Лингвистический атлас вепсского языка (ЛАВЯ). Под общей редакцией Н. Г. Зайцевой, Санкт-Петербург: Нестор-История, 2019. 574 pp.

The mapping of dialects is of great importance for the preservation and study of dialects. The founder of dialect geography was the German linguist Georg Wenker (1852—1911), who in 1877—1887 distributed a set of written German sentences to 45,000 schoolteachers across Germany, asking for their translation into the local dialect. Later, additional material was collected from German dialects outside Germany. Between 1927 and 1956, black-and-white dialect maps reached the readers in the form of 25 fascicles.

Between 1902 and 1910, the first dialect atlas "Atlas linguistique de la France" consisting of 35 volumes and covering the whole French language area was published by the Swiss-French linguist Jules Gilliéron (1854—1926) in collaboration with Édouard Edmont. This inspired many linguists, including Andrus Saareste (1892—1964) in Estonia and Lauri Kettunen (1885—1963) in Finland, to deal with language geography. The first fascicle of Saareste's "Eesti murdeatlas. Atlas des parlers estoniens" was published in Tartu in 1938 and the second three years later. In 1955, the "Petit atlas des parlers estoniens" was published as a continuation in Uppsala. At the same time, Kettunen was active in the field of Finnish dialects and his atlas appeared in 1940.

In 1997, the Karelian dialect atlas, based on material collected by Finno-Ugric linguist Dmitrij Bubrih (1890—1949), was published (Bubrih, Beljakov, Punžina 1997). The three-volume "Atlas Linguarum Fennicarum" (2004—2010), which looks at specific features of all Finnic languages, was completed as a result of a joint effort of Finnish, Estonian and Karelian linguists. The Finnic languages are also covered by the "Atlas of Linguarum Europae", of which 15 fascicles have been published between 1975 and 2015 (see Oja 2002; Itkonen 1995).

The appearance of a large-scale Veps language atlas in 2019 became a major event. It was compiled by well-known Veps language specialists Irma Mullonen, Nina Zaitseva and Olga Žukova from Petrozavodsk, and Igor Brodskij and Sergei Myznikov from St. Petersburg. The atlas maps were made and designed by Nina Šibanova. Not only the field material collected by the authors but also archival materials and published sources were used. The atlas, in A4 format, contains 150 language maps showing the spatial distribution of the Veps language on phonological, morphological and lexical levels. The manuscript was reviewed by Finnic Professor Riho Grünthal from Helsinki and by Veps folklore and religion researcher Irina Vinokurova from Petrozavodsk.

The brief foreword (pp. 3—4), which contains an map of Veps villages, is followed by an overview of the history of Veps dialect research (pp. 5—10). The chapter is illustrated by a map of Veps dialects and the settlements studied. There follows a brief overview of the principles of compiling the Veps linguistic atlas (pp. 11—12). For each keyword, in addition to an explanation of the distribution map and its symbols, there follow (1) a grouped map legend (see below), (2) the dialects represented by the mapped materials, (3) a number register containing the settlement number and name abbreviation, (4) a list of dialectal variants for each settlement (e.g., the sentence *tul'e minunke* 'come with me' shows that the ending of the comitative *-nke* has been recorded in Šeltozero (abbreviation *Št*), and (5) linguistic commentary. These data are located on the same page, but unfortunately, the full versions of the abbreviated settlement names can only be found far down the book (pp. 547—549).

The description of the compilation principles is followed by the bulk of the

atlas, more than half a thousand pages strong, divided into phonological (in the atlas: phonetical), morphological and lexical dialect phenomena (pp. 13—534), plus a summary (pp. 535—545) and bibliography (pp. 551—556). The latter contains 233 literature sources, more than a third of which are entries in the Latin alphabet. A questionnaire for dialect phenomena is presented as an appendix to the book (pp. 557—570). This is much more comprehensive than the map material, because a lot of it did not prove to be informative enough to delineate the Veps dialects (pp. 21, 73, 137). Unfortunately, there is no index for words in Veps, Estonian, Finnish, or any other languages mentioned in the work, the presence of which would have significantly facilitated the search on the distribution, etymology etc. of the lexemes of interest.

