vai ezerā). Vēl daži saistāmi ar sekundāro nozīmes niansi 'augstāka vieta (purvā, pļavā)'. Tomēr lielākoties šajos nosaukumos komponents *sala* lietots metaforiski vai arī Austrumlatvijai raksturīgajā dialektālajā nozīmē 'apdzīvota vieta' (katrs no šiem toponīmiskā lietojuma tiptiem pārstāvēts ar apm. 10 fiksētiem vietvārdiem).

Atbilstošos Lietuvas vietvārdus atrodam Lietuvas vietvārdu vārdnīcas (*Lietuvos vietovardžių žodynas*) 1. sējuma (2008). Tajā gan nav neviena saliktna **Ažuolsala*, iekļauta informācija tikai par četriem vārdkopnosaukumiem *Ažuolu sala*; šis skaits ir pārāk mazs, lai ļautu spriest par onomastiski statistiskām likumsakarībām, tomēr pievērs šev uzmanību fakts, ka tikai 1 no šiem vietvārdiem apzīmē salu ūdenī; attiecīgā nozīmē tātad vismaz šī referāta materiālā ir maz raksturīga ģeogrāfiskajam nomenklatūras vārdam *sala* abās dzīvajās baltu valodās.

Igauņu onomastikonā atbilsme *Tammsaare* – igauņu toponīmijai raksturīgajā ģenitīva formā – visplašāk zināma nevis kā vietvārds (Igauņu valodas institūta vietvārdu datu bāzē atrodami tikai daži analogiski vietvārdi), bet gan kā rakstnieka pseidonīms. Teorētiskajā onomastikā jau pasen izvirzīta (kaut arī nebūt nav vispārāzīta) ideja visus vienādos onīmus traktēt kā homonīmus (*A. Gardiner, W. van Langendonck*); tādu onīmu kā minētais igauņu rakstnieka pseidonīms varētu dēvēt par dominējošo onomastisko homonīmu. Savukārt nominatīvs *Tammsaar* (un varianti

Tammesaar, Tammisaar) ir pārstāvēts igauņu uzvārdu kopumā (bet minēto variantu ģenitīva formas *Tammesaare, Tammisaare* sporādiski fiksētas igauņu toponīmijā).

Šis etimoloģiskās semantikas dominējošais onomastiskais homonīms konstatējams arī somu valodā, tas ir bijušās pilsētas (kopš 2009. gada – Raseborgas pilsētas daļas) nosaukums *Tammisaari*. Savukārt onomastiski semantiskajā analīzē vietvārdu *Tammisaari* kopums aplūkojams, sastatot tos ar vietvārdiem un uzvārdiem *Tammisalo*.

GYVAČIŅU EUFEMIZMAI LIETUVIŅU KALBOJĒ

MARIUS SMETONA

Visame pasaulyje eufemizacija tyrinėjama jau gana seniai, tačiau Lietuvoje tai gana mažai ištirta sritis. Esama straipsnių apie naujuosius ir tradicinius eufemizmus, tačiau apie gyvačių eufemizaciją atskirai nerašyta. Todėl tai yra nauja ir aktuali tema. Pranešime bus aptariami gyvačių eufemizmai, surinkti iš Lietuvių kalbos žodyno, Tautosakos darbų, Lietuvių kalbos atlaso, Lietuvių užkalbėjimų ir dar kelių periodinių leidinių, tokių kaip „Gimtasis kraštas“. Kai kurie pavyzdžiai įtraukti ir iš gyvosios kalbos.

Lietuvių kalbos eufemizmus linkstama skirstyti į komplimentinius ir enigmatinius.

Komplimentiniai eufemizmai smulkiau gali būti skirstomi į:

- tradicinius maloninius kreipinius (kitaip melioratyvus): *paukštelė, margukė*
- eufemizmus, kuriais nusakomos teigiamos kūno ar būdo savybės: *dryžuotukė, margukė*
- eufemizmus, nusakančius aukštą socialinę padėtį: *karalienė liepsnota*
- maloninius pavadinimus pagal būdingą veiksmą ar funkciją: *šnypstėlė, šnypstukė*

Nuo komplimentinių eufemizmų savo pagrindine funkcija skiriasi enigmatiniai. Pastaruosius vartojama ne siekiant išsiteikti, o norint užmaskuoti kalbamąjį dalyką. Juk tikima, kad šventieji dalykai yra tabu – apie juos nevalia šnekėti. Kaip ir komplimentinius eufemizmus enigmatinius galima skirstyti smulkiau:

- eufemizmai, atsiradę dėl gyvatės kūno sandaros: *biznoji, brizgauodegė, raguočė*
- eufemizmai, atsiradę dėl spalvos: *auksinė, dryžė*
- eufemizmai, motyvuoti pagal gyvenamąją ar rodymosi vietą: *krūminė, raistinė*
- eufemizmai, nusakantys būdo ypatybes: *pikta, piktoji*
- eufemizmai, motyvuojami būdingais veiksmais ar funkcijomis: *šliaužas, šnipštokas*
- eufemizmai, motyvuojami pagal gyvatės panašumą į kitą daiktą ar padarą arba tiesiog pavadinant kito, nepavojingo padaro vardu: *kirmėlė, pantis*
- eufemizacija įvardžiu: *toj*
- eufemizmai skoliniai: *cangė, zmieja*

Eufemizmus galima aptarti ne tik pagal tai, kodėl atsirado vienoks ar kitoks pavadinimas, paprastai juos nulemia kuris nors lygmuo, todėl jie skirstytini į fonetinius ir darybinius.

Kalbant apie gyvates nereikėtų pamiršti ir žalčių bei bekojo driežo – gluodeno. Pastarieji dėl panašumo yra pavadinami taip pat kaip ir gyvatės. Todėl žalčių ir gluodeno eufemizmai aptartini kartu.

Jasiūnaitė, Birutė 2005: Eufemizmai tarmėse bei tautosakoje: problemos ir perspektyvos – *Baltistica* VI, 101–117.

Lietuvių kalbos žodynas I–XX. Vilnius.

Vaitkevičienė, Daiva 2005: *Lietuvių užkalbėjimų šaltiniai*. Elektroninis sąvadas.

Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas.

----- 2008: *Lietuvių užkalbėjimai: gydymo formulės*. Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas.

KAI KURIŲ XVI–XVII A. LDK TEKSTŲ SKOLINTŲ VEIKSMAŽODŽIŲ ŠALTINIŲ PATIKSLINIMAS

ANŽELIKA SMETONIENĖ

Lietuvių kalbos skoliniai, ypač slavizmai, yra aptarti senųjų raštų leksikos kontekste (Palionis 1967; Zinkevičius 1988 ir t. t.). Neretai slavizmai yra minimi darbuose, skirtuose konkrečioms autoriams (Lebedys 1963; Zinkevičius 1974; Pociūtė 2004). Keliuose vien slavizmams skirtuose darbuose mėginama tiksliau nustatyti kai kurių slavizmų kilmę (Urbutis 1992; Urbutis 1993). Tačiau tyrinėjant lietuvių kalbos skolinius susidurta su tam tikra problema – LKŽ matyt, kartais sekant P. Skardžiaus tradicija, pateikiami slavizmų šaltiniai neatrodo tikslūs. Pastaruoju metu pasirodė nemažai senosios lenkų, senosios baltarusių, senosios ukrainiečių, senosios rusų kalbų žodynų, kurie atkleidžia, kad galimų lietuvių kalbos skolinių atitikmenų yra ne vienoje kurioje slavų kalboje, bet abiejose – ir senojoje lenkų, ir rusėnų kalboje.

