NEW ETYMOLOGIES FOR SOME FINNISH WORDS
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paññitamitraṣṭyaṁdōtaṁ śasnehaṁ āśīrvādam

In this paper I offer new explanations for eight Finnish etyma. I call these proposals new because, to my knowledge, none but one has been made before — I have checked the most recent references in the database of references to etymological treatments of Finnish words accessible at the home page of the Research Institute for the domestic languages of Finland (Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus, abbreviated Kotus: http://kaino.kotus.fi/sanat/evita). In any case, none of the following proposals is mentioned in the respective entries of the ‘Etymological dictionary of the Finnish language’ (SKES I–VI, 1955–1978) and its successor, ‘Origin of Finnish words: Etymological dictionary’ (SSA I–III, 1992–2000). (As SKES and SSA are written in Finnish, I render their names and their explanations within ‘single quotes’ into English for the benefit of readers not knowing Finnish.) Besides the endorsed explanations, these dictionaries record alternative etymologies that have been considered worth mentioning. SSA also adds to its entries bibliographical references to the most important literature, summarizing the respective conclusions, and takes into account the ‘Uralic etymological dictionary’ (UEW I–III, 1988–1991). There exists a printed ‘index of etymologically discussed Finnish words’ that fairly exhaustively registers all early literature (Donner 1937 & Erämetäsä 1953), but I have not taken the trouble to check the often quite copious references there supplied, trusting that if my proposals had been made earlier, they would have been noted in the above-mentioned etymological dictionaries.

I thank Juha Janhunen, Petri Kallio and Jorma Koivulehto for their valuable comments on an earlier version of this paper.

ON THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF OLD LOANWORDS IN FINNISH IN THE LIGHT OF ARCHAEOLOGY

In 2001, Christian Carpelan and I published a longish attempt to correlate linguistics and archaeology in order to trace the emergence and disintegration of Proto-Indo-European, Proto-Uralic and Proto-Aryan. Our goal and methods are in line with those so well presented by J.P. Mallory (1989 and elsewhere), essentially consisting of a holistic mapping of the genealogical and contact relationships of archaeological cultures and matching these with the corresponding

patterns of the linguistic evidence. Proto-Aryan (Proto-Indo-Iranian) of course is descended from Proto-Indo-European, but it was mentioned explicitly in the title of our paper because there are quite many early Aryan loanwords in Finno-Ugric languages, and there have been only vague ideas about the time and place where these borrowings had taken place. The problem is complicated by the fact that some Proto-Aryan loanwords are attested in Finnic (Baltic Finnic) and/or Saami alone (cf., e.g. Koivulehto 1999a: 214–234). One example is Finnic sammam ‘pillar’, the world pillar and the magic mill sampo of the old Finnic epic poems that I have discussed recently, along with some new Aryan etymologies (cf. Parpola 2005: 38–52; 2006).

As further cases of Proto-Aryan loanwords in Finnic are proposed below, I would like to begin this paper with a short sketch of our reconstruction, not least because it now requires some revision. Readers interested in details are referred to the paper mentioned and its forthcoming revised version. In general, our reconstruction agrees with the views of Jorma Koivulehto (1999a) and with what Tapani Lehtinen (2007) writes in his recent survey of the linguistic development from Proto-Uralic to Finnish. We disagree with the idea of a Uralic homeland in Siberia that Juha Janhunen has been proposing, also in his most recent, in other respects so excellent, summary paper on Proto-Uralic (2009).

