Jan Ivar Bjørnflaten
(Oslo)

Chronologies of the Slavicization of Northern Russia Mirrored by Slavic Loanwords in Finnic and Baltic

0.1 The aim of this paper is to investigate layers of Slavic loanwords in Finnic and in Baltic in order to gain insight into the chronology of the earliest contacts between the Eastern Slavs and their northern neighbors, above all the Finnic peoples. In addressing this issue, the paper contributes to a well-established field of research, representing the work of a number of scholars. Modern research in the field of Slavic and Finnic relations was initiated by Mikkola (1894) with his seminal monograph *Berührungen zwischen den westfinnischen und slavischen Sprachen*, republished with several changes in 1938 with the title *Die älteren Berührungen zwischen Ostseefinnisch und Russisch*. Kalima's book *Die slavischen Lehnwörter im Ostseefinnischen* (1956) still represents the state of the art in this field, as far as I am able to judge. Kiparsky (1948; 1952; 1958; 1962) has contributed substantially to the field with numerous articles. A recent major contribution is Plöger (1973), which notwithstanding its focus on Finnish also treats material pertaining to the other Finnic languages. The scope of this paper does not permit a systematic treatment of the history of the issues to be addressed. But as token of the ongoing research with regard to these issues, one of the most recent contributions could be mentioned, Šilov (2005: 7), where it is stated that «вопрос времени и места наиболее ранних славяно-финских контактов остается остродискуссионным» ('the question about the time and place for the earliest Slavic-Finnic contacts remains highly controversial').

Mediaeval contacts between the Balts and the Slavs in terms of Slavic loanwords in the Baltic languages, have attracted less attention. There is, however, a notable litterature also on this subject, as testified by the "classic" contributions of Būga (1958 [1912]; 1961 [1925]), Endzelīns (1971 [1899]), Skardžius (1931), Milewski (1939), as well as by more recent works such as Levin (1974) and Koškins (2000; 2002).

0.2 Before launching the analysis, attention will be given to some fundamental assumptions on which it is based.

The first fundamental assumption is that a positive fact carries more weight than a negative fact. This implies that if a language A contains accessed material from a language X, while a language B contains less or no accessed material at all from the same language X, language A has had closer contacts with language X than what is the case with language B.

The second fundamental assumption is that linguistic material is transferred from one language to another in different ways. A basic distinction is made between borrowings and intrusions. Borrowing is an intentional introduction of foreign elements into a monolingual tradition of speaking in order to serve specific communicative purposes (Andersen 2003: 6). Borrowing does not require a concrete contact situation in contrast to intrusions which occur in situations of bilingualism or diglossia and therefore have been defined as interference through shift or substratum interference (Thomason & Kaufman 1988: 37). It has been claimed, however, that it may be impossible to determine *ex post facto* whether a loanword entered a language as borrowing or intrusion. It will tentatively be claimed here that the distinction between borrowing and intrusion can be discerned as each of them might leave different patterns of diffusion of accessed lexical items in a group of recipient languages from one common source language.

1.1 The principal preliminary issue to be addressed concerns the corpus of accessed Slavic material in Finnic. The present paper will be based on the assumption that the corpus of Slavic material in the Finnic languages is basically the one produced by Kalima (1956) where the ambition is to present the complete set of accessed Slavic material in Finnic. For the purpose of the present paper, the oldest part of the Slavic material in Finnic is considered to be the part of the material which was accessed before 1150 when the *jer*-change can be assumed to have started in East Slavic. The Slavic material in Finnic is consequently divided in two parts: one older pertaining to pre-1150 and one more recent pertaining to post-1150. The pre-1150 part will be analyzed and split up in chronological layers according to discernable Slavic phonological features.

1.2 It will be argued that at least seven chronologically discernable layers can be established in the older part of the Slavic material in Finnic. These seven layers

each contain one or more of the Slavic phonological features listed here in chronological order from older to younger:

1. Preserved reflexes of the consonantal cluster *tj*
2. Preserved liquid diphthongs
3. Preserved reflexes of nasal vowels
4. Slavic *ă* (not yet labialized > *ŏ*) reflected as *a*
5. Slavic *ě* (*jat'*) reflected as *ää*
6. Loanwords reflecting Christian terminology
7. The Slavic *jers* (strong and weak ones) reflected as *u* and *i*

1.3 This chronological ordering of the layers is crucial and is done by relating phonological features in each of these groups to stages in the evolution of Slavic phonology. If the evolution of Slavic phonology is presented as a seriation of sequences or stages in terms of chronologically ordered changes, each of the layers will be sought related to stages in the evolution of Slavic phonology. This chronological ordering of the changes makes up a relative chronology that will be sought converted into an absolute chronology. The sixth group represents some sort of an absolute chronology in itself as it appears reasonable to assume that the lexical items pertaining to Christianity were not borrowed from the Slavs before Christianity was adopted by the Slavs themselves. This means that lexical items pertaining to Christianity most probably were borrowed from the Slavs after 988 and before missionary activity towards the Finnic peoples started from the West in the mid 12th century. This absolute chronology for the relevant Christian lexical items also makes it possible to date phonological changes and place them in a relative chronology.

1.4 A relative chronology pertaining to the phonological features discernable in the listed groups could be as the following one:

Relative Chronology	**Absolute Chronology**
Nasalization	7th century[1]
tj > *č*	700–900[2]
Elimination of liquid diphthongs	750–850
Denasalization	(850–880[3])[4]
	Introduction of Christianity – 988
Slavic *ă* (not yet labialized > *ŏ*) reflected as Finnic *a*	at least until 988

[1] Cf. Shevelov (1964: 329).
[2] Cf. Shevelov (1964: 217).
[3] Cf. Schramm (2002: 168).
[4] Isačenko (1980: 39).

Narrowing of *jat'*	after 988 – 11th century
The *jer*-change	1150–1250

1.5 When considering this list of changes, it is apparent that all these changes obliterate phonological features and thereby make it possible to posit *termini ante quos* for accessed lexical items which contain features which subsequently were obliterated. In other words, if a phonological feature is present in an accessed lexical item, it can be stated that the actual lexical item must have been accessed before the feature was eliminated in Slavic. This chronology is above all relative and therefore has obvious limitations. A lexical item that contains a reflex of a *jer,* especially a weak *jer*, could therefore, theoretically, be accessed just before the *jer*-change occurred, i.e. approximately 1150, or it could be a much older accession as demonstrated in items like Fin *talkkuna* 'dish of oat or rye'. Notwithstanding this limitation, the relevant lexical items will be ordered here chronologically according to the oldest *ante quem*. Since the oldest *ante quem* pertains to the elimination of the liquid diphthongs, the group containing preserved liquid diphthongs will be considered the oldest. The simplification and affrication of the consonantal cluster **tj > č* in terms of absolute chronology is probably of the same age, but will for the moment be placed after the elimination of the liquid diphthongs. The third group will be the one containing nasal vowels as the *ante quem* for the denasalization in approximately 850–880, and so forth. Each group will be discussed separately.

2.1 According to the criteria for a chronological ordering of the groups outlined here, the group of loanwords containing preserved liquid diphthongs is considered the oldest. When it comes to etablishing an absolute chronology for this change, it can be maintained that this is still an issue of controversy in Slavic linguistics. It appears, however, that the majority of scholars considers the second half of the 8th century as the period of time when this change most probably occurred. This means that the elimination of the liquid diphthongs must have started some time between 750 and 850 (Shevelov 1964: 416–417; Vlasto 1986: 17).

