



BRILL



Search within Publication...



Circum-Baltic Convergence Area

in [Encyclopedia of Slavic Languages and Linguistics Online](#)

Author: [Ilja Seržant](#)

(11,007 words)

In 2001, a seminal publication by Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Bernhard Wälchli considerably advanced the research on the Circum-Baltic (CB) area; its claims and methodological suggestions still hold. This entry summarizes their and newer findings and addresses conceptual, as well as methodological, issues.

The “Circum-Baltic area” (a term introduced by Dahl and Koptjevskaja-Tamm in 1992), is an established linguistic area with some subareas. It has been extensively discussed in the literature (cf., among others, Mathiassen 1985; Stolz 1991; Nau 1996; Dahl and Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2001a; 2001b; Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli 2001). It comprises the following [Indo-European](#) subfamilies: [East Slavic](#) ([Russian](#), northwestern Russian dialects, [Belarusian](#), the west Russian variant of [Church Slavic](#)); [West Slavic](#) ([Polish](#), “[Borderland](#)” [Polish](#) [[Po polszczyzna kresowa](#)]); [Baltic](#) ([Lithuanian](#), [Latvian](#), [Latgalian](#)); west [Germanic](#) ([Low German](#), [High German](#), [Yiddish](#)); north Germanic ([Swedish](#), [Danish](#)); and marginally both [Romance](#) ([Latin](#)) and Indo-Aryan ([Romani](#)). It includes most languages of the Finnic ([Livonian](#), [Estonian](#), [Finnish](#), [Veps](#), [Karelian](#), [Votic](#), etc.) and the Saami subfamilies of the Uralic family, and, finally, [Karaim](#), which belongs to the Kipchak (northwestern) subfamily of the [Turkic](#) family. This area is, thus, largely dominated by Indo-European. Historically, speakers of Indo-European languages immigrated into this region much later than speakers of [Uralic](#) languages.

[Roman Jakobson](#) (1931) was probably the first to investigate the areal impact on the distribution of prosodic phenomena, in particular lexical pitch. Lexical pitch continued to play a prominent role in a number of subsequent studies on the area (Haarmann 1976; Lehiste 1978; 1983; 1988; Mathiassen 1985; Stolz 1991; Wiik 1995; 1997; cf. the overview in Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli 2001: 622–623).

Different authors emphasized different hotbeds within the CB area: (i) the Latvian-Estonian zone (Déscopy 1973; Haarmann 1976; Stolz 1991); (ii) the Wikinger *Sprachbund*, including Scandinavian languages, Saami, and northern Finnic (Déscopy 1973); (iii) the Karelian *Sprachbund* (Sarhima 1992); and (iv) the [Polish-Lithuanian-Belarusian-Ukrainian](#) contact area (Déscopy 1973; Wiemer 2003; 2004; Wiemer et al. 2014).

Moreover, larger combinations have also been suggested, for example, an eastern Baltic *Sprachbund*, i.e., a combination of (i), (iii), and partly (iv), by Mathiasen (1985) and Seržant (2015a; 2015b). Indeed, in contrast to the languages of the eastern coast of the Baltic Sea, western CB languages behave very much like Standard Average European languages (Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli 2001: 732; cf. Haspelmath 2001 on Standard Average European). Still, one can postulate a number of isoglosses for the entire area given they are not expected to exactly match, e.g., the emergence of spatial expressions morphologically realized as fusional postfixes, if viewed as partially due to contact influences across the entire area, despite their variation in the degree of productivity and fusion (see below). Another example is lexical [borrowings](#) from Low and High [German](#). These are present in all languages of the area, albeit not featuring the same sets of lexical items cross-linguistically.

Historical background

Nothing is known about the languages of the peoples that settled in the region prior to the arrival of the major present-day linguistic groups of the area. The Saami constitute the first immigration wave, followed by the closely related Finnic population. Then came the Balts, followed by the Slavs. The western part of the area, Scandinavia, was gradually settled by north Germanic tribes arriving there from Denmark. The west of the CB area (Scandinavia) and the east (Finland, the Baltic states, Belarus, Poland, and the west and northwest of Russia) existed fully independently from each other for a long period time, approximately up until the historical period. At the same time, large parts of both territories were subject to longitudinal Finnic and Saami substrate effects.

