

AGO KÜNNAP (Tartu)

POTENTIAL FINNO-UGRIC SUBSTRATUM IN SLAVIC

Indo-European linguists have been convinced for some time that a number of great changes in the northern part of the Indo-European language area have been caused by a strange extinct language X, but they have not reached an agreement to which modern languages this X could be related. Attempts have been made to associate X with the Basque language or Caucasian languages, but the result is not quite convincing. If we consider the primary existence of a form of Uralic language to the south of the rim of the continental ice sheet and, on the other hand, the character of the substratum of language X in Germanic, Baltic and Slavic languages, then it is not difficult to replace the symbol X with the name *Finno-Ugric*. At that, it should be borne in mind that, while learning the more prestigious language, the speakers of the less prestigious language did not transfer their vocabulary or material morphological elements into the new language. But phonetic and syntactic features could still be transferred. Several scholars have noticed features in Germanic, Baltic and Slavic languages which bear a striking resemblance to Finno-Ugric languages, both in phonetics and morphosyntax.

Sarah Grey Thomason and Terrence Kaufman write, "As Baltic and, centuries later, Slavic speakers expanded northward and eastward from their original homeland, they encountered speakers of non-IE languages, including (but probably not confined to) Uralic [Finno-Ugric and Samoyed — A. K.]. At least two kinds of historical evidence indicate that speakers of various Uralic languages shifted to Baltic and Slavic languages as the Indo-European groups took over new regions. [---] Early chronicles show Slavic and Uralic peoples in contact by 862; Slavic expansion probably established such contacts at least by the sixth century A.D., and Baltic speakers came into contact with Uralic speakers even earlier Finnic speakers along the southern coast of the Finnish Gulf (between Narova and Leningrad) and near the White Sea coast began shifting to Russian in the thirteenth century. [---] Uralic influence on northern Russian dialects and on Latvian is, as far as we know, generally accepted. The most controversial claims are those made for Uralic influence on Slavic as a whole, since such interference would have to have occurred at a period before the final breakup of Common Slavic and thus before we have direct evidence of intensive Slavic-Uralic contacts. One common objection to any such hypothesis is that Slavic has no old Uralic loanwords, so that there cannot have been any other early interference from Uralic in Slavic either. We would of course argue that the absence of old loanwords means only that if there was early interference, it must have come about through shift, not borrowing. Since the histori-

cal evidence points to a shift situation in any case, the lack of loanwords is, in our opinion, not valid as an objection to claims of interference. [---]

Timing is a more serious problem. But if ... the ancestors of the Russians first came into contact with Uralic speakers about the end of the sixth century A.D. then there could have been time for some contact-induced changes to spread from northern to southern Slavic dialects, because communication between northern and southern Slavs was not finally cut off until several centuries later, in the tenth century in the west, later in the east The initiation of the last Common Slavic change — that is, the last single change to affect all the Slavic languages/dialects, namely, the fall of the jers (*i*, *ǐ*) — is generally dated from the tenth century. It spread from south to north, and it was not completed in northern Russian dialects until the thirteenth century. It should therefore have been possible for changes to have spread from north to south before the tenth century. (It must be kept in mind, however, that the jer developments could possibly have arisen independently in the various languages, through drift.)

Even if some Uralic-induced changes affected late Proto-Slavic, the continuing contact between Uralic and Baltic and between Uralic and Slavic in the north would make us expect to find more evidence of Uralic influence in the northern languages and dialects than in Slavic as a whole. One reason is that a longer period of intimate contact is likely to result in more overall interference, especially if borrowing occurs as well as shift-induced change; another reason is that at least some of the northern changes will have been more recent and thus easier to detect. This expectation is in fact borne out by what we do find: a few features that suggest Uralic interference in late Proto-Slavic, a number of additional features in Russian and its nearest Baltic and Slavic neighbours, and still other Uralic interference features confined to northern Russian dialects and/or one or both extant Baltic languages, Lithuanian and Latvian." (Thomason, Kaufman 1988 : 238—240).