Throughout the atlas the dialect maps are on even pages. All maps are the same size, filling the entire page, which makes them clear and easy to use. Language phenomena are marked with symbols on the maps. In the lower right-hand corner of each map is their explanation or legend. The odd page begins with the subtitle "Map legend", which lists, in the same order as in the map, the dialect words, which have been attempted to be grouped. However, subjectivity and inconsistency in some respects can be observed (see examples below).

In addition to an analysis of the regional situation, the comments also contain information on word origin, language contacts, etc. These data are most valuable because the Veps etymological dictionary has not yet been published and the research results are scattered throughout literature. The comments are enriched by some fresh views. Comparative data come mainly from the northern group of Finnic languages. However, there could have been more examples from the southern group, especially in cases where they are not present in the northern group (examples below).

The bulk of the atlas begins with two maps, one showing the Veps' endoethnonym (*vepsläine*, *ičemoi rahvaz* 'our own people', *lüdinik*, *čuharid*), and the other

showing the spread of mother tongue names (translative *lüdiks*, *vepsäks*, adessive *ičemoi kelel*, etc.) (pp. 14—20). A common, thorough commentary has been prepared on both groups of names (2.5 pages). The Russian names for the Vepses include *kaivanid* and *kaibanid*. According to the comment, the word can be associated with the Russian dialecticism *кайбовать* 'to gossip; to talk; to speak'. This is quite plausible as it is an obvious loan from Finnic languages, cf. Est. *kaebama* 'to complain; to denounce; to sneak; to wail, to lament', Vot. *kaivata* 'to denounce; to complain', Kar. *kaivata* 'to yearn, to ache; to need; to mourn; to denounce' and others. Only from the Vepsian language the word has probably disappeared (see EES 113).

Thirteen maps are dedicated to the phonological reflexes of Veps dialects (pp. 21—72). Out of purely phonetic phenomena, the alternation of the first syllable *ü* and *i* (*lüpsan* ~ *lipsan* 'I milk'), the correlation of *ai*, *ei*, *ii* and *ae* (*aiž* ~ *eiž* and others 'shaft, thill'), the alternation of *al'* and *ou* (*tal'v* ~ *touv* 'winter'), alternation and the correlation *-h* ~ *-h́* and *-z* (*herneh* ~ *hernez* 'pea'), as well as vowel harmony or its lack (*vävü* ~ *vävu* 'son-in-law') are discussed here. In addition to the first syllable *u* ~ *uu* variation, the correlation between *i* and *ii* would also have been of interest (*hiŕ* ~ *hiiŕ* 'mouse'). Or should it be assumed that the original long vowel has completely disappeared from Veps?

Although the different vowels in the third person plural of personal pronouns *he* ~ *hö* ~ *hii* ~ *höt* reflect phonology all right, *-t* is, of course, a morphological marker (p. 30 ff.). The map of the change *e > o* observed under morphological phenomena (*tegeb* ~ *teggeb* ~ *teggob* 'it does') (p. 100) could have been added after the map and its commentaries showing gemination in the third person of the present singular (p. 58) because both indicate morphophonological changes in the same words.

Morphological features of the Veps language are expressed in 15 maps (pp. 73—135). In the case of nominal words, the declension ending of the comitative

singular *-nke ~ -ke ~ -(d)me ~ -(d)mu* (e.g., *koiranke* 'with dog'), the allative *-la ~ -le ~ -ľe ~ -lo*, the prolative *-(d)me ~ -(d)mu*, PartSing + *mödo ~ möde ~ möto* and the plural adjective *-l ~ -ľ ~ -v ~ -ii* are included in the atlas. The conjugable words are represented by eight maps, denoting the first and third persons plural of the present indicative (*-m ~ -mei ~ -maa*, etc.), the third person plural of the present (e.g. *toba ~ todas* etc. 'they bring'), the negative *en tegend* etc. *~ en tehnu* 'I did not do'), the impersonal passive (*-t ~ -tet ~ -tu ~ -tud*) and other endings. Of derivational suffixes only collective suffixes *-ik*, *-nik*, *-išt*, *-žom* (attached to nouns) are addressed, e.g. *koivik ~ koivišt ~ koivunik ~ koivžom* 'birch forest'.