Skolinti veiksmažodžiai rinkti iš XVI–XVII a. LDK raštų, todėl ir jų šaltinių buvo ieškoma atitinkamo amžiaus slavų kalbų žodynuose. Tai padarius pastebėta, kad:

- LKŽ kartais nepaduodama galimo skolinio šaltinio, o P. Skardžius nurodo lenkų kalbos atitikmenis (pvz., *afieravoti* 'aukoti' < sen. lenk. *afierować* (Skardžius 1998, 84); *bursavoti* 'bendrauti' < sen. lenk. *bursować* (Skardžius 1998, 107)). Atidžiau išanalizavus atitikmenys ir kiti bendrašakniai žodžiai buvo rasti ir senojoje lenkų kalboje (*ofiarować* (SPol T.21, 22); *bursować* (SPol T.2, 513)), ir rusėnų kalboje (*оферовати*, *офяровати*, *охверовати* (ГСБМ T.23, 326); *бурсовати*, *буршевати* (ГСБМ T.2, 257), *бурсовати* (МСПКУМ T.1, 76)). Šiai grupei galima priskirti ir slavizmus, paliudytus senuosiuose raštuose ir P. Skardžiaus darbuose (nurodant lenkų kalbą kaip šaltinį), bet neįtrauktus į LKŽ (pvz., *feravoti* 'skelbti').
- grupės skolintų veiksmažodžių atitikmenų, anot LKŽ ir P. Skardžiaus, yra tik lenkų kalboje (pvz., *gordyti* 'neatsižvelgti, niekinti' < sen. lenk. *gardzić*; *jednoti* 'vienyti, taikinti' < sen. lenk. *jednać*; *kvitavoti* 'išrašyti kvitą; suteikti kam nors laisvę nuo įsipareigojimų' < sen. lenk. *kwitować*). Tačiau tokių veiksmažodžių šaltinis gali būti ir rusėnų kalba, kurioje aptikta tinkamos reikšmės žodžių (*гардити* (ГСБМ T.6, 254), *гордити* (МСПКУМ T.1, 182), *гардзіць* (ЭСБМ T.3, 58), *гордити* (ЕСУМ T.1, 564); *еднати*, *иднати* (ГСБМ T.9, 173), *еднати* (ССМ T.1, 346), *еднати*,

рьднати (МСПКУМ Т.1, 243); квитовати, квитовать (ГСБМ Т.15, 25), квитовати (МСПКУМ Т.1, 362)).

- LKŽ ir P. Skardžius kartais pateikia skolinių atitikmenis tik senojoje baltarusių kalboje (pvz. *čestavoti* 'gerbti; vaišinti, mylėti' < brus. *честовати*; *klepoti* 'trankyti; įmušti' < brus. *кленати*), tačiau jų yra ir senojoje lenkų kalboje (*czestować* (SPol Т.4, 149); *klepać* (SPol Т.10, 353), *klepać* (SS Т.3, 286)).
- kai kurių slavizmų pateikiami šaltiniai LKŽ ir P. Skardžiaus raštuose skiriasi. Pvz., LKŽ nurodoma, kad *gūbyti* 'naikinti' atėjęs iš baltarusių kalbos (*губіць*), o P. Skardžius kaip šaltinį nurodo lenkų kalbą (*gubić* (Skardžius 1998 138)). Tuo tarpu atitikmenų rasta ir senosios lenkų kalbos žodyne (*gubić* (SPol Т.8, 231), *gubić* (SS Т.2, 521)), ir rusėnų kalbos žodynuose (*губити* (ГСБМ Т.7, 189); *загубити* (ССМТ.1, 374), *выгубити* (МСПКУМ Т.1, 134), *губіць* (ЭСБМТ.3, 111), *губити* (ЕСУМ Т.1, 611)). Užfiksuota ir kitų panašių atvejų (pvz., *dėkavoti* 'dėkoti'; *krosyti* 'dažyti, tepti dažais' ir t. t.). Esant tokiems nesutapimams ir šiuo metu turint aibę slavų kalbų istorinių žodynų verta patikslinti, jei tai įmanoma, skolintų lietuvių kalbos veiksmažodžių kilmę.

LKŽ = *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas I–XX*, Vilnius.

Skardžius, Pranas 1998: *Rinkiniai raštai* tomas 4. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla.

SPol = Stanisław Bał & Maria Karpluk (eds.) 1966–2010: *Słownik polszczyzny XVI w.* 1–34. Wrocław – Warszawa – Kraków: Instytut badań literackich Polski.

SS = Kazimierz Nitsch (ed.) 1955–93: *Słownik staropolski* 1–10. Warszawa: Polska akademia nauk.

ГСБМ 1982–99 = *Гістарычны слоўнік беларускай мовы* 1–29. Мінск: Наука і Тэхніка.

ЕСУМ 1982–2006 = *Етимологічний словник української мови* 1–5. Київ: Наукова думка.

МСПКУМ = Євген Костянтинівич Тимченко 2002–03: *Матеріали до словника писемної та книжної української мови XV–XVIII ст.* 1–2. Київ – Нью-Йорк.

ССМ 1977–78 = *Словник староукраїнської мови XIV–XV ст.* 1–2. Київ : Наукова думка.

ЭСБМ 1978–2008 = *Этымалагічны слоўнік беларускай мовы* 1–12. Мінск: Наука і Тэхніка.

“EXTERNAL PREFIXES” IN LITHUANIAN: A TYPOLOGICAL RARUM

PETER ARKADIEV

The Baltic languages possess a system of verbal prefixes (“preverbs”) expressing spatial and Aktionsart meanings. This is a well-established areal trait of the languages of Eastern Europe, shared by the closely related Slavic and Baltic languages and, to a greater or lesser extent, by a number of other languages of the region. The most thorough studies of this kind of verbal prefixes in Baltic include Endzelīns 1971/1906 and Paulauskas 1958.

In this paper, however, I will deal not with the Aktionsart preverbs, but with a different kind of verbal prefixes attested in Lithuanian and largely neglected in the literature. I call them “external” prefixes, since they attach “outside” of the preverbs according to the following template:

external			internal		stem
permissive restrictive affirmative	negation	aspectual and modal meaning	Aktionsart preverbs	reflexive	
<i>te-</i>	<i>ne-</i>	<i>be-</i>	12+	<i>-sì-</i>	

“External” prefixes *te-* and *be-* differ from the “internal” ones in that they do not affect the lexical meaning and aspectual interpretation of the verb, do not participate in deverbal derivation, impose various co-occurrence restrictions on particular verbal forms, and are so highly polysemous that their different uses can hardly be synchronically (and perhaps even historically) related to each other. Most functions of the prefixes *te-* and *be-* have not been adequately described before, let alone interpreted from a typological or theoretical perspective (see Arkadiev 2010 on *te-* and Arkadiev 2011 on some uses of *be-*).

