

Lembit V a b a, *Uurimusi läti-eesti keelesuhetest, Tallinn—Tampere 1997* (Eesti Keele Instituut. Tampereen Yliopiston suomen kielen ja yleisen kielitieteen laitos). 570 pp.

At first sight Latvian-Estonian contacts do not seem to be especially deep, and it is a well-known fact that of all the neighbouring languages which have influenced Estonian Latvian has left the fewest traces. But in the south of Estonia Estonians and Latvians have been living side by side for hundreds of years and this has obviously left its traces. The southern Finnic element in Latvian seems to be greater than the Latvian influence on Estonian, but it is often difficult to separate Livonian loanwords in Latvian from the Estonian ones.

The present work is based on L. Vaba's previous book "Läti laensõnad eesti keeles" (1977), but has been thoroughly rewritten and much expanded (even an unchanged reprint would have been welcome, taking into consideration the low print run and the difficulties in the 1970's of obtaining books from Estonia). Even though the title has been changed it still basically treats Latvian loanwords in Estonian, as Latvian, contrary to German and Russian, has hardly influenced Estonian in any other way. No particular mention is made of the Estonian influence on Latvian, on which no monograph has, to my knowledge, been published (Aben 1947 and Zeps 1962 treat both Estonian and Livonian loans in Latvian), but this would seem to be a task for Latvian linguists.

Contacts between Estonian and Latvian have been more extensive than one might be led to believe, but up to now more attention has been given to the older Baltic loanwords in the Finnic languages. One can only speak of Latvian-Estonian contacts, though, when one can speak of separate Baltic languages. L. Vaba assumes the split between Latvian and Lithuanian took place around the end of the first millenium.

The book is divided into four main chapters: 1. Introduction, 2. A list of Latvian loanwords in Estonian, 3. Phonetic, morphological and semantic analysis and 4. Conceptual analysis, geographic distribution and age of the loanwords.

The first chapter contains the introduction, methodology, sources used, an overview of previous work on the subject (including a useful enumeration of discarded etymolo-

gies), a short overview of the formation of the Latvian-Estonian linguistic border and a sub-chapter on the Estonian linguistic enclaves in Latvia, the Lutsi and Leivu dialects (L. Vaba is one of the few Estonians to have heard these dialects before the last speakers died) and their specific Latvianisms. (On the origin of the ethnonym *Leivu* L. Vaba mentions that the Leivus were thought to be Livonians and were even given a St. Matthew's Gospel in Livonian, which of course they did not understand. Only in 1869 did F. J. Wiedemann prove conclusively that the Leivus spoke a South-Estonian dialect).

One of these possible Latvianisms is the instrumental use of the impersonal present *tav*-participle in both South-Estonian dialects as well as in the Estonian linguistic enclaves (p. 47—50): *Krl tsia tapõtõv tuut's* 'sticking knife', *Lei mõ`stav tõlv* 'wooden stick, batlet'. This use of the passive impersonal participle can also be found in Livonian, as L. Vaba mentions, but also in the Kreevin dialect of Votic (Ernits 1997 : 190—191). In Latvian this construction is typical: *Latv. dzeramais üdens* 'potable water' (*dzeramais*: present stem of *dzert* 'to drink'+ *-am* passive suffix + definite ending). According to L. Vaba the instrumental use in South Estonian (*Krk rōõva mõstav siip* 'soap for clothes') is most likely of Latvian origin, as it seems to occur in the South Estonian dialects along the Latvian border. These dialects are also characterized by numerous Latvian loanwords. In Latvian instrumental use of this participle is perfectly common, but in Estonian it is, apart from these dialects, unknown. Causative use of the passive participle is also met with in other Finnic languages: *Fin. sor-men mentävä reikä* 'a fingersized hole' and thus might be a rather old feature which may have its origins in older Baltic and Finnic contacts (Pajusalu 1996 : 217).

