Mutual contacts and lexical relations among the Finnic varieties of western Ingria and northeastern Estonia

Abstract The aim of this article is 1) to describe the historical language contact situation between the genetically closely related Finnic varieties of western Ingria, 2) to give examples of the numerous loanwords originating from mutual contacts among local Finnic varieties as well as areal diffusion, and 3) to discuss the method of investigating contacts and borrowing among closely related varieties. The data are taken from old dialectal materials published in vocabularies and dictionaries as well as preserved in archives. The words that are analysed and discussed etymologically in more detail are drawn from Vote, Ingrian, and Estonian. Although it is often difficult to confirm the direction of borrowing among closely related varieties, I seek to determine the direction of diffusion in the varieties whose development cannot be described merely in terms of a traditional binary family tree model. Examples of mutual borrowing between Vote, Ingrian, Estonian, and Finnish are presented. Estonian loanwords in Vote and Ingrian can usually be recognised by their distribution. Most vocabulary originating as loans (in Vote, Ingrian, and Estonian) has been borrowed from Finnish. Loans in both Vote and Estonian often have a distribution not only in Ingrian but also in Finnish. Because of the phonetic similarity of these varieties, the donor variety usually cannot be defined. Vote loanwords occur only sporadically in Ingrian and Estonian: they may also form a substratum.

1. This study is written as a part of the research project “Language change in multilingual Finnic”, funded by the Kone Foundation.
The speakers of Finnic varieties in western Ingria used to live in old rural communities with long-term multilingualism, villages with a mixed population, and vague language boundaries. The arrival of new inhabitants from the countries, which ruled this area and the foundation of St. Petersburg in 1703 changed the ethnographic balance between different peoples in Ingria. This increased linguistic diversity and altered the hierarchy of the languages leading gradually to accelerating language and identity shift of the local peoples of Ingria.
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1. Introduction

The vocabulary of the Finnic varieties in western Ingria and northeastern Estonia reflects the historical language contact situation of the area in several ways. The closely related Finnic varieties spoken in the area are Võte, Ingrian, Estonian, and Ingrian Finnish. When speaking about these, I use the word “variety” instead of “language” in order to stress the fact that their situation in their traditional speech areas resembles more a dialect continuum, especially when it comes to Võte and Ingrian.

The traditional settlements of speakers of Võte and Ingrian were once located in western Ingria, the southeastern coastal area of the Gulf of Finland between the Narva River and the present-day metropolis of St. Petersburg. At the beginning of the 18th century, St. Petersburg was established at a location that had been an ancient trading centre of Finnic peoples. Over the centuries, both Russia and Sweden have governed the Ingrian area, whereas the local people have never formed a politically independent state there. In the 17th century, Finnish speakers migrated to Ingria, and following the foundation of St. Petersburg in 1703 and the Treaty of Nystad in 1721, Russian migration increased considerably. The most recent Finnic-speaking newcomers, Estonian migrants, started to settle in the same area in the second half of the 19th century. Historically, German was spoken in Ingria to some extent and presumably, though more temporarily, Swedish was as well.

The arrival of new inhabitants from the countries, which have historically dominated this region politically, changed the ethnographic balance between different peoples in Ingria. This increased linguistic diversity and altered the language hierarchy leading gradually to accelerating language and identity shift of the local peoples of Ingria. Võte and Ingrian speakers were plurilingual and some of their villages in the Vaipooli area (located in the Lower Luga area), namely Jõgõperä, Liivtšülä, Luuditsa, and Rajo, had a mixed population.

In the easternmost Estonian parish of Vaivara there were also contacts between Estonians and speakers of Võte, Ingrian, and Finnish. The fishermen in the Vaipooli area met other fishermen speaking other Finnic varieties. (Ariste 1968: 14; 1981: 52–59, 79.) Presumably, Võte was once spoken across a wider area than in the 19th and
Map 1. The location of Ingria. Map from the back cover of Teinonen & Virtanen (eds, 1999).


² Finnish was not the main Finnic language in parishes written in [square brackets].
20th centuries and speakers of Võõr lived alongside Estonian speakers in the present-day Vaivara region and also somewhat more to the south (Ariste 1965a: 110; 1965b: 92; Ernits 2005: 82, 83). Ingrian, on the other hand, is supposed to have been spoken as far as the present-day location of St. Petersburg and even to the Sestra River on the southern Karelian Isthmus as well as to the Nazija River in the east (Ernits 2007: 13).

2. Hypotheses and aims

My main hypothesis is that there are numerous loanwords originating from mutual contacts among local Finnic varieties; however, among closely related varieties it is often difficult to define the direction of borrowing. Nevertheless, the main aim is to find the origin of shared words, which in some of these Finnic varieties result from areal diffusion rather than descending directly from the common protolanguage. Furthermore, I seek to determine the direction of the diffusion and to reconstruct the language contact situation in Ingria in the 19th and 20th centuries.

This article has a two-fold objective. In section 6, I describe the historical sociolinguistic situation in western Ingria, as this has not been done to this extent before. The data are collected from various contemporary writings. Section 7 deals with vocabulary and is divided into two parts. I have gathered all the words with at least two Finnic donor varieties found in previous studies and present them in the first part of the section. The latter part of the section is an attempt to describe the method of investigating mutual borrowing between closely related varieties by analysing eight selected words. My aim is to make the method more transparent and, if possible, to develop it somewhat.
3. Data and methods

The empirical part of the current article is based on old dialectal word materials on all Finnic varieties published in vocabularies and dictionaries. In the case of Estonian and Finnish, the materials are still partly unpublished and are stored in archives. The materials were mostly collected between the beginning of the 20th century and the 1970s and they represent the situation of these varieties at a point when the development of multilingualism as well as language and identity shift had been ongoing for a long time. The analysis and detailed etymological discussion in this section focuses on words in Võte, Ingrian, and Estonian. Some words are discussed in more detail in order to make the method more transparent, because often older works in etymology and especially etymological dictionaries only give the conclusion, not the articulation leading to it.

The methods used are contact linguistics, etymology, lexicology as well as comparative dialectology. In the case of closely related varieties in contact, the classical criteria of etymology – phonology, semantics, and areal distribution – unfortunately are not sufficient alone. Recognising borrowing between closely related varieties is complicated, because there are only a limited amount of phonological features which can reveal loanwords. These are mainly found in Võte, for instance sound characteristics suggesting a loan origin (see, Suhonen 1986; Lauerma 1993: 160). Furthermore, defining the direction of diffusion or the precise loan source is often difficult and left unanswered in previous studies and vocabularies (Lauerma 1993; VKJo; VKKu; IMS).

When studying closely related varieties in contact, areal distribution becomes a more significant factor. Additionally, knowledge of the (cultural) history of the area in question and any sociolinguistic information is crucial, because the context of the contact has to be taken into consideration. As for the relationship between the Estonian Northeastern Coastal dialects and Finnish, Suhonen (1979: 360–364; 2000: 373) has pointed out that the most important criteria to be taken into consideration are the following: distributions of words, distributions of their meanings, contacts with neighbouring dialects, the origin of the possible loan original (especially in the case of a young loanword), inflectional types and categories, and the historical likelihood of it being a loan. All these factors suggest what is possible and plausible when investigating the direction of linguistic diffusion.
As for the old sociolinguistic language contact situation, the existing principal resources are the writings of scholars who carried out their fieldwork in the 20th century. These include fieldwork journals written on the trips as well as articles based on the impressions while out in the field but written and published later. My main sources are the posthumously published texts of Paul Ariste, who conducted his fieldwork in Ingria in 1942–1980. His diaries did not appear in print until 2005. Although Ariste conducted his work mostly during the Soviet years, he is known to have written in a way which really did not take Soviet censorship into consideration. Ariste’s notes can therefore be considered relatively reliable and the fact that his journals were written while out in the field and immediately after the situations he describes makes them exceptionally important. Another source are the memoirs written by Lauri Kettunen about his fieldwork. Kettunen conducted fieldwork with Vote speakers in 1911–1915. His book, however, is written decades afterwards and it was most likely also edited prior to its publication in 1945. Therefore, it cannot be considered as authentic or reliable as Ariste’s notes. My third source is the field journal of ethnologist Ilmar Talve from a trip in 1942, published in 1990. Talve translated the text from his native Estonian into Finnish before publishing it. He does not mention editing the text and it has maintained its travel journal style.

The historical mutual contacts of genetically closely related Finnic varieties have received little attention in modern Finno-Ugrian research. These three doctoral dissertations on morphology and phonology are the only larger existing works addressing this topic: Helka Riionheimo (2007) has studied the effects of contacts with Estonian in the past tense formation of Ingrian Finnish speakers living in Estonia, Ossi Kokko (2007) investigated the use of some cases in the speech of Ingrian Finnish speakers living mostly in Estonia, and Petri Lauerma’s (1993) dissertation focuses on Vote vowel harmony, but also examines loanwords with both Finnic and Russian origin (especially pp. 165–192). Viitso (1993: 526) has considered this study to be of great importance for the study of Vote etymology. I am currently conducting lexical research in the field for my doctoral dissertation (a monograph in Finnish) on the language contact situation in western Ingria and northeastern Estonia from the viewpoint of internal borrowing within a language family.
4. The Finnic varieties analysed in this study and their speech areas in western Ingria

In a broader context, the Finnic languages are closely related languages forming a subbranch of the Uralic language family. This article focuses on Võõtse, Ingrian, and Estonian with a special emphasis on the Estonian Northeastern Coastal and Eastern dialects.

4.1. Võõtse

Võõtse was spoken almost exclusively in western Ingria. Võõtse is traditionally considered to have four dialects: Western, Eastern, Kukkuzi, and Krevin Võõtse (see Map 3; classical division of the dialects Kettunen 1915; Heinsoo 1998: 19–22; VKS). Western Võõtse, as the largest sub-dialect, was spoken over the most extensive area. Modern research divides Western Võõtse into two groups: Central Võõtse, which was spoken in the Kattila region, and Lower Luga Võõtse, which is still spoken by a couple of elderly people in the villages with a mixed population, such as Jõgõperä, Liivtšülä, Luuditsa, and Rajo (Ernits 2005: 77; Muslimov 2005; Markus & Rozhanskiy 2011a; Kuznetsova et al. 2015: 130). In the Finnish tradition, these groups have been referred to as the Kattila and Vaipooli (or Vainpuoli in Finnish) dialects. Eastern Võõtse was spoken in the villages of Itšäpäivä, Mahu, Ivanaisi, Kliimettina, Koslova, and Kaprio. When a particular word occurs in the eastern area then it can be considered old and therefore especially noteworthy. The Eastern dialect died out in the 1970s. Kukkuzi Võõtse spoken in Kukkuzi village is, in fact, a mixed language: it has an Ingrian phonetic and lexical superstrate with a Võõtse grammatical base (Suhonen 1985; Muslimov 2005; Markus & Rozhanskiy 2011b; 2012). Krevin was the dialect of the Võõtse speakers who were relocated to Latvia in the 15th century and which became extinct during the 19th century. There is only a small amount of material on this variety, but it is important for investigating the history and earlier stages of development of Võõtse.
Map 3. Dialect areas of Vote and locations of villages. Extracted from the map by Tiit-Rein Viitso in Heinsoo (1998: 28). Idavadja = Eastern Vote. The Kattila area is divided into the Orko ‘valley’ and Mäči (= Mätśi) ‘hill’ areas. Rajo is not marked on the map but it is located west of Jõgõperä on the same side of the Luga River. Liivčülä = Liivtšülä, Luucca = Luuditsa, Ičäpäivä = Itšäpäivä. Laugaz = Luga River; Jaama = Kingissepp.
4.2. Ingrian

Ingrian has four main dialects: Lower Luga, Soikkola, Hevaa, and Oredež Ingrian (see Map 4; classical division of the dialects Porkka 1885; Laanest 1961; Nirvi 1961; 1971). Lower Luga Ingrian is still spoken by some elderly people along the lower course of the Luga River (and a mixed Finnish/Ingrian variety partly on the Kurkola peninsula (Kuznetsova et al. 2015: 131)). Soikkola Ingrian is spoken by some elderly people on the Soikkola peninsula, Hevaa Ingrian was spoken in the Hevaa River area, and Oredež Ingrian was spoken along the upper

3. Although, according to Porkka (1885: 17–18), the Lower Luga dialect is not a dialect of Ingrian. For criticism, see Laanest (1961: 200–202).
course of the Luga River. The latter dialect is only fragmentarily documented, but it may be useful to research, as it could have preserved old vocabulary, which in other dialects of Ingrian may have been replaced with words from Ingrian Finnish dialects (Laanest 1970: 109). It has been assumed that Oredež Ingrian was formed when speakers of Ingrian fled the Swedish regime to the distant Oredež area in the 17th century.