The functions expressed by the “external” prefixes and their polyfunctionality are non-trivial from a European areal perspective, as well as from a broader cross-linguistic point of view. Such grammatical categories as permissive (*te-*), restrictive (*te-*), continuative (*be-*), as well as the not yet fully understood modal and evaluational uses of the prefix *be-*, which can appear in contexts containing expressions of low degree, in the scope of “suspended assertion” (Paducheva 2005) operators, and in universal concessive conditionals, are not expressed by bound morphology in the other languages of the Circum-Baltic and European linguistic areas,

including the closely related Latvian and Latgalian (these languages incidentally possess another kind of a non-trivial “external” prefix, viz. the debitive prefix *jā-/juo-*). Considering just the aspectual functions of the prefix *be-* (continuative, progressive and avertive), we see that they all belong to the imperfective aspectual domain, in sharp contrast to the perfectivizing of “telicizing” function of the Lithuanian “internal” prefixes as well as preverbs in other languages of the region.

The interactions of different functions of the Lithuanian “external” prefixes with each other, with verbal lexical meaning and other verbal categories such as tense and finiteness, and with syntactic and pragmatic context pose interesting problems for the theory and typology of the morphology-syntax-semantics interface.

Arkadiev, Peter 2010: Notes on the Lithuanian restrictive – *Baltic Linguistics* 1: 9–49.

----- 2011. On the aspectual uses of the prefix *be-* in Lithuanian – *Baltic Linguistics* 2: 37–78.

Endzelīns, Jānis 1971 (1906): Latyšskie predlogi II – Jānis Endzelīns: *Darbu izlase* I. Rīga: Zinātne. 521–655.

Paulauskas, Jonas 1958: Veiksmāžodžiu priešdėlių funkcijos dabartinėje lietuvių literatūrinėje kalboje – *Literatūra ir kalba* 3: 301–453.

Paducheva, Elena 2005: *Negation in Russian: suspended assertion and duality*. Paper presented at The Fifth Annual Conference of the Slavic Cognitive Linguistics Association, The University of Kansas, 22–23 October 2005.

The studies on cases, prepositions and verbal prefixes present a striking convergence : most of the debates concerning these three categories consist in determining if such a marker is purely grammatical or if it is possible to assign it a semantic content (cf. the partition grammatical / local cases in Finnish, the debates on the existence of grammatical cases in Lithuanian, on the empty verbal prefixes in Baltic and Slavic languages, on the colorless prepositions in French), or to distinguish, individually for each marker, which uses should be treated as grammatical and which ones carry a semantic value; some examples:

- The partition between lexical functions and grammatical functions operated by J. Paulauskas (1958) in his analysis of the Lithuanian verbal prefixes;
- The existence of an “object value” postulated by J. Šukys (1998) for the Lithuanian prepositions;
- The status as grammatical case that the contemporary grammars (e.g. Viikuna 1996; *ISK*) grant to the partitive case in Finnish conceals its semantism in all its uses other than as argument of the verb.

The research dealing with the semantics of these markers are also very similar: most of the time, the question is to identify a basic meaning, which corresponds to the main spatial value of the marker, and to derive the other meanings from it. This type of definition, whether as a semantic network or a semantic invariant implemented into the temporal and notional domains by metaphorization or by analogy does not go without raising problems. First, the primacy of space over the other domains is by no means obvious. Let us simply quote in this respect the luminous demonstration made by E. Benveniste (1954) with the example of the Indo-European term related to loyalty (‘trust’): this example serves to illustrate the common mistake of assuming that the evolution of the meaning of words is from the concrete meaning to the abstract sense. Secondly, patterns of transition between the different domains often lack justification and the extensive use of the notion of metaphorization is questionable. Finally, systematic studies of specific markers show that many cases resist:

- Thus, the preposition *iš* in Lithuanian is defined as expressing the “exit”, but it seems difficult to link the use of this preposition in (1) for example to such a notion:

(1) *Iš veido ji gana graži.*

from – face – she – [is] quite – pretty

- Also, how to implement this notion of “exit” also applied to the verbal prefix *iš* in a case like (2)?

(2) *Išgulė javai.*

lied down – wheats

- The notion of “movement away” is also considered as the basic value of the separative cases in Finnish. This idea, even metaphorically interpreted, is problematic in expressions involving the impediment of the process, as in (3), or in cases where the separative suffix has a temporal value as in (4).

(2) *Myöhästyin junasta.*

be late-PAST-1 train-ELA

I missed my train.

(3) *Aamuyöstä satoi lunta.*

small hours-ELA fall-PAST-3 snow-PAR

Early in the morning it snowed.

The purpose of this paper is to propose another format for describing cases, prepositions and prefixes in a unified way, i.e. without separating lexical and grammatical uses of the unit and by reporting each value of the marker without posing a relation of dependence on its spatial value. We therefore posit that cases, verbal prefixes and prepositions are *relators*, whose semantics can be defined as an abstract schema (a Schematic Form) which carries the principles of the variation observed. We will illustrate our purpose with the separative cases of Finnish and the verbal prefix and preposition *iš* in Lithuanian.

Benveniste, Émile 1954: Problèmes sémantiques de la reconstruction – *Word* 10 (2/3): 251–264.

De Penanros, Hélène, 2010: La préfixation en lituanien : le cas de *iš* – *Faits de Langues*. Les Cahiers n°2.

Franckel, Jean-Jacques & Paillard, Denis 2007: *Grammaire des prepositions*. Tome 1. Paris: Ophrys.

Helasvuo, Marja-Liisa 1996: A Discourse Perspective on the Grammaticization of the Partitive Case in Finnish – *SKY 1996 Yearbook of the Linguistic Association of Finland*: 7-34.

- ISK = Hakulinen, Auli & Vilkuna Maria & Korhonen, Riitta & Koivisto, Vesa & Heinonen, Tarja-Riitta & Alho, Irja 2004: *Iso suomen kielioppi*. Helsinki: SKS. <http://scripta.kotus.fi/visk/etusivu.php>
- Leino, Pentti 1989: Paikallissijat ja suhdesääntö: kognitiivisen kieliopin näkökulma [Local cases and the relation rule: an approach from cognitive grammar] – *Virittäjä* 93: 161-219.
- Paulauskas, Jonas 1958: Veiksmožodžių priešdėlių tyrinėjimo apžvalga – *Literatūra ir kalba III*. Vilnius: Valstybinė grožinės literatūros leidykla. 305–445.
- Rahkonen, Matti 1977: Suomen paikanilmauksista – *Virittäjä* 81: 21–51.
- Spang-Hanssen, Ebbe 1963: *Les prépositions incolores du français moderne*. Copenhagen: G.E.C. Gads Forlag.
- Šukys, Jonas 1998: *Lietuvių kalbos linksniai ir prielinksniai: vartosena ir normos*. Kaunas : Šviesa.
- Vilkuna, Maria 1996: *Suomen lauseopin perusteet*. Helsinki: Edita.