Table 1: Diffusion of Slavic loanwords in Finnic which reflect original liquid diphthongs

Northern Finnic			Southern Finnic			Russian
Finnish	**Karelian**	**Vepsian**	**Votian**	**Estonian**	**Livonian**	
taltta	*taltta*	*talt*				*doloto*
'chisel'	'id.'	'id.'				'id.'
palttina	*palttin*	*palt�figin*				*polotno*
'linen'	'id.'	'id.'				'id.'
talkkuna	*talkkuna*	*taukun*				*tolokno*
'dish of	'id.'	'id.'				'oat flour'
rye, oat'						
talka						**dolga*
'keel'						
kalkkala[5]		*kaukol*	*kalkkale*			*kolokolka*[6]
'flax bud'		'id.'	'id.'			'id.'
karsta			*karssa*			*korosta*
'scab'			'id.'			'id.'
	parh	*parh*				*poroxa*[7]
	'new snow'	'id.'				'id.'
varpunen	*varpuine*		*värpi*[8]	*varblane*		*vorobej*
'sparrow'	'id.'		'id.'	'id.'		'id.'
suvalkko	*suvalk*	*suvalk*[10]				*svolok*
'Weber-	'id.'	'id.'				'beam'[11]
baum'[9]						
kalsu	*kalšu*	*kal'žud*		*kalts*		*kološa*
'stocking'	'id.'	'id.'		'id.'		'leggings'
värtsi	*värčči*		*värtsi*			*veret'e*
'sack'	'id.'		'id.'			'basket'
värttinä	*värttinä*	*värt'in*	*värttänä*	*värten*		*vereteno*
'distaff'	'id.'	'id.'	'id.'	'id.'		'spindle'

2.2 According to this table altogether 12 lexical items with preserved liquid diphthongs have been ascertained in Finnic. These 12 items are not, however,

---

[5] Recorded in „ingr. Runen", cf. Kalima (1956: 70).

[6] Dialect word, cf. Gerd (1995: 402): 'семенные головки льна'.

[7] SRNG (30: 83).

[8] Cf. Cvetkov (1995).

[9] Cf. Kalima (1956: 126). This word appears to be recorded in many variants in Finnish dialects, cf. SKES (III–IV: 1088), e.g., *suhakko, suvakko, suvalkko*. The last form is recorded in Karelian-Olonetsian dialects. Neither of these forms are, however, listed in the more recent Finnish etymological dictionary SSA.

[10] Cf. Kalima (1956: 126), where this Vepsian word is annotated wepsÄ („Onega-wepsisch"). It is not listed in Zajceva & Mullonen (1972).

[11] Cf. Kulikovskij (1898: 105): 'Сволок, вал в ткацком станке, на который называется основа'.

equally certain. The most uncertain is probably Fi. *kalsu*, which Mikkola considered a possible loanword from Swedish or other West-European languages (Mikkola 1894: 124–125)[12]. In his 1929 article, Kalima (1929: 156) at first included *talka* 'Schiffskiel; Bretterbeschlag auf dem Boden eines Bootes', but in the *Nachtrag* to the same article (1929: 171), he changed his mind.[13]

2.3 This set of lexical items has been widely discussed with regard to chronology. Several scholars have claimed that these items cannot be genuine since that would imply an impossible early dating of the first encounter between the Proto-Finns and the East Slavs. It has been argued (Kalima 1929) that the statistic overrepresentation of items with preserved liquid diphthongs among the Slavic loanwords in Finnic makes it highly unlikely that these can be considered genuine. The circumstance that only Russian has a corresponding lexical item, *poroxa* 'new snow', for Karelian and Vepsian *parh* 'id.', makes it probable that Russian is the source language also for the remaining items. According to Kiparsky (1963: 83), the attested Finnish items do not reflect Proto-Slavic forms, but pleophonic forms *in statu nascendi* where a *Murmelvokal* after the liquid is posited and which is not reflected in the items accessed by Finnish. For several reasons I find it hard to agree with either Kalima or Kiparsky. According to the conception of Kiparsky the development of pleophony is considered a gradual phonetic change. It appears to be more reasonable to consider the elimination of the liquid diphthongs, in terms of metathesis and pleophony, typical abrupt sound changes where intermediate stages consequently never occurred.

2.4 Table 1 shows that these early accessions are more numerous among the northern Finnic languages than among the southern ones. The largest number is found in Finnish and Karelian, with a somewhat smaller number in Vepsian. In the southern Finnic languages there are maximally a couple of recordings in Votian and Estonian, while there is no recording at all in Livonian. On the basis of the geographic diffusion of these most archaic Slavic loanwords in Finnic, it can be claimed that these indicate that the northern Finnic languages have had the most intensive contact with Slavs and with Slavic lexical material. Even if the geographic position of the Finnic languages was somewhat different from the present one in the second half of the first millennium, the geographic

---

[12] Cf. Plöger (1973: 62–63) for more details and references.
[13] Cf. SKES (III–IV: 1211), SSA (3: 261), the origin of this word is apparently not clear.

relationship among the languages has to be considered basically the same as today (Koivulehto 1983; Itkonen 1960: 23).

3.1 The second most archaic layer is made up of the lexical item *kaatio, kaatiot,* 'drawers', 'underwear', in Finnish which traditionally is considered to reflect the preservation of the consonantal cluster **tj*, i.e. a stage prior to the East Slavic affrication which yielded the Russian form *gači*, 'trousers'.

Table 2: Reflexes of Slavic **tj*

	Northern Finnic			**Southern Finnic**			**Slav**
	Finnish	**Karelian**	**Vepsian**	**Votian**	**Estonian**	**Livonian**	
Older	*kaatiot*[14]	*koad'iet*	*kad'jad*				**gatja*
Younger				*kātsat*	*kaats*		*gači*

3.2 It is apparent in this case, as also pointed out by Kalima[15], that the northern Finnic forms demonstrate an older state of affairs than the southern ones which obviously are accessions from Russian as indicated by the affricates. Compared with the previous layer where the archaic accessions are more numerous in the North than in the South, in this case the northern Finnic languages contain a layer of archaic accessions which are not present at all in the southern Finnic languages.

4.1 According to the criteria established here, the third set of loanwords comprises those with preserved nasal vowel since denasalization is considered to have occurred after the elimination of the liquid diphthongs. On the other hand, nasalization is older than the elimination of the liquid diphthongs. This opens up for a possible older dating of the lexical items with preserved nasals than those with preserved liquid diphthongs. But as we have no means by which to determine the relative chronology as to the accession of these two groups, the relative chronology of denasalization and elimination of the liquid diphthongs will here be considered decisive.

---

[14] Cf. Kalima (1956: 69–70), who considers this a borrowing from Proto-Slavic.

[15] Cf. Kalima (1956: 69–70): „Gerade diese Gestalt spiegelt *kaatio* wider, da es weder die russische Lautgestalt (russ. *tj > č*) noch irgendwelche andre slav. Sprachform voraussetzen kann. Russ. dial. *gati* würde zu fi. **katti* führen; es eignet sich also nicht zur Quelle. Lautliche Gründe zwingen bei *kaatio* zur Annahme urslav. Entlehnung. Dagegen machen wot. *kātsat* »Unterhosen« und est. *kaats, kaatsas* »Schenkel eines Ochsen, Pumphose« mit ihrem *ts* sehr wohl den Eindruck russ. Lehnwörter."

4.2 Generally, there is no doubt that East Slavic possessed nasal vowels. At the time of the first encounters with the Scandinavian Vikings nasalization of sequences of vowel plus *m* and *n* before consonants was still a living process in East Slavic as the reflexes of nasal vowels in accessions from Old Norse or Old Scandinavian demonstrate: варꙗгъ < Old Norse **varingr*, кълбꙗгъ < Old Norse *kylfingr*, поүдъ < Old Norse *pund*, соүдъ < Old Norse *sundr*, стꙗгъ < Old Swedish *stængr*, ꙗбетникъ < Old Norse *embætti*, ꙗкоръ < Old Swedish *ankari*.[16] In the work of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De administrando imperio,* dated 950, two names of the Dnepr cataracts clearly show that the nasals have been denasalized. The name of the fourth cataract is written Νεασήτ, *Neasit*, generally considered to render East Slavic *nejasytь* (Karlgren 1947: 40) 'pelican', where a reflex of a denasalized front vowel is ascertained (< **nejęsytь*). The name of the sixth cataract is rendered as Βερούτζη, *Verutsi*. This name has been interpreted (Sitzmann 2003: 80–82) as a present participial form *vьručijь*, Sg.Acc.Masc. (Karlgren 1947: 66) of the verb *vьrěti* 'to boil', not attested in Modern Russian. The attested form in Greek can therefore be assumed to render a participial form with a denasalized back vowel emerged from an earlier **vьrǫčijь*.

4.3 The evidence presented here indicates that the denasalization occurred in a period between the first encounters with the Scandinavian Vikings and the composition of *De administrando imperio*. As the first encounter between Scandinavians and East Slavs hardly can have occcued earlier than the second half of the 8th century and the composition of *De administrando imperio* must be based on information most probably collected in the first half of the 10th century, the absolute chronology for the denasalization in East Slavic must be 750/800–900/950, i.e. basically in the 9th century. A possible more accurate absolute chronology might be obtained by directing the attention to the name of the East Slavic ruler *Igor'*[17] who died in 945 and was probably born around 880. As his name is based on Nordic *Ingvarr*[18], a form like **Jagor* would have to be expected if nasalization was active in his time. A more accurate absolute chronology of the denasalization could therefore be obtained and put to the time

[16] Cf. Kiparsky (1975: 94–98) with relevant literature.