4.3. Estonian

Estonian was spoken throughout all of Ingria at the beginning of the 20th century. The areas from which the Estonian-speaking immigrants moved to Ingria remain unclear, but it is likely that they came from all over the Estonian-speaking region. Estonian was spoken in western Ingria in the Kattila region and surrounding areas by over 2,000 people at the beginning of the 20th century, at least in the Vote villages of Itšäpäivä (in the Eastern Vote area), Jarvikoištsülä, Körvöttula, Mati, Pummala, and in the mixed population Vote villages of the Lower Luga region (Jõgõperä, Liivtsülä, Luuditsa, Rajo, and Kukkuizi) (Ariste 1987: 21–30; 1998: 15–16). At the end of the 19th century, in some parishes in western Ingria even a third of the inhabitants were speakers of Estonian (Hakamies 1991: 201; repeated by Leskinen 1995: 172). There were already 64,116 Estonians in Ingria in 1897 according to the population census conducted in Russia that year. According to Ariste (1998: 15), the contacts between speakers of Estonian and Vote did not become intensive until the second half of the 20th century. According to Muslimov, the largest number of Estonians lived in Novasolkka parish (Mehmet Muslimov, p.c. 16 & 17 October 2015; see Map 6). Speakers

4. Of which, 12,238 in the city of St. Petersburg.
5. Muslimov has had Estonian language consultants in at minimum the following villages in Ingria: Sakkola, Novesi, Zapalje, Ivanovskoje, Tikanpesä, Kattila, Kupanitsa, Viron-Priiskova (Rus. Krasnaja-Priiskova, not marked on the Finnish road map of Ingria from 1992 (compiled by Roland Randefelt) but located between Vennäin-Priiskova and Hakuli), Lopitsa, Moloskovitsa, Spankkova, Serepetta, Muhovitsa, Edasi (an Estonian kolkhoz in Kikkeri), Uusi-Hinkkala (near Spankkova), Markkus (Rus. Marguzi), Simetsa (a village founded by Estonians), Arokylä (Rus. Ara-), Reskutsa (Rus. Treskovitsa), Marvitsa, Suur-Rutja or Pien-Rutja (in either of the villages), Raakovitsa, Saappola, Prömpeli, Mustapää, Kesikylä (Rus. Srednjye, not marked on the map but located northeast from Klenna roughly by the number 12 on the Finnish road map of Ingria), Ivanskoï, and possibly Asikka (Mehmet Muslimov, p.c. 17 October 2015).
of Vote, Ingrian, and Finnish came in contact with speakers of Estonian mostly in or nearby the city of Narva in eastern Estonia, at the Narva-Jõesuu harbour, and in the city of Jaama\(^6\) in western Ingria, where the Estonian congregation had 4 500 members. Inhabitants of Ingria also worked in these places and went there to trade goods. (Ariste 1981: 52; 1987: 30; 1998: 17; Talve 1990: 64.) Conceivably, the dialect of Vaivara parish is of special importance (Vaatso 1993: 524). It has been conjectured that an old Vote-speaking population in eastern Estonia has left traces in the vocabulary of the Eastern and Northeastern Coastal

\(^6\) Jamburg in German, nowadays Kingissepp.
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5. Languages in contact with the Finnic varieties examined in this study

Ingrian Finnish, that is, the Finnish dialects spoken in Ingrian territory, is considered a variety with close contacts with the other Finnic varieties of this area. Russian, although not examined in this article, also had a substantial effect on the Finnic varieties, while German and Swedish did not.

5.1. Ingrian Finnish and other dialects of Finnish

Ingrian Finnish was the largest Finnic variety in Ingria in terms of number of speakers and was spoken across this entire area. Only in western Ingria was Finnish not the main Finnic variety. (Saloheimo 1991: 81.) Ingrian Finnish dialects are classified as Southeastern dialects of Finnish. The speakers of Ingrian Finnish had originally moved to Ingria in the 17th century after the Treaty of Stolbovo in 1617, when Sweden began to colonise Ingria. The newcomers from Äyräpää parish on the Karelian Isthmus were called äyrämöiset, while the others, whose precise origin is harder to define and is not discussed here, were called savakot and the Narvusi Lutherans. The main Ingrian Finnish
Map 6. Ingrian Finnish dialects (northern parishes only partially shown) according to SMS. Map base from ALFE, markings by the author. The dialect spoken on Suursaari (Suu) belonged to the Kymi dialects; the dialects spoken on Tytärsaari, Lavansaari, and Seiskari (Tyt, Lava, Seis) belonged to the Southeastern dialects (South Karelian dialects) of Finnish proper. Dialects from Lüganuse to Vaivara are dialects of Estonian. The Ingrian Finnish dialects spoken in Kallivere7, Kosemkinina, Narvusi8, Kattila, Soikkola, Kaprio, Hevaa, Novasolkka, and Moloskovitsa (Kall, Kose, Nar, Kat, Soik, Kap, Hev, Nov, Mol) are considered the western group of Ingrian Finnish by Muslimov (2009), followed by Kuznetsova et al. (2015: 132–133). Kosemkinina, Narvusi, Kattila, Soikkola, Kaprio, Hevaa are parishes where Finnish was not the main variety. Vote speakers lived in the parishes of Narvusi, Kattila, Hevaa; Ingrian speakers lived in the parishes of Narvusi, Kattila (in the Vaipooli area), Soikkola, and Hevaa. The circled area is the main area – aside from the cities – where Vote and Ingrian speakers would encounter each other most: on the islands this was in connection with fishing, on the mainland it was due to the location of the areas in which they lived.

7. Interestingly, in Kuznetsova et al. (2015: 133), Kallivere is not mentioned in the discussion of Ingrian Finnish dialects of western Ingria. Tyrö is regarded as a western Ingrian Finnish dialect.
8. Kuznetsova et al. (2015: 133) call the Ingrian Finnish dialect spoken in Narvusi parish the Lower Luga dialect. In fact, Kettunen (1930: 191, 193, 194, 195) also writes in Finnish about the [Finnish] dialect of the Lower Lugans, the dialect of (the Lutherans of) Lower Luga, the [dialect] group of Lower Luga, the Lower Lugans, and the Lower Luga dialect.
dialects were the äyrämöis-dialects, spoken mainly along the coast of Ingria, and savakko-dialects, spoken mainly inland. The smallest dialect, the Narvusi or Kosemkin dialect, also classified as the Finnish dialects of Kurkola and Rosona (in Leppik 1966; 1972; 1973; 1975 and Mägiste 1925), is strongly influenced by the other Finnic varieties of the area. The background of the Finnish dialects of Ingria was not uniform and Ingrian Finnish in the 20th century was already a fusion of different dialects. (Leskinen 1991: 230; 1995: 170–171; Savijärvi 1996a: 8–10; Riionheimo 2007: footnote 8, 18). Speakers of other Southeastern dialects of Finnish were encountered while fishing on Seiskari, Lavansaari, and Tytärsaari – islands in the Gulf of Finland. In St. Petersburg, there likely were speakers of even more Finnish varieties, for example the Southern Karelian dialects of Finnish. For the Ingrian Finnish dialects in western Ingria, see Map 6.

5.2. Other languages of Ingria

The most widely spoken language in Ingrian territory was, of course, Russian. Other Indo-European languages also have been spoken in this area: Hakamies (1991: 200) conjectures that as 6 600 of the 11 490 Germans in Ingria in 1848 lived in Kronstadt and Narva (data by von Köppen 1849; 1867), there were relatively few Germans in the countryside and that they did not have contacts with or impact on speakers of the Finnic varieties spoken there. Presumably, at one point there were also Swedish speakers in Ingria, at least Krjukov (1993 [1987]: 24) mentions that the Swedes and Germans who moved to Ingria in the 17th century, assimilated into other Lutherans (i.e., Finnish- and Estonian-speaking people) in the 18th and 19th centuries. For example, the Swedish-speaking chronicler Thomas Hiärne (1638–1678) of Livonia was born in Skuoritsa, central Ingria.

In comparison to the number of speakers of German, there were 5 148 Votes, 17 800 Ingrians, 76 069 Finns, and 3 522 Estonians living in Ingria in 1848 when the peoples of Ingria were documented for the first time by ethnologist Peter von Köppen (von Köppen 1867: 20, 41, 92, 105, 114).
6. The historical sociolinguistic situation in western Ingria

Sociolinguistically, in these Finnic-speaking rural communities, the language boundaries were extremely vague. In fact, both Vote and Ingrian speakers have repeatedly expressed the opinion that their dialects are dialects of the same language (Ariste 2005: 47).

