

**Я.В. Мызникова.** Русско-прибалтийско-финские языковые контакты и их отражение в области диалектного синтаксиса. СПб.: Нестор-История, 2014. 195 С.

Janina Myznikova's book, devoted to the contacts between Russian and (Baltic) Finnic languages, focuses primarily on a number of syntactic parallels in Finnic and Northern Russian dialects. In fact, the constructions considered are at the most marginal in the codified Finnic languages, but they occur in various dialects of Karelian, Ingrian, Votic, and Veps spoken in northwestern Russia.

The empirical data that Myznikova uses come from a few different sources: collections of Russian, Karelian, and Veps 19th century folklore, published recordings of the dialects, and original material gathered in the course of the author's own fieldwork.

The book consists of an Introduction and four chapters plus a Conclusion chapter, a bibliography of 12 pages, and lists of sources and abbreviations.

A state-of-the-art overview of research into the contacts between Russian and the Finnic languages is given in **Chapter 1**. This chapter offers a description of the main effects of Russian influence on the Finnic languages, as well as discussing the Finnic substrate influence on Russian. It is symptomatic that there are sections of phonetic and grammatical *substrate phenomena*, while the third section is overtly titled "*Finnic substratum in vocabulary*."

Discussing the possible Finnic origin of the Russian enclitic *-ka* in imperatives, the author finds it not very likely and remarks that Votic, Karelian, and Veps have copied this *-ka* (cf. Estonian and Finnish *anna!* with Votic *annaka!*, both 'give!') as an imperative suffix from Russian. She thinks that the borrowing might have been induced by the lack in Finnic of an imperative marker in singular (p. 55). Explanation via the need to fill a "gap" in the system seems not quite viable, because it is typical of imperatives cross-linguistically to be formed through zero markers (cf. Russian, where the imperative suffix is realized as *-i* only under stress: *idi!* 'go!/come!', but *otvet'* 'answer!').

A key question in the context of the possessive perfect constructions is the origin of the Russian expression of possession in general: *u menja est'*, rather than the lexical verb *imeju* 'I have' common in the rest of the Slavonic languages. The author inclines to the view that the similarity of the possessive construction in Finnic only helped to preserve this kind of expression in Russian, while the other Slavonic languages, influenced by the usage of related Indo-European languages, generalized the *habere* construction.

**Chapter 2** offers a contrastive analysis of impersonal sentences involving constructions with an independent infinitive. Introducing Marja Leinonen's account of similarities in Russian and Finnish impersonal constructions, the author gives two examples of modal constructions, both necessary (p. 76). The first, *Minun on juotettava hevonen* 'I have to give the horse to drink' (not from Leinonen 1985), is translated into Russian with the conditional *by*, which is not quite exact. The second example, *Mitä minun on tekeminen?* 'What should I do?', again displays a construction with the 4th infinitive that is archaic, as mentioned by Leinonen.

In the discussion of infinitive constructions in Finnish (p. 82), two examples are taken from Dubrovina's monograph (1972). They are apparently used to corroborate the conclusion that in the Finnish literary language infinitive subordinate clauses are used "almost exclusively." However, there is a problem here, as the first example displays a relative clause, not a purpose clause (though translated into Russian with *čtoby*).

The second example, from *Kalevala* (with a misprint that makes it incomprehensible: *jousta pro juosta 'run'*), is not possible in the standard language.

**Chapter 3** deals with the functions of prepositions in adverbial phrases in Northern Russian dialects. It seems beyond reasonable doubt that the expression of place and time without prepositions (primarily *v 'in'*) in the dialects investigated has developed under external influence. Myznikova reports of similar phenomena of dropping the prepositions in the dialects of the Volga region (*Povolzhje*), inhabited, besides Russians, by speakers of the Uralic Mordvin languages, as well as by Chuvash and Tatar speakers. Zaliznjak (2004) maintains that the preposition-less locatives in Novgorod Birch Bark letters of the 14th century can be explained by Finnic influence, rather than as an archaism.

**Chapter 4** deals with constructions employing predicative passive participles. The major part of the chapter is devoted to contrasting the use of these constructions in Russian and Finnic under slightly different aspects, including a classification of the constructions with predicative passive participles. Additionally, the chapter is rounded off with a survey of predicative passive participles in 19th century folklore texts.