[17] For a detailed discussion of the name *Igor'* and different interpretations, cf. Strumiński (1996: 150–154).

[18] According to Sitzmann (2003: 58), the source is most probably Old Swedish *Ingvorr*.

between 750/800–850, i.e. practically in the first half of the 9th century, 800–850.

Table 3: Diffusion of Slavic loanwords in Finnic which reflect nasal vowels

Northern Finnic			Southern Finnic			Russian
Finnish	**Karelian**	**Vepsian**	**Votian**	**Estonian**	**Livonian**	
kuontalo 'bunch'			*kõntala* 'id.'	*koonal* 'id.'		*kudel'* 'id.'
suntio, *sontio* 'verger'						*sud'ja* 'judge'
				und 'rod'		*uda* 'id.'
			lonkka 'bend'		(*lunka*) 'id.'	*luka* 'id.'
suunta 'direction'				*sund* 'order'		*sud'ja* 'judge'

The Livonian word is not sure and is most probably an accession from Latvian (Kettunen 1938: 210). Items from this layer appear in the northern Finnic languages as well as in the southern ones. But there is one feature in the Finnish *kuontalo* which sets it apart from the others. The rendering of the nasal vowel with *uon* (< *ōn*) indicates a long nasal vowel. As there are no indications of difference in vowel quantity in East Slavic, the state of affairs in West Slavic has been referred to as in Table 4 below:

Table 4: Reflexes of long and short nasal vowels in Polish and Czech

Finnish	**Polish**	**Czech**	**OCS**	**Russian**
kuontalo	*kądziel*	*koudel*	**kǫdělь*[19]	*kudel'*
suntio	*sędzia*	*sudí*[20]	*sǫdijь*	*sud'ja*

The fact that the Finnish borrowings *kuontalo* and *suntio* fit in with West Slavic with regard to vowel quantity has led several scholars (Setälä 1932: 42) to posit a West Slavic origin for these items. The main reason for such an assumption is, of course, the circumstance that no distinction in vowel length has been recorded in East Slavic. Some, like Kiparsky (1963: 76), have assumed that also East Slavic or *Urrussisch*, in a prehistoric time possessed this prosodic feature. So,

---

[19] In several works a OCS form *kǫdělь* is referred to. But this lexical item is not listed in Cejtlin et al. (1999) and the Prague dictionary SJSS.
[20] Obsolete for Modern Czech *soudce* 'judge'.

even if the lexical items *kuontalo* and *suntio* do not have their origin in West Slavic, the Finnish material is unique as it reflects features of East Slavic preserved neither in East Slavic nor reflected in the southern Finnic languages. Again, northern Finnic stands out with particular archaic accessions from Slavic.

5.1 The reflexes of *jat'* in Slavic borrowings in Finnic are at least twofold and seem to reflect a development of *jat'* from a broad *æ*-type vowel towards a more narrow *e* and even a diphthong *ie*. The reflexes of a narrow *jat'* are considered more recent as they conform to the general development of *jat'* in East Slavic where in some areas *jat'* and *e* tend to merge or where in other areas the *jat'* yielded a diphthong *ie* or an *i*. It has therefore been assumed that Finnish *määrä* < мѣра reflects an older layer of accessions than Finnish *viesti* < вѣсть and Karelian *vieru* < вѣра (Kiparsky 1946: 85). It is hard to posit a chronology for the narrowing of *jat'*, but if грѣхъ 'sin' is considered part of Christian terminology, it could probably be assumed that at the time of borrowing of Christian terminology, i.e. the end of the 10th century, the narrowing of the *jat'* had still not occurred. On the other hand, however, as the first instances of writing ѣ for *e* and the opposite occur in the birch bark letters in the beginning of the 12th century (Zaliznjak 2004: 25), the narrowing of *jat'* could be dated to the 11th century. This implies that the oldest layer rendering ѣ as *ää* must have been accessed before the year 1000 (Mikkola 1894: 33; Samilov 1964: 97–99).

Table 5: Distribution of Slavic loanwords in Finnic which reflect *jat'* as *ää*

Northern Finnic			Southern Finnic			OESlav
Finnish	**Karelian**	**Vepsian**	**Votian**	**Estonian**	**Livonian**	
määrä 'amount'	*meärä* 'id.'	*mär* 'measure'	*mārä* 'id.'	*määr* 'id.'	(*mār*) [21]	мѣра 'id.'
				sääs 'pond' [22]		сѣжа 'net'
läävä 'stable'	*leävä* 'id.'	*läve* 'id.'				хлѣвъ 'id.'
räähkä 'sin'	*reähkä* 'id.'	*grähk* 'id.'				грѣхъ 'id.'
			mäsätä 'hinder'			мѣшати 'hinder'

[21] According to Kettunen (1938: 240), this could as well be a loan from Lat *mērs*.

[22] If this really is an accession from Slavic, the connection must be through 'fishpond' and 'fishing net'.

As in the preceding groups of Slavic accessions in Finnic, it appears that the number Slavic loanwords is larger in the northern Finnic languages than in the southern ones.

6.1 Granted that Finnish *räähkä* 'sin', from East Slavic can be considered part of Christian terminology, the narrowing of *jat'* must have occurred after the borrowing of lexical items pertaining to Christianity. Let us then turn to the acknowledged older set of borrowings from Slavic pertaining to Christianity as presented in the following table:

Table 6: The set of accessed Slavic lexical items pertaining to Christianity

Northern Finnic			Southern Finnic			OESlav
Finnish	**Karelian**	**Vepsian**	**Votian**	**Estonian**	**Livonian**	
pakana	*pakana*	*pagan*	*pagana*	*pagan*	*pagānəz*	поганъ
'pagan'	'id.'	'id.'	'id.'	'id.'	'id.'	'id.'
pappi	*pappi*	*pap*	*pappi*	*papp*	*päp*	попъ
'priest'	'id.'	'id.'	'id.'	'id.'	'id.'	'id.'
risti	*risti*	*rist, krist*	*rissi*	*rist*	*rišt*	крьстъ
'cross'	'id.'	'id.'	'id.'	'id.'	'id.'	'id.'
raamattu				*raamat*[23]		грамота
'bible'				'book'		'document'
räähkä	*reähkä*	*grähk*				грѣхъ
'sin'	'id.'	'id.'				'id.'
	nedäl'i	*nedali*	*nätäli*	*nätäli, nädal*	*nädal*	недѣлia
	'week'	'id.'	'id.'	'id.'	'id.'	'Sunday'

6.2 The dating of this layer of accessed Slavic items is above all sought determined in relation to the introduction of Christianity. As Christianity was introduced into the East Slavic lands most probably towards the end of the 10th century, while missionary activity from the West first took place in 1154, it appears reasonable to assume that these lexical items were accessed between 988 and 1154. For the reflexes of the *jer*, this chronology fits well as the *jer*-change in East Slavic most probably started in the mid 12th century in the South and ended in the mid 13th century in the North. But despite the circumstance that all these lexical items must be considered to have corresponding East Slavic Christian terms as their origin, it cannot be wholly excluded that the Proto-Finns borrowed these at an earlier time. In 988, as we know, Slavic Christian terminology had been around for at least a hundred years. It should, however, be

---

[23] Cf. Kalima (1956: 111).

noted that the borrowed Slavic items in two cases do not belong to the oldest layer of Old Church Slavic. The items **поганъ** 'heathen' and **попъ** 'priest' are not recorded in the oldest texts[24]. It is, however, reasonable to assume that since these lexical items most probably were borrowed from East Slavic, a dating corresponding to the adoption of Christianity in Rus and the period immediate following makes up a reliable absolute chronology for this layer.

6.3 When considering the geographic diffusion of this layer, it appears that it is more or less equally present in all the Finnic languages. This circumstance seems to allow for positing another contact situation than the one obtained for the other layers discussed here. In case of the layer of Christian lexical items, we have to do with a classical contact situation of borrowing when the speakers of a language intentionally borrow in order to serve specific communicative purposes. Faced with the concepts of a new religion, the Proto-Finns intentionally borrow lexical items from the East Slavs. This is also the reason why in this case internal borrowing between the Finnic languages has to be reckoned with, as Kalima (1956: 111) does when he claims that Finnish *raamattu* 'the Scriptures, the Bible', is borrowed from Estonian which in its turn has borrowed it from East Slavic. It is further noteworthy that in this case Livonian is more or less in line with the remaining Finnic languages, although Latvian *pagāns* as a source for Livonian *pagānəz* should not be excluded.