6.1. Plurilingualism and receptive multilingualism

In the Vaipooli area in western Ingria, the plurilingualism of the last speakers of Vote and Ingrian can be described as receptive multilingualism: they used their own language when communicating with each other (Kettunen 1945: 237; Ariste 1957: 122; 1958: 148; 1981: 58). The traditional use of the different Saami languages was also like this (Pasanen 2015), and using one’s own language for contacts between speakers of the Saami languages and speakers of Finnish was a traditional model in the Saami area (M. Aikio 1988: 73–74, 77). These languages are, in principle, genetically related but not mutually intelligible, and receptive multilingualism is based on speakers living in the same area for a long time. Due to a shared basic vocabulary and grammar the closely related Finnic varieties have mutual intelligibility to some extent. However, receptive multilingualism in western Ingria was based on and very much supported by the fact that speakers of the different Finnic varieties of this region had lived for an extended period of time alongside each other in an area consisting of villages with mixed population and long-term multilingualism. Ariste (2005: 69) also notes that the Ingrians, who had had more contact with either Finnish-speaking or Estonian-speaking people, better understood the language in question. Talve (1990: 64) notes that in 1942, almost all the Votes in Vaipooli understood Estonian, because there had been Estonian inhabitants in Vaipooli. At the end of the 19th century, when even a third of the inhabitants were Estonian speakers in some parishes in western Ingria, Finnish speakers in western Ingria would even read Estonian books when they did not have Finnish books (Hakamies 1991: 201).9

9. On receptive multilingualism in contemporary Finnish–Estonian interaction see Härmävaara (2013; 2014; 2017; forthcoming). However, in spite of the studied languages being closely related, the situation of Finns and Estonians brought up in
In fact, many speakers of Finnic varieties – especially the Votes and Ingrians – in western Ingria also spoke each other’s varieties. According to Kettunen (1930 [1915]: 7), this was the case for Vote and Finnish speakers in Lempola, Pummala, and Mahu. In Luuditsa (Luuccca, Luutsa their own countries and then trying to interact with one another can not be compared with the situation of western Ingria directly.
on maps 3 & 7), there lived “truly bilingual Votes”, who were equally proficient in Ingrian and Vote (Ariste 1981: 62). In Soikkola, Finnish speakers could understand Vote (M. Paulaharju 2010: 142 [original source S. Paulaharju 1915]). However, the data available are somewhat ambiguous. For example, it has been said that in the past, speakers of these four different Finnic languages usually did not learn each other’s varieties because they got along by only speaking their own (Ariste 1957: 122). In the 20th century, Ingrian became the more common language of communication between Vote and Ingrian speakers, because there were more speakers of the latter variety. Ariste states that the last speakers of Vote in the Vaipooli area knew Ingrian but not vice versa. (Ariste 1981: 58.) It has also been said that services in Lutheran churches also had to be held in Estonian, because Estonian speakers did not understand Finnish (Kettunen 1957: 126–127); however, this is likely due to the fact that speakers of Estonian were the most recent immigrants to the area.

6.2. Language prestige and asymmetry of contacts

The prestige of Russian, the urban and a fully developed language used in all domains, was high, whereas the rural languages Vote and Ingrian had neither official status nor literary use and were used only in informal domains. Russian, on the other hand, was the language of administration, education, and the Orthodox church 10. Finnish was also a rural language in Ingria, but as the major Finnic variety it had higher prestige than the smaller Finnic varieties also because of its use in the Lutheran church and later in the Finnish schools of Ingria. Its use among speakers of Vote and Ingrian – considered “Finns” by the Lutheran priests at one time – had even been supported by any means possible in the 17th century (Savijärvi 1998: 274).

Generally speaking, the language contacts and use of local varieties has been asymmetric, as also Markus & Rozhanskiy (2010; 2013) have pointed out in their studies of Vote and Ingrian. These two Finnic varieties had the lowest prestige in Ingria; however, Ingrian was still in a more powerful position. Ingrian had more speakers and there was

---

10. The language used in masses held at the Orthodox church was, of course, Church Slavic, which was not intelligible (even) for speakers of Russian. However, the church was considered the Russian church without a doubt.
even an attempt to create a standard language and to use it as a language of instruction in schools in the 1930s. In his often quoted article, Tsvetkov (1925: 43) notes that when an Ingrian-speaking wife was brought to a Vote-speaking household, the whole family shifted their language to Ingrian. Though, most likely they shifted to a convergent variety, as suggested by Fedor Rozhanskiy (p.c. 20 August 2015; more about this variety in Rozhanskiy & Markus 2013: 230; 2014). According to Rozhanskiy, the women were mostly from Soikkola, and, of course, the Ingrian spoken in the Lower Luga area is not the Soikkola variety. It was also typical for speakers of Vote to speak Ingrian with speakers of Ingrian despite the fact that Ingrian-speakers knew Vote as well (Tsvetkov 1925: 43), but this also may have been a mixed variety. Vote was very rarely used with children. At the last stage, it has been reported that there were children in only two families speaking Vote with their Vote-speaking father and Ingrian with their Ingrian-speaking mother at the beginning of the 20th century (Ariste 1968: 15; 2005: 98, 111, 112).

Russian was preferred with children because it was believed that they would absolutely need Russian in the future.

Estonian, like Finnish, had a standard language and literary use. These languages had a status in their homelands which added to their

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>lowest rural language</th>
<th>rural language</th>
<th>newest rural language</th>
<th>largest rural language</th>
<th>urban language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no standard language</td>
<td>no standard language</td>
<td>standard language</td>
<td>standard language</td>
<td>standard language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no literary use</td>
<td>no literary use*</td>
<td>(literary use in Estonia)**</td>
<td>education, media</td>
<td>education, media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no administration</td>
<td>no administration</td>
<td>no administration</td>
<td>(administr. in Finland)</td>
<td>administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no church</td>
<td>no church</td>
<td>no church</td>
<td>Lutheran church</td>
<td>Orthodox church</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Prestige, status, and use of the languages of western Ingria at the beginning of the 20th century.

* With the exception of an attempt in the 1930s.
** In schools in so-called Estonian Ingria in the 1920s and 1930s.
status in Ingria, but the autochthonous languages of Ingria – Vote and Ingrian – were spoken only in Ingria. In so-called Estonian Ingria, a ten kilometre-wide strip on the eastern side of the Narva River, which was ceded to Estonia in 1920, the language of education was Estonian in 1922–1926 (in Kallivere, Vanaküla, Kullaküla) and in 1933–1940 (in Kallivere, Vanaküla) (Alenius 2015). However, the Finnic varieties in this article are examined as they were spoken during a period mostly during the middle of the 19th century and this political development is more recent. In the case of Russian, the position of the dominant language should be discussed in more detail. Ultimately, political power guaranteed a more prestigious status for Russian.

6.3. Ethnic and linguistic identities

Accordingly, the ethnic and linguistic identities of the speakers of Vote and Ingrian were vague: the main factor in defining identity was religion, which meant that local people could define themselves as Russian because of their “Russian” religion. The Greek Orthodox religion played a significant role and it in fact was the main connective factor between the speakers of Vote and Ingrian and the Russians. In spite of their language, every person in the Orthodox faith could be considered a Russian. For example, mixed marriages were allowed only with other Orthodox people, not with the Finnish-speaking Lutheran people. Being Russian became more prestigious as time went on and having a Finnic ethnic identity might even have been dangerous after the Russian Revolution – at least if it was written in one’s passport. Usually speakers of Vote marked their ethnicity as Ingrian (ижорец, ижорка in Russian) and nationality as Russian when answering censuses because they simply did not have a Vote identity. Working in the cities, especially in St. Petersburg, contributed to the language shift to Russian. These facts led to a gradual assimilation where Ingrian speakers assimilated into the Russians as Vote speakers assimilated into both Ingrian speakers and the Russians. (Tsvetkov 1925: 41–42, 44; Ariste 2005: 31, 40, 67, 74.) In 1967, Ariste’s (2005: 104) language consultants were of the opinion that Vote and Ingrian were disappearing because of the deportations of their speakers to Finland and Russia during the war, which is also certainly true.
One of the few means used for describing belonging to a particular Finnic group was a distinction Vote and Ingrian speakers would make. Namely, the verb used for ‘speaking’ is different: in Vote pa-jattaa, in Ingrian läkkää, and this difference was used to define the language of the other speaker. The terms pajattaja and läkkääjä, both meaning ‘speaker’, were used without the potential name of the language spoken. However, it seems that the speakers understood this difference to be dialectal. (Ariste 1981: 62; 2005: 66, 83, 92, 97, 124, 125, 126, 142.) Another means for drawing this distinction was to use terms derived from local place names: names of villages, parts of villages, or village groups (Ariste 2005: 28, 30). On the other hand, some speakers have referred to songs in Finnic languages as Finnish songs in order to draw a distinction with Russian culture (Ariste 2005: 55). The adjectives Vo. soomalain, Ing. suunelain ‘Finn’ have been used for speakers of Finnish in Ingria, and people from Finland have been called Vo. soomõõmaakko (approximately ‘a person from Finland, Finlander’) or even Vo. finn(i) (a Russian loanword). All Lutherans may also have been called Finns or “of Finnish belief” – also Estonians and Germans – because the Lutheran church was the Finnish church in Ingria. (Ariste 2005: 31–32; IMS s.v.; VK s.v.) One representative example is when on a field trip in 1942, Ariste asked in Vote if an old Russian man speaks Vote. The man answered in Russian: “Немного по лютерански говорю”, ‘I speak a little bit of Lutheran’ (my translation and italicisation). (Ariste 2005: 37.) The concepts of language, nation, and religion were completely intermingled in Ingria.

6.4. Language attitudes

As for language attitudes, there has been very little, if any, awareness or interest among the speakers of the smallest Finnic varieties of Ingria – Vote and Ingrian – in their own local varieties or in raising their profile. In 1942, Ariste noted that Vote speakers were totally uninterested in and passive about the possibility of the extinction of their language. Ariste encountered only two language consultants who felt otherwise: a Vote-speaking consultant who despised her mother tongue and another consultant whom he classified as “a true Vote patriot”. One would think that most likely not until the repressions would Vote and Ingrian
speakers have underrated their mother tongue and called it “non-cultural” or “the language of calves” or “sheep” – and in cases where this occurred, this probably would have been due to mistreatment. However, it is interesting that in 1913 in Mahu, where Eastern Vote was spoken, Kettunen was told that fifty years earlier Vote had been spoken all over the village but then the speakers had suddenly begun to scorn their language. One reason for this might have been that unlike Finnish and Estonian, Vote had no standard language, as one speaker of Vote interviewed by Kettunen stated: “kammuga tšeeli, bõõ tširjaa bõõ pappia” ‘such a language, no book, no priest’ (my translation). This may sound slightly negative but can, nevertheless, be interpreted as a rather neutral statement concerning the situation of this variety. In any case, this development is likely to be somewhat earlier compared with developments in the western speech areas of Vote, which Ariste visited in 1942, because Eastern Vote died out already in the 1970s. (Kettunen 1945: 231; Ariste 2005: 43, 44, 65, 67, 74, 77, 87, 133.)

6.5. Mixed varieties

Ariste often describes the language of his consultants as a mixed language: Vote with Ingrian influence or even vice versa (Ariste 2005: 62, 65, 67, 73, 74–75, 95, 97, 101, 130, 138, 151, 157). This reflects the nature of plurilingualism and its effects on idiolects. However, the question is, whether these varieties have always been mixed to some extent. Like all of the dialectologists conducting fieldwork at that time, Ariste also looked for speakers of the so-called “purest” language or dialect possible. This idealised concept does not really reflect reality, as no “pure” Vote-speaking or “pure” Ingrian-speaking communities have ever existed. A consultant might even say that someone speaks Vote, but during his conversations with the person in question Ariste might instead say that their idiolect is Ingrian. The Kukkuzi dialect of Vote is a topic of its own: it is a variety with substantial Ingrian influence on a Vote substrate, and it can be classified as a mixed language (Suhonen 1985; Muslimov 2005; Markus & Rozhanskiy 2011b; 2012).

7. Vocabulary

This section will discuss earlier studies dealing with mutual borrowing among Finnic varieties in Ingria. In the portion focusing on empirical research, word examples found in Vote, Ingrian, and also Estonian are discussed from an etymological perspective. Despite the presence of individual words in these varieties, these are examples of areal diffusion, not genetic inheritance. The words analysed here illustrate the etymologically most unambiguous cases, and are given here in order to describe the method of etymologising borrowing among closely related varieties. Each is categorised according to its probable donor variety. In earlier research, some have noted the senselessness of attempting to etymologise the direction of borrowing (Laakso in VKJo 1995: IV–V). This is likely true in many cases; however, with detailed and diligent work some proposals concerning the direction of borrowing can be posited using etymology.