And they summarize, "The analysis of possible Uralic interference features in Baltic and Slavic suggest the following historical picture. In the northernmost languages and dialects — Lithuanian, Latvian, and northern Russian — the process of shift from Uralic left indisputable linguistic traces in the target languages. The influence is so clear here partly, perhaps, because the Uralic presence was numerically stronger in the north. More importantly, the shifts were more recent in this area, so that interference features are still structurally transparent and thus easy to identify — that is, the shift-induced changes have not been obscured by subsequent changes. Russian as a whole, and its neighbours, also show a number of definite Uralic substratum features. All the evidence for Uralic interference in Slavic as a whole is problematic, but it seems likely to us that the difficulty arises primarily from the fact that the structural links are harder to verify at the relatively great time depth — a thousand years or more. In any case, Uralic substratum interference throughout Balto-Slavic territory is moderate rather than heavy: structural interference features can be found in several grammatical subsystems, but most of the inherited Indo-European grammatical patterns remain intact." (Thomason, Kaufman 1988 : 251).

As a single comment to the S. G. Thomason's and T. Kaufman's views I accentuate that a linguistic majority may transfer to a more prestigious language of a linguistic minority, too. We must remember the possibility of the spread of objects and patterns of activity rather than a considerable population migration should be considered.

In the following the hitherto existing references to Finno-Ugric/Slavic linguistic affinities known to me will be listed.

Phonetics

1. The change of the vowel system in Proto-Slavic so that it becomes fully comparable to that in Proto-Finno-Ugric (Wiik 1996; see also Ткаченко 1989 : 89—90; Raukko, Östman 1994 : 24).
2. Opposition of short/long vowels in Proto-Slavic (Viitso 1996).
3. Replacement of vowel length distinctions by quality distinctions in Proto-Slavic. The lack of the distinctive vowel length in Russian, Belorussian, Ukrainian and the eastern dialects of Slovak (Strade 1995 : 248—249).
4. The change Proto-Indo-European *c* > Proto-Slavic *s* (Wiik 1996).
5. Merger of the palatal and velar places of articulation of plosives in Proto-Slavic (Wiik 1996; see also Strade 1995).
6. Loss of the aspiration of plosive stops in Proto-Slavic (Wiik 1996).
7. A vowel harmony rule that affects its weakest vowels (*ǐ, ǔ*) in Old Church Slavic (Thomason, Kaufman 1988 : 248; Raukko, Östman 1994 : 24; see also Dahl, Koptjevskaja-Tamm 1992 : 12).
8. Tendency to the phonetic accommodations within syllable and word in Slavic (Bednarczuk 1991 : 13).
9. The simplicity of vocalism (the quality of vowels) and not complicated prosody as opposed to developed consonantism in Slavic (Bednarczuk 1991 : 13; see also Wiik 1996).
10. Correlation of front/back vowels as well as palatal/nonpalatal consonants in Slavic which led to the symmetry of the phonemic system. Almost every non-palatalized consonant in the phonemic inventory has a palatalized counterpart in Russian (Thomason, Kaufman 1988 : 247; Raukko, Östman 1994 : 24; Bednarczuk 1991 : 13; see also Dahl, Koptjevskaja-Tamm 1992 : 12.)
11. Development of prothetic *v* before back rounded vowels in Russian and of prothetic *j* before front unrounded vowels in Slavic (Thomason, Kaufman 1988 : 244).
12. The change *o* > *a* or *ə* in southern and central dialects of Russian (including standard language) (*аканье*), Belorussian, Slovenian, western and eastern dialects of Bulgarian (Thomason, Kaufman 1988 : 244).
13. *c* and *č* > *c* in Russian (*цоканье*) (Thomason, Kaufman 1988 : 241).
14. Fixed word-initial stress in some northern dialects of Russian (Thomason, Kaufman 1988 : 241; Raukko, Östman 1994 : 28; Wiik 1996; see also Strade 1995; Viitso 1996).
15. **tl, *dl* > **kl, *gl* in Pskov and Novgorod dialects of Russian (Viitso 1996).

