

TALLINNA ÜLIKOOLI
AKADEEMILINE
RAAMATUKOGU

JORMA KOIVULEHTO (Helsinki)

INDO-EUROPEAN LARYNGEALS IN URALIC: A REPLY

Tiit-Rein Viitso has written an extensive article published in this journal (LU XXVIII 1992, pp. 161—172) on my book "Uralische Evidenz für die Laryngaltheorie" (Koivulehto 1991). While I appreciate his undertaking as a token of his interest in these matters, I find it necessary to reply to it: there are several points that need a critical discussion; among other things the article contains several new etymologies and etymological combinations.

A typical feature in Viitso's treatment of my etymologies consists in the following: first he tries to discredit them, often overlooking or ignoring my arguments, and then he tries to replace them by new etymologies of his own. — For a fuller account of my etymologies I must refer to my book.

It would take too long to discuss all the points in Viitso's article thoroughly. Therefore I shall deal in more detail only with the first etymology, because it reveals his method.

Tiit-Rein Viitso tries to discredit my IE etymology (Koivulehto 1991 : 23—25) for Finnish *kasa* 'sharp point, edge, corner' = Lapp *gæčče* 'end, point' < **kaća* (← IE [Pre-Germanic] **h₂akā*, **h₂ako-* or, perhaps most probably, Pre-Germanic **h₂akýā* [> Engl. *edge*, see below], nouns belonging to the IE root **h₂ak-* 'sharp') by stating that Finnic *a* = Lapp *æ* is no regular correspondence (p. 164). This objection has no point, since it is well established that the Lapp *æ* in this special case is due to the palatalizing effect of the following palatal affricate (see SKES, UEW etc.). We even know an exact parallel to this palatalization: Finnish *vasara* 'hammer' = Lapp *væččer* id., which I correctly give in my book but which Viitso fails to mention. Note that even this word is a (well-known, for that matter) borrowing (an Aryan/Iranian one). As an alternative etymology for the Lapp word Viitso refers to a Nostratic guess presented by Illič-Svityč, who, hesitatingly, connected it with certain Mari and Ugric words for 'knife' (cf. Hungarian *kés*). But these words, as also Viitso admits, are reconstructed as FU **kečs* 'knife' (UEW), which is incompatible with the Lapp form showing a palatalized affricate (or spirant).

For the Finnic word Viitso proposes two alternative loan etymologies. (1) An old Slavic borrowing: cf. Russian *конец*, gen. sg. *конца* 'end' < (Viitso) "Proto-Slavic **konikū*" (we can today more accurately write Proto-Slavic *a* for the traditional *o*, see Aitzelmüller 1978 : 8, 23). Apart from the phonetic difficulty (the total disappearance of the nasal in Finnic, which however could be possible if the borrowing were very old, and if we additionally assume that the short *i* in the second syllable was lost in the borrowing), the semantics is not good either, because

'end' is not the general notion of the very specialized meaning of the Finnic word (of course, we can define Finnish *kasa* and South Estonian *kadsa* as "an end of the ax's edge"). 'End' would be more appropriate for the Lapp word, but it is just this word that Viitso excludes; and, of course, the Slavic etymology is incompatible with the Lapp word, the latter showing no reflex of the nasal. The same is true of alternative (2), Baltic etymology, which Viitso believes to be a better solution: the word could better come "from an unknown derivative of the Baltic verb that is represented as Lithuanian *kąsti* 'to bite': *káнду* 'I bite' (cf. also *kañdis* : gsg *kañdžio* 'bite, piece') and Latvian *kuōst* 'to bite, to be sharp' (e.g. a knife or a saw): *kuōžu*". The "unknown derivative" could just be the cited Lithuanian nomen 'bite, piece', but it is difficult to see how this etymology (cf. the semantics!) could compete with the established one. Moreover, if it were a Baltic loan, instead of *kasa* we should expect Finnish **katsa*, on account of the Baltic *-dj-* : cf. *metsā* 'forest' from the Baltic word represented by Lithuanian *mēdis* : gen. *mēdžio* 'tree, wood, [dial. also] forest'. As Viitso rightly points out, we have the affricate in South Estonian *kadsa* [*kadʒä*], as also in Tver-Karelian (see e.g. Posti 1953/54 : 20–22), but for such cases cf. Posti l.c. The variation between simple and geminate affricate in Finnic fits well my IE etymology of the word, because we can start at IE (Pre-Germanic) **h₂ak_{yā}* (*-ā* = originally *-ah₂*) = Proto-Germanic **agjō* > Engl. *edge*, German *Ecke*; see also footnote 10 (p. 24) in my book.