7.1. Earlier research

In the research literature, some Finnic loanwords with a distribution across the three aforementioned varieties can be found. I have collected these from the literature and will present them here with English translations of their meanings (the translations from Finnish and Estonian into English are my own except for the translations from Söderman 1996).

7.1.1. Research on Vote

In his doctoral dissertation, Petri Lauerma (1993: 165–192) lists a total of 33 Ingrian, Finnish, or Estonian loans in Vote, which, according to him, have a distribution in both Ingrian and Estonian as well. However, I have already found wider Finnic distributions for some of the words he mentions. These will be dealt with later in the ongoing study. Words given by Lauerma are the following:
Vo. ahteri ‘stem (of a ship)’, ennustā ‘to predict’, hame ‘skirt’, hertain ‘warm-hearted, kind, sweet, good’, heruttā ‘to get a cow to increase its milk production when milking’, kaneppi ‘hemp’ (< Est. Ariste 1941), kapteni ‘captain’, kena ‘nice, beautiful, slender, vain’, koer ~ koera ‘dog’, koppeli ~ koppeni ‘pen (for animals)’

Dmitri Tsvetkov’s Vocabulary of the Joenperä (Jõgõperä) dialect of Vote (Vatjan kielen Joenperän murteen sanasto, VKJo 1995, edited by Johanna Laakso) presents 87 loans in Jõgõperä Vote from either Ingrian or Estonian. I have collected these from the VKJo reverse vocabulary compiled by Johanna Laakso. An asterisk in front of a word indicates that the word form is an assumed nominative or infinitive construed by the Finnish editor. The words are:


7.1.2 Research on Ingrian

In his Dictionary of Ingrian dialects (Inkeroismurteiden sanakirja, IMS 1971), R. E. Nirvi presents words borrowed into Ingrian from two other Finnic languages: 40 loans from Estonian or Võte and 34 from Estonian or Finnish. However, many of these words share the same stem. I have collected these words from the Reverse Vocabulary of Ingrian dialects, Inkeroismurteiden käänteissanasto edited by Raimo Jussila (1986). He uses the term donor language (Fi. lainanantajakieli) and indicates that the information concerning the donor languages is taken as such from Nirvi’s dictionary (Jussila 1986: IV). Nirvi, though, usually only compares words in different varieties with the Ingrian words. An asterisk marks the words that are not entry words in IMS according to Jussila, an asterisk in parentheses marks the words that are not entry words but are not marked as such by Jussila, and an exclamation mark shows the words which are not at all compared with other Finnic words by Nirvi himself. The words are as follows:

Ing. •ahteri ‘stern (of a ship)’, •ahter|speili ‘id.’, •ahteri|seili ‘spanker, driver (the last sail of a ship)’, •ahteritammes ‘stern log of a ship’, •ahteri|töppi ‘top stern sail’, •ækkuri ‘anchor’, hāla|Dä ‘to hoist sails, to draw on land (a ship, for example); to gather sth’, •jahti ‘ship or boat with one mast’, kurssī ‘direction; course’ (Nirvi: < Fi., comp. Rus.), !LediDä v. ‘of plaiting warp’, !leDittä ‘to plait’, letti ‘plait made when warping fabric; plait’, !letti|mado ‘plait of worms’, a lot of worms together’, !lettiä ‘to plait’, likki ‘reinforcement of the outer edge of a sail’, mamm ‘mother’, nötti ‘note’, parkki ‘willow bark’, !parkkia ‘to bark hide into leather’, •pirkkeli ‘a piece of wood with which the sail of a ship is tautened’, posti ‘post office; postman’, putel ‘bottle’, !puteli|kanta s., räkki ‘carcase, scrap, wreck’, !räkkia ‘to spoil by hitting; to maltreat’, rämi ‘frame’, •rıkki ‘state’, •riŋki ‘circle’, •vint(j)eli ‘gimlet, auger’, •vintelin ‘id.’, !(*)vokka|seili ‘fore-sail’, ülöz ‘up’, *üllesse ‘id.’, *üleze ‘id.’ (all < Fi./Est.; words with a bullet in front of them are primarily borrowed from Estonian. The words rämi and vokkaseili may also have been borrowed from Russian.)
7.1.3 Research on Estonian

In her doctoral dissertation, Tiina Söderman (1996) studied 698 words found in at least three of the parishes of the Estonian north-eastern coastal area not attested anywhere else in the Estonian language area. The data source is VMS. The exact subdialects in the study are the Northeastern Coastal dialects of Jõelähtme, Kuusalu, Haljala, Viru-Nigula, Lüganuse, Jõhvi, Iisaku, and Vaivara, complemented with the Central dialect of Jõelähtme, Kuusalu, Haljala, Iisaku, Kadrina, and Rakvere (see Map 5). Söderman (1996: 39, 157) gives one Estonian (NE) dialect word, ilama, with the donor language being either Ingrian or Vote. According to her (ibid.), in the eastern part of the area and especially in Vaivara, it is not always clear if the Estonian dialect words in question are borrowed from Finnish or Ingrian/Vote. She gives eleven examples of these words:

Est. (NE) akkun ‘window’, kaarn(a) ‘pine bark; float of a net; wart’, karsin ‘pen for pigs and calves’, kiista ‘race’, kimbur ‘bitter, sour (e.g., milk)’, kokk(a) ‘hook, fork’, mutkas ‘playful, trick’, parv ‘choir loft’, peugal ‘thumb’, pulika(s) ‘wooden plug, little stick’, raadu ~ raado ‘miserable; thin, bad creature, loathsome’ (all < Fi./Ing./Vo.).

In fact, in the word articles, Söderman (op. cit., s.v.) has considered all eleven of these words to be likely Finnish loanwords. All of the examples are not actually even attested in Vote and Söderman also does not take the extent of the distribution in Ingrian and Vote into consideration. However, in my opinion, some of the distributions are found over such a limited range that there is no question about the donor variety.

Kaja Toikka (2003) studied the vocabulary of the eastern part of the northeastern coastal area of Estonia in her master’s thesis. Her data consist of 432 dialect words from VMS all attested in two of the following parishes, Viru-Nigula, Lüganuse, Jõhvi, Iisaku, and Vaivara (see Map 5), but nowhere else in the Estonian language area. Toikka (2003: 21–113) gives approximately 40 Estonian Northeastern Coastal dialect words in two parishes with a distribution in Vote and Ingrian as well. However, for example, for rengi ~ trengi ~ renki she gives no attestation in Ingrian, although this word is widely known in
Ingrian (IMS 473, 597). For most words, she assumes they are shared among the different Finnic languages and descend from the common protolanguage. Additionally, there are Russian loans found in all of these varieties; however, these are not discussed in this article. The following words were analysed by Toikka:


In comparison, the master’s thesis of the present author (Björklöf 2012) deals with the vocabulary in the western subgroup of the Estonian Northeastern Coastal dialects. The data consist of words attested in at least two of the following parishes: Jõelähtme, Kuusalu, and Haljala (see Map 5) but nowhere else in the Estonian language area. The data source is VMS. These three studies of Estonian dialect vocabulary show clearly that influence of Võte and Ingrian is apparent in the eastern part of the northeastern coastal area, but at the same time, no influence of Võte or Ingrian exists in the western area. (See also Pajusalu et al. 2009: 154.)

In his articles, Paul Ariste (1962: 16–17; 1977: 9; 1981: 57) points out seven loans in the Estonian Vaivara dialect (see Map 5) spoken on Estonia’s eastern border. These words may have been borrowed from any of the other Finnic languages of Ingria:

Ariste notes that there are several loans from Finnish, Ingrian, and Võte in the Estonian dialect of Vaivara. However, in his three different works from three different decades, the only examples he provides of the numerous loanwords he had mentioned are these seven words.11 This subject matter will be examined more carefully in the future. Nevertheless, having examined a larger lexical corpus, it can be reported that there certainly is a large amount of words borrowed from Finnish as well as from either Finnish or Ingrian in the Estonian dialect in Vaivara.

7.2. Analysed examples of mutual borrowing

In this article, five of the words mentioned above are discussed: trehvama from Lauerma (1993), hulkua and polle from VKJo, ilama from Söderman (1996), and roju (s.v. raju in this article) from Toikka (2003). The other words discussed in the following sections, heikko, kiuru, raju, and höyry, are words I have otherwise come across when conducting my research. These words are chosen because they are methodologically illustrative examples of mutual borrowing. Some of the etymologies are totally new. The rest of the words given above will be analysed in my forthcoming doctoral dissertation.

In the next sections, the words are presented according to the following principles. The variant of the words chosen for the numbered headings corresponds to their appearance in the donor variety; only one variant is given. For example, the first heading is “EstN, EstS trehvama ‘to meet accidentally; to happen’ > Võ., Ing.”, because this Estonian word has been borrowed into Võte and Ingrian. The words are discussed in an order of increasing complexity. For example, the first Estonian loanword I discuss is trehvama, because its etymology is the most straightforward, I continue with põll, and conclude the section with hulkuma, because its relationship with other Finnic varieties is more complicated. In order to make the text easier to follow, variants drawn from different Finnic varieties as well as comments on their areal distributions are given at the beginning of each word section. The order of presenting the words is Võte, Ingrian, Estonian,

11. Constructing hypotheses on language contacts in this way but not providing substantial evidence for them is, in fact, common to Ariste (see Junttila 2015: 26).
and Finnish, followed by possible variants in other Finnic languages (Karelian, Lude, Veps, and Livonian). When quoting dictionaries, the explanations of meanings given in Finnish and Estonian have been translated into English; however, some German explanations have been left untranslated in the text. Some Jõgõperä and Kukkuzi variants of Vote are given with different orthographies due to different practices in dictionaries. The dictionary sources are marked when giving the words for the first time (see the list of sources of data at the end of the article; all of them have been searched for these words).

7.2.1. Estonian loanwords in Vote and Ingrian

Estonian loans in both Vote and Ingrian can be relatively easy to identify because they usually are words not attested in the northern Finnic varieties, in (Ingrian) Finnish, for example, and in Ingrian, of course. The areal distributions in the investigated varieties give us clear evidence for the direction of diffusion – especially when it comes to Vote, another southern Finnic variety.