Most of the morphological phenomena are grouped in an understandable way, e.g. 1) *todas ~ todasei ~ todaze* and 2) *toba ~ tobad* to register the third person plural of the present tense of the verb *toda* 'to bring', but in some cases the grouping principle remains incomprehensible. Why *-l*, *-v* and *-(i)i*, on the one hand, and *-ľ* (p. 83) on the other, are contrasted as endings of the plural adessive, while they all originate in the *l*-vowel? It also remains a mystery why the palatalization of the vowel *l* in the allative singular marker *-la ~-le ~ -lo* should be more important than the alternation of the final vowels *e ~ o ~ a* (p. 87).

Most of the atlas maps are lexical, showing the distribution of vocabulary (pp. 136—534). This lexis is divided into 21 conceptual groups such as flora, fauna, meteorological phenomena, landscape, man, etc. Most of the words are nouns, there are only 12 adjectives, 7 verbs, 6 adverbs, etc. The dialect variants are divided on different grounds. In some cases, the difference is based on the word stem, e.g. 1) *niiń*, *niń*, *niinpuu*, *niinveza* and 2) *lehmuz* 'linden' (p. 139). In contrast, in the case of the concept 'horsetail, equisetum' it is the simple and compound words that are contrasted: 1) *korteh ~ kortez ~ korthed* and 2) *kortehiin ~ kortezhein* 'Equisetum palustre' (p. 159). In the case of 'sparrow', in addition to the stem difference, a distinction is also made between simple and compound words: 1) *hereč*, 2) *herelind*, 3) *paskač*, and

4) *pasklind* (p. 179). The concept 'seaweed, algae' is distinguished, among other options, by a suffix, which is not the practice in other cases: 1) *hiinik*, 2) *hiiništ* (differentiated by suffix), 3) *nälö ~ näľod ~ näľad ~ näľud* (by stem), 4) *näľuhiin* (the same stem as in the previous group, but in a compound word), 5) *šoľ-ľod*, 6) *vedehižen ~ vedehiižen tukad* 'literally: hair of the water spirit', and 7) *vezihiin ~ vedoheinad ~ vedohiinad* (p. 161). A comparison of these groups based on different principles makes one wonder whether the grouping should have been done somewhat differently.

Let us continue on the same subject. In the field of vocabulary, in some cases, phonological variants of the morphological segment of the atlas are contrasted, e.g., 1) *heim* and 2) *hiim* 'relatives; tribe' (p. 371), and *küľbeť, küubet, tüubeť* ja *kiľbeť* 'sauna', all bearing a different serial number (p. 467). However, there seems to be no point in grouping phonological variants in general. In this case, a good example is *kivduk, küüdug, küutk* 'hearth, sauna heater' (p. 463), where no grouping has been performed. Grouping is all right where different stems are distinguished, but not for phonological variants or derivatives, e.g., 1) *hapatoz ~ hapišt*, 2) *mi̭igotez ~ mi̭igitez ~ muigotez ~ muigotiš*, etc., 3) *noustatez*, 4) *rand*, 5) *sep*, 6) *prigolouk* 'bread starter' (p. 487) or 1) *veneh ~ veneh́ ~ venez ~ venoi*, 2) *karbaz*, 3) *roikad ~ roikod ~ roikud*, 4) *soim* ja 5) *ruhd́* 'boat' (p. 501). Only *sep* 'yeast' (from the basing meaning 'blacksmith') has a different meaning as 'bread starter'.