Proto-Indo-European could not have disintegrated much before 3500 BCE, because wheeled vehicles were invented shortly before this date, apparently in the Late Tripolye culture of Moldavia and Ukraine, and because the protolanguage had many terms relating to this novel technology (see now Parpola 2008). As proposed by many scholars (see especially Mallory 1989 and Anthony 2007), early expansions of Indo-European speakers can be recognized in two major archaeological complexes that both possessed ox-pulled carts and wagons. The Corded Ware or Battle Axe cultures spread to wide areas of north-western Europe, from the Netherlands to the coasts of Finland, around 3200 BCE, and later, in the form of the Fatyanovo culture, from the eastern Baltic and Belo-Russia to central Russia around 2800 BCE. The Italo-Celtic, Germanic, and Balto-Slavic branches of Indo-European are likely to have developed in the cultures that succeeded the Corded Ware cultures respectively in the west, north and east. The Yamnaya or Pit Grave cultures, on the other hand, spread after 3300 BCE to the southeast-European steppes, from the Danube to the Urals, and they had been preceded in the east by a very similar Afanasevo culture that around 3500 BCE reached southern Siberia. While the Tokharian speakers probably descended from the people of the Afanasevo culture, Greek, Armenian and Aryan speakers are likely to have their distant ancestors in the Yamnaya cultures.

An early form of Proto-Aryan is likely to have started developing in the Pontic steppes around 2500 BCE. While the language of the Catacomb cultures of the treeless steppe probably evolved into an early form of Proto-Iranian (cf. now
Parpola 2008: 44), a slightly different dialect eventually becoming early Proto-Indo-Aryan seems to have been spoken in the forest steppe of the mid-Volga, in the Abashevo culture. In its northward push, the Abashevo people came to the territory of the Volosovo culture, like the Fatyanovo people slightly earlier in their eastward push.

The Volosovo culture (c.3650–1900 BCE) that occupied most of the European side of forested central Russia very probably had as its language Proto-Uralic. The Ugrian and Samoyedic branches seem to have been initiated when some Volosovo people crossed the Urals around 2200 BCE together with some Abashevo people who took possession of the rich metal ores in the southern Urals, founding there the Sintashta-Arkaim culture. From the southern Urals the successors of the Abashevo people proceeded further east, creating a flourishing metal industry in Siberia. Ancestors of later Samoyed speakers are likely to have been links in the Sejma-Turbino system that in the early second millennium BCE transported bronze weapons from the Sayan Mountains to northern Europe.

Comb ceramics had already spread to Latvia, Estonia, Finland and Karelia around 3900 BCE from the immediate predecessor of the Volosovo culture; in 3600 BCE and 3100 BCE, related ceramic styles came from the Volosovo culture to Finland and Karelia. Around 1900 BCE the Volosovo culture was transformed into the Netted Ware culture in its core area, the interfluve of the Volga and Oka, and the new ceramic immediately spread northwards to Finland and Karelia. We now think that the language of the early Netted Ware was Proto-Finno-Permian, which immediately started disintegrating as the result of that northward spread. The newcomers who brought Netted Ware to Finland and Karelia fused with the earlier population that spoke a related but more archaic language. The Early Proto-Finnic which thus came into being later split into two, the Saami and Finnic branches, when part of the Proto-Finnic speakers infiltrated the coastal regions that had received Proto-Northwest-Indo-European speakers c.3200 BCE (Corded Ware), and where Early Proto-Baltic influences were received from 2200 BCE (Kiukais culture) and Early Proto-Germanic influences from 1600 BCE (Nordic Bronze Age).

I return to the Abashevo and Fatyanovo people, who lived in symbiosis with the Volosovo people in central Russia: they appear to have formed an elite layer, which spoke, respectively, Early Proto-Indo-Aryan and (Para-)Proto-Balto-Slavic. These elite minorities gradually became assimilated to the Finno-Ugric speaking majority. The assimilation was completed when the Netted Ware culture was formed in 1900 BCE, strong formative influence also being exerted by the neighbouring Pozhnyakovo culture. This had a Catacomb culture background and its language was probably early Proto-Iranian. Proto-Finno-Permian (which we correlate with the Netted Ware culture) can thus be assumed to have been in close contact with Early Proto-Aryan represented by both of its main dialect groups
and with (Para-)Proto-Balto-Slavic. The Indo-European loanwords of Proto-
Finno-Permian soon spread with this language form northwards to Finland and
Karelia, to be preserved there in the emerging Early Proto-Finnic.