1) EstN, EstS trehvama ‘to meet accidentally; to happen’
   > Vo., Ing.
   Vo. trehvata Li Ra (Lu) ~ trehvõt J-Tsv, pr. trehvaan Li Ra J; trehvaak (P), pr. trehvaab Ku ‘to happen’, trehvama, trehvõt J-Tsv ‘id.’, trehvõb Ku ‘id.’ (VK; VKJo; VKKu)
   Ing. trehvaDa Me ‘to happen; to meet (sth)’ (IMS)
   EstN, EstS trehvana ~ (i)rähvama ~ rehvama widespread ‘to meet someone (by accident); to happen; to meet’ (VMS) (< Germ. treffen)
   Fi. treffata LounSm EPohjanm, areally Häme Kpohjanm PSm ~ trehvata areally Häme dialects ~ rehvata areally Häme and Savo dialects; Peräp ‘to meet’ < Swe. träff ‘to meet; to happen’ (SSA)

The verb ‘to meet accidentally; to happen’ is attested in three dialects of Vote and one dialect of Ingrian, in fact only in a single Ingrian parish: Vo. trehva ~ trehvõt ~ trehvaak, pr. trehvaab ‘to happen’, Ing. trehvaDa ‘to happen; to meet (sth)’. In Estonian, the German loan-verb (treffen >) Est. trehvana ~ (i)rähvama ~ rehvama ‘to meet someone (by accident); to happen; to meet’ is widespread, which is a clear
indicator the word is an Estonian loan in both Vote and Ingrian. In Vote, the word is attested in the Vaipooli area and Kukkuzi, which are the typical areas most likely to have taken loanwords. Unfortunately, only a few words are this clear and straightforward. Ariste (1987: 23, 29) has indicated that his Vote-speaking language consultants use words of Estonian origin when talking about their connections with Estonians, the word in question being one of the examples; Lauerma (1993: 178) has also compared these three words. The second Finnish etymological dictionary, Suomen sanojen alkuperä (SSA), shares my view on the Estonian origin of this word in Vote and Ingrian (however, SSA presents some peculiar forms of the words in question that are not found in other dictionaries: Vo. trehveə, Ing. trehvata 12; the Vote form is also given in SKES). In the first Finnish etymological dictionary, Suomen kielen etymologinen sanakirja (SKES), it was suggested that the word in Vote and the word trehvata used in so-called Estonian Ingria (“Viron Ink.”) – the area ceded to Estonia in 1920 – have been borrowed from Estonian, German being the donor language of the Estonian word. In SSA, the term “Viron Ink.” used in SKES has been interpreted to stand for a dialect area of Finnish – which would mean approximately the dialects of Kallivere, Kosemka, and Narvusi – although the term is not explained in SKES (SSA uses “InkVi” for Estonian Ingria). In any case, nowadays this word does not seem to be known in the Finnish dialect of Ingria; at least none of Muslimov’s language consultants know this word (Mehmet Muslimov, p.c. 16 & 17 October 2015). In (mainland) Finnish, the same word has been borrowed separately from Swedish: Fi. treffata ~ trehvata ~ rehvata ‘to meet’ < Swe. träffa ‘to meet; to happen’ (SSA). Also according to the Estonian etymological dictionary EES, Vo. trehvata ~ trehvaa ‘to happen’ and Ing. trehvada ‘to happen’ are borrowed from Estonian.

12. The source for the Ingrian word is Sovijärvi (1944: 39), who actually gives the form trehvaDa.
2) EstN, EstS põll ‘apron’
   > Vo., Ing., Fi.

Vo. polle Lu Li Ra J-Tsv ~ pollõ Lu J (R-Eur), g. pollee Lu Ra J ~ pollõõ
   R Lu ‘apron’ (VK; VKJo)
Ing. polle Re Sa Vi (Paulaharju) Hev Kur Uus Vää Ro ~ polli Hev
   ‘apron’ (IMS; IKHe)
EstN, EstS põll ~ poll ~ põlles (gen. põlle ~ polle) widespread ‘apron’
   (VMS); in the Northeastern Coastal dialects poll Jõe Kuu13, polle
   VNg Vai, põll Lüg Jõh (EMSkk)
Fi. polle Kanteletar, Gulf of Finland islands, Ink ‘apron’ (SSA) (at least
   Tyt Lava Tyrö Mol Nov Kap Kat Kose14)

The same word for ‘apron’ is attested in four Finnic varieties. In
Vote, polle ~ pollõ ‘apron’ is attested only in the Vaipooli area and in
Ingrian, polle ~ polli ‘id.’ in three dialect areas out of four. In Estonian,
the word põll ~ poll ~ põlles (gen. põlle ~ polle) ‘id.’ is widespread
and it has several phonological variants. In Finnish, polle ‘id.’ is at-
tested only in Ingrian Finnish dialects in parishes where contacts with
speakers of Estonian and Ingrian have emerged. Consequently, it is
an Estonian loanword in Finnish, in Vote, and most likely in Ingrian
as well, because the southern Finnic variety Estonian and the north-
ern Finnic variety Ingrian do not share words exclusive to them. The
phonetic systems of Ingrian and Finnish lack the midvowel /õ/ which
has been substituted in these Estonian loans with the nearest vowel /o/.
The absence of initial syllable /õ/ in the variants polle ~ pollõ in Vote
refers to a loan origin: in this case the word might have been borrowed
via speakers of Ingrian and Finnish if not from the Estonian variants
poll ~ polle. The non-initial syllable /õ/ in the variant pollõ in Vote,
on the other hand, is typical for Vote: it is an accommodation to the
variety’s own structure, also known as etymological nativisation (on
this phenomenon, see A. Aikio 2007). Lauerma (1993: 186) compares
the word in Vote only with Ingrian and with the Finnish of Kosemkina

13. According to Posti (1970: 470), the variant poll would be known in Haljala, but in
    the Word register of the Dictionary of Estonian dialects (EMSkk) there is no such slip.
14. According to Muslimov (2015), Fi. polle is known in the Finnish dialect of Mo-
    loskovitsa and also in the Finnish dialect of Tyrö, Novasolkka, Kaprio, and Kattila
    (Mehmet Muslimov, p.c. 16 October 2015). I have found its use noted in different
    sources from Tytärsaari, Lavansaari, and Kosemkina.
even though Äimä (1901: 33) and Ojansuu (1916: 173) had already written that Fi. *polle* in Tytärsaari is an Estonian loan. In VKJo there are doubts about the origin of the word and Vo. *polle* in Jõgõperä has been considered an uncertain Ingrian or Estonian loanword, which is indicated with a question mark. In IMS, Ing. *polle* is compared only with the Estonian word *põll*. SSA and EES consider the direction of borrowing to be Fi., Ing., Vo. < Est., quite like I do, while Posti (1970) considered it to be Ing., Vo. < Est. SKES states that the Estonian dialect word in Vaivara would be *polle* and in Haljala *poll*, which is likely because the dialects in question do not have the midvowel /õ/. According to the Word register of the Dictionary of Estonian dialects (EMSkk), the variant *poll* is attested in Jõelähtme and Kuusalu, *polle* in Viru-Nigula and Vaivara (see also footnote 13). The background of the Estonian word has been analysed in more detail in articles by Posti (1970) and Oja (2005).

3) **EstN, EstS** *hulkuma* ‘to wander around’
   > Vo., Ing., Fi.

   *hulkku* J-Tsv ‘id.’, *hulkku* ~ *xulkku* Ku ‘id.’, *hulkku*G Ma ‘id.’
   (VK; VKJo; VKKu; VKMa)

   Ing. *hulkku* Me Sa L-Suu Ro ‘to wander around’ (IMS)

   EstN *hulkuma* ~ (h)ulkma ~ *ulkama* widespread ‘to wander around’
   (VMS)

   EstS *hulkuma* ~ *hulkma* ~ *ulkma* ‘to wander around’ (VMS)

   Fi. *hulkku* Lönnrot 1874; Ink (only Nar Kall), *hulkutella* Eastern dialects, Kall in INK, *hulkia* Uusikirkko Vpl., *hulkehtia* Ilomantsi
   ‘to wander around / umherschlendern’ (SSA; SMS)

   Li. *ūl* pr. *ūkkōb* SjW ‘herumziehen, herumstreichen / to wander around’ (LW)

---

15. According to EES, even the Estonian Swedish word *päll* ‘apron’ is a loanword from Estonian.
16. SSA records the word in Vote only from Jõgõperä (Tsvetkov).
17. A name (and a year) given in SSA stands for the first occurrence of the word in written Finnish.
The verb ‘to wander around’ is attested in all southern Finnic varieties, namely Vote, North Estonian, South Estonian, and Livonian. It is found in three dialect areas in Vote: *ulkkua ~ hulkkua ~ xulkua ~ həukkuag ‘to wander around; to walk’, in Estonian *ulkuma ~ (h)ulkma ~ ulkima ~ ulkama is widespread (see above for the division of the North and South Estonian variants), and in Livonian *ulk pr. ulkkəb ‘herumziehen, herumstreichen / to wander around’ was originally given in the Livisch-deutsches und deutsch-livisches Wörterbuch (‘Livonian-German and German-Livonian dictionary’) by Sjögren and Wiedemann from 1861. The southern distribution, as there is a cognate also in Livonian, suggests this might be an inherited word also in Vote, as does its presence in two eastern Vote villages, Itšäpäivä and Mahu. However, taking a closer look at the Livonian word with only one attestation raises the question of a more probable Estonian loan origin and Kettunen in LW in fact has compared the word with Estonian hulkuda. In addition, the word-initial /h/ has disappeared in the development of Vote and therefore is a sign of a loan origin. The variants lacking /h/ appear only in older data, which are not the most accurate in their marking of the linguistic material and therefore might not be the most reliable. In these cases, etymological nativisation is also possible (see A. Aikio 2007). In Ingrian and Finnish, the word is a loan from Estonian: Ing. hulkkua ‘to wander around’ in two dialect areas and Fi. hulkkua ‘to wander around / umherschleppern’ in two parishes, although the Ingrian word might also have been mediated via Vote and the Finnish word via Ingrian or Vote. In Finnish, the word is attested only in Ingrian Finnish dialects in western Ingria, the contact area with other Finnic varieties. Laanest (1964: 31) and also Krohn (1901: 238) have considered the Ingrian word (Krohn ibid.: in western Ingria) to be a probable Estonian loanword and Savijärvi (1998: 276; repeated in Savijärvi 2001: 163) has proposed that the word in the Finnish dialect in western Ingria is “an item from Ingrian, Votian, or Estonian”. In VKJo Vo. hırkku ‘to wander around’ is considered either as an Ingrian or Estonian loan, and in IMS Ing. hırkkua is compared with Est. hulkuda. Ahlqvist (1856: 157) considers the words in Vote and Estonian to be equivalents and strangely enough, SSA considers all the words to be equivalents. Ojansuu (1916: 138–139) considered this word in Finnish – with the meaning ‘to wander around; Fi. kuljeksi’ – to be a literary loan from Estonian (borrowed in the 20th century by Lauri
Kettunen) and that its “original” meaning in Finnish would be “hölskyä”, ‘to swash, slosh, slop about’. However, it is more likely that the word is a homonym. EES\(^{19}\) follows SSA and considers the stem to be a Finnic stem and does not indicate any mutual borrowing.

### 7.2.2. Finnish loanwords in Võru, Ingrian, and Estonian

Etymologising loanwords in Võru, Ingrian, and Estonian with Finnish as the possible donor variety can be difficult due to lack of materials. Even though the Finnish dialect collection in the Archive of the Dictionary of Finnish dialects (SMSA) is considerable, the materials on Ingrian Finnish dialects are unfortunately inadequate\(^{20}\) (see Elomaa 1989: footnote 2, 37–39; Lauvila 1993: 161). However, when a word is widespread in mainland Finnish, there is little reason to assume it would not be known in the Ingrian Finnish dialects. In such cases it is reasonably safe to suppose the word in question was part of the Ingrian Finnish vocabulary as well. As for words with a limited distribution in Finnish, the lack of comparative data makes it impossible to elaborate on their etymology.