LITHUANIAN GENITIVE VS. FINNISH PARTITIVE IN EXISTENTIAL SENTENCES MARJA LEINONEN

In this paper, my intention is to continue defining the Baltic/Finnic correspondences in the use of the partitive genitive. At present, Lithuanian and Finnish as the presumed archaic representatives of the Baltic linguistic continuum, provide the points of comparison. As noted in several typological studies, the correspondences of the Lithuanian partitive genitive and Finnish partitive cover a wide semantic-syntactic area than is usually mentioned in the descriptions dedicated to this Sprachbund or convergence area (Matthiassen 1995, Larsson 2001; Klaas 1996).

Correspondences of partitive genitive in Lithuanian (Senn, Ambrazas) and partitive in Finnish are found in the following grammatical categories:

- I Subjects and objects:
 - a) subjects of existential sentences with negation;
 - b) subjects of existential sentences without negation;
 - c) as objects of negated transitive verbs;
 - c) as objects of transitive verbs designating an indefinite quantity of objects or mass;
 - d) as objects of certain aterminative verbs.

II As predicatives, the genitive appears in Lithuanian:

a) when expressing a mass noun: *medžio širdelė anksti rytelį – aamuvarhain on sydän puuta; stalas buvo prasto medžio – pöytä oli huonoa puuta; vijau virveles baltų kanapių – punoin nuorat valkoista hampua,*

b) when inclusion/origin is expressed: *(jis yra) aukštos giminės – (hän on) ylhäistä sukua.* (Senn: Genitiv der Beziehung: *aš toks pat didumo kaip kiti vyrai – Olen samaa kokoa kuin muutkin miehet.*) *Kokios spalvos tavo paltas? – Mitä väriä on sinun takkisi?* This is a reflection of the former function of source of the partitive, and is in Finnish much restricted.

III NPs, AdjPs, AdvPs concerned with quantification show Lit genitive, Fi partitive: *truputėlis druskos – hiukkanen suolaa, kilogramas sviesto – kilo voita, maišas miltų – säkki jauhoja, minia žmonių – joukko ihmisiä,*
- with numerals, Lit 10-20, ... pl.gen – Fi 2,3,...+ sg.part; *dešimt įsakymų – kymmenen käskyä;* - with indefinite pronouns: *kažkas pikto – jotakin paha,*
- with certain adjectives and adverbs concerned with quantification: *pilnas + gen – täysi + part, čia daugiau vietos – tässä on enemmän tilaa.*

Despite the similarities, the Lithuanian textual usage of the partitive genitive in the subject and object in groups Ib and Ic shows some differences. Although the definition of the partitive (partitive-genitive) in these functions refers in both languages to an indefinite quantity of objects or mass while that of the nominative or accusative indicates definiteness or concreteness, the use of the partitive in Finnish seems to be much wider. In this paper I shall present examples of such usage taken from fiction, and try to determine the motivations of the choice between genitive and subject nominative or object accusative in Lithuanian, as compared to Finnish.

Examples of the differing treatment (from APFi + Li):

Talon rappusille ilmaantui alusvaatteisillaan olevia ihmisiä
(Part.PI.), *isąntą, emąntą, ąskeinen nuori nainen.* (APFi 2000, 88)

Ant namo laiptelių pasirodė žmonės (Nom.PI.) *apatiniais drabužiais šeimininkas, šeimininkė, ta pati jauna moteris.* (APLi 2000, 64).

Mažos žuvelės (Nom.PI.) *tirštais guotais judusiavo prieš srovę...*(APLi 2000, 10).

Pieniä kaloja (Part.PI.) *ui tiheänä parvena ylävirran suuntaan...*
(APFi 2000, 13).

- Ambrazas, Vytautas (ed): *Lithuanian Grammar – Lietuvių kalbos gramatika* 1997. Institute of the Lithuanian Language. Baltos lankos.
- APFi = Paasilinna, Arto 2000: *Jäniksen vuosi*. Keuruu: Otava / Suuri suomalainen kirjakerho.
- APLi = Paasilinna, Arto 2000: *Zuikio metai*. Translated by Aida Krilavičienė. Tyto alba.
- Berg-Olsen, Sturla 1999: *A syntactic change in progress: The decline in the use of the non-prepositional genitive in Latvian, with a comparative view on Lithuanian*. Mag. Art. thesis in Baltic linguistics, University of Oslo, Dept. of East-European and Oriental Studies.
- ISK = Hakulinen, Auli & Viikuna Maria & Korhonen, Riitta & Koivisto, Vesa & Heinonen, Tarja-Riitta & Alho, Irja 2004: *Iso suomen kielioppi*. Helsinki: SKS. <http://scripta.kotus.fi/visk/etusivu.php>
- Klaas, Birute 1996: Similarities in case marking of syntactic relations in Estonian and Lithuanian – Mari Erelt (ed.): *Estonian: Typological studies I*. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli eesti õppetooli toimetised 4. 35–67.
- Larsson, Lars-Gunnar 2001: Baltic influence on Finnic languages – Östen Dahl & Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.): *The Circum-Baltic Languages 1. Past and Present*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. SLCS Vol. 54. 237–256.
- Mathiassen, Terje 1995: Some aspects of language contacts and convergency phenomena in the Baltic Area – Evidence from Lithuanian, Latvian, Livonian, Estonian, Russian and Polish. – Jocelyne Fernandez & Raimo Raag (eds.): *Contacts de langues et de cultures dans l'aire baltique*. Mélanges offerts à Fanny de Sivers. Uppsala Multiethnic Papers 39. 171–180.
- Ramonienė, Meilutė & Pribušauskaitė, Joana 2008: *Practical Grammar of Lithuanian*. Baltų lankų leidyba.
- Senn, Alfred 1966: *Handbuch der litauischen Sprache von Alfred Senn. Band I: Grammatik*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Valeckienė, Adelė 1998: *Funkcinė lietuvių kalbos gramatika*. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų institutas.

COMPARING THE OBJECT CASE ALTERNATION IN FINNISH AND LITHUANIAN
MAIJA TERVOLA

My presentation is about comparing the object case alternation in Finnish and Lithuanian. I will make an overview about the different meanings of the case alternation in these two languages. There are a lot of similarities in the meaning and use of the partitive case in Finnish and the genitive case in Lithuanian – and they both are in opposition with the Finnish genitive/nominative/accusative and the Lithuanian accusative, respectively.

My approach to this subject is synchronic, although we must keep in mind that both Finnish and Lithuanian have historic roots in the same area, and they both are parts of the Circum-Baltic language contact superposition zone, where many languages with many kind of background have been in contact with each other in many different ways for centuries. The assumption is that the Baltic type of case alternation has influenced that of Finnic languages at the Proto-Finnic era. The question, though, how Baltic alternation influenced the Finnic one, remains unanswered.