Morphosyntax

1. An animate/inanimate gender distinction in Proto-Slavic (Thomason, Kaufman 1988 : 249; see also Raukko, Östman 1994 : 24).
2. The lacking of conventional perfect/imperfect opposition in the languages in the area of the Baltic Sea (Dahl, Koptjevskaja-Tamm 1992 : 14).
3. The use of the present tense instead of inflectional future in the languages in the area of the Baltic Sea (Dahl, Koptjevskaja-Tamm 1992 : 15—16; see also Metslang 1996 : 122—144).
4. Inflectional preterite (independent of the opposition perfect/imperfect) in the languages in the area of the Baltic Sea (Dahl, Koptjevskaja-Tamm 1992 : 15).
5. Tendency to agglutination resulting in abundance of formants and relational morphemes which caused the lengthening of the word in Slavic (Bednarczuk 1991 : 13).

6. The nominal conception of a sentence (verbal and nominal predicate being little differentiated) in Slavic (Bednarczuk 1991 : 13).
7. The dominance of co-ordination over subordination in Slavic (Bednarczuk 1991 : 13).
8. The development of declension as opposed to the simplicity of conjugations (aspects and manners of action in the function of tenses; small distinctions of moods, voices and persons in verb) in Slavic (Bednarczuk 1991 : 13).
9. A considerable number of the participial formations and respective constructions, as well as impersonal expressions in Slavic (Bednarczuk 1991 : 13).
10. The high level of maintenance of the inherited Indo-European case system by all but the most balkanized (Thomason, Kaufman 1988 : 250).
11. The emergence of the predicative instrumental construction in Slavic. It is best developed in Russian and Polish, e.g. *Р он был солдатом* 'he was a soldier' (Thomason, Kaufman 1988 : 250; Dahl, Коптјевскаја-Тамм 1992 : 31; see also Raukko, Östman 1994 : 24), cf. Estonian *ta oli sõduriks* (translative) id.
12. Semantically motivated alternation in the subject and object declension forms in Eastern Slavic (Dahl, Коптјевскаја-Тамм 1992 : 29–36; see also Raukko, Östman 1994 : 23; Ritter 1996 : 185–186; Ткаченко 1989 : 81–82; Klaas 1996 : 38–44).
13. The object is in a different case in the negative sentence as compared to that in the affirmative sentence in Russian and Polish (Thomason, Kaufman 1988 : 245; Dahl, Коптјевскаја-Тамм 1992 : 29–30; Raukko, Östman 1994 : 23), e.g. Russian *не пью чая* 'I am not drinking tea' — *пью чай* 'I am drinking tea'.
14. Use of the possessive pronoun instead of the personal pronoun in Russian, e.g. *я читаю с в о ю книгу, ты читаешь с в о ю книгу* etc. 'I am reading my book, you are reading your book' etc. (literally *свою* 'own') (see also Stolz 1991 : 55–58), cf. Estonian *ma loen oma raamatut, sa loed oma raamatut* id.
15. The so-called second locative in Russian, e.g. *в лесу́* 'in forest' — *в ле́се* 'there is in forest, forest has' (Thomason, Kaufman 1988 : 245; Raukko, Östman 1994 : 24; Ткаченко 1989 : 82–83).
16. The so-called second genitive, a partitive construction that arose through reinterpretation of a vanishing noun-class distinction in Russian, e.g. *стакан чаю* 'a cup of tea' — *цена чая* 'the price of tea' (Thomason, Kaufman 1988 : 245; Dahl, Коптјевскаја-Тамм 1992 : 81–83), cf. Estonian *klaas teed* — *tee hind* id.
17. The lack of a verb 'have' partly in Eastern Slavic, especially in Russian, e.g. *у меня пакет* 'I have package' (literally 'at me [is] package') (Thomason, Kaufman 1988 : 246; Stolz 1991 : 73–76), cf. Estonian *mul on pakki* id.
18. The imperative suffix *-ка*, which is added to the simple imperative to soften the force of an order in Russian (Thomason, Kaufman 1988 : 245; Raukko, Östman 1994 : 24), e.g. *иди-ка* 'well, go now!'.
19. The dative and the verb 'to come' in the debitive in Russian, e.g. *мне пришлось долго ждать* 'I was to wait long', cf. Estonian *mul* (addressive) *tuli kauga oodata* id. (Klaas 1996 : 57–58; see also Stolz 1991 : 77–81).
20. A mixed system of pre- and postpositions in Russian (Stolz 1991 : 81–88).
21. Particular possessive construction in northern dialects of Russian, e.g. *у волков тут корову йидено* 'here the wolves have eaten a cow' (literally: 'at' + gen.pl. + 'here' + acc.sg. + part.perf. pass.) (Meerwein 1993; Leinonen 1996 : 33), cf. Estonian *huntidel on siin lehm söödud* id.
22. Replacement of the feminine accusative singular form of nouns by the nominative singular form in northern dialects of Russian (Thomason, Kaufman 1988 : 242).
23. Nominative object in (old) northern dialects of Russian, e.g. *а велено им служить городавая осадная служба* 'and ordered them serve city rampart service'