4) Fi. heikko ‘weak’

> Vo., Ing., EstN (A TOTALLY NEW ETYMOLOGY)

Vo. heikko K-Al. M-Set. J-Tsv. Ku ~ eikko K-Ahl., g. heikoo J ‘weak; thin; poor’ (VK; VKJo; VKKu)

Ing. heikko Me Re Sa Sä ‘weak’ (IMS)

EstN (h)eik Kuu ‘weak’ ~ eiko Vai ‘fussy, mercurial’ (EMS)

Fi. heikko Agricola; widespread ~ heiko Satak Häme EPohjanm Peräp Länsip ~ heikeä Lönrott Lis 1886; dial. ‘weak’, heiketä, heikentyä ‘to weaken’ (SSA), widespread (SMS)

Ka. heikko rare ‘weak, poor’ (KKS; SSA)

Ve. heikembäńe southern dialects ‘weaker’ (VVS; SVJa; SSA)

---

19. According to EES, even the Estonian Swedish word holka ‘to wander around’ is a loanword from Estonian.

20. According to Jussila (ed., 1991), in SMSA, Archive of the Dictionary of Finnish dialects, the number of word slips from western Ingria are as follows: Moloskovitsa 469, Novasolkka 0, Hevaa 0, Kaprio 0 (however, there is one example from Kaprio in SMS, s.v. järven|emä), Soikkola 0, Kattila 38, Narsus 64, Kosemkina 0, Kallivere 35 573.
The word for ‘weak’ is attested in three dialect areas in Veps and in one dialect area in Ingrian and Estonian: Vo. heikko ~ eikko ‘weak; thin; poor’ in Kattila (the materials are old), the Vaipooli area, and Kukkuzi; Ing. heikko ‘weak’ in Soikkola, Est. (h)eik ~ eiko ‘weak; fussy, mercurial’ in the Northeastern Coastal dialects. The limited distributions refer to a loan origin from Finnish, where the word heikko is widespread and has phonological variants as well as verbal derivations (heiko, heikeä ‘weak’; heiketä, heikentyä ‘to weaken’). The word-initial /h/ in Veps is an indication of a loan origin because historically it has disappeared in Veps and, additionally, at least eleven other words with the meaning ‘weak’ have been attested in Veps according to VK. The Estonian dialect words have in fact been borrowed from two different directions: Kuusalu, a parish located east of Tallinn, most likely received the word across the Gulf of Finland from either the coastal area of Kymenlaakso or the Karelian Isthmus (about the borrowing areas, see Björklöf 2012; 2017; 2018), while Vaivara on Estonia’s eastern border borrowed it from Ingrian Finnish. The Karelian rare heikko ‘weak, poor’ in two dialect areas out of three is also a Finnish loan according to SSA. In the southern dialects of Veps only the comparative heikembäńe ‘weaker’ is attested, which seems peculiar, but there actually are strange derivations in Veps without an attested stem, -Áne in fact being one of the derivational types. Lauerma (1993: 165), oddly enough, compares the word in Veps only with Ingrian but not with Estonian or even with Finnish. Ahlqvist (1856: 123), one of the first linguists studying Veps, considered the words in Finnish and Veps equivalents, which is not the case, because in Veps, there is no word-initial /h/ and words with /h/ in this position are always borrowings or at least are the result of later influence from other languages. Surprisingly, SSA also does not take borrowing into consideration and instead treats the words as cognates.
5) Fi. kiuru ‘Eurasian skylark, Alauda arvensis’
   > Vo., Ing. (A NEW ETYMOLOGY), EstN

   Li (M) ~ Kõypo Tum. ‘Eurasian skylark’, kiuru ‘id.’ J-Tsv Ku, 
   kiurukkõin JTsv. J dem. ‘id.’ (kiurukkein J-Tsv), kiuruútinta M ‘id’; 
   kiuruttan; kiuurtõma, kiurutta, kiuurtõma, kiurutegõ J-Tsv ‘to trill, 
   to warble’ (VK; VKJo; VKKu)

   Ing. kiuru Re Sa Ro ‘Eurasian skylark’ (IMS)

   EstN kiur Hlj VNg Lüg Jõh IisR Vai Iis Kod ~ kiuro Vai ‘Eurasian 
   skylark’; kiurama Hlj, tsiuruma IisR ‘to trill, to warble’ (VMS; 
   EMS)

   Fi. kiuru Juslenius 1745; mostly E dial.21 ‘Eurasian skylark’, kiur(u)inen, 
   kiuri SE dial. ‘Eurasian skylark’ (SSA); probably partially literary; 
   vernacular especially in KAR INK (SMS)

   Ka. kiuru ~ k’iuru widespread, kiurinkki Paatene ‘Eurasian skylark’; 
   kiuruta Paatene ‘to trill, to warble’ (KKS; SSA)

   Lu. kiur Sn ~ kiuroi B ~ k’iuru Lm ~ kiuruine B ‘Eurasian skylark’;
   kiuruta Sn ~ kiuruttada B ‘to sing like an E. skylark’ (LS; SSA)

   The name of the bird ‘Eurasian skylark’ in Vote, Ingrian, and Esto-
   nian is most likely a Finnish loan: Vo. kiuru ~ k’iuru ~ tšiuru ~ Kõypo 
   ‘Eurasian skylark’ (attested also in Eastern Vote), Ing. kiuru ‘id.’ (in 
   two dialect areas, Soikkola and Rosona22), EstN kiur ~ kiuro (NE, E 
   dial.) ‘id.’ < Fi. kiuru (Jusl 1745; mostly E dial.) ‘id.’, kiur(u)inen, kiuri 
   (SE dial.) ‘id.’. In Karelian, kiuru ~ k’iuru is widespread and in Lude, 
   kiur ~ kiuroi ~ k’iuru ~ kiuruine are also attested. In Finnish, this word 
   has been regarded either as onomatopoeic (SSA) or a potential Bal-
   tic loanword (Kalima 1936; SKES; SSA). In studies on Finnish bird 
   names, Marttila (2010: 196) follows SSA and classifies the word as on-
  omatopoeic or a loan, but Salminen (2010: 352) categorises the Finnish 
   word as an onomatopoeic word. The most recent etymological study 
   (Junttila 2015: 102, 108) regards the possible Baltic etymology given

21. Also in the Finnish dialect of central and northern Ingria (Rääp Sku Kup) 
   (Mehmet Muslimov, p.c. 16 October 2015).
22. Rosonanjoki (Rosona River) dialect area according to J. Mägiste (1925): 
   Ingrian dialects spoken in so-called Estonian Ingria.
in SKES as controversial due to the way in which the etymology has been received by the research community. The derivation of the word is defined to be irregular and the word is categorised as part of a group of words listed as descriptive, contaminations, or onomatopoeic (ibid.).

The words could be cognates in all of the eastern Finnic varieties (Eastern Finnish dialects, Ingrian, Karelian, Lude). However, the limited distribution in Ingrian suggests a Finnish loan origin. The sound change \( *k > tš \) in front of front vowels in itself is the most characteristic feature in Võte, but in the variant tšiuru in Võte it probably is only a Votism in a loanword, as Lauerma (1993: 167) has also suggested; in modern terms it has to be classified as a result of etymological nativisation (see A. Aikio 2007). Suhonen (1986: 152) gives the words in Võte as an example of loans with either Ingrian or Ingrian Finnish origin. Kettunen (1930: 17 [1915: 16]) considered the path of borrowing to be Vo. kiuru < Fi.\(^{23}\) and SSA similarly lists it as Vo. tšiuru < Fi. However, the latter is the only borrowing of this word between the Finnic varieties given by SSA. The word in Võte was also mentioned by Setälä (1964) as a cognate of the Finnish word. Mägiste (1927) considered the word to be a loan from Võte into Estonian, and the variant siuru (< Vo. tšiuru) in old folk songs in fact might be one, as Saareste (1952: 62) also writes. Laakso regards Vo. kiuru (in Ku Ma, Setälä’s materials, and Kettunen 1915) as a loan from either Finnish, Ingrian, or Estonian in the Reverse Vocabulary of Võte (Laakso ed. 1989). In the reverse vocabulary of the Vocabulary of the Joenperä (Jõgõperä) dialect of Võte (VKJo, Laakso ed. 1995), the nouns Vo. kiuru, kiurukkein in the Jõgõperä dialect are considered loans from Ingrian and the verbs Vo. kiurutta, kiuruteä in Jõgõperä are regarded as having been borrowed from either Ingrian, Finnish, or Estonian, although there are no such Ingrian or Finnish verbs in the dictionaries. In Võte, Estonian, and also Lude, verbs used to describe the singing of this bird have even been attested in a couple of areas in each variety: Lu. kiuruta, kiuruttada ‘to sing like an E. skylark’; Vo. kiuruttaa; kiurutõlla (freq.) (JTsv. J) ‘to trill, to warble’; Est. kiurama (Hlj), tsiuruma (IisR) ‘to trill, to warble’.

\(^{23}\) In fact, Kettunen (1930: 17 [1915: 16]) writes: “Words like these [with \( k \) before a front vowel] are borrowings from other Finnish dialects of Ingria - -” (my translation and italicisation): in the context of the time of writing in question (and considering the pronoun other), this might be interpreted to mean other Finnic languages or varieties of the area. In SSA it simply has been interpreted to mean dialects of Finnish.
The phonetic form of the latter Estonian variant in Iisaku, located west of the easternmost Estonian parish Vaivara, might have some influence from Võte. Ariste (1956: 15), on the other hand, has treated the Estonian Northeastern Coastal kiur and the Finnish kiuru as cognates and Mäger (1967: 128) has considered the Estonian word an onomatopoeic word.

6) **Fi. raju ‘wild; severe, hard’; in compounds meaning ‘storm’**

> **Vo., Ing., EstN (A totally new etymology)**


Ing. **raju adj. ‘fierce’** Me usually raju ilma ‘bad weather’ Sa. Also **roju n.: roju Ro ‘storm’; roju|ilma L-suу ‘rainy, windy, and stormy weather’; rojugas adj. L-Suu ‘r-y, w-y, and s-y (about weather)’; Sa ‘quarrelling’; rojustaa v. Sa ‘on a bad, r-y and s-y autumn; to quarrel’; rojuz n. Sa ‘r-y, w-y, and wet autumn; bad-mannered’. (IMS)

EstN **raju ~ rajo Lüg Jõh IisR Vai Khk VJg Trm Kod Ėks Lai ‘storm’**.