And finally, even if the Finnic and Lapp words should not be cognate(!), the IE etymology could not be discredited, because in this (purely theoretical) case either the Finnic or the Lapp word would fit the IE origin proposed.

To sum up: it should be obvious that we cannot replace (or even consider the possibility of replacing) an established Finnic-Lapp combination (with an incontestable and exact phonetic parallel like Finnish *vasara*) with a Nostratic speculation which even in itself is phonetically irregular. To state it more generally (also with reference to the Slavic and Baltic etymologies substituted by Viitso): we cannot discredit proposed etymologies just by substituting new etymologies which are evidently inferior to the proposed ones.

The other cases I discuss more briefly and, to some degree, even selectively.

Viitso (p. 164) objects to *-ll-* in Finnish *kallis* 'dear' from IE / Pre-Germanic **-ly-* (= *-lj-*), but he fails to cite the case mentioned by me: Finnish *salli-* 'to let' from Germanic **salja-*. It is not difficult to think that before *i* a sequence like **-lj-* could be assimilated to **-ll'-* > *-ll-*. I can now cite two more cases: (1) Finnish *kal-lita* (inf.), stem *kallitse-*, Karel. *kallita*, *kallitšou* 'to harden, to sharpen by hammering (iron)' ← Russian *калѣть, калѣ* 'harden (iron)' (SSA I 288); Karel. *kalie*, *kalita* 'harden (iron)' (SSA), without gemination, is probably a more recent loan. (2) Finnish *hillitä*, stem *hillitse-* 'to calm, to control, to restrain', a verb correlate to Finnish *hilja* : (partitive) *hiljaa* 'quiet(ly), silent(ly)' (see SSA I 164, 163).

Viitso would expect IE *-zg-* to be reflected as Finnic *-hk-*, instead of *-sk-* (in Finnish *kaski*, stem *kaske-* 'burnt-over clearing' ← IE [= Pre-Germanic] **h₂azg-V-* > Proto-Germanic **askōn-* > Old Icelandic *aska* 'ashes'). But cf. Uralic **moške-* 'to wash' (would be Finnish **moske-*) ← IE **mozg-* (cf. Lithuanian *mazgóti* 'to wash', a well-known parallel!) cited and analysed by me (Koivulehto 1991 : 30, 113): i.e., the sequence *-sk-* shows that the borrowing took place earlier than the borrowings from Germanic, which show *-hk-* < *-šk-* for Germanic *-sk-* (as I have shown). PU **koške* 'dry place etc.' could also be a borrowing from the same IE family (as Viitso [?] and I are inclined to think; in that case from an IE *o* grade: ← IE **h₂ozg-*), but **h₂o* > *h₂a* (if it is supposed) is not an *ad hoc* change (as Viitso believes; see note 13 in my book). I see no reason to think that PU **koške* (= **koški*) would have

become Finnic *kaski*. (If we suppose $o > a$ in Finnic, then an a -stem proto-form should be posited: **koška* > *kaski*, see note 13 in my book.) Instead one could suggest that the PU word **koske* might be represented by Finnish *koski* 'rapids, torrent': cf. semantically Lat. *torrens* 'burning, hot, rapid (of water); torrent', *torrēre* 'to dry, to scorch', or Lapp *buol'le* 'burning; foaming, boiling (rapids)'.