7.1 Among the oldest Slavic loanwords in Finnic are those which render Slavic *ă* (not yet labialized > *ŏ*) as *a*. These words are not numerous. Since the loanwords pertaining to Christian terminology demonstrate this kind of state of affairs, there is reason to assume that the labialization of Slavic *ă* has to be put to a more recent date then the adoption of the Christian loanwords.

Table 7: Distribution of Slavic loanwords where Slavic *ă*
(not yet labialized > *ŏ*) is rendered as *a*

Northern Finnic				Southern Finnic		OESlav
Finnish	**Karelian**	**Vepsian**	**Votian**	**Estonian**	**Livonian**	
tappara	*tappara*			*tapper*		*toporъ*
'axe'	'id.'			'id.'		'id.'
vapaa				*vaba*	*vabad*[25]	*svoboda*
'free'				'id.'	'id.'	'freedom'

[24] The corresponding lexemes in the oldest texts are *języčьnikъ* and *svęščenikъ, svętitelь*.
[25] Possibly from Latvian (SSA 3: 408).

akkuna 'window'				*aken* 'id.'		*okъno* 'id.'
				sahk 'plough'		*soxa* 'id.'
ahrain 'spear'	*azrain* 'id.'	*azrag* 'id.'	*astraga* 'id.'			*ostroga* 'id.'
apea 'dejected'	*apie* ('id.')	*abid* 'offence'				*obida* 'id.'
kassa 'hair, plait, braid'	*kašša* 'id.'	*kas* 'id.'		*kassapea* 'hairhead'		*kosa* 'hair'
kasukka 'gown'				*kasukas* 'fur coat'		*kožux* 'id.'
papu 'bean'		*babu* 'id.'				*bobъ* 'id.'
kassara 'hook'	*kassara* 'id.'	*kasaŕ* 'chopper'	*kasuri* 'id.'			*kosarь* 'id.'
pappi 'priest'	*pappi* 'id.'	*pap* 'id.'	*pappi* 'id.'	*papp* 'id.'	*päp* 'id.'	*popъ* 'id.'

Even in this case (Table 7) it is clear that the majority of these loans is found in the North. Livonian is in this case practically without any secure loans at all.

8.1 Slavic accessions in the Finnic languages have a long history in Slavic linguistics in providing evidence for the *jers*, both the weak and the strong ones.

Table 8: Distribution of Slavic loanwords in Finnic reflecting
the strong and weak back *jer* as *u*

Northern Finnic			Southern Finnic			Slavic
Finnish	**Karelian**	**Vepsian**	**Votian**	**Estonian**	**Livonian**	
lusikka 'spoon'	*lusikka* 'id.'	*luzik* 'id.'	*luzikka* 'id.'	*lusikka* 'id.'		**lъžъka* 'id.'
tuska 'pain'	*tuška* 'id.'	*tusk* 'grief'	*tuska* 'id.'			**tъska* 'grief'
akkuna 'window'	*ikkun* 'id.'	*ikkun* 'id.'	*akkuna* 'id.'	*aken* 'id.'		**okъno* 'id.'
talkkuna 'dish of rye, oat'	*talkun* 'id.'	*taukun* 'id.'				**tolokъno* 'oat flour'

Table 9: Distribution of Slavic loanwords in Finnic reflecting
the strong and weak front *jer* as *i*

Northern Finnic			Southern Finnic			Slavic
Finnish	**Karelian**	**Vepsian**	**Votian**	**Estonian**	**Livonian**	
lusikka	*lusikka*	*luzik*	*luzikka*	*lusikka*		**lъžъka*
'spoon'	'id.'	'id.'	'id.'	'id.'		'id.'
värttinä	*värttinä*	*värtin*				**vertьno*
'distaff'	'id.'	'id.'				'spindle'
palttina	*palttin*	*paltin*				**poltьno*
'linen'	'id.'	'id.'				'id.'
risti	*risti*	*rist, krist*	*rissi*	*rist*	*rišt*	**krъstъ*
'cross'	'id.'	'id.'	'id.'	'id.'	'id.'	'id.'
virsu	*virsu*	*virz*				**vьrzni*
'birchbark shoe'	'id.'	'id.'				'id.'
pirta	*pirta*	*bird*	*pīrta*	*piird*		**bьrdo*
'reed'	'id.'	'id.'	'id.'	'id.'		'id.'

8.2 Summing up the evidence provided by the two latter tables, it can be concluded that the northern Finnic languages have a far larger amount of lexical items belonging to this layer than the southern languages. In case of Table 9 it is easy to see that *risti* for 'cross' has another pattern of diffusion among the Finnic languages because this lexical item has to be considered a typical borrowing in contrast to probably most of the remaining words in this group.

9.1 If we now sum up the investigation of the layers of older accessed Slavic lexical material in Finnic, the attention has above all to be directed to the geographical distribution of this material. The evidence brought forward makes it possible to conclude that the oldest Slavic loanwords in Finnic are with regard to almost all layers predominant in the northern Finnic languages, in Finnish, Karelian and Vepsian. This is above all conspicuous with regard to the very oldest loanwords like *kaatio* and the rather numerous set of lexical items with reflexes of preserved liquid diphthongs and nasal vowels.

9.2 One set of loanwords does not, however, fit into this pattern. In the case of the lexical items pertaining to Christian terminology, the picture is different. It appears appropriate to interpret this rather even distribution of these lexical items in Finnic as accessions in terms of intentional borrowings to serve specific communicative purposes. In the other cases, the accessions have to be regarded as intrusions, as unintentional results of interference in contact situations which

in its turn accounts for the rather random distribution of the remaining layers discussed here. This means that in this case of the Christian terminology, it is possible to state that borrowings make up a different pattern of distribution among the Finnic languages than is the case with intrusions, cf. 0.2.

9.3 On the basis of the evidence presented it can be maintained that the largest amount of older Slavic loanwords is found in the northern Finnic languages. This is a claim that has never been brought forward explicitly. To my knowledge, the only scholar who somewhat intuitively grasped this relationship was Julius Mägiste. In his book *Äldre ryska lånord i estniskan särskilt i det gamla estniska skriftspråket* ('Older Russian Loanwords in Estonian, especially in the Old Estonian Literary Language'), published in 1962, Mägiste (1962: 6–15) criticizes Mikkola for being too Finnish-biased in his investigations. He accuses Mikkola of negligence of the Estonian material since it is obvious, as Mägiste claims, that the Estonians and their close relatives, the Votes, were the first to enter into contact with the East Slavs in the area to the east and southeast of the Peipus-lake. Since, at the time of the earliest contacts with the Slavs, the Proto-Finns did not form a language unity any more, the presence of Slavic loanwords in the other Finnic languages must be due to internal borrowing among them. Mägiste even claims that all Slavic loanwords that are present in Finnish, but not in Karelian and Vepsian[26], must be considered loanwords from Estonian. Mägiste therefore concludes that the southern and southeastern parts of the Finnic language area must contain older and more interesting material pertaining to Slavic accessions than Finnish in the North. In that connection Mägiste directs attention to extensive un-published dialectological field work conducted in Estonia in the 1920s and 1930s allegedly supporting his claims. Today we are in a much more fortunate position. Mari Must's dictionary of Russian Loanwords in Estonian Dialects published 5 years ago (Must 2000) should make it possible to test the claim of Mägiste. Having worked my way through the impressive dictionary of Must, I have not found any material that could possibly support the claim of Mägiste[27]. As far as I am able to see, since

---

[26] The rather comprehensive study of Krawczykiewicz (1972) does not provide any relevant material for the present paper as it treats almost exclusively recent Russian loanwords in Vepsian.

[27] This also pertains to Ariste (1958) who discusses and presents a list of Russian loanwords in the old Estonian literary language.

the publication of Kalima 1956, no substantial Estonian material has been brought forward which could modify the picture which emerges in this paper.[28]

9.4 The Votian language has been subjected to less research that Estonian with regard to accessed Slavic material, but there exist, nonetheless several works which address this issue[29]. The leading expert on Krevinian, the language of the Votian population that in the mid 15th century was transplanted into southern Kurland (Winkler 1997), has in a more recent publication (Winkler 2000: 458) summed up the corpus of older Slavic accessions in Votian[30] without adding any material to the corpus presented by Kalima in 1956.