Also **roju ‘storm’ VNg Lüg. (VMS)**

Fi. **raju Hemminoki 1605; widespread ‘wild; severe, hard; (also areally dial.) large, enormous’, comp. raju|ilma Finno 1583, raju|myrsky (SSA)**

Ka. **raju adj. ‘on wind, rain: hard, heavy; on animals: fierce’ (KKS; SSA)**

The word for ‘storm’ is attested in all three analysed varieties: EstN **raju ~ rajo ‘storm’ in northeastern and eastern parishes; Vo. raju ‘id.’ in one village, compounds raju|ragõ ‘hailing, hailstorm’, raju|vihma ‘rainstorm’ both in one village; Ing. raju (adjective according to IMS) ‘fierce’, usually raju ilma ‘bad weather’ in two villages. In Finnish, the word is widespread: Fi. **raju ‘wild; severe, hard; (also areally dial.) large, enormous’**, and it is attested also in compounds raju|ilma, raju|myrsky. In Võte, Ingrian, and Estonian, **raju** has to be considered a Finnish loan because of its wide distribution in Finnish and limited distribution in the recipient varieties – and also due to its semantics: in Finnish, this word has more meanings, in the recipient varieties it only refers to a storm (in Ingrian, it is used only as an adjective). The Estonian attestation in the westernmost parish of Kihelkonna on the island of Saaremaa is most likely also a Finnish loanword, because this is another contact area with Finnish. In SKES, the Finnish, Karelian (in two
dialect areas out of three), and Estonian words are considered to be equivalents, which I doubt, because an old word in North Estonian also would be found in South Estonian. SSA does not give the variants in Võõn and does not take any borrowing into account, either, but considers the Finnish, Ingrian, Karelian, and Estonian variants cognates. EES simply considers the stem to be a Finnic stem, while the distributions are not taken into account at all. A word with /o/ in the initial syllable and a couple of derivatives of it are known as well, attested only in Võõn in the Vaipooli area, in Lower Luga and Soikkola Ingrian, and in Estonian in two northeastern parishes: Võõn roju ‘storm; stormy’, rojukaz ‘stormy’; Ing. rojuilma ‘rainy, windy, and stormy weather; storm’, rojugas adj. ‘rainy, windy, and stormy (about weather)’, rojustaa v. ‘on a bad, rainy and stormy autumn’, rojuz n. ‘rainy, windy, and wet autumn’; EstN roju ‘storm’. These could be considered phonological variants. Toikka (2003: 83) simply writes that the word roju is a shared word in Võõn, Ingrian, and the Estonian Northeastern Coastal dialects.

7) Fi. höyry ‘steam’
> Vo., Ing. (A NEW ETYMOLOGY), EstN

Vo. höürü Lu J-Must. J-Tsv, g. höürüü J ‘steam’, höürü Ku ‘steam; air’; höürüüssä: höürüssä Lu höürüss J-Tsv ‘to steam’, höürüssä Ku ‘to steam’, höürüä J-Tsv ‘to steam; to stagger, to totter (with fatigue)’, höürütellä: höürütell J-Tsv ‘to steam sth’ (VK; VKJo; VKKu)

Ing. höürü ‘fog’ Me ‘steam’ Sa; höürüssä Me L-suu ‘to steam’, höürütäätä Me ‘to steam’, höürütellä freq. Me ‘to steam sth’ (IMS)

EstN öür ~ öürü ~ öür VNg Lüg Jõh Vai ‘steam’, öür Lüg, aur widespread; öürüne ‘steamy’ VNg Vai; öürämä ‘to steam’ Lüg Vai, öüritamma ~ öüritämä ‘to steam sth’ VNg Lüg (VMS)

Fi. höyry Juslenius 1745; widespread, except for SW dial. and LUus ‘Dampf, Dunst’ (SSA); höyry widespread24; höyrytä ~ höyrätä no data from INK ‘to steam’, höyryttää ~ höyryyttää sporadic ‘to steam sth’ (SMS)

Ka. höyry ~ höyry ‘steam, vapour, fog; dispute’ (KKS; SSA)

Lu. höür (B) Td ~ höürü B N Ph Lm ‘water vapour, steam (e.g., coming from a machine, breath in cold weather)’ (LS; SSA)

Ve. höüur ‘steam’ (SSA); not in VVS or SVJa

24. Also in the Finnish dialect of central and northern Ingria (Mehmet Muslimov, p.c. 16 October 2015).
The word for ‘steam’ is attested in all eastern Finnic varieties. Fi. höyry is widespread, except for in the Southwestern dialects and Länsi-Uusimaa, Ingrian höürü ‘fog; steam’ is known in two villages, while other attested variants include Karelian höyry ‘steam, vapour, fog’ (in all three dialect groups; ‘dispute’ in one group), Lude höür(ü) ‘water vapour, steam’, and Veps höür ‘steam’. This word has been borrowed into Vote as höürü ‘steam’ in two villages in the Vaipooli area and in Kukkuzi and into Estonian as öür ~ öüri ~ öur ‘steam’ in a couple of northeastern parishes. I agree with SSA, which considers these both to be Finnish borrowings. However, SSA gives EstNE forms öur (g. öüru), öüri, öürü, of which öüri is not known in VKS; none of these forms are known in Wiedemann (1893 [1869]), which usually is the source of Estonian dialect words for SSA. In VKJo, the noun Vo. höürü in the Jõgõperä dialect is considered a loan from either Ingrian or Finnish. As the form generally used in Estonian is aur, the Estonian variant öur in Lüganuse parish might be a contaminated form in a dialect area (Alutaguse) where the midvowel /õ/ is especially productive and usually replaces the vowel /o/. In Finnish, the verb höyrytä ‘to steam’ is widespread, höyryttää ‘to steam sth’ is sporadic. In Vote, a couple of verbal derivations are known in the same villages as the noun: Vo. höürüssä, höürüss, höürüssä, höürüä ‘to steam’, höürütell ‘to steam sth’. In Estonian, adjective öürüne ‘steamy’ and verbal derivations öürämä ‘to steam’, öüritamma ~ öüritämä ‘to steam sth’ are known in a couple of the same northeastern parishes where the noun is known. In Ingrian, the distribution of a couple of verbal derivations is even more limited, one village in Lower Luga and one village in Soikkola: Ing. höürüdellä (causative, frequentative) ‘to steam sth’, höürüssä, höürüttää ‘to steam’. The Ingrian word can be considered a loan because of its limited distribution.

7.2.3. Are there Ingrian loanwords in both Vote and Estonian?

When it comes to possible Ingrian loans in Vote and Estonian, the donor variety is difficult to define as these words are often found in Finnish as well and also due to the phonological similarities between Ingrian and Finnish. Words borrowed into both Vote and Estonian are usually known in both Ingrian and Finnish, and therefore it is typically
impossible to tell which variety was the source of the loan. In fact, both varieties are in a position to have mediated loans in such cases. In principle, almost every Finnish loan in Vote (which is also found in Ingrian) may have been mediated via Ingrian. The Ingrian influence on Vote has been strongest in the mixed population villages in Vaipooli (e.g., Lauerma 1993: 50), where Ingrian can be considered the primary donor variety. Vote has borrowed plenty of words from Ingrian, but as of now, I have not found loans in both Vote and Estonian which I could say with certainty were borrowed from Ingrian.

7.2.4. Are there Vote loanwords in both Ingrian and Estonian?

Although there are some loans from Vote known in Ingrian and possibly in Estonian as well, loans from Vote found in both Ingrian and Estonian are exceedingly scarce. For comparison, Arvo Laanest (1988) has studied 490 Vote words from the materials found in the Finnic atlas ALFE, which was being compiled at the time. The main group consists of Vote-Ingrian-Finnish words. The remainder is composed of two equally-sized groups. Laanest divides the words of these groups into those found in 1) Vote and Finnish (and usually Ingrian as well) but not in Estonian and into those found in 2) Vote and Estonian but not in Finnish. For example, in the Lower Luga area, Ingrian has a Vote substrate and the local Finnish dialect has both a Vote and Ingrian substrate (Savijärvi 1998: 274; 2001: 165; Muslimov 2005; Rozhanskiy & Markus 2014). According to Kuznetsova et al. (2015: 133), all the Finnish varieties of western Ingria, except the dialects in Kaprio and Tyrö, have substrate vocabulary from Vote.

Although there is borrowing between Ingrian and Vote, the lack of loanwords from Ingrian and Vote into each other and into Estonian might refer to the lower prestige of these two varieties compared to Estonian. In fact, words with an attestation only in Vote and Estonian might be worth examining more closely, because of the old assumption that these two varieties have had even closer contacts in the past.
8) Vo. *ilata* ‘to clean up’

> Ing. (A NEW ETYMOLOGY), EstN, Fi. (A NEW ETYMOLOGY)


*ilat* J-Tsv ~ *ilata*G I ‘to clean up, to put away, to cleanse, to arrange; to take care of (animals)’, *izama, izat* J-Tsv ~ ‘to clean up’, *izatA* Ku ‘to clean up, to cleanse, to clear away’ (VK; VKJo; VKKu)

Ing. *ilaDa* Sa L-Suu Ro ~ ‘to clean up (slightly), to repair, to cleanse’ (IMS)

EstN *ilama* Jõh Vai ~ *ilamaie* Lüg ‘to clean up; to take away’ (VMS; EMS)

Fi. *ilata* ‘to clean up, to cleanse’ Kall (SMS)

So far, I have managed to find only one probable borrowing from Vote into both Ingrian and Estonian: Ing. *ilaDa* ‘to clean up (slightly), to repair, to cleanse’ in two villages and Rosona, EstN *ilama* ~ *ilamaie* ‘to clean up; to take away’ in a couple of northeastern parishes. In Vote, the same verb is widespread and attested also in Eastern Vote: Vo. *ilata ~ ilata*G ‘to clean up, to put away, to cleanse, to arrange; to take care of (animals)’ and VK also gives many examples of its use. Söderman\(^{25}\) (1996: 39, 157) treats the Estonian word as a loan from either Ingrian or Vote (or as derived from the Estonian word *ilu* ‘beauty’), but an Ingrian origin is not very plausible when comparing the distributions. A particular origin for a loanword is more likely when its distribution is like that of other borrowings. Thus, we see there are many borrowings in the same direction with a similar distribution in Estonian. In Finnish, the verb *ilata* ‘to clean up, to cleanse’ is attested only in Kallivere, where it is an apparent loanword. The word could also be a substrate word in at least Ingrian and Estonian.

---

\(^{25}\) Söderman also gives a distribution in VNg, but the word attested there is simply a homonym with the meaning ‘Est. ilastama; to make slimy’.
8. Discussion

Areal distribution is a crucial factor for the etymological research of borrowings between closely related varieties (see also Björklöf 2018). When there are few sound criteria, the importance of distribution is emphasised. There can be other problems as well: There is a somewhat limited amount of lexical material on the small Finnic variety Ingrian (and Vote), although when compared with available Livonian materials, for example, the data from Vote are substantial (on Ingrian, see, e.g., Grünthal forthcoming: p. 23 in the manuscript). Despite the size of the collection on Finnish dialects in the Archive of the Dictionary of Finnish dialects (SMSA) being impressive even on a worldwide level, the materials on Ingrian Finnish dialects are inadequate, as mentioned earlier. In western Ingria, lexical material from Ingrian Finnish dialects has been collected almost exclusively from Kallivere. This material is worth closer scrutiny, because it contains many loanwords from other Finnic varieties of that area. Collecting newer text materials has also revealed interesting facts: according to Savijärvi (1996b: 187; 1998: 276), the Finnish dialects of the Narvusi region in western Ingria seem to have a considerable amount of lexical items from Ingrian, Vote, and Estonian, and words with these forms and meanings are apparently not found in standard Finnish or the other Finnish dialects (of Ingria). It must be noted that already Merle Leppik – in her thorough survey on the development of the phonological system of the Ingrian Finnish Kurkola dialect – wrote that Vote and Ingrian played a considerable role in the development of the Finnish dialects in Kurkola and the Lower Luga area (Leppik 1975: 197). A portion of the lexical items from Ingrian and Vote in the western Ingrian Finnish dialects can probably be considered a substratum, because a portion of the Ingrian and Vote speakers there were converted to Lutheranism and were therefore Fennicised in the 17th century (Krjukov 1993 [1987]: 22, 23; Savijärvi 1998: 274; 2001: 165).