Viitso doubts my IE etymology for Finnish *kasva-* etc. 'to grow, increase' = Mordvinian *kas-* id., firstly by claiming that Mordvinian *-s-* (*-ss-*) "is an abnormal reflex of **sw*". This assertion is slightly strange, because we do not know any other reflex for Finnic *-sv-* (= *-sw-*) in Mordvinian (see Keresztes 1987 : 72; 1986 : 50), the said sequence being extraordinarily rare in Finnic, which, by the way, suggests that it arose in language contacts (in the first place metathetically: cf. Finnish *rasva* 'fat'). For **-sw-* > Mordvinian (unvoiced) *-s-* cf. **-sn-* > Mordvinian *-s-* in the inessive case: Mordvinian (E) *toso* 'there', *tese* 'here': the voicing did not take place before a voiced consonant like *n*. Viitso's suggestion that **kaswa-* 'to grow, increase' as well as the corresponding Mordvinian verb would be separate Baltic borrowings (cf. Lithuanian *gausėti* 'to multiply, increase') is not very probable, the Lithuanian verb being an apparently rather recent derivative (this type of derivation is productive in present Lithuanian: see Senn 1966 : 339; but I do not find the corresponding verb in Latvian) of the adjective *gausūs* 'abundant', which belongs to *gauti*, *gautu* 'to get, to receive, to obtain etc.' It would be quite extraordinary if such a secondary verb — and only the verb! — should have been early borrowed separately into two different languages. That the corresponding Mari verb *kuška-* 'to grow' should be connected with Estonian *kohu/da* 'to rise, to go or come up or higher (esp. dough, milk when boiling, soil)', Finnish *koho-ta-* 'to rise, to go up (also of dough etc.)' (= German 'sich erheben, aufsteigen, aufgehen') is an even more speculative (and unnecessary) assumption (the Mari *-k-* ought to be a sort of infix; Viitso cites Finno-Volgaic **süs-kä-* 'to push etc.' which in Finnish shows no *-k-*, but this is not a good example, since the Estonian verb here normally shows *-k-*: see also UEW 768). These speculative explanations — which at best could be taken into account only if no better etymologies were possible — cannot refute the fact that the IE etymology I propose explains both the Finno-Mordvinian and the Mari verb (Koivulehto 1991 : 32—36), which otherwise could not be connected. It is not reasonable to think that this would be just a coincidence. — But I am pleased to find that Viitso accepts the metathesis (cf. *gausėti* ~ *kasva-*).

Viitso (p. 165) makes the proposal to combine the Permic word, Udmurt *kuz*, Komi *goz* 'pair, couple (esp. a married couple)', "with the PF stem **kosja-*, cf. Estonian *kosja/d* 'wooing'". The latter word belongs to Finnic *kosi-* 'to woo, to make a proposal',¹ and the Finnic o does not regularly correspond to the Permic vocalism, which clearly points to a Pre-Permic e followed by a non-low vowel (= e), as I have stated: FP **kese* (and see Sammallahti 1988 : 527—531; Itkonen 1953/54 : 277—279); this regular correspondence also fits my IE etymology. Viitso thinks that IE $h_1es(en/er-)$ 'summer, harvest-time' (→ Finno-Mordvinian **kesä* 'summer') ought to have given a FP e -stem (as in Finnish *vesi* 'water', *uni* 'sleep; dream'); but in this case it would have been confused with **kese* (**kesu*, **kesü*) > Finnish *kesy* 'tame', in which word the e (and $ü/u$) stem is more appropriate (cf. IE $*h_1(e)su-$ 'good, brave', etc., for a more thorough discussion see my book, pp. 40—44). I really see no point in discussing the distribution of endings, since the Finno-Permic combination suggested by Viitso is invalid, and since, in any case, a distinction was to be made between **kese* etc. and **kesä*.

Contrary to what Viitso claims (p. 165), **koke-* 'to experience; to check fish-

ing nets' need not be a PU verb (Janhunen 1981; Sammallahti 1988 do not accept the old combination, and see the argumentation in my book p. 47). Consequently, the case is not "very problematic".

Viitso (pp. 165—166) doubts the PU reconstructions **näxi* 'woman', **pexi-* 'to cook, to ripen', and **suxj-* 'to row' made by Janhunen (1981) and Sammallahti (1988). I do not see any real reason for this. His claim that the Finnish derivation *souta-* 'to row' (according to E. Itkonen: < **sūγ-ta-* = Lapp *suw'de-*) would not point to PU **suxj-* (or **suyē-*) is clearly unfounded (cf. PU **nōxj-* > PFU **nuxj-* 'to pursue' > Finnish *nou-ta-* 'to fetch', Janhunen 1981 : 245; Sammallahti 1988: 539, 540; Itkonen 1949 : 13): in *-tA-* derivatives the development seems to be regular. The regular reflex of the unextended PU stem would be Finnish **suo-*: cf. Finnish *suo-* 'to grant, to bestow' which semantically matches a central Old Indian meaning of the IE original **suHe-* 'to propel' proposed by me.