My questions are: what kind of semantic oppositions are there in the object case alternation in Finnish and Lithuanian, what meanings do they have, and which oppositions and meanings are common for both languages and which occur only in one or the other language.

The main difference between Finnish and Lithuanian object case alternation is that in Finnish it is highly aspectual, unlike in Lithuanian. Although there are traces of some kind of aspectuality also in Lithuanian case alternation – that is in the lexical type of aspectuality. Some of the verbs in Lithuanian take genitive case, and those verbs have an extremely irresultative meaning, such as *bijoti* 'to fear', *laukti* 'to wait', *norėti* 'to want' and *ieškoti* 'to look for'. Apparently, in earlier centuries, Lithuanian case alternation expressed that kind of aspectuality more widely and more clearly. Later the Baltic genitive has lost almost all its aspectuality. In Finnish - on the contrary - the partitive case has been expanding ever since it became aspectual in the Proto-Finnic era and it has widened up to express almost all kinds of imperfection, openness, incompleteness - as an opposition to perfection, limitation and completeness.

I will consider here four kinds of case alternation: the lexical aspect, the grammatical aspect, the quantitation of the object and the negation.

Nowadays in Finnish the aspectuality is expressed widely on the lexical level. Some verbs take partitive object almost always, some verbs can take

both – they take part in the grammatical aspect – and some verbs take only genitive/nominative/accusative case. The group of verbs which take partitive is much larger than in Lithuanian. In Finnish not only the verbs with extremely irresultative meaning take partitive but also verbs, whose meaning is relatively imperfective, such as *rakastaa* 'to love', *ravistaa* 'to shake', *lyödä* 'to hit'. All these verbs take accusative case in Lithuanian.

The grammatical aspect is expressed in Finnish with the partitive case for the object so that the imperfective variant is marked with the partitive and the perfective variant with the genitive/nominative/accusative. In Lithuanian there is no case alternation in grammatical aspect, because the grammatical aspect is expressed with prefixes, similarly as in Slavic languages.

Both in Finnish and in Lithuanian the object case is alternating among the quantitation of the object entity itself. If the activity covers some kind of amount of the entity, it is marked with a partial case in both languages. There is, though, a difference between these languages. In Finnish the neutral variant is the partitive, and the opposite variant is used only, when there is a special reference to a limited amount of the entity. In Lithuanian on the contrary the neutral variant is the accusative, and the genitive refers to a special quantitation

In both languages the negation affects the object case. Again, there is a difference in how the negation affects it. In both languages the negation turns the object case into the partial one, but in Finnish the negation works on the semantic level, as in Lithuanian it is a pure morphologic issue. Another difference concerning negation is that in Finnish the distance between negated verb and object. In Finnish the negation affects object case even when there is a long distance between them. In Lithuanian the negation loses its power when there is more than one other word between the negated verb and the object.

While the syntax and semantics of the constructions involving the Latvian dative case is generally well-charted territory, there remain certain less-explored areas on the fringes of this category. This paper will examine constructions where the dative is employed to express a relationship between speech-act participants rather than action-chain participants. The term *speech-act dative*, deemed to be more precise than the traditional *ethical dative*, is used here as an umbrella term for several subconstructions that differ somewhat both in form and meaning, cf. (1)–(3):

1. Assertion of power:

(1) *Nedomā tu man tajās grāmatās vien gulēt!*

“Don’t you go thinking that you can just lie there with those books!”

2. Claim or assertion that something concerns someone:

(2) *Tērauds nav vis tev kādi lini vai kaņepāji.*

“Steel is nothing like your ordinary linen or hemp.”

3. Expression of empathy:

(3) *Ratos viņa man guļ uz muguras.*

“In the pram she lies on her back.”

I take the defining features of a speech-act dative to be that 1) it is not required by any element in the syntactic structure; 2) it can be removed without rendering the utterance ungrammatical or changing its truth-functional meaning; 3) it can only be expressed by a subset of the nominals in the language (more specifically, only by personal pronouns) and 4) it expresses a relationship between speech-act participants.

Framing my analysis within the usage-based constructionalist framework, I will argue that the speech-act dative is compatible with and motivated by the semantics expressed by the dative in its core uses, the principal difference being the application of the concept of affectedness to the speech-act domain. Elsewhere (Berg-Olsen 2005:61–119) it has been argued that an element of affectedness is present in most dative constructions in Latvian. Although constructions of the types in (1)–(3) are mostly confined to certain styles due to their pragmatic purport, I will argue that they do form an integral part of Latvian grammar and deserve more attention than the mere footnotes devoted to them in some of the existing

standard works (as also remarked by Holvoet & Čížik-Prokaševa (2005:87) in the context of Lithuanian).

I will also explore how constructions with speech-act datives are related to certain other constructions, namely 1) the ordinary predicative possessive, 2) the external possessive construction and 3) the personal dative construction, which involves the reflexive pronoun *sev* and is similar to the American English personal dative as discussed e.g. in Horn (2008). In this connection I will discuss some borderline cases where the dative may or may not be interpreted as a speech-act dative.

Berg-Olsen, Sturla 2005: *The Latvian dative and genitive: A Cognitive Grammar account. Acta Humaniora* 242. Faculty of Humanities, University of Oslo.

Holvoet, Axel & Čížik-Prokaševa, Veslava 2005: Papildiniai ir aplinkybės – Axel Holvoet & Rolandas Mikulskas (eds.): *Gramatinių funkcijų tyrimai*. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas. 65–92.

Horn, Laurence R. 2008: “I love me som him”: The landscape of non-argument datives – Olivier Bonami & Patricia Cabredo Hofherr (eds.) *Empirical Issues in Formal Syntax and Semantics* 7. Papers from CSSP 2007. 169–192. <<http://www.cssp.cnrs.fr/eiss7/>>

ON COMPANION-ORIENTED COMITATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN LATVIAN AND ESTONIAN

NATALIA PERKOVA

In my talk I'm going to discuss one type of comitative constructions which one can find both in Latvian and Estonian.

Besides primary comitative markers (*ar* + ACC_{CSG} / DAT_{PL} in Latvian, *-ga* in Estonian), there are secondary markers of so-called companion-orientation. In (Stolz et al. 2006: 315) companion-orientation is defined as “the description of situations from the point of view of the participant who has less control over the action than the accompanee, if there is one at all”. For example, the difference between two types of orientation can be seen in the pair of examples (1-2), taken from Latvian:

- (1) *Un tad ar mani ir mans Dievs, ticība un spēks.*
'After all, my God is with me, as well as my faith and my power'
- (2) *Kad braucām uz sacensībām, somā parasti bija līdzi arī lekciju pieraksti, metodiskie materiāli.*
'When we went to the competition, we usually had the notes on lectures, methodological guides with us'

In fact, there is a rather restricted set of predicates (or situations) where the marker *līdzi* can be used: a) non-causative predicates of motion (*iet* 'to go', *skriet* 'to run', *doties* 'to leave, to depart'), b) predicates of caused motion (*ņemt* 'to take', *aicināt* 'to invite'), c) some situations with an assistive-sociative meaning, cf. such predicates as *dziedāt* 'sing', *just* 'feel', see (3). It appears that *kaasa*-constructions in Estonian prefer the same types of situations.