We now turn to the new etymologies, which I present in alphabetic order.

1. FINNISH AUKKO ‘HOLE’

The Finnish word aukko ‘hole’ is first attested in the writings of Agricola (c.1510–
1557); it has cognates in other Finnic languages, but not in more distantly related
Finno-Ugric languages: Ingrian aukku, Karelian aukko, Votian aukko, Estonian
auk (gen. augu) (the Estonian word has been suspected to be a borrowing from
Finnish) and Livonian ouk.

SKES (I, 1955: 28b) groups aukko together with Finnish auki, aukea, aukia,
aukiu, ‘open, open place’ and aueta (aukeaa or aukenee), aukaista, aukoa, ‘to open,
to be opened’. According to SKES, ‘the words [aukko etc.] are related to the words
ava, avata etc. [which also denote ‘open, spacious’ and ‘to open’], even though
the origin of the -k- formant is unclear (the relation of aukko with -kk- to aukea
‘open’ may be similar to sotkko ~ soikea, sokko ~ sokea; or possibly aukko < *au-
kkio, cf. puukko ~ puo, yökkö ~ yö’). For avata ‘to open’, SKES (I, 1955: 31a) records
cognates in Mordvin and in Ugric languages. The SSA repeats the explanations of
SKES, but attaches a question mark to the proposed relationship to the Mordvin
and UEW (I, 1988: 11) thinks aukko is of Proto-Finno-Ugric origin.

One way to form words for the concept ‘hole’ in the world’s languages is to
derive them from words denoting bodily holes, especially eyes and mouth. In
early times in north Europe, a bare hole in the wall formed the window, which in
Germanic was conceived as ‘wind-eye’: Old Norse vind-auga > Middle English
windowe. Compare also Late Church Slavic and Russian okno ‘window’ (whence
Finnish akkuna, ikkuna ‘window’, SKES 1, 1955: 13–14) from oko ‘eye’. In Old
Indo-Aryan, ‘window’ is gavākṣa-, literally ‘bull’s eye’, or gehākṣa- ‘house-eye’.
(Cf. Buck 1949: 469–470.)

I propose that Finnic aukko ‘hole’ is a Germanic loanword, from Proto-
Germanic *augōn ‘eye’ (Gothic augo, Old High German ouga, Middle High
German ouge, Old Norse and Icelandic auga, Old English ēga, Swedish öga). The
diphthong in Germanic is based on an irregular transposition of the labial
element in the original labiovelar of Proto-Indo-European *okw- ‘eye’ (cf. Kluge
included the diphthong *au in the first syllable and *o in the second syllable;
Proto-Germanic *g had to be replaced with *k. Jorma Koivulehto (1999b: 29)
has pointed out that when a Finnish word ends in -o, it usually suggests that it
is a loanword, and more specifically a Germanic word ending in -o(n) (for the
difference in the vowel length, cf. Koivulehto 1999b: 33). The regular development of Proto-Germanic *augōn in Late Proto-Finnic would be *auko and this would lead to Finnish **auko, gen. *auvon (cf. tauko, gen. tauon), rather than aukko, gen. aukon. However, there are numerous Finnish nouns with unexplained alternation between a short stop and a geminate at the end of the stem that does not seem to be (at least directly) related to stem gradation (see Hakulinen 1968: 185–186 # 57). Koivulehto (1999b: 172–173) records Finnish (northern dialects) viekko and vieko, Saami viekko < Germanic *wegō.

2. FINNISH KAIVAA ‘TO DIG’, KAIVO ‘DIGGING, WELL, PIT’

The Finnish words kaiva-a ‘to dig’ and kaiivo ‘digging, well, pit’ have cognates in Finnic languages, in Saami and the Volgaic and Permian languages (see SKES I, 1955: 144; SSA 1, 1992: 279). Ante Aikio (2002: 41–42) has shown that Proto-Finno-Ugric *kajwa- can be regularly connected with Proto-Samoyedic *kajwa ‘spade’, as “the change *a > *ä took place in Samoyedic before a tautosyllabic palatal consonant”, thereby settling an old problem, the history and material of which is fully discussed by Aikio. Hence the etymon is an archaic Uralic nomenverbum.