It is clearly an overstatement to claim that "It is hard, if possible at all, to follow JK's argumentation" of the semantic shift 'strength, power, capacity' to **possibility* > (as a fossilized nominative: 'possibly'): cf. Finnish *ehkä* 'maybe, perhaps, possibly'. On the contrary, the suggested development belongs to the most trivial semantic changes: cf. e.g. Engl. *may*, originally 'be able to', Engl. *can*, which expresses both 'capacity' and 'possibility', or *power* and *possible*, which are ultimately etymologically linked, etc., etc. This kind of treatment can hardly be called objective — especially with regard to Viitso's own rather hazardous suggestions. Besides, here the whole "pattern" must be taken into consideration: viz. the existence of Finnish *ehhti-*, *ehtä-* (< **eš-tä-*) 'to be able to do something, because one has time enough' (cf. Finnish *joutaa* id. = Estonian *jõudma* 'to be able to, to have the power to do something'). But Viitso is not able to recognize that verb loans often have the verbalizing suffix *-tA-*. Nevertheless, this suffix is even today obligatory in verb borrowings into Finnish; it is just that the verbal stem is today a vocalic one (e.g. **buukka-ta-* → *buukkaa-* 'to book'), while in earlier times a consonantal stem was often (or always?) used. The same holds true for derivative verbs: cf. **wos-ta-* > Finnish *osta-* 'to buy', derived from FU **wosa* 'merchandise', an ancient borrowing from IE **wosā* > German *Ware* 'merchandise' (see p. 74 of my book).

Viitso is unable to see (p. 167) that the syllabic vowel *i-* in Finnish *ihminen* 'human being, man' (< **inhi-mi-nen*: cf. Finnish *ihimillinen* 'human', Estonian *inimene* 'human being' etc.) and *ihme* 'miracle' < **imeh* (*-eh* being a suffix that often occurs in old borrowings, see Koivulehto 1992) is in this syllabic function the vocalic reflex of the IE consonantal *ǵ-*, which in non-syllabic position would give Finnic *j* (as in FU **aja-* = Finnish *ajā-* 'to drive' ← IE **aǵ-e/o-* id.; Viitso ignores this traditional etymology, even in his new article: see footnote 3).² IE **ǵn-* → Finnic (Finno-Mordvinian) **in-* because **jn-* was of course impossible (and this first syllable could not be omitted). The Baltic etymology which Viitso proposes for *ihminen* etc. is phonetically and morphologically very complicated (cf. Old Lithuanian *žmuõ*, pl. *žmónes* etc. 'human being'): it would be necessary to accept a prothetic vowel (unattested in any other borrowing within Finnic) and to accept, as Viitso actually does, two different words (stems) of two different origins (**inhe-* and **ihmV* < **inše* and **išmV*; only the latter would be of Baltic origin!). The assertion that I avoid "the question where the element *-m-* in the Finnic forms comes from", is strange because I provide a detailed analysis of this question, explaining that it must be a suffix (followed by another suffix): **inhi-mi-nen* like, say, *-sydä-mi-nen* 'hearted'. The basic stem is represented by Mordvinian *inže* 'guest' (cf. semantically Finnish *kansa* 'people' = Lapp *guos'se*

'guest', and see UEW). The mordvinian *i* (instead of *e*) suggests that the stem was borrowed early from Finnic. Since the IE initial sequence **ǵn-* is rather rare, it would be rather a miracle if the identical explanation that applies to both words, *ihminen* and *ihme*, were just due to a coincidence (for a more thorough discussion of *ihme* I refer to Koivulehto 1992: 178—182).³