- (3) *... es skaļi dziedāju līdzi radio, kas skanēja...*
'I sang along with the sounds of the radio in a loud voice'

It's worth mentioning that in Estonian companion-oriented comitative constructions the comitative marker is inflected distinctively according to the semantics of causative situation. If the result is emphasized, the postposition is put into the inessive form (4), but otherwise the illative is used (5):

- (4) *Kas sul on pass kaasa_{INESS}?*
'Do you have a passport with you?'
- (5) *Võta mind (endaga) linna kaasa_{ILL}!*
'Take me along to the city!'

In my talk, I would like to put emphasis on semantic and syntactic properties of such constructions. It seems that the investigation of companion-orientation in comitative constructions in other Circum-Baltic languages could help much with the analysis of these data.

Stolz, Thomas & Stroh, Cornelia & Urdze, Aina 2006: *On Comitatives and Related Categories. A Typological Study with Special Focus on the Languages of Europe*. (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 33). Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

FINNIC ACTIVE-PASSIVE DIATHESIS AND BALTIC CONTACTS

MERLIJN DE SMIT

Lars-Gunnar Larsson's (1983) research on the development of the Finnic partitive case established that influence from the Baltic languages in Finnic goes beyond the lexicon and has guided language change in structural, syntactic domains as well. This presentation takes as its point of departure another phenomenon to which Larsson (1996; 2001: 247-249) has drawn attention, namely that of the Finnic *-mA* passive and its equivalents in the Baltic languages, e.g. Finnish:

tämä leipä on hiiren syömä
this bread is mouse-GEN eat-PARTIC
"This bread has been eaten by a mouse"

and Lithuanian:

Darbininkų vežama plytos
The workers-GEN being-carted-*ma* bricks-NOM PL
"Workers are evidently carting bricks." (lit: "The bricks are being carted by the workers") (Lavine 1999)

The relationship between these two constructions is difficult to determine: the Finnic *-mA* participle occurs in this construction only in Finnish and dialectally in Karelian, but has cognates in more distantly related languages; the Baltic suffix is represented thinly in Indo-European languages outside of Balto-Slavic. In Finnic, interestingly, there is a much more widespread construction involving a *-ttU* passive and a genitive agent:

tämä leipä on hiiren syöty
this bread is mouse-GEN eat-PARTIC PASS
"This bread has been eaten by a mouse"

which has a parallel as well in Baltic, e.g. Lithuanian:

Jonuko tie grybai atnešta
Jonukas-GEN these mushrooms-NOM PL brought-*ta*
"Apparently Jonukas brought these mushrooms." (Lavine 1999)

This means that the occurrence of these constructions, and possible Baltic influence, should be sought in the replacement (in Proto-Finnic times) of an older **-mA* participle by a diathetic pair of **-nUt* (active) and **-ttU* (passive), both of which have origins which are not entirely clear (though the dental element in the passive participle seems obviously related to that of the Finnic

passive in general); and in a wider sense, in the development of active-passive diathesis as such in Proto-Finnic. Notably, the Finnic passive has no cognates in more distantly related languages, and the category cannot be reconstructed to Proto-Uralic.

The question I seek to answer is thus that of the origin of active-passive diathesis in Finnic, and the role of Baltic model patterns in its development.

Larsson, Lars-Gunnar 1983: *Studien zum Partitivgebrauch in den ostseefinnischen Sprachen*. Uppsala 1982.

----- 1996: Bemerkungen zur Geschichte der *mA*-Partizipien im Finnischen – *Congressus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum 8*. Pars III. Jyväskylä. 145–152.

----- 2001: Baltic influence on Finnic languages – Östen Dahl & Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.): *The Circum-Baltic Languages 1. Past and Present*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. SLCS Vol. 54. 237–256.

Lavine, James 1999: Subject properties and ergativity in North Russian and Lithuanian – Katarzyna Dziwirek & Herbert Coats & Cynthia Vakareliyska (eds.): *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 7*. Ann Arbor. 307–328.

OBLIQUE ANTICAUSATIVES IN LITHUANIAN
VALGERDUR BJARNADÓTTIR

Anticausative -the non-causal and marked member of a transitive/intransitive alternation- is a relatively recent concept. It was first introduced by the Russians Nedjalkov and Sil'nickij in 1969 from the Leningrad Typology Group and was later firmly established by typologists such as Comrie (1985), Haspelmath (1987).

Lithuanian and Latvian are quite unusual among European languages in that they possess a productive morphological causative *-(d)in-ti, -(d)y-ti*), where the causative is the marked member and not the other way around cf. *degti/deginti* : burn (intr) /burn (tr).

This has been compared to Finnish affixal markers of causation cf Lith. *šokdinti* "make someone dance" and Fin. *tansittaa* "idem" (Rackevičienė 2002).

Furthermore there exists an even more productive morphological anticausative which is based on the reflexive marker *-si-* cf. *atsidaryti /atidaryti* open (intr) /open (tr)

A less productive group of morphological anticausative has a root vowel change where the anticausative shows the zero grade of vocalic ablaut cf. *kilti /kelti* : rise/raise

In this paper I would like to propose yet another group of morphological anticausatives. I prefer to call them oblique anticausatives. The morphosyntactic change lies not in the verb, as in the above mentioned groups, but in the noun. The object preserves its case after it has been promoted to the subject. The sole remaining argument the subject thus, has an oblique case (accusative).

<i>Šaltis gelia rankas</i>	<i>rankas gelia</i>
Cold:NOM bites hands:ACC	hands:ACC freeze/hurt

This has already been suggested for Old Norse (Ottósson 2009, Sandal 2011) Ottósson claiming this to be unique for Old Norse. Barddal, Cennamo and Eythorsson however, have shown that this can be found in other in IE language (). As other anticausatives they denote change-of-state events occurring spontaneously. The semantic spheres for the Lithuanian oblique anticausatives are typically:

1. Force of nature

<i>Nuo laukų jau</i>	<i>leidžia</i>	<i>sniegą</i>
----------------------	----------------	---------------

from fields already melts:3PRS snow:ACC
'snow is already melting from the fields'

2. Unvolitional physical events

a) pain:

man gelia kojas
Me:DAT hurt:3PRS feet:ACC
'I have a stabbing pain in my feet'

b) cutaneous eruptions

Vaiką išbėrė raudonais spuogeliais
child:ACC erupt3PST red spot:INSTR
'The child('s body) erupted in red spots'

3. Experiential events

Mane purtina nuo tavęs
Me:ACC disgust from you
'I'm disgusted by you – you disgust me'

My proposal of this new group of anticausatives will hopefully be helpful in explaining and understanding certain morphological and syntactic phenomena and may cast a light on their historical development.