North Germanic tribes entered the eastern coast of the Baltic sea – including the territory of northern Poland and the Baltic states – sometime during the so-called Viking age (800–1000 CE). Thus, words like *simkala* (*Zemgale*, the central region of Latvia), *uitau* (the Latvian city *Vents-pils*, Ge *Windau*), *l[i]flant* ‘Livonia’ (cf. Ge *Livland*), and *uirland* (< *Vir-land* < Es *Viru-maa*) are found in a number of runic inscriptions in Scandinavia (Eliasson 2017: 2049). This is also the time of more far-reaching contacts. The expansion of Christianity in the area had started by the end of this period and reached its peak at different times in different parts. For example, the initial success of Orthodox missionaries (possibly from Novgorod) in the eastern part of the area was later undone by the Crusaders, primarily the German Teutonic and Livonian Orders. Nevertheless, a number of Old Russian terms survive to this day in Lithuanian, Estonian, and Latvian; cf. Lt *baznīca* and Li *bažnyčia* from [East Slavic](#), OESl *božьnica/bozьnica* ‘church’ (Sreznevskij, vol. I, 1893: 143; Seržant 2006).

After a short period of Denmark’s dominance in the Baltic Sea, Middle Low German and subsequently High German – especially during and after the Reformation – became the dominant language of the area. This was due to the enormous economic success of the Hanseatic League, as well as the military success of the Livonian (Teutonic) Order in Livonia, which largely covered present-day Estonia (including the Tallinn region, and the formerly Danish islands Saaremaa and Läänemaa), and Latvia.

The language of merchants was not only Low German but also various subdialects of High German, as evidenced by contracts and documents from the area. These were often composed in the scribe’s subdialect. Combinations of Low and High German dialects co-occurring in the same document were not uncommon. Gradually, Low German was entirely replaced by High German dialects.

German lexical borrowings are found in all languages of the area with no exception, in Scandinavian perhaps even more than elsewhere (Winge 2017). Moreover, German continued to be a superregional language even after the demise of the German orders in the 16th century, when Sweden became the dominant power in the Baltic region, while Poland controlled the East Slavic, Latgalian, and Lithuanian territories of the former [Grand Duchy of Lithuania](#).

Since the Nordic War (1700–1721), Russian gradually rose to dominance in the eastern part of the area (achieving its peak in the 19th c.) until the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991.

To summarize, the CB area has never been politically unified under any one dominant language. Instead, different languages of the region, including Danish, Swedish, Old West Russian (the [Old West Russian chancery language](#) of the [Grand Duchy of Lithuania](#), although highly dominated by [Old Church Slavic](#), may nevertheless be considered a local variant; cf. Stang 1935), and Russian, dominated a particular part of the area (Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli 2001: 728). The only lingua franca to have reached all parts of the CB area was probably German (during the prosperity of the Hanseatic League; also, to a minor extent, [Medieval Latin](#)).

Selected phenomena

Linguistic contact situations typically involve two languages at a time, while larger, areal effects are due to the multiplication of bilateral contact situations, e.g., two phenomena of the area: vowel harmony and spatial cases, spread through contact situations, gave rise to larger areal correlations. The most uncontroversial isoglosses of the area are listed at the end of this section.

Vowel harmony

Finnic languages typically have vowel harmony. The only exceptions are Livonian and Estonian, but not the south Estonian Võru dialect (Stolz 1991: 38–39; Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli 2001: 628) as well the Finnish dialect of Gällivare in northern Sweden (Wande 1982: 52). The stressed vowel conditions the vowel quality of the other syllables. Western Russian and Belarusian dialects also attest sound changes conditioned by harmony with the vowel quality of the stressed syllable. Thus, in a subtype of *jakan'e* (change of the unstressed ['e]), the unstressed *-e-* is realized as [a], [i], or [e], depending on the quality of the vowel in the stressed syllable. For example, in Pskov dialects /s'estrá/ > s'astrá 'sister' as opposed to the lack of the change in v'el'ík'im 'great.INS.SG' which remains as in Standard Russian due to a front vowel being present in the stressed syllable of the latter but absent in the former (Careva 1962: 61–63; Seržant 2010: 199).