The assertion that the IE etymology for Finnish *puhdas* 'clean' etc. < **puštas* (originally proposed by Tryggve Sköld) would raise difficulties "just as any other attempt to explain a Finnic nominal ending in **-as*/**-äs* to be borrowed from Indo-European on the basis of an Aryan form which is a non-**as*-nominal", is also very strange. The Aryan word, Skt. *pūtáh* 'clean', is, of course, not an *as*-stem, but the Aryan nominative (masc.) ends in **-as* < IE **-o-s*, and it is a well-known fact that we have Aryan / Iranian borrowings with *-as* as a reflex of this ending: Finnish *taivas* 'heaven', *porsas* 'piglet', FU **orpas* (> Lapp. *oarbes* 'orphan'; Finnish *orpo* id. is a derivative) etc. But in a sense Viitso may be right: the oldest nominal borrowings — e.g. borrowings with laryngeal reflexes — possibly do not yet end in *-as* (but in *-e/-a/-ä*). Furthermore, considering the fact that *puhdas* is attested in Finnic only, I think that the new etymology recently proposed by Kari Liukkonen is a better solution. According to this the Finnic adjective is a Baltic borrowing from the passive past participle of the Baltic verb (Lithuanian) *puõšti*, (Latvian) *pùost* 'schmücken, putzen' (< IE **pōk-*), from a representative of Proto-Baltic **pōš-ta-s*. A representative of Lithuanian and Latvian *uo* can be reflected by Finnic *ū* or *u*. It must be said, however, that the parallel cases (see Koivulehto 1993: 34, note 2) show a Baltic *uo* which occurs in stems with an IE (and Early Proto-Baltic?) "long diphthong" **ōu*.

On the basis of certain Finnic reflexes, Viitso reconstructs for Finnish *vaihe*, Estonian *vahe* ('something between two objects, distance, boundary etc.') a proto-form **vajšeš* (instead of the traditional **vaješ*, a derivative from **vaja*). Not being like Viitso a specialist in Finnic dialectology I will not object to that. But connecting this proto-form with the Finno-Volgaic and Permic word traditionally reconstructed as **woša* 'branching' will hardly support the IE etymology proposed by me (although Viitso thinks so): I cannot see how we can obtain a Finno-Permic form with an *-a-* in the first syllable from an IE **woyHeh₂* (as Viitso thinks); and, if we should start at **wayHeh₂* — which Viitso does not do — **-eh₂* would of course be anachronistic in a form with *a* < IE *o* in the first syllable.

I cannot see how Late-Proto-Finnic **ūhi* 'ewe' and **vōhi* 'she-goat' could originally represent the same word, since the latter is a well-known borrowing from a Baltic word, the meaning of which must have been 'goat' (whether 'he-', or 'she-goat', we cannot know) or how the phonetic difference could "result from a homonymic split" (what does that actually mean here?). Nor can I understand how this suggestion could be supported by the fact (interesting in itself) "that ancient sheep breeders have often used a he-goat as the leader of a sheep-herd" or by the fact that a kind of iris is called in Estonian dialects sometimes a "goat's sword", sometimes an "ewe's sword" (p. 169). But Viitso is right in stressing the phonetic differences between the different FU words for 'ewe' (I too have hinted at this). This phonetic instability can, on the one hand, be regarded as a hypocoristic variation (cf. the Finnic hypocorisms: dial. Finnish *uutti*, *uukki*, *uukko* etc.); on the other hand it may indicate that the FU words were "borrowed separately from some related languages or dialects", as Viitso puts it. I understand that he consents to the ultimate IE origin of the word(s).

With the best will in the world I cannot understand the conclusions that Viitso draws from my materials (see pp. 170—171); e.g. I am unable to see what

the U and FU reflexes of the IE palatals (= palatalized velars, according to Viitso) can contribute to the question.⁴

Nevertheless, Viitso finally arrives at the positive conclusion "that the Uralic languages bear a certain evidence for the existence of at least two laryngeals in Proto-Indo-European" (p. 171).

There are even some details that show a positive attitude to my etymologies; e.g. Viitso is, curiously enough, willing to think that FP **kuδa-* 'to weave' "may really be a borrowing that has come together with the skill of weaving" (p. 165), notwithstanding the fact that this etymology, exceptionally and admittedly, has rather weak IE evidence. (More precisely, the statement that there are no attested reflexes in IE is perhaps a little too strict: the postulated IE derivational type in itself is a typical one, and Modern Lithuanian *pa-ūdėti* 'ein wenig weben' reflects the same ablaut degree [zero], with the typical secondary Balto-Slavic-Germanic lengthening of the IE *u*.) But if Viitso had shown the same attitude towards my etymologies in general the tenor of his article would have been a rather different one. Now he has, for example, nothing to say about my IE etymology for the Permic word for 'sieve' (pp. 87–91 of my book), although it is clearly one of the most convincing ones. Here I show in detail that the Pre-Permic form must have been, according to the sound laws and also on the strength of the Permic verbal derivations meaning 'to sieve', precisely **pe(w)šenz*; I give also exact morphological parallels. With the same certainty the IE/Pre-Aryan proto-form must be given as IE **pewHeno-* > Old Indian *pāvana-* 'sieve' (it is known that in an IE *-eno-* derivation the IE *e*-grade of the verbal root, here IE **pewH-*, is required).