Cennamo, Michela & Eythórsson, Þórhallur & Barðdal, Jóhanna 2011: The Rise and Fall of Anticausative Constructions in Indo-European: The Context of Latin and Germanic – *Linguistics: Typology of Labile Verbs: Focus on Diachron*.

Comrie, Bernard 1985: Causative verb-formation and other verb-deriving morphology – Timothy Shopen (ed.): *Language typology and syntactic description 3: Grammatical categories and the lexicon*, 301–348. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haspelmath, Martin 1987: *Transitivity alternations of the anticausative type*. (Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität zu Köln, Arbeitspapiere N. F. 5.) Köln: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität zu Köln.

Ottósson, Kjartan 2009: *The anticausative and related categories in the old Germanic languages*. University of Oslo.

Rackevičienė, Sigita 2002: Morfologiniai lietuvių, norvegų ir suomių kalbų kauzatyvai – *Kalbųtyra LI* (1).

Sandal, Catrine 2011: *Akkusative Subjekt og antikausativitet i norrønt*. Master thesis. University of Bergen.

MORPHOSYNTAX AND MODAL SEMANTICS OF LATVIAN VERB
VAJADZĒT 'TO NEED'

ILZE LOKMANE, ANDRA KALNAČA

To express the meaning of necessity in Latvian, constructions with a modal verb and infinitive verb are used. From the formal point of view they all are morphologically unmarked analytical constructions in terms of the person and number categories. In colloquial language and also in mass media texts the construction *vajadzēt* 'need' + *infinitive* is wide-spread. The subject of the action in *vajadzēt* + *infinitive* constructions is in the Dative case where the Dative is used to mark the semantic role of experiencer:

- (1) *Man vajag nopirkt maizi*
I.DAT need.PRS buy.INF bread.ACC
'I need to buy bread'
- (2) *Mums vakar vajadzēja iet uz tirgu*
we.DAT yesterday need.PST go.INF to market.ACC
'Yesterday we had to go to the market'
- (3) *Kaimiņiem pēc nedēļas vajadzēs pļaut mauriņu*
neighbour.DAT.PL after week.GEN need.FUT cut.INF grass.ACC
'After a week the neighbours will have to cut grass'

The verb *vajadzēt* can also be used in impersonal constructions without infinitive:

- (4) *Viņai vajag darbu*
she.DAT need.PRS job.ACC
'She needs a job'

There are two subtypes of the construction *vajadzēt* + *infinitive* (or single verb *vajadzēt*) possible in Latvian:

Relative subtype

- (5) *Man esot vajadzējis nopirkt maizi*
I.DAT be.AUX.REL need.PTCP buy.INF bread.ACC
'They say I had to buy bread'

Conditional subtype

- (6) *Tev to būtu vajadzējis zināt agrāk*
you.DAT this.ACC be.AUX.COND need.PTCP know.INF earlier
'You should have known this earlier'

It must be pointed out that verb *vajadzēt* is derived from archaic noun *vajaga* 'necessity' considered as borrowing from Livonian *vajāg* 'necessity' (Mülenbachs, Endzelīns 1932: 445, see also Karulis 1992: 472, Beitiņa 1997). *Vajadzēt* is a defective 3rd person verb in Latvian. Construction *vajadzēt + infinitive* functions as semantic variant of the debitive mood from earlier Latvian texts from 16th century till today (in details see Fennell 1995, Paegle 2003, Holvoet 2007). In all cases these constructions can be replaced by the paradigmatic debitive form or its relative or conditional subtype. It must be admitted though that unlike the obligatory and objective necessity expressed by the debitive mood, the construction *vajadzēt + infinitive* in certain contexts can denote optional necessity (Paegle 2003, Holvoet 2007).

From the point view of modality, the construction *vajadzēt + infinitive* expresses nearly the same modal meanings as the debitive mood which are related to deontic (examples (1), (2), (3), (4)), epistemic (6) and evidential (5) modality.

The data of current issue are taken from the following sub-corpora that are included in the Corpus of Latvian (*Latviešu valodas tekstu korpuss*): *miljons-1.0*, *miljons-2.0*, *miljons-2.0m*, *timeklis-1.0* (www.korpuss.lv).

References

- Aikhenvald, Aleksandra Y. 2004: *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Auwera, Johan van der & Ammann, Andreas & Kindt, Saskia 2005: Modal polyfunctionality and Standard Average European – Alex Klinge & Henrik Høeg Müller (eds.): *Modality. Studies in Form and Function*. London – Oakwille: Equinox. 247–272.
- Beitiņa, Maigone 1997: Kā no lībiešu nomena *vajāg* radās latviešu verbs *vajadzēt* – *Vārds un tā pētišanas aspekti. Zinātniskās konferences tēžu krājums*. Liepāja: LiePA. 7–9.
- Fennells, Trevors 1995: Verbu konjugācija pirmajās latviešu gramatikās. *Lingua Lettica*. Melbourne: Latvian Tertiary Committee. 95–109.
- Haan, Ferdinand de 2006: Typological approaches to modality – William Frawley (ed.): *The Expression of Modality*. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 27–70.
- Holvoet, Axel 2001: *Studies in the Latvian Verb*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo universitetu Jagiellońskiego.

- 2007. *Mood and Modality in Latvian*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Karulis, Konstantīns 1992: *Latviešu etimoloģijas vārdnīca 2*. Rīga: Avots.
- Mülenbachs, Kārlis & Endzelīns, Jānis 1932: *Latviešu valodas vārdnīca. Lettisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*. IV. Band. Rīga: Kultūras fonda izdevums.
- Paegle, Dzintra 2003: *Latviešu literārās valodas morfoloģija*. Rīga: Zinātne.
- Palmer, Frank 2001: *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press [2nd edition].
- Plungian, Vladimir 2001: The Place of Evidentiality within the Universal Grammatical Space – *Journal of Pragmatics* 33. 349-357.

EVIDENTIALITY IN LIVONIAN

PETAR KEHAYOV, HELLE METSLANG, KARL PAJUSALU

The study focuses on dedicated grammatical evidentials and evidentiality strategies in the two main dialects of Livonian – Courland and Salaca Livonian. The analysis of Livonian evidentiality is based on a model originally proposed by Huno Rätsep for Estonian, which posits two subsystems of reported evidentiality – the reported indicative (oblique mood) and the reported imperative (jussive). The present tense form of the reported indicative is marked by the suffix *-(j)i* (1). The affirmative form of the jussive consists of the particle *la ~ las ~ laz* (similar to Estonian *las* and Latvian *lai*) and the *k(ō)/g(ō)*-marked form of the lexical verb (2).

- (1) *Tämmõn ka voļļ-i vigā, tām umta*
 he:DAT also be-REP.IND.SG problem he.NOM be.PRS.3SG
kītõn, ku sõ-ji tijā makkõks
 say:APP if he.NOM get-REP.IND.SG empty.GEN stomach:INSTR
kilmõ vietā jūodõ, ta ē-ji īd
 cold:PART water:PART drink:INF he.NOM go-REP.IND.SG only
reitkõks ūlõks.
 time:INSTR crazy:INSTR

'He is also reported to have a problem; he has said that if he is said to be able to drink water on an empty stomach, he is reported to go mad at once (i.e. to fall ill).'