The [Baltic](#) languages, in parallel to the East Slavic dialects, also underwent several sound changes based on vowel harmony. Proto-Latvian underwent one harmonic vowel change, predating the split of Proto-Latvian into later dialects, and later Proto-Latgalian (the pre-stage of east Latvian), underwent yet another set of three harmony-conditioned changes, e.g., PLt *e...a/u* > *ε...a/u* > Ltg *a...a/u*, but PLt *e...i/e* > Ltg (*i*)*e...i/e*; also PLt *i...a/u* > Ltg *y...a/u*, but no change in the environment of a stressed front vowel, i.e., PLt *i...e/i* remains unchanged in Latgalian (Seržant 2005). Moreover, southeast Lithuanian dialects underwent similar changes on a harmonic basis: Common Li *medūs* > southeast Li *madūs* 'honey' (cf. Ltg *mads* < PLt *medus* 'honey'), but southeast Li *mergiot'a* 'girl' (~ Li *mergiotė*).

Except for Latvian and Latgalian, the stressed syllable determines vowel harmony in Finnic, west Russian, and Lithuanian. However, since the harmonic changes of Proto-Latgalian and Proto-Latvian are demonstrably old phenomena (Seržant 2005), they are likely to have predated the loss of the original, mobile-stress patterns in Proto-Latgalian. It is thus likely that the harmony-driven changes of Proto-Latgalian were, too, conditioned by the stressed vowel.

To summarize, vowel harmony must have played a role in all three branches at an early period: Finnic, East Slavic, and Baltic. Finnic must have influenced the latter two, which attest harmonic alternations only in very specific phonological environments somewhat disguised by later morphological leveling. In a second wave, several harmonic systems disappeared in the area of most intensive contacts with German, Russian, or Scandinavian. Estonian (but not south Estonian) and Livonian gave up vowel harmony entirely. Likewise, the Finnish dialect of Gällivare in northern Sweden has entirely lost vowel harmony (Wande 1982: 52). Similarly, Latgalian and East Slavic remodeled harmonic alternations by leveling, thus almost entirely removing previously harmonic patterns, leaving behind only traces thereof (Nau 2011: 15–16). For example, Ltg *cyts* 'other' has generalized *-y-* also in those cases in which it was originally absent, e.g., PLt *cit-i* > Ltg *cyt-i* 'other-NOM.PL' in analogy to Ltg *cyt-am* 'other-DAT.SG'.

Spatial relations

Another phenomenon to be considered is the expressions of **spatial** relations via highly fusional postpositions. The **case** system, particularly the spatial cases, may be considered subject to areal influence (Balode and Holvoet 2001: 44). Finnic languages, as is well known, have a set of spatial cases: e.g., ellative, inessive, illative, adessive, and allative, derived from more basic cases via case stacking. Baltic languages have, in a similar fashion, **grammaticalized** several new spatial cases, also via case stacking. The illative is derived from the accusative by adding the postposition **-na* (cf. OLi *dang-u-n* ‘into the sky’). The allative stems from the genitive with the postposition *-p(r)i* (cf. OLi *diev-o-p[i]* ‘to God’). The inessive is the locative with the postposition **-ēn* (cf. OLi *dangu-j-e* ‘in the sky’). The adessive derives from the locative with the postposition *-p(r)i* (cf. OLi *diev-ie-p[i]* ‘at God’) (Kazlauskas 1968: 153; Stang 1966: 228; Seržant 2004a; 2004b; 2004c).

Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli (2001: 672) argue that the assumption of Finnic areal impact on Baltic is problematic here for the following reasons. (i) New grammaticalized spatial cases also occur elsewhere in **Indo-European**, e.g., Umbrian, Tokharian, and Ossetic, and may, therefore, be historically accidental in Baltic. (ii) There is only a partial functional overlap between the spatial cases in Baltic and Finnic: e.g., **body-part** locations as targets of clothing are coded with *in*-cases in Finnic, but with the *on*-preposition in Lithuanian. Another example is the verb ‘to stay’, which requires the illative in Finnic but the inessive in Baltic. (iii) This functional “incompatibility of the Finnic and Baltic local case systems” was removed only in Latvian and Livonian. However, they are overly pessimistic.