In principle Viitso has done what was needed: he has tried to check my results for possible shortcomings. And I thank him for having done so. I think, however, that I have stood up to his examination. And as a general observation I can, after all, state that even Viitso accepts the main result of my book: that there are reflexes of IE laryngeals in the Uralic languages. And this shows, after all, an unprejudiced attitude to my work.

Notes

¹ Finnic (Finnish) *kosi-/kositse-* 'to woo, to propose to (a girl)' (in Karelian also: 'to ask for, to demand gifts, a dowry'), (partly also *kosjo-[ta-]*, see SSA I 408) with its (rare) nominal correlate *kosjo/kosio (kosja)* 'proposal, wooing' seems to be an old Germanic borrowing: < **koti-* (? < **kote-j-*) ← Proto-Germanic **kwað(i)ja-* (= Pre-Germanic **g^wot-éye/o-* or, perhaps, **g^wot-ye/o-*) > Old Icelandic *kveðja* 'to address, greet; to ask, desire, require, demand; to call', etc.; for the noun cf. Old Icelandic *kveðja* 'greeting', etc. < Germanic **kwaðjōn-*; cf. semantically e.g. French *demande* 'to ask, to desire, to demand': *demande une fille (en mariage)* 'to propose to a girl'. The "correlative pattern" of this group that is attested exclusively in Finnic (see SSA I 408) is similar to some other Finnic groups originating from Germanic *-ja-* verbs: cf. Finnic *maini-/mainitse-* 'to mention', Finnish *mainio* 'excellent' (~ Germanic **main[i]ja-* > Old High German *meinen* 'to aim at; to mention', etc.), Finnic *vali-/valitse-* (Finnish dial. also *valjo-*) 'to choose', Finnish *valio* 'excellent, élite' (~ Germanic **valja-* > Swedish *välja* 'to choose'), Finnic *taritse-/tarjo-ta-* 'to offer, to spend', Finnish *tarjo* (Finnish *tarjo-na, tarjo-lla* 'available', etc.) (~ Germanic **tarja-* > Middle High German [*ver*]zern 'to cater, pay for somebody' = [German] 'beköstigen, verköstigen, freihalten', Middle High German *zer* 'maintenance, expenses' < Germanic **tarjō*). As to the phonetic aspect of the etymology cf. e.g. Finnish *koiso* '(cancerous) tumor' ← Germanic **kwaisōn-* > Swedish *kvesa* id. and see Koivulehto 1982.

² I do not understand why Viitso gives, with much motivation, the same well-known traditional explanation for 'miracle' which is already given in my book (< **imeh*). Nor can I see how this explanation should impair my etymology; on the contrary: my etymology is

based on it (for a more thorough discussion see now Koivulehto 1992: 178—182). There must be some misunderstanding here.

³ After having written the present article, I received from Viitso the manuscript of an article on the Finnic word(s) for 'gum; palate' (cf. Estonian *ige* 'palate', plur. *igemed* 'gums', etc.), to be published later in this journal. In this article he shows a changed attitude to my etymologies concerning the words for 'human being' and 'miracle', at least in principle ("there is no doubt that in view of these etymologies Koivulehto has once again discovered a hitherto unknown model of pattern correspondence in prehistoric borrowings from Indo-European to Finno-Ugric"). He introduces, however, a new conception "resegmentation". I am pleased to find that Viitso has changed his mind, but it would take too long to comment on his new etymologies here.

