

studies of the Indo-Iranian-Finno-Ugric contacts in the 1990s and 2000s. Although the etymological work by Korenchy is important, it is a fact that the research in both historical phonology of the Uralic languages (for instance, Zhivlov 2007 offers a more regular reconstruction of Ob-Ugric vowel system) as well as in the field of Indo-Iranian-Uralic contacts has developed greatly since the 1970s, and in order to keep the standards of loanword research high, the earlier etymological material has to be reevaluated with the help of the new results.

It is the aim of my presentation to apply the new findings of historical phonology and loanword research, such as the more regular substitution rules and the clearer picture of different Indo-Iranian loanword layers in other Uralic languages, in the study of the Iranian loanwords in the Ugric languages, and review the earlier etymologies.

The loanword research can also have relevance in studying the relationship of the Ugric languages, at least during the time of the Iranian contacts. The loanword corpus contains irregular cases: for example, Sammallahti (1988: 504) observes the irregular vowel and consonant relations between Hungarian *hét* and Ob-Ugric **θāpet* ‘seven’, and also some other loanwords such as **mańćV* ‘human’ (Korenchy nro 13.), **mēŋkV* ‘forest spirit’ (nro 14.) and *wāryV* ‘fishing object’ (nro 41.) feature unclear vowel developments, so a more critical study of the etymologies with Ugric or Ob-Ugric distribution can prove that some of them are not cognates but separate, parallel loans instead.

References

- Joki, A.J. 1973a: *Uralier und Indogermaner*. MSFOu 151; Helsinki: Finno-Ugrian Society.
- Koivulehto, J. 1999: Varhaiset indoeurooppalaisyhteistyöt: aika ja paikka lainasanojen valossa. *Pohjan poluilla. Suomalaisten juuret nykytutkimuksen mukaan*. Toim. Paul Fogelberg. Bidrag till kännedom av Finlands natur och folk 153; Helsinki: Suomen Tiedeseura. 207–236.
- 2007: Saamen ja suomen ’poro’. *Sámit, sánit, sátnehámit. Riepmočála Pekka Sammallahtii miessemánu 21. beaivve 2007*. Doaimmahan Jussi Ylikoski ja Ante Aikio. MSFOu 253; Helsinki: Finno-Ugrian Society. 251–258.
- Korenchy, É. 1972: *Iranische Lehnwörter in den obugrischen Sprachen*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Sammallahti, P. 1988: Historical phonology of the Uralic languages. *The Uralic languages: description, history and foreign influences*. Ed. by Denis Sinor. Handbuch der Orientalistik 8: Handbook of Uralic studies 1; Leiden: E. J. Brill. 478–554.
- Zhivlov, M. 2007: K voprosu o rekonstrukcii obsko-ugorskogo vokalizma. *Doklady konferencii pamjati S. A. Starostina*. 281–309.

Junttila, Santeri
University of Helsinki

Revisiting the ‘separate Proto-Balto-Slavic borrowings’ of Saami

According to Korhonen, S(aami) š originates from a change of Pre-S(aami) clusters *šk and *št through E(arly) P(oto-)S(aami) *čk and *čt to Late PS *šk

and *št. Elsewhere, Pre-S ~ P(roto-)U(ralic) *ś has given PS *ć > S č. Before the new š emerged, Pre-S (PU) *š had changed into S s. The new phoneme š integrated into the system by increasing its distribution through numerous loanwords from P(roto-)F(innic), where PU *š, later resulting in F(innic) h, was still unchanged. It was not the only PF sound substituted for PS *š, but also instances of PF *s before palatal vowels went the same way. (Korhonen 1981: 130, 163, 178)

Sammallahti, instead, proposed that the Pre-S *ś never changed to PS *ć (> S č) before consonants. Instead, the clusters *šk and *št remained, and *ś reconquered prevocalic positions through some P(roto-)B(alto-)Sl(avic) borrowings. This *ś changed later to *š. Sammallahti's hypothesis is based on his two PBSI loan etymologies, N(orth) S šuvon 'good dog' < EPS *šōvonji ← PBSI *śowon(i)- > Lith(uanian) šuo 'dog', NS šearrat 'bright' < Pre-S *šerä- ← PBSI *žer- > Lith žerėti 'to shine' and a third one by Aikio, NS šielbmá 'threshold', cf. Lith šelmuo 'frame (of a window or roof)'. (Sammallahti 2001: 400–401, Aikio 2012: 107)