First, with reference to (i), quite in parallel, the new spatial cases in other Indo-European languages indeed emerged due to a strong areal influence: Tokharian was heavily influenced by Turkic languages (Old Uighur), whereas Ossetic has certainly been heavily influenced by some Caucasian language, perhaps Georgian (Kartvelian) or Ingush (Nakh-Dagestanian), which have rich case systems. Thus, this comparison only reinforces the explanation that spatial cases in Baltic are essentially the result of language contact.

Second, with reference to (ii), it is true that Finnic languages have extended the original spatial meanings to cover more spatial, as well as some nonspatial, contexts. By contrast, the Baltic languages, primarily Old Lithuanian and dialectal Lithuanian, mostly attest only actual spatial meanings with these cases, that is, the adessive denotes the meaning of *at* a place, the inessive denotes the meaning *in* a place, etc. Moreover, the adessive case in Finnic acquired the meaning of *on* a place, a development that the Baltic adessive did not undergo. However, there are also common developments here. Thus, the allative case and the adessive case of Finnic may be used *pro dative*, e.g., to mark the recipient role. Old Lithuanian also attests nonspatial meanings of the spatial cases, albeit, indeed, very rarely. For example, the Old Lithuanian allative case may also mark the recipient, a meaning typically covered by the dative case in this language; e.g., in Chyliński’s Bible translation from 1659–1661 (cf. Range 1995; Žilinskaitė-Šinkūnienė 2016). Another example of a parallel development is the use of the illative with the verb ‘to stay’. Similarly to Finnic languages, some northern Lithuanian dialects – and Old Latvian – do allow the illative case to be used with stationary verbs including ‘to stay’, since both the inessive and the illative merged functionally (in northern Lithuanian dialects) and morphologically (in Latvian).

Crucially, contact-induced **grammaticalization** rarely proceeds to the same degree in the target language as it does in the donor language. Indeed, the functional differences between the Baltic and Finnic systems are due to different degrees of grammaticalization. In this respect, Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli (2001: 672) are right that this might have inhibited the transfer of other meanings from Finnic into Baltic. However, grammaticalization clines – in which the historical development maps onto the geographic diffusion – are the default outcome of contact-induced grammaticalization (Dahl 2001: 1468–1469). “[R]eplica categories are generally less grammaticalized than the corresponding model categories,” as has been emphasized by Heine (2012: 132; cf. Wiemer and Wälchli 2012: 37). In this sense, the different degrees of semantic extension are expected and do not represent counterevidence to the claim that the spatial cases of Proto-Baltic are due to a strong Finnic influence. These morphological correlations are unique in the larger European context (Basque or Turkish being geographically remote exceptions) and certainly outweigh the variation in functional extensions discussed above.

Moreover, it is important to mention the phenomenon of what one might, with due disclaimers, call “spatial cases” in Scandinavian. A somewhat larger set of input words than in the other Germanic languages, all denoting different kinds of locations, may host spatial postpositional clitics in Scandinavian. These, crucially, do not allow for any insertions – except for the obligatory marker *-i-* in Swedish / *-e-* in Norwegian – and are, thus, more like agglutinative, stacked inflectional-case forms morphologically; cf. Swedish *därunder-i-från* (lit. ‘there-under-in-from’) ‘from below’, *var-i-från* (lit. ‘where-in-from’) ‘from where’, *väst-i-från* (lit. ‘west-in-from’) ‘from the west’. The following table presents Norwegian Bokmål because it better illustrates that the ablative postposition was added onto the inessive form (case stacking):

Table 1: Norwegian illative, inessive, and elative “cases” with some spatial words

	basic / illative	inessive	elative
<i>hem</i>	<i>hjem-ø</i>	<i>hjemm-e</i>	<i>hjemm-e-fra</i>
‘home’	‘(to) home’	‘home’	‘from home’
<i>ned</i>	<i>ned-ø</i>	<i>ned-e</i>	<i>ned-e-fra</i>
‘down, below’	‘down’	‘below’	‘from below’
<i>nord, vest</i>	–	–	<i>nord-fra, vest-fra</i>
‘north’, ‘west’			‘from the north’, ‘from the west’
<i>der</i>	<i>der-ø</i>	arch. <i>der-i</i>	<i>der-(i)-fra</i>
‘there’	‘(to) there’	‘there’	‘from there’

Note: In Swedish, the “inessive” vowel is disguised by later sound changes; cf. *hemm-a* ‘home’ but *hemm-i-från* ‘from home’. Furthermore, note that “spatial cases” are also extant in Danish. Danish is certainly more remotely related to the area. However, it also has other features typical of the area, such as the suprasegmental glottal stop (*stød*).