In the **Conclusion** chapter the author attempts a reappraisal of specifically "Northwestern" features shared by Russian dialects and the Eastern Finnic languages in the behavior of participle constructions:

1) Those Russian dialects where the participle is "not inflected" (*starosta byl vybrano 'the eldest was elected'*) are separated from those where the noun takes the object position and the construction qualifies as impersonal (*dom postroeno, izbu postavleno 'the house/hut was/has been built/raised'*).

2) Notwithstanding the extension of the lexical verbs appearing in this construction, the domain of verbs is restricted: for instance, among intransitives, verbs of motion prevail. However, the author is of the opinion that the extended lexical basis, including intransitive and even reflexive verbs, in formally impersonal constructions allows expression of not only indefinite-personal but also definite-personal meanings.

3) The subject in these constructions is most frequently expressed in Russian dialects by the preposition *u* governing the genitive case (*u nego uexano 'he has gone/left'*). In Finnic dialects the corresponding pattern shows the adessive case, which is also the standard expression of possession in the literary Finnic languages. Whereas the perfect, for example in Finnish and Estonian, is not of the possessive type, in Karelian, Veps, Ingrian, and Votic the adessive noun phrase can denote the real agent of an action, not only the possessor of the result, cf. Veps: *priheiču-ü(-ADES) om joksutut(PPP) 'the lad has run/been running'*.

4) The author acknowledges that the passive participle constructions in Finnic languages have traditionally been regarded as indefinite-personal (or impersonal). This is true; moreover, the traditional term "passive" for verb forms inflected in all the indicative tenses and oblique moods is actually misleading because they can only refer to personal (human) subjects, while at the same time leaving the reference indefinite. The author emphasizes, however, that in Eastern Finnic this construction is found with definite personal reference as well. Besides, most of the examples seem to come from Veps.

5) The use of the copula seems to be a clear case of bidirectional mutual influence. If there are examples of the use of the copula *est'* in the (possessive) perfect construction in some Russian dialects, which is definitely due to Finnic influence, so in some

Finnic dialects (notably in Veps), on the contrary, constructions without the copula are frequent.

The author suggests quite cautiously that the perfect type *molodye uexano* ‘the young (ones, people) have left’ has developed under the influence of analogical constructions in Veps and Karelian. The example from Karelian provided in this connection, *Kokoran külässä on elettü joo miun d’eeduškad* ‘My grandpas already used to live in Kokora village’, may be misleading: the indefinite-personal (“passive”) forms (here: *on elettü*) have in Karelian entirely replaced the proper forms for 3rd person plural, which is obviously a case of Russian influence.

The author does not have strong opinions on the origin of the possessive perfect (*u nix poženenos* ‘they have married’) that is found both in Russian and in Finnic dialects approximately in the same territories. Given the Tikhvin Karelian example quoted by the author *Kellä buit on potšut’ittu* ‘Somebody has played a joke’, one feels tempted to claim that the direction of the borrowing is precisely from Russian into Finnic. In addition to copying the syntactic construction, this example demonstrates lexical elements adopted from Russian. Only the pronominal stem *ke-* and the copula verb *on* ‘is’, which belong to the core material of any language, are inherited from Uralic. The indefinite marker *buit* < Russ. (*ni*)*bud*’ is evidence of the tendency of indefiniteness markers to be borrowed, unlike pronouns in general (similarly, for example, the Slovak *bár-* comes from the neighboring Hungarian, e.g. *bárkde* ‘anywhere’ vs. *bárhol*). Finally, the verb stem (*potšut’i-*) is a direct loan from Russian. At the same time, the morphology is intact with the adessive (*-lä*) and perfect passive participle (*-ttu*) endings.

The author argues for and against direct borrowing of the possessive perfect constructions in Russian dialects from Finnic languages, pointing out that the process could as well have taken place in the opposite direction. The discussion does not seem to lead to any conclusion, even though the author repeatedly proposes typological convergence as the explanation for similar constructions in both groups of genetically non-related dialects. This solution, mutually conditioned structural developments, has been applied when confronted with areal—*Sprachbund*—problems, for example, by Janhunen (Amdo) and Lindstedt (Balkan).

Myznikova’s book offers interesting reading for Russian and Finno-Ugrian scholars, dialectologists, historical linguists, and ethnographers.

HANNU TOMMOLA