Another interesting eventual Latvianism (see p. 61) is the occurrence of the so-called diminutive optative (K. Pajusalu's term) in two Estonian dialects that border on Latvia: *Karksi võtakest* 'take', *Häädemeeste ei nutukest* 'don't cry', in which *-kest* is probably a partitive singular form of the Estonian diminutive nominal suffix *-ke(ne)*. The

citation from Häädemeeste could in fact be a verbal form used nominally; *ei* 'no ~ not' instead of *ära* 'don't' seems to point to this. It might thus mean 'no crying!' instead of 'don't cry!'. In Latvian the diminutive suffix *-īņ* can be added to verbs (Latv. *iet/īņ/āt* < *iet* 'to go'), which is said to be extremely rare in the morphology of verbs (Pajusalu 1997 : 165). But also in Mansi the diminutive suffix *-riš* ~ *-rəš* is used not only to form diminutives of nouns, c.f. *χum* 'Mann', *χumrəš* 'Männlein' (Kálmán 1989 : 41), but it is also to form the so-called favouring mood: *tājərišen!* 'iß (du armer, elender Hungerleider)!' (Kálmán 1989 : 61). Still, this does obviously not mean that the Southern Estonian diminutive optative is not of Latvian origin.

The second chapter is divided into two parts: the first treats the Latvian loanwords in the Estonian standard language and in the dialects of Estonia proper (pp. 62–247); the second the Latvian loanwords in the Estonian dialect enclaves (pp. 248–400), although loanwords which occur in both Estonia proper and the dialect enclaves are discussed in the first part. From the first part internationalisms like Est. *latgalid* 'Latgals', *santiim* 'centime' and slang terms like Est. *saldejum(p)s* 'Latvian' (< Latv. *saldējums* 'ice-cream') have deliberately been left out.

L. Vaba has collected his material not only from previous works on the subject and various other linguistic works but has apparently been on the look-out for possible Latvian loanwords whilst reading Estonian literature: many loanwords are only to be found in literary works. In his list of 370 Latvian loanwords in the first part of the second chapter L. Vaba fluctuates between giving explicit explanations and short comments, often where one would wish to read more. He also includes words he does not believe to be loanwords from Latvian (*elgutama*, *poogen*) or for which he assumes a reverse loan direction. One could ask why these are discussed in this chapter and not just briefly mentioned in his enumeration of discarded etymologies.

In the second part the Latvian loanwords of the dialect enclaves of Lutsi and Leivu are treated. There were obviously many Latvian loanwords in these extinct dialects, L. Vaba has listed 775 of them, more than twice as much as in the standard language and the dialects of Estonia proper. These are all quite

new and most are quite transparent. In these dialects the influence of Latvian has understandably been very strong and loanwords are often not adapted to the same extent to the phonology of Estonian as they have been in other dialects: for example Latvian intervocalic *ž* has been substituted with *ž* ~ *š* ~ *s* in the dialects of Estonia proper, but in Leivu has been kept as such.

Sometimes the explanations accompanying a loanword seem a lean: for example Est. **lapak* in the expression *lapakut laskma* 'to gallop' is said to derive from Latv. *lapās laisties* 'sich davon machen, das Hasenpanier ergreifen', but no explanation whatsoever is given as to why *-s* has been substituted with *-k* (*-k* is a common enough derivational suffix in Estonian, but these things should be mentioned).

The third chapter consists of a detailed phonetic, morphological and semantic analysis of the loanwords (pp. 401–445). A special sub-chapter treats the question of German(ic) loanwords that have entered Estonian via Latvian: 19% of all Latvian loanwords in Estonian proper are of Germanic origin, in the enclaves 39%. (In Livonian this figure is almost the same: 565 of the 2562 Latvian loanwords in Suhonen 1973 are ultimately of German origin, i.e. 22 %). This is really a very useful chapter, which is of much help in this thorny question.

In the fourth chapter the loanwords are conceptually analyzed. Latvian loanwords do not belong to the basic vocabulary of either the standard language or the dialects, excepting the dialect enclaves. Most Latvian loanwords in Estonian are related to farming and animal husbandry.

In comparison with Vaba 1977, on which the present work is based, the sum total of known Latvian loanwords in Estonian has barely increased: Vaba 1977 has 1130 loanwords, Vaba 1997 has 1143. However, in Vaba 1977 only 254 of those were found in standard Estonian and in the dialects of Estonia proper, in Vaba 1997 there are 370. It would thus seem that loans previously found in the Lutsi and Leivu dialects also occur in the other dialects.