9.5 When it comes to Livonian, I have not come across recent literature with relevant material. Kettunen's impressive dictionary from 1938 (Kettunen 1938) and Kalima's corpus are still the sources we have to rely on. This means that the observations and conclusions presented here with regard to the distribution of the oldest layers of Slavic loanwords in Finnic so far hold true. But the objections and arguments of Mägiste should still be taken seriously, and the question arises how it could be possible to test and verify the conclusions reached so far. One way could simply be to move further towards the south, where, in some way or another, the Slavs should be expected to have turned up before getting into contact with the Finnic peoples. Let us now therefore consider the state of affairs with regard to the oldest layers of Slavic loanwords in the Baltic languages, Latvian and Lithuanian, without, however, treating these with the same degree of detail as was the case with the Finnic material.

10.1 Turning to the Baltic languages Latvian and Lithuanian, the Slavic loanwords in these languages will be investigated in the same way as in the Finnic

---

[28] It deserves to be mentioned that Must (2000: 95) consideres the lexical item *kääv* a recent Russian loan, "see hiline vene laen" as this item by several scholars has been considered as crucial evidence for archaic Slavic material in Estonian. But as corresponding lexical material is still preserved in the adjacent Pskov dialects, cf. *kivec*, *kevka*, etc., it has not, in accordance with the criteria posited here, been considered a pre-1150 Slavic loanword in Estonian. The same pertains to Estonian *vigl* which corresponds to Pskovian *viglo* and which is still, or was recently recorded in the Pskov area. For further discussion on *kääv*, cf. Posti (1959) and Plöger (1973: 85–86).

[29] Szabó (1980), unfortunately brings no material relevant to the issue addressed here. Suhonen (1992: 158–159) states that a part of the older Russian loanwords in Finnic is also found in Votian when referring to the set of relevant lexical items adduced by Kalima (1956).

[30] The same is valid also for Nilsson (1991) and (1998).

languages. Referring to the oldest *ante quem*, possible Slavic loanwords with preserved liquid diphthongs will be sought out first. It then turns out that in Latvian two lexical items with preserved liquid diphthongs are ascertained. The first one is *kalps*[31] 'servant', representing *xolpъ*, cf. Ru. *xolop* 'serf', Polish *chłop* 'peasant'. The second lexical item of this kind is recorded only in Latgalian dialects. It is the word *kārms* 'building', claimed to represent *xormъ*, corresponding to Ru. *xorom* 'peasant hut', and OCS *xramъ* 'house'. In his work on Slavic loanwords in Lithuanian from 1925, Būga (1961 [1925]: 752) claims to have ascertained four Slavic loanwords with preserved liquid diphthong in Lit.: *čerpė* 'tile', *skavarda* 'pan', *karvojus* 'tart', *karbas* 'basket'. All of these words, have, however, later been claimed not to represent liquid diphthongs (Zinkevičius 1996: 64). One word however, *šalmas*, 'helmet', has been considered Slavic. Kiparsky (1952: 73), on the other hand, convincingly argues for the point of view that this word cannot be of Slavic origin. This means that while Latvian possibly could be said to have two lexical items with preserved liquid diphthongs, Lithuanian appears to have none. Even this limited material lends credence to the assumption that the northern Latvian displays more archaic accessions from Slavic than the more southern lying Lithuanian.

Table 10: Reflexes of preserved liquid diphthongs in Latvian and Lithuanian

Latvian	Lithuanian	Old East Slavic	Proto-Slavic
kalps 'servant'		холопъ 'slave'	*xolpъ* 'id.'
kārms 'building'		хоромъ 'house'	*xormъ* 'building'

10.2 The next group of Slavic loanwords to be assessed is the one possibly containing reflexes of nasal vowels. As Kiparsky (1952: 71), once pointed out, it is fortunate from the point of view of the philologist that the same words containing nasal vowels in Finnic have also been borrowed by the Baltic languages, designating the 'fish-hook', the 'distaff' and 'judge'. In Latvian these words are *ūda, kuodens, kuodaņa, kuodeļa, suods, suoģis*. Since Latvian changed all groups *an*, and *un* before consonants and in *Auslaut*-position into orals *uo, ū,* preserving only those containing *m*, when not followed by a labial, eg., *simts* 'hundred' it is impossible to decide whether these words were accessed at a time when the back nasal vowel was still intact in the Slavic donor language. When it comes to the front nasal vowel, the situation is different. If a Slavic lexical item

---

[31] Karulis (2001: 372) cannot be followed when he states that this word must have entered Latvian before the 13th century. As mentioned above with regard to the same type of loans in Finnic, it must have entered Latvian before the year 800.

had been accessed with traces of a front nasal vowel, *en*, eg., **svent-*, it would have been expected to yield *ie*, cf. *mieturs* 'whorl', vs. Li. *menturis* 'id.', but the Latvian words *svēts* 'holy', *sprēst* 'to spin', indicate that the nasality had been lost at the time of the accession. And if this was the case with the front nasal vowels, it should be expected to be the case also with the back nasal vowels. It should therefore be sufficient evidence to conclude that there is no accessed Slavic material at hand in Latvian with indicate reflexes of nasal vowels.

10.3 In older works on Slavic loanwords in Lithuanian, it was claimed that the language contained three accessed Slavic lexical items with reflexes of Slavic nasals (Būga 1958 [1912]: 339–340). The relevant items are *lenkai* 'Poles', *pundus* 'weight, pound' and *ungurůse* (loc.pl.) 'in Hungary'. According to Kiparsky (1948: 37–39), there is no reason to consider these items as evidence for the presence of nasals in borrowings from Slavic in Lithuanian. The relevant Lithuanian examples, *ūdas* 'fishing line', *kuodelis* 'distaff', *sūdas*, *sūdžia*[32] 'judge', therefore, show clearly that the nasals had turned into orals at the time of the accession. By virtue of fortunate chance, as mentioned above, more or less the same set of lexical items were accessed from Slavic and the situation could be depicted as follows:

Table 11: Reflexes of nasal vowels in Finnic and Baltic

	Finnic	**Latvian**	**Lithuanian**	**OCSlavic**
Older:	*kuontalo* (Fin) 'distaff' *suntio* 'verger'			**kǫdělь* *sǫdijь*
Intermediate: old nasal rendered *uo*	*muokka* (Kar) 'torment' *mok* (Vep) 'torment'	*suods* 'judge' *ruobeža* 'border' *muokas* 'torment'	*kuodelis* 'distaff'	**kǫdělь* **rǫb-* *mǫka*
Younger: old nasal rendered *u*	*muuka* (Vot) 'torment'	*ūda* 'fishing line'	*mūka* *sūdas* *sūdžia*	

10.4 When it comes to the accession of Slavic lexical items containing the *jat'*, the situation in Latvian resembles the one in the Finnic languages as there can be distinguished between layers which renders the *jat'* in two different ways. In

---

[32] The latter two are attested already in Mažvydas, cf. Skardžius (1931: 209).

the presumable oldest layer the *jat'* is rendered as an open, long *e*, while in the presumable younger layer it is rendered as a diphthong, *ie*. cf. *grēks < grěxъ*, *klēvs > xlěvъ*, *vēsts < věstь*. The *jat'* is in younger loans rendered as a diphthong, cf. *diedis < dědъ, cieņa < cěna*. While it is possible in this way in Latvian to distinguish between two chronological layers, in Lithuanian, on the other hand, only the younger layer is reflected. In all Slavic loanwords in Lithuanian the *jat'* is rendered as a diphthong, cf. Lithuanian *griekas*, *miera*, *viera*, *viestis*, *susiedas* (Būga 1958 [1912]: 344–345; Kiparsky 1952: 76). The conclusion to be drawn from these data is that the Slavic loanwords containing the *jat'* in Lithuanian must be accessed at a later date than those in Latvian.

Table 12: Reflexes of *ě* (*jat'*) in accessed Slavic lexical items
in Latvian and Lithuanian

	Latvian	**Lithuanian**	**Old East Slavic**
Older	*grēks* 'sin'		грѣхъ 'id.'
	klēvs 'barn'		хлѣвъ 'stable'
	vēsts 'message'		вѣсть 'id.'
Younger	*diedis*[33] 'old man'	*griekas*[34] 'sin'	грѣхъ 'id.'
	cieņa 'respect'	*miera* 'measure'	мѣра 'id.'
		viera 'faith'	вѣра 'id.'
		viestis 'message'	вѣсть 'id.'
		susiedas 'neighbour'	соусѣда 'id.'