The grouping of different stems also shows etymological coherence. The grouping of some descriptive words is problematic. In one column of the atlas we find the *s*-initial verbs *simotada ~ sumetada ~ sumitada ~ sumotada ~ sipitada*, and in the other column, the *č*-initial verbs *čibaita ~ čipitada ~ čimberta ~ čimerta* 'rain drizzle' (p. 229). They vary in the initial and internal consonants as well as in the phonetic system. At least the internal consonant could have been taken into account in the grouping. Therefore, *sipitada* is difficult to group in with other descriptive words such as *sumitada ~ su-*

motada, etc. but is closer to the *č*-initial *čipitada*, which may be related to Est. *tibama*, *tibutama* and South-Est. *tsibistämmä ~ tsiputamma* (VMS 541, 543).

Thus, the words with *čim- ~ ?čimb-*, *čip-*, *sim-*, *sip-*, and *sum-* could all be separate. *sum*-stem lexemes are correctly compared with the *sum*-word for fog, which mainly means 'fog', but in Lude also 'drizzle'. It is correctly noted that Veps *sumorosťa* is a Russian loanword, cf. Rus. *суморосить* 'rain dripping' (p. 230). However, it would be reasonable to continue studying the relationship between the Veps and the Russian stem because the Russian dialect word is registered only in the historical Vepsian area in the Vologda region. Rus. *суморок*, *суморочна* 'drizzle' and *суморочь* 'foggy weather' are recorded only in this region, but *суморось* 'fine, heavy autumn rain' also in the Arkhangelsk, Yaroslavl and Smolensk regions (СРНГ 241).

The words *lodeita* and *lobaata* 'speak' are placed in the same etymological nest, considering the latter to be a phonetic variant of the former word (p. 509, 510). This is not right, because both Veps words are independent, albeit belonging to the so-called descriptive or emphatic lexemes, cf. on the one hand Est. *lodisema* 'to chatter', Fin. *lotista* 'squelch, splash; clatter, clap; talk empty' etc., but on the other Est. *lobisema* and Fin. *lopista* 'talk empty, chatter, talk nonsense' etc. (see EES 244). According to the author of these lines, there is no need to associate the lexeme *lodeita* with the Russian word *ладить* 'prepare; reiterate', although the commentator considers the possibility promising, despite a phonetic problem.

It is not clear why *läheli* 'close' is placed separately from the group *lähen ~ lähän ~ lähäšti*, although all are equally derivatives of the **läh*-stem (p. 279). The commentary mentions that the concept 'swallow' has five groups of names, but only four are distinguished in the map legend (p. 185). Here the author of these lines would rather combine the compound words *saraklinduine* with the names *sarakoine* and *sarakeine*. Thus there would be only three groups: 1) *päsk-*, 2) *sarak-*, and 3) *ďumalanlindǯine* (literally: 'bird of God').

The commentary states that both *lölik*, *dilingǯine* and *düuringeine* 'whortleberry' are derived from the stem **jol-* (cf. Fin. *juolukka*) and they are compared with the synonymous Estonian lexeme *alligad ~ halli(n)gad* (p. 145, 146). In the opinion of the author, such developments are not likely due to vowel differences. The word *käŕǵ* is used for a woodpecker in one Veps dialect, which otherwise means 'black woodpecker' (p. 177). It could be added that this word of onomatopoeic origin has equivalents from Finnic to Volga languages, cf. Est. *kärg ~ kärik ~ kärr* 'black woodpecker', Fin. *kärki* 'green woodpecker', Kar. *käŕg ~ kärgi* 'black woodpecker' (Mäger 1967 : 119; SSA 1 : 476).