The extensive bibliography, which evinces L. Vaba's wide reading, has expanded from 315 titles to 476; in the intermediate 20 years much has appeared which L. Vaba has used to his advantage.

LITERATURE

- A b e n, K. 1947, *Eesti ja liivi laenud läti keeles*. Dissertatsioon, Tartu.
- E r n i t s, E. 1997, *Ein neuer Rekonstruktionsversuch der kreewinischen Texte*. — LU XXXIII, 181—192.
- K á l m á n, B. 1989, *Chrestomathia Vogulica*, Budapest.
- P a j u s a l u, K. 1996, *Multiple Linguistic Contacts in South Estonian. Variation of Verb Inflection in Karksi, Turku* (Turun Yliopiston suomalaisen ja yleisen kielitieteen laitoksen julkaisuja 54).
- S u h o n e n, S. 1973, *Die jungen lettischen Lehnwörter im Livischen*, Helsinki (MSFOu 154).
- V a b a, L. 1977, *Läti laensõnad eesti keeles*, Tallinn (Eesti NSV Teaduste Akadeemia Keele ja Kirjanduse Instituut).
- Z e p s, V. 1962, *Latvian and Finnic Linguistic Convergences*, The Hague.

ROGIER BLOKLAND (Tartu)

Школьный этимологический словарь коми языка, Сыктыв-кар 1996. 240 с.

Коми книжное издательство выпустило «Школьный этимологический словарь коми языка», составленный известными коми языковедами В. А. Ляшевым, Л. М. Безносиковой, Е. А. Айбабиной и Н. К. Забоевой.

Книга состоит из двух неравных по объему частей: справочной, включающей небольшое теоретическое введение, разделы о структуре словаря, принятой транскрипции, условных сокращений и др. (с. 3—13), и основной — словарной (с. 14—233).

Отрадно то, что составителям и издателям словаря успешно удалось избежать абсолютно ненужного упрощенчества — путем сохранения (1) общепринятой в настоящее время финно-угорской транскрипции на латинской графической основе, применяемой в реконструкциях праформ и в отдельных источниках по некоторым языкам, и (2) оригинальной системы письма различных финно-угорских народов как на латинице, так и на кириллице. В этом заключается одно из существенных положительных отличий данного словаря от популярного характера кратких этимологических словарей эрзянского (ЭЖНЭС) и мокшанского (МЖНЭС) языков, в которых как латинские буквы, так и специфические буквы русского алфавита отдельных языков заменены — не совсем адекватно и не всегда последовательно — буквами мордовских алфавитов.

Для удобства восприятия форм, записанных в финно-угорской транскрипции на латинице, неспециалистами в области

финно-угроведения (учителями, студентами, учащимися, а также всеми, кто интересуется коми этимологией) составители дают толкование абсолютного большинства транскрипционных букв и знаков (с. 10—11). Однако для полноты необходимо было включить в список еще и следующие знаки: 1) букву *ÿ*, нередко применяемую в прапермских реконструкциях; 2) знак долготы гласного [ː]; 3) знак редукции гласных [˚].

В отдельных случаях неверно определено фонетическое содержание транскрипционных знаков, например, буквой *ŋ*, вопреки мнению составителей, отмечается веллярный согласный, а не мягкий (с. 10); гласный, обозначаемый знаком *ш*, по своему подъему не идентичен гласному, фиксируемому как *ø* (с. 11).

Основу словаря составляет, естественно, этимологический корпус, включающий свыше 870 словарных статей. Исключительно важно в методическом отношении — с точки зрения воспитания подрастающего поколения в духе любви и уважения к родному языку — то, что львиная доля словника словаря состоит из общеупотребительных коми слов исконного (уральского, финно-угорского, финно-пермского, общепермского) характера и доками заимствований из праиндоевропейского, иранских, тюркских языков; поздние же собственно коми заимствования (из русского, прибалтийско-финских, обско-угорских, ненецкого и других языков) представлены относительно меньшим списком. Ограничен-