Observe case stacking in the elative “case” – a morphological property that is found with spatial cases in all languages of the area (Russian resembles it with the combination of case and preposition).

What is more, both the adposition used for the elative (Swedish *från*, Norwegian *fra* ‘from’) and the one used for the inessive (Swedish *i* ‘in’) are prepositions in Scandinavian and cannot be used postpositionally anywhere else. The development (or, possibly, the retention from an earlier period) of postpositional enclitic variants goes thus against the rigid prepositional order of modern Scandinavian. In turn, the input restrictions may be explained by an early grammaticalization stage: expressions most frequently occurring in spatial contexts generally tend to develop a more efficient and concise system of encoding spatial orientation (cf. Creissel and Mounole 2011). It thus does not come as a surprise that there are spatial “cases” in Scandinavian with words denoting spatial relations only. Moreover, although structurally similar expressions exist in Icelandic with the older elative *-an*, it is only Scandinavian that has renewed this marker by creating a new postpositional clitic *-fra/-från*. Combinations reminiscent of these are also marginally attested in other languages, such as German. Here, the anaphoric and deictic *dar-* and *hin/her* may also host enclitic postpositions: *dar-in* (lit. ‘this-in’) ‘in this / here’ vs. *dar-aus* (lit. ‘this-from’) ‘from this / there’. However, crucially, these are considerably less productive in German than in Scandinavian in terms of type frequency since

they do not occur with nouns, but with the two particles *dar-* and *hin/her* and the question *wo(r)-* only. The functional continuity as well as higher type-frequency of such expressions in Scandinavian as opposed to other Germanic languages may be evidence for Saami and Finnish influence in the domain of spatial expressions of these languages.

Finally, incipiently, new spatial cases have partially emerged also in Russian – though in no other Slavic varieties – as has been illustrated by Breu (1994). While prepositions, such as *na* ‘on’ and *o* ‘about’ both take the old locative, i.e., the prepositional case in other [East Slavic languages](#), Russian has secondarily introduced a formal difference between the spatial meaning (‘on’) and the nonspatial one (‘about’) with certain nouns:

(1) Ru	<i>na</i>	<i>most-u</i>	vs.	* <i>na</i>	<i>most-e</i>
	on	bridge-LOC	vs.	*on	bridge-LOC
	‘on the bridge’ (Breu 1994: 51)				

(2) Ru	* <i>o</i>	<i>most-u</i>	vs.	<i>o</i>	<i>most-e</i>
	*about	bridge-LOC	vs.	about	bridge-LOC
	‘about the bridge’ (Breu 1994: 51)				

The singular ending *-u* is originally the allomorph of the old locative (prepositional) case of the *u*-declension alongside the more frequent ending *-e* (originally *-ě* belonging to the *o*- and *a*-declensions) and has always been fully synonymous to the latter. Breu (1994: 50–52) shows that, in Russian only, following the demise of the *u*-declension, the old locative ending *-u* was reinterpreted exclusively to mark spatial relations. In turn, the ending *-e* occurs with any kind of prepositions governing the locative case, including nonspatial prepositions, such as *o* ‘about’. By contrast, in the other East Slavic languages, namely [Ukrainian](#) and [Belarusian](#), as well as in West and South Slavic, this ending has either disappeared altogether (e.g., [Bulgarian](#)) or remained as an allomorph, albeit under varying conditions, for example, in [Polish](#) and [Sorbian](#) (Breu 1994: 50). The creation of a purely spatial (locative) case ending in *-u* in Russian only is strong evidence for an areal impact of the Finnic substrate population on Russian, as Breu (1994: 51) convincingly shows.