The PBSI palatal sibilants *ś and *ž originated from P(roto-)I(ndo-)E(uropean) palatal stops *k, *g and *gh. This stage can be reconstructed for the earliest I(ndo-)E(uropean) borrowings in S, e.g. PIE *kuk- → Pre-S *śuka > PS *ćokō- > NS čohkut 'to comb'. In B(altic), the palatal sibilants developed to *š and *ž. In the B loanwords shared by S and F, their substitution in S is s, as in NS suidni, Fi(nnish) heinä 'hay', cf. Lith šienas id. In somewhat later B loans, undoubtedly mediated by F, S š occurs: Aanaar S šišne 'tanned leather', Fi hihna 'leather strap', cf. Lith šikšna 'tanned leather'. (Kallio 2009, Aikio 2012: 75)

It is problematic to suppose a PBSI layer of three exclusively S words, while the earlier stratum is widely spread throughout Western U(ralic) and the later one shared with F. In addition, the three words have a narrow distribution among S languages, as Kallio points out. He proposes that the šuvon group is in fact later than the suidni group: "As PS *ś was frequently substituted for Middle PF *š, it can very well have been substituted for PB *š, too". In this case, the šuvon words should be contemporary with the šišne words, but borrowed directly from B, without F mediation. (Kallio 2009: 35)

This suggestion solves one problem but creates another, geographical one: the later any direct B-S contacts are dated, the more difficult it gets to find a suitable context for them. If F was the mediating link for the presumably earlier suidni group, why could not it have brought the šuvon words to S as well? In fact, this seems to be the case with šielbmá as proposed by Aikio (2012: 107). As a new etymology, I suggest a similar solution to šearrat: it was borrowed from PF *šeretä, cf. Estonian ere, Võro herre 'bright' and the PF form from B. Šuvon, in turn, is probably not from BSI at all, since the reconstruction *śowon(i)- is not valid: the IE stem is monosyllabic and its BSI form was *śwon(i)-.

Without the hypothesis of 'separate PBSI' words in S, there is no need to postulate a PS *ś in prevocalic positions. Further, it means there are no certain traces of IE loanwords representing a stage between PIE *k, *g, *gh and PB *š, *ž in any U languages.

Sources

- Aikio, Ante 2012: An essay on Saami ethnolinguistic prehistory – MSFOu 266, 63–118.
- Kallio, Petri 2009: Stratigraphy of Indo-European loanwords in Saami – Publications of the Giellagas Institute 12, 30–45. Oulu: Oulun yliopisto.
- Korhonen, Mikko 1981: Johdatus lapin kielen historiaan. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Sammallahti, Pekka 2001: The Indo-European loanwords in Saami – MSFOu 242: 397–415.

Kuokkala, Juha
University of Helsinki

Saami labial vowel stems and their background

The Saami languages have two types of labial vowel word stems, one containing a Proto-Saami palatal glide (*-ōj) and one without the glide (*-ō). Both stem types appear in nouns as well as verbs. So far there has been little account for explaining the difference of these stem types: Formerly the *-ōj stems were occasionally connected with Finnic -oj (<*-aj) derivatives, but since Sammallahti (1999), both *-ō and *-ōj stems have generally been derived from Pre-Saamic (Saamic-Finnic-Mordvinic) *-aw/-äw/-ew. The current presentation investigates different possibilities of explaining the background of these Saami stem types, starting from internal reconstruction of Saamic but taking into account the historical relationship with Finnic and other Uralic branches as well. A central question is, whether the differing morphological types require reconstruction of two (or more) different derivational suffixes in a former state of the language, or whether the differences can be accounted for by conditional sound changes (and possible later analogical levelling). It is noteworthy that amongst the North Saami translative-continuative -u verbs (Proto-Saami *-ō), all verbs having etymological stem cognates in other Uralic branches seem to be derived from a former *-a stem (*čoallut* ← *šola; *duorbut* ← *tarpa, cf. Veps *tarbād'a*; *noaidut* ← *nojta; *gohččut* ? ← Proto-Baltic *kuaitja-/o-; *loggut* ? ← *lunka; *molljut* ? ← *mulja-; *njoallut* ← *ńola-; *oažžut* ← *oša; *oskut* ? ← *uska-, cf. Fi. *uska-ltaa*; *soallut* ← *šola). Also a great majority of other North Saami -u verbs which have a “primary” illabial stem correlate seem to correlate with an -i (*-a/ä) stem instead of -a (*-e). In contrast, many of the oldest passive-automotive -o verbs (*-ōj) seem to derive from former *-e stems (e.g. *gullot* ‘be heard’ < *kullōj- < *kūle-v-). Despite these tendencies among the verbs, the nouns seem to exhibit more diverse correspondences: For about half of the Common Saami *-ōj nouns (from Lehtiranta 1989), a derivational correlation with a former *-a/ä stem can be established, and a lesser number can be correlated to a former *-e stem. Even if theories can be made about the original conditions of the emergence of different stem types, it must probably be recognised that later generalisations in derivational types and other kinds of language-internal and contact language influences have altered the situation considerably, as is the case with Finnic labial vowel stems too.