What I offer here is not a new etymology, but simply a reference to an old etymology proposed as early as 1920 that was not included in the indexes of etymologically treated Finnish words by Donner (1937) and Erämetsä (1953), and so has escaped notice in SKES and SSA. K.F. Johansson (1891: 119) had reconstructed an archaic Proto-Indo-European heteroclitic noun *kaiw-ṛ-t (nom.) ~ *kaiwṇn-ēs (gen.) on the basis of Greek and Old Indo-Aryan. Hesychius records καίατα in the sense of ‘pits, excavations, trenches, ditches’ (ὀρύγματα) or ‘landslide chasms caused by earthquake’ (η τα υπο σεισμων καταρραγεντα χωρια). (A number of Greek authors use slightly different words in the meaning ‘chasms in Sparta, chasm caused by earthquake’: καώδας, καώτας, καώτος; cf. further καυτακόλα, ‘having many chasms’, Zenodotus’ reading for the Homeric epithet of Lakedaimon, instead of Aristarchus’ κητώεσσαν in Iliad 2,581 and Odyssey 4,1; cf. Frisk 1960 I: 753, 846; Chantraine 1999: 479b, 528a.) The plural καίατα is supposed to stand for *καίρατα, from the singular *καίρατ. Old Indo-Aryan kevata- ‘pit’ is attested in a single occurrence in the oldest text, Rigveda, 6,54,7; Old Indo-Aryan e goes back to Proto-Indo-Aryan *ai, and *rt has often become retroflex *ṛ. Pokorny (1959 I: 521) accepts the comparison and reconstructs for Proto-Indo-European *kaiwṛt *kaiwṇ-t. Thomas Burrow (1946: 21) and Manfred Mayrhofer (1956 I: 267) have considered the scanty evidence in both Old Indo-Aryan and Greek as too uncertain for the assumption of a PIE heterocliton. Still Mayrhofer (1992 I: 400) thinks it is possible that the words are related. Herbert Petersson (1920: 42–43) also emphasizes that no trace of this etymon is found in other Indo-European languages – and Frisk (1960 I: 753 points out that no
corresponding PIE verbal root can be traced — while the root structure too, with a diphthong followed by -w-, also looks peculiar for PIE. Pettersson therefore takes this to be one of the rare cases where Proto-Indo-European is likely to have borrowed from Proto-Finno-Ugric. Mayrhofer (1956 I: 267 and 1992 I: 400) refers to Pettersson’s suggestion as noteworthy but unconfirmed. However, the confirmed Uralic origin of *kajwa- and the archaic appearance of the word on both sides gives new significance to Pettersson’s hypothesis.

3. FINNISH KATKETA (INTR.), KATKAISTA (TR.) ‘TO BREAK IN TWO PARTS’

The Finnish words katketa (intr.) and katkaista (tr.) ‘to break in two parts’ are attested in Agricola’s writings. SKES (I, 1955: 170b) and SSA (I, 1992: 327–328) record cognates having essentially the same shape from the Finnic languages Ingrian, Karelian, Lycic, Vepsian, Votian, Estonian and Livonian.

SKES relates these words to Mari (Cheremiss) kușkeδam ‘to tear, rend’ and Udmurt (Votyak) kwatškat- ‘to smash, tear into parts’. UEW (I, 1988: 641) accepts the Mari and Udmurt comparisons unquestioningly, but SSA excludes the Mari word as irrelevant and adds a question mark to the Udmurt comparison.