At this point, an important observation about the mechanisms of dispersion in the early CB can be made: the emergence of spatial expressions morphologically realized via case stacking crucially involving postfixes took place at different hotbeds (Scandinavia, northwest Russia, west Latvia, and west Lithuania) and most probably through independent historical processes, but, notably, triggered by the same substrate (Finnic and possibly Saami).

Much later, in a second wave, the system of spatial cases decreased in most of the languages of the eastern CB area. Thus, in Latvian, the different meanings of the four Proto-Baltic spatial cases may be encoded in the inessive case (traditionally “locative”) – the only case to denote spatial relations surviving in contemporary Latvian. This is only possible if the figure and the ground are in their conventional (most frequent) spatial relation, such as *a necklace around the neck* but not *a snake around the neck*, and *a hat on the head* but not *a bird on the head*, as nonconventional combinations require prepositions. While Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli (2001: 672) take this as evidence against areal influence in the Baltic spatial cases, this is demonstrably a much later development independent of the rise of the spatial cases. This second wave affected not only Latvian but also north Lithuanian dialects, as well as Livonian (cf. Wälchli 1998). First, all three branches removed the morphological adessive and allative cases (these are only

found with **place names** in Livonian, and as the new dative in the Salis dialect thereof). Moreover, the illative case – although morphologically distinct in north Lithuanian – functionally merged with the inessive case. This is also the state of affairs already in Old Latvian, which also retains the illative *-an* (singular), and the inessive (locative) case *-ā* (singular). In contemporary Latvian, both subsequently merged into one case, which is historically derived either from the former or from the latter (Vanags 1992: 392; 1994: 125; Wälchli 1998; Seržant 2004a).

Finally, Estonian, too, shows an incipient development toward losing the adessive case in favor of adpositional phrases. The use of adpositional phrases instead of the respective spatial cases has been fostered by Swedish (Eliasson 2017: 2051) and German, for example with the Estonian postposition *peal* ‘on’ taking the genitive instead of the adessive case. Moreover, Old Latvian, German-influenced writings, as well as some Low Latvian dialects, also employ the postposition *iekšā/iekšā* ‘inside’ with the genitive case on the noun instead of the inessive (traditionally “locative”) case.

To summarize, there is good evidence to assume that the development of spatial cases has been subject to strong language contact in the whole area. Finnic and Saami were the donor languages, even though they exercised their impact on the neighboring languages to varying degree. We observe that different processes in different languages affected the encoding of spatial relations by means of case: Russian has recycled the former locative ending of the *u*-declension. East Baltic has encliticized former postpositions for the ‘at’ cases (adessive, allative) and ‘in’ cases (inessive, illative), while Scandinavian has encliticized the adpositions ‘from’ and ‘in’ with a few words. It is probable that different Finnic and/or Saami areas provided the input here. In a second wave, however, Swedish and German must have played the main role in propagating the adpositional phrases that gradually replaced the former spatial cases. The chronology of these changes is noteworthy because it is recurrent in the area, and it leads to the following key claim: the earlier layer of changes is often due to contacts with the autochthonous Finnic and Saami population, while the later changes are due to contacts with the politically and socially dominant languages, such as Swedish, Low/High German, Polish, and Russian. Contact-induced changes relating to vowel harmony, as discussed above, also confirm this finding. This does not apply to lexical borrowings and lexicalizations of grammatical patterns, such as *pluralia tantum*.

Circum-Baltic Area isoglosses

Here is a list of the most uncontroversial isoglosses of the area (note that the features [i]–[xxvii] are not exclusive to the languages of the area, since many CB languages maintain genealogical and areal relations to languages outside of it as well):