10.5 Summing up the state of affairs in Latvian and Lithuanian, it can be stated that the lower chronology for the accession of Slavic lexical material is related to the two instances of preserved liquid diphthongs which again allows for an absolute dating to approximately the second half of the 8th century, i.e. 750–850 when any intermediate accession from another language is left out of consideration. Since neither of the two Baltic languages demonstrate any reflexes of Slavic nasals, it occurs that the two Latvian items with preserved liquid diphthongs stands out as particularly archaic, since the relevant items without traces of nasals must have been accessed not earlier than in the middle of the first half of the 9th century. The reflexes of the *jat'* indicate a relative earlier accession by Latvian than Lithuanian. The Latvian accessions can have been made before 988, while the Lithuanian accession must have occurred after that date, in the 11th or even in the 12th century. As both languages show clear traces of the *jers*, it can be stated that Slavic accessions occurred in Latvian and

---

[33] Endzelīns (1971 [1899]: 100).
[34] In the oldest texts also written *griechas* (Skardžius 1931: 78; Fraenkel 1962: 168).

Lithuanian (Zinkevičius 1987: 71–75) before the *jer*-change started around the middle of the 12th century.

10.6 After now having investigated the oldest accessed Slavic material in the Baltic languages, we are facing observations which conform with those previously made with regard to the Finnic languages. When moving towards the South, less archaic Slavic material is found. Only Latvian and Latgalian *kalps* and *kārms* stand out as archaic and can match some of the material ascertained further to the North. While previously Mägiste appeared to be the only scholar who perceived the difference between northern Finnic and southern Finnic, Kiparsky[35] has been the only scholar who in several publications directed attention to the difference between Finnic and Baltic.

11.1 How are we then to interpret the picture emerging here? Let us first consider reasonable options. Let us start presuming that the Slavs moved in a general direction from the South towards the North into the territory of present-day Northwestern Russia. It is more controversial, however, to determine with more precision from which area the East Slav migration started. The most widely accepted area from which the East Slavs started moving towards the north is placed to the South of the river Pripjat' between the Carpathians and the middle Dnepr extending south to the open steppe (Barford 2001: 47). The area along the upper reaches of western Bug and Vistula towards the northern slopes of the Carpathians could possibly also be included. In the relevant period of time the prevailing archeological culture was the *Luka-Rajkoveckaja* which is considered beyond any reasonable doubt East Slavic (Goehrke 1992: 24). This archaeological culture in its turn had grown out of the *Prague-Korčak* and *Pen'kova* archaeological cultures. As the discernable Old East Slavic archaeological culture grew out of the *Luka-Rajkoveckaja* culture, it is possible to follow the migration to the north of the Pripjat' and into the Baltic territory. While Slavic findings from the 7th century have been located to the north of Pripjat', it is agreed that the *Kulturwechsel* and massive Slavicization of the Baltic population occurred in the 9th and even in the 10th century[36]. If it then can

---

[35] « En somme, on a l'impression que les Lituaniens ont entendu les mots russes dans une forme plus récente que ne l'ont fait les Finnois et les Lettons » (Kiparsky 1948: 38).

[36] Cf. Goehrke (1992: 29): „... kann man daher als heute gängige Forschungsmeinung festhalten, dass nördlich des Pripjet und am oberen Dnepr zwar vereinzelte slavische Spuren bereits im 6. und 7. Jh. aufzufinden sind, jedoch ein eigentlicher Kulturwechsel, der auf massive

be proved that the linguistic and cultural change between Pripjat' and Il'men' was accomplished by the middle of the 10th century, this would fit well for the accessed layers in Baltic as well as in Finnic with the exception of the three older ones.

11.2 Most archaeologists would probably agree to the scenario sketched above. More controversial is, however, a scenario which posits the Vistula-Oder area as the point of departure for the migration of the Slavs into Northwest Russian across the Niemen basin toward the lakes of Peipus and Il'men' at a period of time which lies centuries ahead of the Slavic migration from the South. This scenario which could be called the Sedov-scheme, is of course intrinsically linked to the question of the ethnic identification of the *Przeworsk* archaeo-logical culture, an issue that will not be further elaborated here[37].

11.3 A migration of Slavs from the West, from the Oder-Vistula basin into the basin of Niemen towards the northeast is, however, basically based on the assumption of the Slavic character of the *dlinnye kurgany* and *sopki*. Whether these monuments are Slavic or belong to the Balts or Proto-Finns is highly controversial. If such a migration, however, had taken place, we would in any case have expected to find the most archaic accessed Slavic material in the south rather than in the north. We would have expected to find more archaic material in Lithuanian than in Latvian, and we would have expected to find more archaic Slavic material in Livonian than in Vepsian. But nothing of that sort can be ascertained. Livonian can be considered to be void of traces of early mediaeval contacts with the Slavs with the exception of Christian borrowings.

11.4 Old Prussian demonstrates a decent amount of Slavic mediaeval accessions due to the early presence of Slavs on the Baltic seaboard. Old Prussian contains accessed Slavic material reflecting preserved liquid diphthongs, nasal vowels and *jers* in weak positions, all testifying to early mediaeval contacts with the Slavic Lekhitic population in the area (Milewski 1939; Levin 1974). When considering this a more or less normal situation in Old Prussian, the picture changes when we move into the area to the northeast of the Old Prussian language area where there are practically no similar traces. The area between Niemen and and Latgalia is to a large degree void of Slavic early mediaeval

---

Slavisierung der baltischen Vorbevölkerung schliessen liesse, erst seit dem 9./10. Jh. statt-gefunden hat."
[37] Cf. Bjørnflaten (1998) for a more detailed discussion of this and related issues.

linguistic material. In that connection it should not be forgotten that the Niemen basin was considered to be the core area of the *dlinnye kurgany* related to those found in the Pskov-area. The relationship between the *dlinnye kurgany* in the Pskov-area and in the Niemen basin were considered indicative of the migrational route into Northwest Russia which allegedly should provide proof for the entry of an early Slavic population in northwest Russia several centuries before the real East Slav arrived from the South.

11.5 Based on the linguistic data presented here, it is clear that the Sedov-scheme is not supported by linguistic evidence. And the archeological evidence in favor of it is weak to say the best, cf. the famous archeologist Artamonov (1974: 252):

> «… движение славян через области западных балтов в обход Припятских болот и с пересечением Немана и Западной Двины, т.е. в условиях необычных и поэтому маловероятных для народных переселений, совершенно фантастично, а главное ничем не засвидетельствовано.»

It seems therefore reasonable to agree with Goehrke (1992: 32) when he writes:

> „... dass Sedovs Theorie einer frühen Zuwanderung der Slaven in das Pleskauer und Novgoroder Land derzeit noch auf schwachen Beinen steht.“

11.6 If we then assume that any immigration of Slavs from the southwest is precluded, we still have a problem to solve with regard to the archaic Slavic material in northern Finnic. One way to account for this distribution of the archaic accessed Slavic lexical material would be to assume a more eastern route of northbound migration of the Slavs than usually assumed. This would imply that the Slavic immigration to the basin of the Velikaja and the areas adjacent to the southern Proto-Finns were colonised later than the areas further to the East, along Volkhov and the shores of Ladoga. Such a scenario would bring the Slavs in an earlier contact with the Finns, Karelians and the Vepsians than with the remaining part of the Finnic language area. Only later, after a western movement, and even a movement towards the South, contact was established between the Slavs and the southern Finnic peoples and finally with the ancestors of the Latvians and the Lithuanians. This scenario was sketched by Kiparsky (1952: 78). Such a scenario has, however, several weak points. The principal is the early dating it necessitates for the first encounter between Slavs and Proto-Finns. Let us therefore consider the assumed three oldest layers of accessed Slavic material in Finnish:

Finnish	Polish
kaatiot 'drawers, underwear'	*gacie*
taltta 'chisel'	*dłóto*
palttina 'linen'	*płótno*
talkkuna 'dish of rye, oat and barley'	*tłokno*
kalkkala (Ingrian) 'flax bud'	*kluokü'öl* (Polab)
karsta 'scab'	*krosta*
varpunen 'sparrow'	*wróbel*
värtsi 'sack' (obsolete)	*vřece* (Old Czech)
värttinä 'distaff'	*wrzeciono*
kuontalo 'bunch'	*kądziel*
suntio 'kyrkovaktare', *sontio* 'id.'	*sędzia*
suntia 'vara kyrkovaktare' (all Lönnrot)	

11.7 The adduced lexical material makes up the most archaic layer of accessed Slavic material in Finnish. When considering this material in view of the distinction between borrowing and intrusions, it can well be argued that all this material consist of borrowings. In contrast to intrusions, borrowings do not necessarily presuppose a contact situation, though this might normally be the case. Almost all the lexical items here designate artefacts and activities which may be considered typical of borrowings. If we here have to do with borrowings, these items do not require a contact situation in the same way as intrusions do. The distinction between borrowings and intrusions lends credence to an argumentation for a West Slavic origin of the most archaic layers. This is a point of view which has been brought forward by several scholars. But due to the authority of Kiparsky, it has to a large extent been accepted that all accessed Slavic lexical material in Finnic comes from East Slavic. It appears to me that this point of view needs a modification. If the most archaic Slavic material in Finnic is considered West Slavic, we will be relieved of one problem and invested by another.