The Finnic words denote breaking into two parts, as expressly stated in the first German gloss of katketa in SSA, ‘entzwei gehen’. I am therefore rather surprised that these dictionaries (as well as the four additional references given in SSA) do not mention the explanation I am proposing, namely derivation, through simple metathesis, from (Proto-Uralic *kekta > Proto-Finno-Permian *kakta > Early Proto-Finnic *kakta > Late Proto-Finnic *kakki/*kakke-, before it became Finnish kaksi ‘two’ (the numeral is discussed in SKES I, 1955: 146; SSA I, 1992: 282; on its reconstruction, cf. Janhunen 2009 and below, and Lehtinen 2007).

In the opinion of Juha Janhunen (pers. comm.), the metathesis would be Late Proto-Finnic or perhaps Proto-Finno-Mordvinian, because the stem *kakti : *kakte- came into being only then (in Saami still *kakta, Mordvin ambivalent). The metathesis may have been triggered by the derivative postfix that started with *-t-: *kakte-tak : *kakte-ta- would have changed into *katke-ta-, which should be easier to pronounce; from this the metathesis would have spread elsewhere.

Janhunen further notes that the correlative derivative katki belongs to a series of particles ending in the syllable -ki: halki, pubki, rikki, poïikki. Halki in particular behaves in derivation exactly like katki (cf. katketa : katkaista : katki : katko : katkoa etc. with haljeta : halkaista : halki : halko : halkoa etc.). If the etymology from *kakki is correct, then the -k- in the final syllable -ki is etymologically motivated in katki, which could have spurred even other particles to develop into a -ki-ending. On the other hand, if the other particles are older, they too could have stimulated the metathesis in the word katki, so that it too would develop a -ki-ending.
Arvid Genetz’s thesis (1890) on the shapes of the Finnish particles includes an analysis of the particles ending in -i (pp. 64–87). Katki is included in his first list of about 90 particles, which contains nominative-shaped adverbs, alliterative emphasizing particles, -ti ending variants of particles ending in -tain and -ten, and postpositions and prepositions. Nearly exactly half of these c.90 particles end in -ki, and some of them have variants ending in -ti (biuki / biuti, irki / irti, labki / lahti, oiki / oiti, tuiki / tuiti), -ti being the next most common ending in this list with c.15 occurrences.

Katki is clearly a nominative-shaped adverb. Genetz’s list also includes yhti (cf. also yhti-kä, yhti-käis), derived from the numeral yksi ‘one’ < Late Proto-Finnic *ykti : *ykte (cf. SSA 2000 III: 489), the nominative-shaped yhti being an analogical formation based on oblique forms similar to lahti ‘bay’ instead of *laksi (cf. Lehtinen 2007: 104).

Juha Janhunen (pers. comm.) notes that the change *kt > ht postdates Late Proto-Finnic, because it is absent in South Estonian. On the basis of South Estonian katški corresponding to Finnish katki Petri Kallio (2007: 233–235) has suggested that the Early Proto-Finnic shape of this particle might be reconstructed with an affricate as *kački. This is however contradicted by the derivation of the particle from Late Proto-Finnic *kakti : *kakte- < Early Proto-Finnic *kakta- ‘two’.

4. FINNISH KERTA ‘TIME, TURN’

Finnish kerta (first recorded in Agricola’s works) denotes ‘time, turn, layer’, and the derived verbs kerrata and kertoa mean ‘multiply, repeat, narrate’. This etymon has cognates not only in other Finnic languages (Lydic, Vepsian, Votian, Estonian, Livonian), but also in the Volgaic languages Mordvin (Erza kirda, Mokša korda ‘time, turn’) and Mari (kerδə in püläyerdə ‘fairly long time ago’, šukerδə ‘long time ago’).

SSA (I, 1992: 347–348a), where the material is given in detail, offers two alternative etymologies, either Baltic *kerdā attested in Old Prussian sg. acc. kērdan, kerdan ‘time’, Lithuanian *kerda ‘turn, order’ (preserved in words denoting persons whose turn it is to tend animals) or Proto-Germanic *χerđā (whence Old High German herta ‘phase, alternation’) from Pre-Germanic *kerdhā.