- i **strong tendency toward initial stress**: Scandinavian, Latvian, Žemaitian Lithuanian, all Finnic languages, German, some north Russian dialects (Daugaviete 2008; Veenker 1964: 74; Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli 2001: 638–640);
- ii **vowel harmony** and **related phenomena**: south Estonian Võru, some harmony-based sound changes in Latgalian, Proto-Latvian, northeast Lithuanian, west Russian, and Belarusian (Stolz 1991: 38–39; Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli 2001: 628; Seržant 2010: 199, 206; Wiemer et al. 2014; see above);
- iii **tonemic distinctions**: Scandinavian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Low German dialects (Lehiste 1978; 1983; Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli 2001: 640–646; Daugavet 2015);
- iv **overlength**: Estonian, Livonian, Latvian, Low German (Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli 2001: 641–644);
- v **pluralia tantum**: East Slavic, Baltic, Finnic, Romani (Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli 2001: 629–637);
- vi **pseudo-partitivity-related functions pertaining to aspectuality**: Latgalian, Lithuanian, Russian, north Russian, Polish, all Finnic languages (Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli 2001: 654–656; Seržant 2015b);
- vii **partitive (genitive) objects and subjects**: Latgalian, Lithuanian, Russian, North Russian, Polish, all Finnic languages (Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli 2001: 663–666; Seržant 2015b);
- viii **partitive (genitive) case with numerals**: Latgalian, Lithuanian, Finnic, East Slavic, Polish (Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli 2001: 698–704; Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2001);
- ix **nominative objects**: Latvian, Latgalian, Lithuanian, various Russian dialects of the region, all Finnic languages (Timberlake 1974; Holvoet 1993; Ambrazas 2001; Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli 2001: 660–663, 667–669; Seržant 2016);

- x **differentiated spatial cases:** Proto-East Baltic, Old Lithuanian, Lithuanian dialects, Russian, all Finnic languages (Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli 2001: 671–673; see above);
- xi **partitive-marked objects and subjects under negation:** Latvian, Latgalian, Lithuanian, Russian, north Russian, all Finnic languages (Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli 2001: 639–653, 656–660; Seržant 2015b; Arkadiev 2017; Arkadiev and Kozhanov forthcoming);
- xii **differential case marking of nominal predicates:** Latvian, Latgalian, Lithuanian, Russian, north Russian, all Finnic languages (Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli 2001: 674–675; Stassen 2001);
- xiii **predicative possession:** Latvian, Latgalian, Russian, north Russian, all Finnic languages (Mathiassen 1985; Stolz 1991; Nau 1996; Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli 2001: 676–679; Seržant 2015a; Mazzitelli 2017);
- xiv **idiosyncratic correlations in dative-like experiencer constructions:** Old Scandinavian, all Finnic languages, German, Latvian, Lithuanian, Russian (Seržant 2015a);
- xv **comitative-instrumental syncretism:** Scandinavian, Estonian, Livonian, Latvian, German (Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli 2001: 679–682; Stolz 2001);
- xvi **Slavic-style aspectual system:** Yiddish, Romani, Lithuanian (Pakerys and Wiemer 2007; Wiemer 2009; Kožanov 2011; Arkadiev 2014; 2018; Šišigin 2014);
- xvii **zero-subject, “active” impersonals:** Baltic, Finnic, East Slavic, Polish (Holvoet 2001; Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli 2001: 685–686);
- xviii **impersonals with passive-like morphology and properties of an active-like syntax:** Latvian, Livonian, Votic, Estonian, Finnish, north Russian, Polish (Christen 1998; Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli 2001: 686–690; Holvoet 2001; Danylenko 2005; Wiemer and Giger 2005; Smit 2006; Seržant 2012; Drinka 2017);
- xix **postfixes as markers of reflexivity:** Scandinavian (Haspelmath 1987; Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli 2001: 691–692);
- xx **adjective agreement:** Scandinavian, Baltic, East Slavic, Finnic, Saami (Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli 2001: 692–694);
- xxi **loss/lack of some gender distinctions:** Scandinavian (M=F vs. N), Low Latvian (M=F=N), Belarusian varieties (N>M/F), Proto-East-Baltic (N>M/F), Finnic (M=F=N, inherited) (Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli 2001: 694–698);
- xxii **flexible subject-verb-object (SVO) word order:** Baltic, Slavic, Finnic (Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli 2001: 704–705);
- xxiii **rigid possessor-possessed word order and SVO:** Scandinavian, Latvian, Finnic, some dialects of Russian, Polish, Belarusian in the Baltic region (Christen 2001; Čekmonas 2001; Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli 2001: 705–709);
- xxiv **mixed adpositional system as the result of linguistic contacts:** Latvian, Estonian (Stolz 1991: 81–88; Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli 2001: 710–712);
- xxv **yes/no-question particles clause-initially:** Scandinavian, Baltic, Belarusian, western Russian dialects, Polish, Yiddish, Livonian, Estonian, Sothern Saami (Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli 2001: 712–714);
- xxvi **verb fronting in yes/no questions:** Scandinavian, German, Estonian, Finnish, Russian (Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli 2001: 712–714);
- xxvii **evidential mood:** Latvian, Lithuanian, Estonian (Haarmann 1976; Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli 2001: 715–723).