(Thomason, Kaufman 1988 : 242; Dahl, Koptjevskaja-Tamm 1992 : 33—36), cf. Finnish *ja heidän on käsketty suorittaa kaupungin puolustuspalvelu* (nom.) id.

24. Derivational causative suffix in northern dialects of Russian, e.g. *сосать* 'suck' — *соситать* 'to suckle' (Thomason, Kaufman 1988 : 244).

25. A particular final infinite form possibly in northern dialects of Russian (Ritter 1996 : 183—188).

It is a reasonable to suppose that a further scrupulous research of Slavic languages coupled with a more ardent collaboration by Finno-Ugrists will contribute to the lengthening of this list considerably.

REFERENCES

- Bednarczuk, L. 1991, Balto-Slavic and Finno-Ugric Linguistic Convergences in Typological and Areal Aspects. — The 6th International Congress of Baltists. October 2—4, 1991. Abstracts, Vilnius Universiteto leidykla, 13.
- Dahl, Ö., Koptjevskaja-Tamm, M. 1992, Language Typology around the Baltic Sea. A Problem Inventory, Stockholm (Papers from the Institute of Linguistics. University of Stockholm (PILUS) 51. June 1992).
- Klaas, B. 1996, Similarities in Case Marking of Syntactic Relations in Estonian and Lithuanian. — Estonian. Typological Studies I, Tartu, 37—67.
- Leinonen, M. 1996, Possessive Impersonal Constructions in Komi and Northern Russian Dialects. — Symposium Finnisch-ugrische Sprachen in Kontakt. Groningen 21.—23. November. Abstracts. Teilnehmer, Groningen, 33.
- Meerwein, G. 1993, Einige Anmerkungen zu Gemeinsamkeiten in den Tempussystemen der Sprachen des Ostseeraums (Vortrag, gehalten im Rahmen der Baltischen Studententage, Bonn—Bad Godesberg, 19.—21. November 1993) (Manuscript).
- Metslang, H. 1996, The Development of the Futures in the Finno-Ugric Languages. — Estonian. Typological Studies I, Tartu, 122—144.
- Raukko, J., Östman, J.-O. 1994, Pragmaattinen näkökulma Itämeren kielialueeseen, Helsinki (University of Helsinki. Department of General Linguistics. Publications 25).
- Ritter, R.-P. 1996, Zum Supinum im Ostseefinnischen, Lappischen und Baltischen. — CIFU VIII, Pars III, 183—188.
- Stolz, T. 1991, Sprachbund im Balticum? Estnisch und Lettisch im Zentrum einer sprachlichen Konvergenzlandschaft, Bochum.
- Strade, N. 1995, Uralic, Germanic, Paleo-European — about the Earliest Interactions of Different Language Families in Northwestern Eurasia (Manuscript).
- Thomason, S. G., Kaufman, T. 1988, Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics, Berkeley—Los Angeles—Oxford.
- Vitsos, T.-R. 1996, Finnic and its Indo-European Neighbors. Common Changes (Manuscript).
- Wiik, K. 1996, Kantagermaanin suomalais-ugrilainen substraatti (Manuscript).
- Ткаченко О. Б. 1989, Очерки теории языкового субстрата, Киев.

АГО КЮНАП (Тарту)

ВОЗМОЖНЫЙ ФИННО-УГОРСКИЙ СУБСТРАТ В СЛАВЯНСКИХ ЯЗЫКАХ

Автор ссылается на мнение С. Г. Томасон и Т. Кауфман (см. Thomason, Kaufman 1988) о контактах балтийских и славянских языков. Он приводит известные ему указания на финно-угорско—индоевропейские фонетические и морфосинтаксические соответствия.