5. FINNISH MYKKÄ ‘DUMB’

SKES (II, 1958: 356) is rather laconic when dealing with Finnish mykkä ‘dumb’: it records the verbs mykistää (‘to make dumb, silence altogether’) and myksityä (‘become completely silent’) derived from it, and the cognates in other Finnic languages, Karelian miikkä, Votic miitšä and Estonian mükk (gen. müka) ‘dumb’, and equates these, with a query, with South Saami mákkalit ‘stop in one’s speech’.

SSA (II, 1995: 187b) notes that the Finnish word is first attested in Agricola’s writings, that it is also attested in Ingo Island as miikkä, and that Estonian mükk is only found in the northeastern dialect and apparently comes from Finnish, as suggested by Julius Mägiste in 1958 (mentioned among the five references given). Janne Saarikivi (2007: 333–335) finds cognates in addition to Saami also in Mari (Cheremiss) and Permian (Udmurt and Komi).

Indo-Aryan mūka- ‘dumb’ is first attested in the Vedic texts Vājasaneyi-Saṃhitā, with the acute accent on the first syllable, and in the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, with the acute accent on the second syllable. In Middle Indo-Aryan, the word is attested in the form mukka-, and the cognates in Neo-Indo-Aryan languages presuppose several variants such as *mūga-, *mukka-, *mokka- (cf. Turner 1966: no. 10231; Mayrhofer 1996 II: 365).

Comparison with Greek μυκός, which Hesychius records in the meaning ἄφωνος ‘voiceless, silent’, allows reconstructing *mūka- for Proto-Aryan. *Mūka- is derived from the Proto-Indo-European root *mū- preserved, e.g. in Latin mūtus ‘dumb, silent’, and Greek μūω ‘to close, be shut (i.a. of the mouth)’ (cf. Frisk 1970 II: 268), which Nils Idman (1774: 52) in his early attempt to prove that Finnish and Greek are related languages compared with Finnish mykkä. The Indo-Aryan alternation mū-ka-/muk-ka- is likely to have existed already in Proto-Aryan: according to Jorma Koivulehto (pers. comm.) it reflects Proto-Indo-European *muH-ko-. Finnic mykkä is simply a later front vocalic variant of *mukka (cf., e.g. Finnic tuhma = tyhmä ‘stupid, naughty’).

6. FINNISH SAADA ‘TO GET, OBTAIN’

For Finnish saada ‘to get, obtain; arrive’, SSA (III 2000: 137) records cognates in Finnic, Mordvin, Mari and Komi (Zyryene), and, with a question mark, Samoyedic (the connection with Proto-Samoyedic *tajwa- ‘to arrive, reach; to bring’ is refuted by Ante Aikio 2002: 29, who reconstructs Proto-Finno-Ugric *gxi-). Jorma Koivulehto (1995, cf. 1999a: 227) reconstructs Proto-Finno-Permian *saxe- and suggests its derivation from Proto-Aryan *saj’b- > Proto-Indo-Aryan sab- (considering both developmental stages possible as the Aryan source). In Old Indo-Aryan, sab- (present sābate) means ‘to vanquish, overcome, conquer, be victorious, have power, gain (battles etc.)’. On the Iranian side, there is Avestan hazab- n. ‘force, superiority’ (= Old Indo-Aryan sahas- n. ‘might, force, victory’).
The verb comes from Proto-Indo-European *seg'h- 'to overcome' whence Greek ἔχω 'to have, possess, obtain', Old Irish seg 'power (of hands)', Gothic sigis 'victory' (cf. Mayrhofer 1996 II: 717–718).

This etymology is criticized in SSA as follows: ‘The oldest meaning of the Finno-Permian word (if one assumes the Samoyedic words to be of different origin) seems to be "to come, arrive, reach, obtain". On this basis the proposed Aryan etymology is quite uncertain, as the basic meaning of the Aryan verb is ‘to vanquish, seize, rob, win’.