⁴ Viitso claims (p. 170) e.g. that **k* and **š* as reflexes of PIE laryngeals reveal that the PIE laryngeals have behaved in Uralic almost in the same way as did the PIE palatalized velar stops **k₁*, **g₁* **g₁h₁*: the latter have become unpalatalized in one part of IE languages and have satemized (i.e. have become affricates or sibilants) in another part." I am unable to see the relevance of this assertion, nor can I see the point of the subsequent conclusions: "In the light of these circumstances the number of IE borrowings in Proto-Uralic or Proto-Finno-Ugric exhibiting **γ* (Janhunen's **x*) or **k* for a PIE laryngeal must be restricted, i.e. Koivulehto's etymologies with cognates in Mordvinian, Mari and Permic must be treated as tentative. Similarly, any etymologies proposing the substitute **š* for a PIE laryngeal outside the Finnic, Lapp and Mordvinian languages need an explanation" (pp. 170—171). The different reflexes are (according to my explanation) for the most part due to the different position in the word (*k* in initial, *š* in non-initial position). Does Viitso perhaps think that the *š* reflex of IE laryngeals is somehow bound up with "satemization" and the *γ* and *k* reflexes show a "non-satemic" representation? But this makes, of course, no sense. **š* for later Baltic representatives of IE palatals occurs in Baltic borrowings and, correspondingly, **k* in Germanic ones, but then they are not, of course, reflexes of (Proto-)IE palatals.

LITERATURE

- Aitzelmüller, R. 1978, *Altbulgarische Grammatik als Einführung in die slavische Sprachwissenschaft*, Freiburg i. Br. (Monumenta linguarum Slavicae XII).
- Itkonen, E. 1949, Beiträge zur Geschichte der einsilbigen Wortstämme im Finnischen. — FUF 30, 1—54.
- 1953/54, Zur Geschichte des Vokalismus der ersten Silbe im Tscheremissischen und in den permischen Sprachen. — FUF 31, 149—345.
- Janhunen, J. 1981, Uralilaisen kantakielen sanastosta. — JSFOu 77, 219—274.
- Keresztes, L. 1986, Geschichte des mordwinischen Konsonantismus II. Etymologisches Belegmaterial, Szeged.
- 1987, Geschichte des mordwinischen Konsonantismus I, Szeged.
- Koivulehto, J. 1982, *Rasia ja asia*. — Vir. 86, 257—276.
- 1991, Uralische Evidenz für die Laryngaltheorie, Wien (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte, 566. Band).
- 1992, Der Typus *palje* '(Blase)balg', *turve* 'Torf' unter den Lehnwörtern des Ostseefinnischen. — JSFOu 84, 163—190.
- 1993, Zur Etymologie von fi. *susi*, *tosi* — und *kesi*: eine Entgegnung. — LU XXIX, 21—37.
- Posti, L. 1953/54, From Pre-Finnic to Late Proto-Finnic. — FUF 31, 1—91.
- Sammallahti, P. 1988, Historical Phonology of the Uralic Languages, with special Reference to Samoyed, Ugric, and Permic. — D.Sinor (ed.), *The Uralic Languages. Description, History, and Foreign Influences*, Leiden—New York—København—Köln, 478—554.
- Señen, A. 1966, *Handbuch der litauischen Sprache, Band I. Grammatik*, Heidelberg.
- Suomen sanojen alkuperä. Etymologinen sanakirja I—. Päätoimittaja Erkki Itkonen, toimittussihteeri Ulla-Majja Kulonen, Helsinki 1992— (= SSA).
- Viitso, T.-R. 1992, Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Uralic. — LU XXVIII, 161—172.

ИНДОЕВРОПЕЙСКИЕ ЛАРИНГАЛЬНЫЕ В УРАЛЬСКИХ ЯЗЫКАХ

Тийт-Рейн Вийтсо опубликовал пространную статью (LU XXVIII 1992, с. 161—172) о книге автора «Uralische Evidenz für die Laryngaltheorie» (Koivulehto 1991). Оценивая в принципе работы Вийтсо как свидетельство его интереса к данной проблематике, автор книги считает необходимым высказаться здесь по ее поводу: в критическом обсуждении нуждаются отдельные положения статьи, а также ряд этимологий, которыми Вийтсо пытается заменить приведенные в книге.

Автор рассматривает основные положения статьи Вийтсо. Он показывает, что большинство аргументов и выводов статьи безосновательны или даже невразумительны, кроме того, в связи с предложенными Вийтсо новыми этимологиями возникают фонетические и семантические затруднения, частично же — сложности хронологического плана (анахронизм), а потому они явно уступают этимологиям, которые он подвергает критике. С другой стороны, заканчивая статью, автор констатирует, что Вийтсо в принципе относится к основным положениям книги без предубеждений: согласно его точке зрения, имеются известные доказательства отражения индоевропейских ларингальных в уральских языках.