The Veps words *litik* and *lituińe* 'young bream' are rightly associated with the Finnish word *lituska* and Karelian lexemes *litti* and *litšu* 'small fish', considering them descriptive words, which can be compared with Fin. *litistää*, *litsata* 'tear to pieces; compress' and *lattea* 'flat' (p. 189; see also SSA 2 : 83). At this point, it is worth remembering the common name of bream in Estonian and Votic *latikas* and *latikka*, respectively, which are related to Est. *latakas* 'large, wide and flat; large piece, splinter' and Fin. *lattea* 'flat' (see Kendla 2014 : 68; EES 229). It is possible that a similar phenomenon may appear here, which was probably first described in Estonian by Saareste (1940 : 86 ff.), an assumption still valid today. According to him, the vowel *a* of the first syllable is associated with a large object and *i* with a small one, cf. Est. *kala* 'fish' and *kilu* 'sprat' [= 'small fish'], *korts* 'fold' and *kirts* 'small wrinkle'. To a lesser extent, the phenomenon is also known in Livonian and Finnish (Kehayov, Blokland 2007 : 90—93, 110—111). In the present case, the range of the phenomenon under study may be seen extended to the entire Finnic language area. The Veps and other *i*-words can be compared to the Finnish adjective *litteä* 'flat'. In this case, it should be assumed that Fin. *latikka* 'small bream', Ingr. *ladikka* 'small roach or bream' and Lude *laťikko* 'small bream' are secondary in meaning. There would have been no need to include suspicious or erroneous words on the distribution map in question,

such as *lahn* 'bay' and *särgud* 'roaches', which certainly do not refer to young bream.

In the case of the Veps *lučču̇d* 'fish-monger', which only survives in Northern Veps, it is assumed that it is related to the Rus. *луч* 'bundle of pine splinters in the light of which fish were caught at night', cf. Veps *ajada lučale* 'go at night to catch fish in the light of fire'. Indeed, the AllSing *lučale* is related to the above-mentioned Russian word, but in the case of the fish name *lučču̇d* the reference material should rather be found in other Finnic languages, cf. Est. and Liv. *luts* 'burbot', Lud. *lutš́* 'river bullhead (*Cottus gobius*)?, spiny loach (*Cobitis taenia*)?' and *ludž́u* 'small fish less than one year old' (EES 256).

In the atlas commentary the Northern Veps lexeme *putikaine* 'frog polliwog; small child' has been considered either a loan from the Russian dialects or, conversely, a loanword to Russian. The first variant could be ruled out because the Russian word *путикан* only occurs on a very narrow strip of land in South Karelia, but the Veps word has equivalents in other Finnic languages, cf. Est. *putukas* 'insect', *putik(as)* 'bug' (VMS 267), Kar. *put́une* 'lamb'. This *p*-initial family of words denoting small beings is associated with the words *pudi* 'small fine pieces' and *pudenema* 'to fall; collapse; decompose'(EES 215) and, in the author's view, is also of descriptive origin. This assumption could be supported by synonymous *m*-initial equivalents found in Finnic languages, cf. Est. *mutukas* 'insect', Vot. *mutukaz ~ mutukka* 'insect; polliwog; baby fish', Fin. *mutiainen* 'fuss; polliwog; mosquito', Kar. *mut́t́* 'small fish', Ingr. *mudukkain* 'mosquito', and Lude *mut́iine* 'small fish' (EES 290). Phonetically, cf. also Veps *puču* and *muču* 'small' (p. 355).

Of interest is the Russian loan *svaŕb* 'wedding', cf. *свадьба* and dial. *сварьба*, in which Slavist Max Vasmer has assumed contamination of words denoting wedding and quarrel (p. 391). In this context, Est. *pulm*, Vot. *pulma* 'wedding' and Fin. *pulma* 'weight; embarrassment' could also be mentioned. This word has been associated with either wedding cries or distress

(see EES 391). The authors of the atlas have correctly compared Veps *leskuz* 'upper part of the flame', known only in Voilahta (Vologda district), with Fin. *lieska* 'flame' (p. 460). Unfortunately, the Veps equivalent is not mentioned in the etymological dictionaries of Estonian and Finnish.