Since the archaic accessed material is most numerous in Finnish and in the northern Finnic languages, it somehow appears reasonable to assume that the source of the diffusion of these lexical items in Finnic has been Finnish. It would be paradoxical to claim, for instance, that Estonian accessed these items from East Slavic, and passed on to Finnish a larger amount of items than it possessed itself.

The evidence of vowel quantity directs the attention to West Slavic since no difference in quantity has been observed in East Slavic.

11.8 Major evidence for early contact between the Proto-Finns and the Baltic Slavs is provided by the Finnic ethnonym for the Russians, *venät-*, *Venäjä* 'Russia'. As the East Slavs were never called by this ethnonym, the candidates are the Baltic Slavs who reached the southern Baltic seaboard at an early date. According to Kiparsky (1952; 1934: 165–168) this ethnonym reached the Proto-Finns through Germanic and does not require any direct contact between the Proto-Finns and the Baltic Slavs. The opinion of Kiparsky is not generally accepted (Laanest 1982: 388), and it seems hard to accept that the Proto-Finns, without any knowledge based on direct contact with Slavs and their language, were able to identify the East Slavs with those on the Baltic seaboard and assign them the same designation. This issue could be further supported by archeological evidence for contacts between the Vistula estuary and southwestern Finland in early mediaeval times (Laanest 1982: 339) and generally by evidence of contacts over sea between the lands around the Baltic sea.

11.9 Four arguments can be brought forward for positing a West Slavic source for the most archaic Slavic material in Finnic:

 (i) Slavic material is more widely diffused in the North than in the South. This circumstance does not favor a conception of accession from north-moving East Slavs.
 (ii) The most archaic material is typical borrowings with cognates in West Slavic on the Baltic seaboard.
(iii) The most archaic material demonstrates an opposition in vowel quantity which is not recorded in East Slavic, but a well attested feature of West Slavic.
(iv) The general Finnic ethnonym *venät* indicates early contacts between the Proto-Finnic tribes and the West Slavs on the Baltic seaboard.

11.10 If this argumentation holds true, the most archaic Slavic material in Finnic has nothing to do with the encounter between Proto-Finns and East Slavs. This further implies that a later dating of the oldest East Slavic material in Finnic has to be made. If the three oldest layers are excluded, it can be stated that the oldest East Slavic layer in Finnic can be dated to the second half of the 10th century.

12.1 The fact that there is less archaic Slavic material to the south of the Finnic languages, with virtually none in terms of intrusions in Livonian, can only call

for the conclusion that this area as a migration route into northwestern Russian has to be excluded. In order to account for the relative archaic character of the Slavic material in Finnic, above all in northern Finnic, an eastern route of migration into northwestern Russia has to be posited. It could be envisaged that the main arteries have been Dnepr and its eastern tributaries and Volchov which in its turn led to an early encounter between the East Slavs and the northern Finnic peoples in the Ladoga-area and on the Karelian isthmus. The contact with the southern Finnic peoples and the adjacent Baltic ancestors of the Latvians and the Lithuanians must have taken place later, perhaps a century later.

References

Andersen 2003 = H. Andersen: Introduction. In: Andersen, H. (ed.): *Language Contacts in Prehistory. Studies in Stratigraphy* (= Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science; Series IV: Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 239). Amsterdam – Philadelphia, pp. 1–10.

Ariste 1958 = P. Ariste: Vene laensõnadest vanemas eesti kirjakeeles. *Keel ja kirjandus* 1, pp. 25–33.

Artamonov 1974 = М.И. Артамонов: Некоторые вопросы отношений восточных славян с болгарами и балтами в процессе заселения ими Среднего и Верхнего Поднепровья (В.В. Седов: *Славяне Верхнего Поднепрья и Подвинья*. М. 1970). *Советская археология* 1 (1974) , pp. 245–254.

Barford 2001 = P.M. Barford: *The Early Slavs. Culture and Society in Early Medieval Eastern Europe*. London.

Bjørnflaten 1998 = J.I. Bjørnflaten: Proto-East Slavic: Fact or Fiction? Archeological Aspects of a Linguistic Problem. In: *A Centenary of Slavic Studies in Norway. The Olaf Broch Symposium*, Oslo 12–14 September 1996, eds. J.I. Bjørnflaten, G. Kjetsaa & T. Mathiassen (= Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo; Skrifter 2; Historisk-filosofisk klasse, Ny serie 20). Oslo, pp. 23–35.

Būga 1958 [1912] = K. Būga: К вопросу о хронологии литовских заимствований с русского. *Rinktiniai raštai* I. Vilnius, pp. 339–350. [Published originally 1912].

Būga 1961 [1925] = K. Būga: Die litauisch-weissrussischen Beziehungen und ihr Alter. *Rinktiniai raštai* III. Vilnius, pp. 749–778. [Published originally 1925].

Cejtlin et al. 1999 = Р.М. Цейтлин, Р. Вечерка & Э. Благова: *Старославянский словарь (по рукописям X–XI веков)*. Москва.

Cvetkov 1995 = D. Tsvetkov: *Vatjan kielen Joenperän murteen sanasto*. Helsinki. (Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae XXV; Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskuksen julkaisuja 79).

Endzelīns 1971 [1899] = J. Endzelīns: Латышские заимствования из славянских языков. In: J. Endzelīns: *Darbu izlase*. I. Rīga, pp. 80–113. [Published originally 1899].

Fraenkel 1962–1965 = E. Fraenkel: *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. I–II. Heidelberg – Göttingen.

Gerd 1995 = А.С. Герд: *Словарь русских говоров Карелии и сопредельных обастей*. Выпуск 2. Санкт-Петербург.

Goehrke 1992 = C. Goehrke: *Frühzeit des Ostslaventums*. Darmstadt. (Erträge der Forschung 277).

Isačenko 1980 = A. Issatschenko: *Geschichte der russischen Sprache*. 1. Band. *Von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des 17. Jahrhunderts*. Heidelberg (Slavica. Neue Folge).

Itkonen 1960 = E. Itkonen: Die Vorgeschichte der Finnen aus der Perspektive eines Linguisten. *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* XXXII. Wiesbaden, pp. 2–24.

Kalima 1929 = J. Kalima: Zur Herkunft der slavischen Lehnwörter im Ostseefinnischen. *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie* 6, pp. 154–172.

Kalima 1956 = J. Kalima: *Die slavischen Lehnwörter im Ostseefinnischen*. Berlin – Wiesbaden. (Veröffentlichungen der Abteilung für slavische Sprachen und Literaturen des Osteuropa-Instituts (Slavisches Seminar) an der Freien Universität Berlin 8).

Karlgren 1947 = A. Karlgren: *Dneprfossernes nordisk-slaviske navne*. København. (Festskrift udgivet af Københavns universitet i anledning af universitetes årsfest, 1947).

Karulis 2001 = K. Karulis: *Latviešu etimoloģijas vārdnīca*. Rīga.

Kettunen 1938 = L. Kettunen: *Livisches Wörterbuch mit grammatischer Einleitung*. Helsinki. (Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae V).

Kiparsky 1934 = V. Kiparsky: *Die gemeinslavischen Lehnwörter aus dem Germanischen*. Helsinki. (Annales Academiæ Scientiarum Fennicæ B XXXII, 2).