There is indeed considerable semantic difference, for the Sanskrit dictionaries do not record the meanings ‘seize, rob’ for sab-, and the meaning ‘robbery’ is rare for Avestan hazab-, hazah-:m. ‘robber’ literally means ‘one having (using) force’. The Greek cognate is semantically closer, but does not imply that Proto-Aryan had this meaning. I would like to suggest an alternative Proto-Aryan etymology which would amend the semantic drawback of Koivulehto’s etymology, namely Proto-Finno-Permian *saxe- < Proto-Aryan *saH- > *sā- (whence Old Indo-Aryan sā-, e.g. in vāja-sā-, vāja-sāti-), from *sṇH₂-, reduced grade variant form of the root alternating with the regular *sanH- > *sā- from Proto-Indo-European *senH₂-. This verb means ‘to win, obtain, reach, get’. (Cf. Mayrhofer II 1996: 696–697.) On the Early Proto-Aryan laryngeal H and its development in Proto-Indo-Aryan and Proto-Iranian, cf. Mayrhofer 1989: 7–8 and Mayrhofer 2004, 2005.

7. FINNISH SAMMUA ‘(FIRE, ETC.) TO BE EXTINGUISHED, GO OUT, DIE DOWN’

The Finnish verb sammua ‘(fire, light, etc.) to be extinguished, go out, die down’ is attested in Agricola’s writings. It has cognates in the Finnic languages Karelian, Lydic and Vepsian. According to SSA (III 2000: 152), these words ‘may in one way or another be related to the etymon of Finnish samea "muddy, turbid, messy, dim, misty, cloudy".’

I propose to derive the Finnish verb from Proto-Finno-Permian *śami- < Proto-Aryan or Proto-Indo-Aryan *śamH- > *śam(i)-, cf. Old Indo-Aryan śam- ‘to be extinguished, die out, abate, cease, stop, go to rest, be calm or quiet’. Old Indo-Aryan has another root śam- ‘to toil, to labour’; both appear to go back to Proto-Indo-European *k'emH₂- ‘to toil, become tired’, cf. Greek κάμειν ‘to toil, labour, be weary, be outworn, be dead’. (Cf. Mayrhofer II 1996: 610–611.) Proto-Finno-Ugrian and Early Proto-Finnic *s and *s fell together into *s in Late Proto-Finnic (cf. Lehtinen 2007: 96). Introduction of the suffix u- with reflexive-translative or passive meaning that is found in many Finnish verbs (cf. Hakulinen 1968: 222–223, 239) could take place only in Late Proto-Finnic when it became possible to have u in the second syllable and a geminate -mm- (Lehtinen 2007: 110, 88).
8. FINNISH VIHTA ‘BATH WHISK’, VIHTOA ‘TO BEAT ONESelf WITH A BATH WHISK’

There is a clear east-west division in the Finnish names of the traditional sauna bath whisk, which is usually made of leafed branches of the birch tree. In the eastern dialects it is called vasta (with cognates in Ingrian, Karelian, Lydic and Vepsian) and in Vepsian there is a corresponding verb vastoida ‘to beat oneself with the bath whisk’. It is widely agreed that these words are derived from Russian хвост ‘tail, whisk’ and хвостать ‘to beat oneself with bath whisk’ (cf. SSA III, 2000: 416). The Russian words have cognates throughout the Slavic languages, ‘tail’ being a common meaning, as it is for Czech khvost, but Czech too has the verb khvostati in the meaning ‘to beat oneself with the bath whisk’ (cf. Vasmer III, 1958: 237–238; though Vasmer usually notes Russian loanwords in Finnic, a reference to vasta is missing here).