Overall, when investigating Finnic varieties in this particular area, careful attention must be paid to the extent and location of the distribution. We cannot take a distribution in only one or two parishes and assume the word in question derives from the protolanguage (surprisingly, this has sometimes been done when preparing the SSA, for
example, with Ing. *ennustā* ‘to predict’ which is attested in Ingrian only in the Rosona area according to IMS). One might, of course, assume that the word has not been registered anywhere else although it “in fact” has been known more widely, but such an approach is non-scientific and should be avoided.

Examine mutual borrowing in western Ingria and northeastern Estonia shows that the hallmark of Estonian loanwords in Võte and Ingrian is usually their relatively limited distribution. As for the Estonian distributions in the present study, it seems that a limited distribution in the Northeastern Coastal and Eastern dialects usually indicates that the word is borrowed from the other Finnic varieties spoken in western Ingria. Whereas, Estonian loanwords in the other Finnic varieties in western Ingria usually have a more widespread distribution in Estonian and may also be attested in South Estonian. Lembit Vaba (2014) discusses distribution as an etymological criterion using the example of Estonian, the donor languages being genetically distant languages. As his earlier research (Vaba 1977; 1997; 2015) and the work of Mari Must (2000) have shown, loanwords borrowed from the same donor language usually have a specific, limited distribution in Estonian dialects. There are also loanwords with small, punctual distributions that appear almost scattered around. The studies of Söderman (1996) and Björklöf (2012; 2018) show the same distributional correlation in the Finnish loans in Estonian.

Finnish, the Finnic variety with the highest prestige in Ingria, has been the donor variety for a large number of borrowings: most of the loanwords in Võte, Ingrian, and Estonian are borrowed from Finnish. Loans found in both Võte and Estonian often occur not only in Ingrian but also in Finnish. Due to the phonetic similarity of these varieties, it is usually impossible to determine the donor variety. Võte loans in Ingrian and Estonian only occur sporadically and these may also result in part from a substratum.

However, at this point there exists practically no literature on the methodology for investigating mutual contacts among closely related varieties. Riionheimo (2013) discusses the use of comparison between languages (Fi. *kielenvälinen vertailu*) for studying languages in contact, but she is comparing languages, which are used in profoundly different ways in education, legislation, and in relation to national
identity. On the contrary, areal varieties are more typical in the traditional Finnic linguistic area. When it comes to the Finnic varieties in the Lower Luga area, we can even speak of mixed varieties.

Jouko Lindstedt (2000: 242) has proposed that linguistic areas, for example the Balkans but also many others, have shown that convergence may be more than borrowing, because donor and recipient languages cannot always be clearly distinguished and there is mutual reinforcement of change. This might be the case with language areas formed by genetically related and typologically close varieties as well. In the Balkans there is morphological convergence but hardly any lexical borrowing because the languages are used as an important means of (self-)identification and they are symbols of group identity (Lindstedt 2000: 239). Therefore, this sociolinguistic situation is quite the opposite of that found in western Ingria. At the same time, this counterexample sheds light on the impact of identity issues on language change: the identity of the speech community affects the borrowing processes enormously – either on a conscious or a subconscious level.

The Finnic varieties are a continuum spoken across a relatively broad area, in which Ingria forms the core area and the meeting point of closely related varieties. The internal integration of the Finnic language area has been difficult to describe, and in their traditional speaking areas, the varieties of the present-day national languages Finnish and Estonian have considerably levelled off. In my opinion, the most fruitful way of investigating the varieties of western Ingria is to treat them simultaneously and with a comparative approach. This is because the language varieties of this region have never existed in a monolingual environment.
Abbreviations

**General:** adj. = adjective, comp. = compound, dem. = diminutive, dial. = dialectal/dialects, freq. = frequentative, g. = genitive, n. = noun, pr. = present tense, v. = verb.

**Other languages:** Ger. = German, Rus. = Russian, Swe. = Swedish.


**Dialects of Vote:** *Western Vote:* 1) Lower Luga (Vaipooli) Vote: J = Jõgõperä, Li = Liivtšülä, Lu = Luuditsa, Ra = Rajo; 2) Central (Kattila) Vote: Ja = Jarvikoistšülä, K = Kattila, Ke = Kerstova, Ki = Kikeritsa, Kõ = Kõrvõttula, L = Lempola, M = Mati, Mu = Muukkova, P = Pum-mala, Pi = Pihlaala, Po = Pontizõõ, R = Rudja, S = Savvokkala, U = Undova, V = Velikkä. *Eastern Vote:* I = Itšäpäivä, Li = livanaisi, K1 = Kliimettina, Ko = Kozlova, Ma = Mahu. Ku = Kukkuizi (dialect area); Kr = Krevin (dialect area).

**Dialects of Ingrian:** Ala-L = *Lower Luga* dialect area: Soi = Soikkola parish / villages: Har = Harkkola, Kol = Kolkanpää, Lo = Loka, Me = Metsäkylä, Ou = Ouussimäki, Re = Repola, Ru = Ruutsia, Sa = Saarove, Sä = Sääthinä, Tam = Tammikontu, Tar = Tarinaisi, Uus = Uusikylä, Vi = Viistina, Vää = Väärinoja (a Lutheran village); Kosemkina (= Nar = Narvusi) parish / villages: Kur = Kurkola, L-su = Laukaansuu, Vibjä (Vipiä). Hev = Hevaa dialect area: Kap = Kaprio parish / villages: Mur = Murtöve, Ve = Vepsä. Ro = Rosonanjoki (Rosona River) dialect area according to J. Mägiste; Ylä-L = Oredež dialect area.


**Dialects of South Estonian** appearing in this study: *Tartu dialect:* TMr = Tartu-Maarja, KodT = Kodavere (Tartu).

**Dialects of Finnish** appearing in this study: *Kymi dialects:* Suu = Suursaari. *Southeastern dialects:* South Karelian dialects of Finnish proper (Western): Tyt = Tytärsaari, Lava = Lavansaari, Seis = Seiskari.

Dialects of Lude appearing in this study: B = Bošinkylä, Lm = Lidžmi, N = Nuomoil, Ph = Pyhäjärvi, Sn = Sununsuu, Td = Tiudia.


In sources of data and references: EKI = Eesti Keele Instituut [Institute of the Estonian Language]; KGTK = Kotimaisten kielen tutkimuskeskus [Institute for the Languages of Finland]; KGTKJ = Kotimaisten kielen tutkimuskeskuksen julkaisuja [Publications of the Institute for the Languages of Finland]; LSFU = Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae; MSFOu = Memoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne; p.c. = personal communication; SKS = Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura [Finnish Literature Society]; SKST = Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran toimituksia [Publications of the Finnish Literature Society]; SUS = Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura [Finno-Ugrian Society].

26. The Ingrian Finnish dialects are divided according to Muslimov (2009), followed by Kuznetsova et al. (2015: 132–133).
27. The parishes in [square brackets] are parishes where Finnish was not the main Finnic language.
Sources of data


LW = Kettunen, Lauri 1938: Livisches Wörterbuch. LSFU V. Helsinki: SUS.
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Itämerensuomen varieteettien keskinäiset kontaktit ja sanastolliset suhteet Länsi-Inkerissä ja Koillis-Virossa

Sofia Björklöf

Länsi-Inkerin ja Koillis-Viron historiallinen kielikontaktitilanne heijastuu alueen kielen sanastossa eri tavoin. Lähemmin tarkasteltavat kielimuodot ovat viron koillisrannikkomurteet, viron itämurteet, inkeroismurteet sekä Inkerin suomalaismurteet. Kaikki nämä kielimuodot ovat geneettisesti läheisiä itämerensuomalaisia varieteetteja.


Uusien asukkaiden saapuminen poliittisesti hallitsevilta alueilta muutti Inkerin väestörakennetta, lisäsi kielellistä diversiteettiä, muutti kielen välistä hierarkiaa ja johti asteittain Inkerin kanta-asukkaiden kielen ja identiteetin vaihtoon. Sekä vatjan että inkeroisen puhujat olivat monikielisiä ja joissain kylissä oli seka-asutusta. Yleisesti ottaen varieteettien väliset rajat vanhoissa maalaisyhteisöissä ovat olleet hyvin häilyviä: vatjan ja inkeroisen puhujat ovat toistuvasti ilmaisseet mielipiteenään, että heidän murteensa ovat saman kielen murteita.

Tässä artikkelissa kuvaan yhtäältä Inkerinmaan historiallista sosiolingvististä tilannetta, toisaalta Inkerin historiallista kielikontaktitilannetta. Artikkelin sanasto-osuus pohjautuu vanhoihin murremateriaaleihin, jotka on julkaistu sanakirjoissa, sekä viron osalta edelleen osin julkaisemattomaan, arkistossa säilytetään materiaaliin. Sanat, joita analysoin etymologisesti, esiintyvät vatjassa, inkeroisessa ja

Läänemeresoome keelte omavahelised kontaktid ja sõnavara seosed Lääne-Ingeris ja Kirde-Eestis

Sofia Björklöf

Lääne-Ingerimaan ja Kirde-Eestis ajaloolised kõnelekontaktid peegelduvad selle geograafilise ala keelte sõnavaras erinevatel viisidel. Käesolevas artiklis vaadeldakse lähemalt eesti kirderannikutumurdeid, eesti idamurdeid, vadja keele murdeid, isuri keele murdeid ning Ingerimaan soome keele murdeid. Mainitud kõnelejutud on ajalooliselt lähedased läänemeresoome sugulaskeeled.


Peamiseks hüpoteesiks on, et on võimalik leida omavaheliste kontaktide tulemusena levinud laensõnu, kuigi lähedaste sugulaskeelte puhul laenamise suunda on tihtipeale raske tõestada. Laensõnad täpsustavad pilti lähedaste sugulaskeelte vahelist kontaktidest, mille arengut ei saa üksnes traditsionaalse binaarse sugupuuga kirjeldada. Näiteid tuuakse vadja, isuri, eesti ja soome murrete omavahelise sõnade laenamise kohta (eesti keelest on laenatud sõnad *trehvama*, *pöll*, *hulkuma*, soome keelest *heikko 'nõrk*', *kiuru 'lõoke*', *raju 'metsik; äge'*, mis esi-neb ka liitsõnades *rajuilma*, *rajumyrsky 'torm*', *höyry 'aur' ning vadja keelest on laenatud *ilata 'koristama'*) Nende näidete abil kaalutakse ka metoodiliselt lähedaste sugulaskeelte vahelist laenamisprotsessi. Artiklis avaldatud etümoloogiatest osad on uued. Eesti laenud vadja ja isuri keeles on tavaliselt tuvastatajad oma kitsama levila alusel. Seevastu suurem osa laenatud sõnavarast, mis on ühine vadja, isuri ja eesti keelele, on pärast soome keelest. Nii vadja kui ka eesti keele esinevaid laene tuntakse tavaliselt peale isuri ka soome keelest. Kuna kahe viimase häälikuline ülesehitus on sarnane, on kindlat laenuandjakeelt tihtipeale võimatu määratleda. Vadja keelest isuri ja eesti keelede on saadud ainult üksikuid laene, mille puhul võib olla tegemist ka substraadiga.