Kiparsky 1946 = V. Kiparsky: Über die Vertretung des *ě* in den slaw. Lehnwörtern der ostseefinn. Sprachen. *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* XXIX, pp. 76–86.

Kiparsky 1948 = V. Kiparsky: Chronologie des relations slavobaltiques et slavofinnoises. *Revue des Études slaves* XXIV, pp. 29–47.

Kiparsky 1952 = V. Kiparsky: The Earliest Contacts of the Russians with the Finns and Balts. *Oxford Slavonic Papers* 3, pp. 67–79.

Kiparsky 1958 = В. Кипарский: О хронологии славяно–финских лексических отношений. *Scando-Slavica* 4, pp. 127–136.

Kiparsky 1962 = V. Kiparsky: Wie haben die Ostseefinnen die Slaven kennengelernt?. *Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 125, pp. 223–230.

Kiparsky 1963 = V. Kiparsky: *Russische historische Grammatik*. Band I. *Die Entwicklung des Lautsystems*. Heidelberg.

Kiparsky 1975 = V. Kiparsky: *Russische historische Grammatik*. Band III. *Entwicklung des Wortschatzes*. Heidelberg.

Koivulehto 1983 = J. Koivulehto: Seit wenn leben die Urfinnen im Ostseeraum? Zur relativen und absoluten Chronologie der alten idg. Lehnwortschichten im Ostseefinnischen. *Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 185, pp. 135–157.

Koškins 2000 = I. Koškins: Senkrievu aizguvumu latviešu valodā vēsturiski valodniecisks vērtējums. *Baltu Filoloģija* IX: *Papers on Baltic linguistics*. Rīga, pp. 39–49.

Koškins 2002 = I. Koškins: Slāvismi Latviešu valondā: Diahrōniskās rekonstrukcijas problēmas. *Vārds un tā pētīšanas aspekti. Rakstu krājums* 6. Liepāja, pp. 364–367.

Krawczykiewicz 1972 = A. Krawczykiewicz: Zapożyczenia rosyjskie w języku wepskim. *Acta Philologica* 5. Warszawa, pp. 39–129.

Kulikovskij 1898 = Г. Куликовский: *Словарь областного олонецкого наречия в его бытовом и этнографическом применении*. Санктпетербург.

Laanest 1982 = A. Laanest: *Einführung in die ostseefinnischen Sprachen*. Hamburg.

Levin 1974 = J.F. Levin: *The Slavic Element in the Old Prussian Elbing Vocabular*y. Berkeley. (University of California Publications in Linguistics 77).

Mikkola 1894 = J.J. Mikkola: *Berührungen zwischen den westfinnischen und slavischen Sprachen.* I. *Slavische Lehnwörter in den westfinnischen Sprachen.* Helsingfors. (Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne VIII).

Mikkola 1938 = J.J. Mikkola: *Die älteren Berührungen zwischen Ostseefinnisch und Russisch.* Helsinki. (Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne LXXV).

Milewski 1939 = T. Milewski: Stosunki językowe polsko-pruskie. *Slavia Occientalis* XVIII, pp. 21–84.

Mägiste 1962 = J. Mägiste: *Äldre ryska lånord i estniskan särskilt i det gamla estniska skriftspråket.* Lund. (Lunds Universitets Årsskrift, N.F. Avd. 1, Bd. 55, Nr. 1).

Must 2000 = M. Must: *Vene laensõnad Eesti murretes.* Tallinn.

Nilsson 1991 = T. K. Nilsson: Slavicisms in the Language of the Baltic-Finnic *krieviņi* in Kurland, Latvia, *Lingua Posnaniensis* XXXII–XXXIII, pp. 187–191.

Nilsson 1998 = T.K. Nilsson: Slavicisms in Krievinian Revisited. *Linguistica Uralica* 34, pp. 92–94.

Plöger 1973 = A. Plöger: *Die russischen Lehnwörter der finnischen Schriftsprache.* Wiesbaden. (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 8).

Posti 1959 = L. Posti: *Käämi*-sanan alkuperästä. *Virittäjä* 63, pp. 207–210.

Samilov 1964 = M. Samilov: *The Phoneme jat' in Slavic.* The Hague. (Slavistic Printings and Reprintings 32).

Schramm 2002 = G. Schramm: *Altrusslands Anfang. Historische Schlüsse aus Namen, Wörtern und Texten zum 9. und 10. Jahrhundert.* Freiburg i. Br. (Rombach Wissenschaften; Reihe Historiae 12).

Setälä 1932 = E. Setälä: Les contacts des langues finnoises baltiques avec les langues slaves. *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* XLIII, Édition francaise, pp. 35–45.

Šilov 2005 = А.Л. Шилов: Прибалтийско-финская лексика и восточнославянское языкознание. *Вопросы языкознания* 2 (2005), pp. 7–28.

Sitzmann 2003 = A. Sitzmann: *Nordgermanisch-ostslavische Sprachkontakte in der Kiever Rus' bis zum Tode Jaroslavs des Weisen.* Wien. (Wiener Studien zur Skandinavistik 6).

Shevelov 1964 = G.Y. Shevelov: *A Prehistory of Slavic. The Historical Phonology of Common Slavic.* Heidelberg.

SJSS = *Slovník jazyka staroslověnského.* I–. Praha 1966–.

Skardžius 1931 = P. Skardžius: *Die slavischen Lehnwörter im Altlitauischen.* Kaunas.

SKES = *Suomen kielen etymologinen sanakirja.* I–VII. Toim. Y.H. Toivonen et al. Helsinki 1987–1981. (Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae XII).

SRNG 1996 = *Словарь русских народных говоров.* Выпуск 30. Санкт-Петербург.

SSA = *Suomen sanojen alkuperä. Etymologinen sanakirja.* I–III. Toim. E. Itkonen & U.-M. Kulonen. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura; Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus, 1992–2000.

Strumiński 1996 = B. Strumiński: *Linguistic Interrelations in Early Rus'. Northmen, Finns, and East Slavs* (*Ninth to Eleventh Centuries*). Roma – Edmonton. (Collana di filologia e letterature slave II).

Suhonen 1992 = S. Suhonen: Über Art und Umfang des russischen Einflusses im Wotischen. *Finnisch-ugrische Sprachen zwischen dem germanischen und dem slavischen Sprachraum. Vorträge des Symposiums aus Anlass des 25-jährigen Bestehens der Finnougristik an der*

Rijksuniversiteit Groningen 13.–15. November 1991, Hgg. L. Honti et al. Amsterdam – Atlanta GA, pp. 157–166.

Szabó 1981 = L. Szabó: Russian Loanwords in Wotic. *Congressus Quintus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum, Turku 20.–27. VIII. 1980*. Pars VI, red. O. Ikola. Turku: Suomen Kielen Seura, pp. 279–284.

Thomason & Kaufman 1988 = S.G. Thomason & T. Kaufman: *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley – Los Angeles – London.

Vlasto 1986 = A.P. Vlasto: *A Linguistic History of Russia to the End of the Eighteenth Century*. Oxford.

Viitso 1990 = T.-R. Viitso: On the Earliest Finnic and Balto-Slavic Contacts. In: *Itämerensuomalaiset kielikontaktit / Läänemeresoome keelekontaktid* (*Itämerensuomalainen symposium kansainvälisessä fennougristikongressissa Debrecenissä 27.8.–1.9.1990*). Helsinki, S. 140–147.

Winkler 1997 = E. Winkler: *Krewinisch. Zur Erschliessung einer ausgestorbenen ostseefinnischen Sprachform*. Wiesbaden. (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 49).

Winkler 2000 = E. Winkler: Früher russischer Einfluß auf das Wotische? *Inter Dialectos Nominaque. Pühendusteos Mari Mustale 11. Novembril 2000* (= Eesti Keele Instituudi Toimetised 7). Tallinn, pp. 448–461 .

Zajceva & Mullonen 1972 = М.И. Зайцева & И.И. Муллонен: *Словарь вепсского языка*, Ленинград.

Zaliznjak 2004 = А.А. Зализняк: *Древненовгородский диалект*. Второе издание. Москва.

Zinkevičius 1987 = Z. Zinkevičius: *Lietuvių kalbos istorija*. II. *Iki pirmųjų raštų.*Vilnius.

Zinkevičius 1996 = Z. Zinkevičius: *The History of the Lithuanian Language*. Vilnius.