The word vihta of the western dialects of Finnish (in the southwest, Häme and parts of Pohjanmaa, the islands of the Bay of Finland, and Viipuri) is used in the meaning ‘bath whisk’ by From in 1702, but it is attested already in the 16th century. Agricola namely says that “Adam and Eve made themselves wichtat out of fig leaves”, undoubtedly referring to the Finnish habit of covering the private parts with the bath whisk when naked in the sauna. There are cognates in Ingrian (vihta), Votian (vihta) and Estonian (viht, gen. viha). A corresponding verb ‘to beat oneself with the bath whisk’ is found in Finnish (vihtoa), Ingrian (vihtoa) and Estonian (vihelda, present tense vihtlen).

According to SSA (III, 2000: 439a), ‘the word has been considered as a Russian loanword, probably mediated to Finnish by Estonian, cf. dialectal Russian вехоть, вихоть “bunch of straw or hay, washcloth”; but it is more likely of descriptive origin (cf. vihistä, vihma (especially the derivative vihmaa ‘to lash’, of rain), viuhua (and possibly also vihko).’ The first part of this statement summarizes the more detailed exposition of SKES (VI, 1978: 1739b), where the derivation from Russian is considered uncertain, in spite of the phonetic similarity. SSA gives eleven references to earlier studies, with summaries. Neither SKES nor SSA mentions the proposal I make below, nor is it found in the most recent references given in the Kotus etymological database: Koponen (1999: 515) notes that vihta may be connected with the onomatopoeic verb vihistä, while Nikkilä (2002: 128) observes that “vihta [!]” is among the several words that previously had been considered as loan words, but are now taken to be of onomatopoeic origin in SSA, while Jarva (2003: 50, 186), with reference to SSA, lists vihta among the uncertain borrowings from Russian.

Both SKES and SSA consider vihtoa to be a derivative of vihta, but in my opinion the opposite is true (with the noun vihta created on the analogy of vasta), and the origin is the 13th–15th century Swedish vefta / vifta or rather,
via Estonian, Danish vefte / vifte ‘to whisk, swish, wag (the tail)’. Neither SKES nor SSA refers to the Finnish verb viuhtoa, which I take to be a variant of vihtoa. Viuhtoa ‘to whisk, swish, swipe, bustle about, botch’, attested in Lönnrot’s dictionary (1880) is used widely in Finnish dialects, and it has a cognate in Karelian viuhtuo. Both SKES (VI, 1978: 1800–1801) and SSA (III, 2000: 466) consider viuhtoa to be a descriptive-onomatopoeic verb, comparing Finnish viuha and viuhka, yet acknowledging that viuhtoa may partly be based on Swedish vifta, ‘which in any case has influenced the distribution of viuhtoa’ (SKES). According to the references given in SSA, viuhtoa was first derived from vifta by Johannes Neuhaus (1908: 131).


The ultimate root is Proto-Indo-European *weip- (Old Indo-Aryan vep- ‘to tremble, shake’, Gothic bi-waibjan, Old Norse veifa ‘to swing’) from which is derived Proto-Germanic *waiβtjan ~ *wibatjan (reduced grade) ‘to whisk, swish’ > Norwegian veifta ~ vifta (reduced grade, ‘to sift grain’), Old Swedish vepta > early New Swedish vefta > vifta (Serenius 1741) (according to Hellquist, either e > i in front of two consonants or in order to avoid an e-form that sounded vulgar, as in fesk : fisk) ~ vifta (Småland dialect preserving the reduced grade), Old Danish vefte > New Danish vifte; cf. also Danish vifte ‘fan’, vifte sig ‘to fan oneself’. (Cf. Hellquist 1939 II: 1336, 1340.) That the borrowing took place in Estonia during the Danish occupation (1219–1346) is suggested by the fact that the Estonian verbs vihtuda, vihelda, vihtleda ‘to beat oneself with a bath whisk’ (SKES 1978 VI: 1739b) have variants with the vowel e (recorded in SKES 1978 VI: 1680b s.v. vehdata): vehtida, vehelda, vehtleda ‘to whisk, swish’.
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