According to the language atlas, the word *Sünd*, meaning 'god' and 'Jesus Christ', is known throughout the Veps language area (p. 398 ff.). Based on etymological dictionaries, the lexeme alludes to the verb *sünduda* 'to be born'. It is assumed that the Veps *Sünd* is more closely associated with Christianity than the corresponding Karelian word, which denotes just a mythical creature operating between Christmas and New Year's Eve (pp. 400—401). This gives the impression that such a character belongs in some way to the dark times of antiquity but this is not quite the case. The author of these lines is convinced that the name *Sünd* is fully connected with the spread of Orthodoxy, including Church Slavonic and Russian, in which *Рождество́ Христо́во* 'Birth of Christ', with the full name *Рождество по плоти Господа Бога и Спасителя нашего Иисуса Христа* 'Birth of our Savior Jesus Christ, the incarnation of the Lord God' means ecclesiastical Christmas. On the other hand, Jesus Christ is called the Son of God: *Ангел сказал Ей в ответ: Дух Святый найдет на Тебя, и сила Всевышнего осенит Тебя; посему и рождаемое Святое наречется Сыном Божиим* 'The angel answered, 'The Holy Spirit will come on you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you. So the holy one to be born will be called the Son of God' (Luc 1:35; Библия 1992; As told 2011). But the Son of God is also a god. Thus, the complex of new concepts became rooted in the Veps consciousness, whereas the word *sünd* 'birth' began to mean both Jesus Christ and Christian god in general. The word *raštvad* 'Christmas' was borrowed directly from Russian and has been simplified over time but the period from Christmas to Epiphany was called *Sündum*, using a *sünd*-stem word (see also Винокурова 2015 : 384 ff.; 420 ff.).

The first subchapter of the summary of the atlas surveys and explains the phonological, morphological and lexical features of the Northern, Central and Southern Veps dialects. The second subchapter of the summary follows the development of the historical Veps area and reconstructs its boundaries (see map p. 543).

The comments and complements in the review above are secondary to dialect geography and do not in any way preclude the study of the areal distribution of the main objects of the language atlas, i.e. words and morphological elements. The compilation and publication of the dialect atlas is and remains an outstanding contribution to the development of vepsology (Rus. *вепсоведение*; p. 136).

Abbreviations

Est. — Estonian, **Fin.** — Finnish, **Ingr.** — Ingrian, **Kar.** — Karelian, **Liv.** — Livonian, **Rus.** — Russian, **Vot.** — Votic.

As told — As Told in the Books of The Holy Bible. New International Version, Colorado 2011; **EES** — Eesti etümoloogia-sõnaraamat, Tallinn 2012; **EK** — Eesti Keel, Tartu; **ESA** — Emakeele Seltsi Aastaraamat, Tallinn; **SSA** — Suomen sanojen alkuperä. Etymologinen sanakirja 1—3, Helsinki 1992—2000; **Vir.** — Virittäjä, Helsinki; **VMS** — Väike murdesõnastik 2, Tallinn 1989; **Биб-лия** — Библия. Книги Священного Писания Ветхого и Нового Завета, Москва 1992; **СРНГ** — Словарь русских народных говоров 42, Санкт-Петербург 2008.

REFERENCES

B u b r i h, D. V., B e l j a k o v, A. A., P u n ž i n a, A. V. 1997, Karjalan kielen murrekartasto. Диалектологический атлас карельского языка, Jyväskylä (Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskuksen julkaisuja 97).

I t k o n e n, T. 1995, Karjala on saamassa kieliatlaksen. — Vir. 3, 464—470.

K e h a y o v, P., B l o k l a n d, R. 2007, Mittesufiksaalne deminutiivituletus eesti keeles. — ESA 52, 87—124.

K e n d l a, M. 2014, Eesti kalanimetused. Kujunemine, levik ja nimetamise alused, Tallinn 2014 (Tallinna Ülikool. Humanitaarteaduste dissertatsioonid 37).

M ä g e r, M. 1967, Eesti linnunimetused, Tallinn.

O j a, V. 2002, Eesti keel keeleatlastes. — Oma Keel 2, 11—20.

S a a r e s t e, A. 1940, Sõna *kilu* algupärasest sisetunnusest *i*-st. — EK, 86—105.

В и н о к у р о в а И. Ю. 2015, Мифология вепсов. Энциклопедия, Петрозаводск.

ENN ERNITS (Tartu)

Address

Enn Ernits
Estonian University of Life Sciences
E-mail: enn.ernits@emu.ee