- (2) □ *ma* *kītiz*, *la* *ma* *vōtā-k*
 mother.NOM tell:PST.3SG IMP.PTCL I.NOM take-IMP.SG
pūnda zēpō, *lā-k* *piezōm*.
 pound.NOM soap:PART go-IMP.SG wash:INF
 'Mother told me to take a pound of soap and to go and wash myself.' (KET 146)

In Livonian, as also in Estonian and Latvian evidentiality is marked morphologically; the past tense forms of the reported indicative coincide with the past participles; the reported indicative seems to have developed as a result of reanalysis of the complement clause of an utterance verb. Similarly to Latvian but differently from Estonian, the Livonian reported evidential ('oblique mood') has future constructions and special debitive forms. Nevertheless, the evidentiality in Livonian – despite the intense and long-lasting contacts of this language with Latvian (resulting in heavy structural borrowing in many domains of grammar) and its close genetic relatedness to Estonian – manifests a rather unique configuration of structural features. The most striking of them is that the present tense forms of the Livonian reported indicative are expressed by means of agent nouns agreeing in number with the subject NP. It is argued that this type of evidentiality coding is typologically very rare.

KET = Kettunen, Lauri 1925: *Untersuchung über die Livische Sprache I. Phonetische Einführung. Sprachproben.* Acta et Commentationes Universitatis Dorpatensis B VIII 3. Tartu.

ON THE THEORY OF A URALIC SUBSTRATUM IN BALTIC
 JAN HENRIK HOLST

Baltic and Balto-Finnic are neighbouring language groups (I use *Balto-Finnic* for what in German is *Ostseefinnisch*, in Finnish *itämerensuomalaiset kielet*; in English there are several designations, e.g. also *Finnic*), and it is well-known that they exhibit various language contact phenomena. Partly these contact phenomena have been studied in more detail, partly less so.

Mańczak (2008: 149f.) has put forward a hypothesis according to which already Proto-Baltic was influenced in its structure by a Uralic language, most likely then, by Balto-Finnic. He claims that there is a Uralic substratum in Baltic; he also maintains that it is exactly this contact which made Baltic split off from Balto-Slavic or Indo-European. For sources he assembled contributions from other scholars on this topic who, however, often refer to later contact events.

The objective of my talk is to investigate Mańczak's hypothesis. The topic merits investigation, irrespectively of whether the result is positive or negative. I intend to let the data speak for itself as far as possible. I check the innovations within Baltic adduced by Mańczak and develop an opinion on the question whether they really can be due to such a substratum. (I have published both on Baltic and on Estonian.)

Example: Lithuanian, Latvian and Old Prussian all share 3rd person verb forms which are indifferent for number. This trait must be reconstructed to Proto-Baltic. As the comparison with other branches of Indo-European shows, historically these forms are singular forms. The diachronic change was that the use of the singular form was expanded to cover also dual and plural functions. The next step is to investigate whether this can be due to Balto-Finnic influence. This is what Thomason / Kaufman (1988: 243) tend towards and Mańczak (2008: 150) approves. One may consider colloquial constructions such as Finnish *ihmiset laulaa* (instead of *laulavat*), and Estonian has *on* "is, are" in both numbers. But these phenomena seem to be younger (looking at all languages of the branch) and can therefore not be the source. Moreover, the foundation for the Baltic phenomenon can be located in a syntactic feature of Proto-Indo-European, as I will demonstrate. This is why I do not support this point.

All in all, I am able to show that Mańczak's hypothesis has not been backed up in a sufficient way, and therefore there is no need to believe in it.

Mańczak, Witold 2008: *Linguistique générale et linguistique indo-européenne*. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności. (A collection of articles. Original source: *Baltistica* 26: 29–38.)

Thomason, Sarah & Kaufman, Terrence 1988: *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Participants of the conference

Organising Committee

Laimute Balode
University of Helsinki /
University of Latvia
laimute.balode@helsinki.fi

Riho Grünthal
University of Helsinki
riho.grunthal@helsinki.fi

Aurelija Kaskelvičienė
University of Helsinki /
University of Vilnius
aurelija.kaskelviciene@helsinki.fi

Marja Leinonen
University of Helsinki
marja.leinonen@kolumbus.fi

Santeri Junttila
University of Helsinki
santeri.junttila@helsinki.fi

Volunteers

Johanna Toivainen
johanna.toivainen@helsinki.fi
Mikko Hakalin
mikko.hakalin@helsinki.fi
Johan Lindholm
jopalin@kotiportti.fi
Sari Ali-Melkkilä
saralime@mappi.helsinki.fi
Johanna Virkkula
johanna.virkkula@helsinki.fi

Participants with presentations

Peter Arkadiev
Moscow State University
alpgurev@gmail.com
Pauls Balodis
University of Latvia
pauls.balodis@gmail.com

Sturla Berg-Olsen
University of Oslo
sturla.berg-olsen@iln.uio.no

Ojārs Bušs
Latvian Language Institute
ojaars@lycos.com

Anna Daugaviete
Saint Petersburg State University
anna.daugavet@gmail.com

Jan Henrik Holst
Hamburg University
webmaster@janhenrikholst.de

Adam Hyllested
University of Copenhagen
ah@hum.ku.dk

Ilga Jansone
Latvian Language Institute
ilgajan@lza.lv

Andra Kalnača
University of Latvia
kalnaca@latnet.lv

Ilze Lokmane
University of Latvia
ilokmane@latnet.lv

Helle Metslang
University of Tartu
helle.metslang@ut.ee

Karl Pajusalu
University of Helsinki /
University of Tartu
karl.pajusalu@helsinki.fi

Hélène de Penanros
Institut National des Langues et
Civilisation Orientales
helene.depenanros@inalco.fr

Natalia Perkova
Russian Academy of Sciences
(Saint-Petersburg)
nofpernat@gmail.com

Janne Saarikivi
University of Helsinki
janne.saarikivi@helsinki.fi

Marius Smetona
Vilnius University
marius.smetona@gmail.com

Anželika Smetoniene
Lithuanian Language Institute
anzelika.smetoniene@gmail.com

Merlijn de Smit
Stockholm University
merlijn.de.smit@finska.su.se

Maija Tervola
University of Tampere
maija.tervola@uta.fi

Valgerdur Bjarnadóttir
Stockholm University
valgerdur.bjarnadottir@balt.su.se

Pēteris Vanags
Stockholm University /
University of Latvia
peteris.vanags@balt.su.se

Other participants

Mariko Faster
Võro Institute
mariko.faster@wi.ee

Mirja Hovila
mitkonen@pp.inet.fi

Seppo Hovila
seppo.hovila@gmail.com

Stefan Jacobsson
Uppsala University
stefan.jacobsson@nordiska.uu.se

Helena Johansson
University of Helsinki
helena.johansson@kuntaliitto.fi

Evar Saar
Võro Institute
evar.saar@wi.ee