The concept of *Sprachbund*

The Russian term *jazykovoĵ soĵuz*, later translated into German as *Sprachbund*, was introduced by Trubetzkoy (1923; 1928; 1930) to refer to a group of languages that share common syntactic, morphotactic, and phonological traits as well as a number of common cultural words but not the basic vocabulary. This concept was necessary to account for groups of languages that have a high degree of homogeneity but are genealogically unrelated. It was then applied by Jakobson (1931) to account for areal correlations of phonological properties. Since then, different notions have been adopted: linguistic area, convergence area, diffusion area, *union linguistique*, *affinité linguistique*, etc. (Campbell et al 1986: 530). While for many scholars *Sprachbund* and linguistic area are synonymous (Dahl 2001: 1456), others use these notions to cover different degrees of convergence. For example, Heine and Kuteva (2005: 172) take *Sprachbund*

to be a subtype of a linguistic area that is characterized by a set of linguistic properties but not by mutual intertranslatability.

The notion of *Sprachbund* is sometimes taken to refer to a hierarchically organized area with one epicenter from which innovations spread across the languages of the area via direct contact. This is only possible if the donor language is socially, culturally, and politically dominant. When it comes to the CB area, it has been observed that convergence effects here are motivated by various local effects of mutual influence with different epicenters and historically layered contact effects (Nau 1996). Accordingly, Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli (2001: 626–627, 728) and Koptjevskaja-Tamm (2002) refer to the CB area as a “contact superposition zone” and contrast it with the traditional understanding of a *Sprachbund*. However, the CB area is not atypical in this respect. Multilateral dispersion of traits is also typical for other areas, such as the textbook example of the *Balkan Sprachbund* (cf. Thomason and Kaufman 1988: 95). From this, it follows not that the CB area is atypical, but rather that *Sprachbunds* with just one epicenter are. Therefore, it seems that taking the notion of *Sprachbund* to refer to a situation in which a group of languages undergo changes radiating from one epicenter is ill-advised, because such situations are too special and rare. By contrast, the default is a contact superposition zone.

This has to do with the very mechanisms involved in the dispersion of linguistic traits across languages. Substantial adaptation of languages to each other in an area is only possible under extensive **bilingualism** across different languages of the area. In a bilingual setting, speakers employ different strategies in order to enhance shifting between languages, for example, by **switching** only between the vocabulary of the two languages but not their structures. This, in effect, leads to the increase of structural homogeneity in an area. While many studies on the CB area concentrate on historical events leading to different politically and socially dominant languages, much less is known about different combinations of local **bilingualisms**. Politically and culturally dominant languages certainly do contribute considerably to convergence effects, but local bilingualism situations demonstrably have a much stronger effect (the term “local bilingualism” refers to a bilingual situation in which the L1 speakers of the languages involved inhabit roughly the same territory).

Bilingualism does not require the existence of a socially, culturally, and/or politically dominant language for transfer to take place. In contrast to linguistic dispersion from a dominant language, local bilingualism cannot affect an area at once, because speakers typically master only two or, rarely, three languages of the area. Consequently, the dispersion of a linguistic trait beyond these languages is mediated, layered, and less exact. It brings about a higher degree of structural homogeneity via layered and multilateral transfers with no clear epicenter – something that is typical for the CB area, as has been repeatedly argued in the literature (Nau 1996; Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli 2001); cf. the observation above that the earlier layer of contact phenomena in the CB area is primarily based on independent processes of pattern borrowing from (and into) Finnic and Saami languages in different hotbeds. It is essential for an understanding of the CB area that nearly all its languages assimilated parts of the Finnic and/or Saami population: Scandinavian, Latvian, Lithuanian, and northwest Russian.

Furthermore, the traditional concept of *Sprachbund* requires another type of revision. This concerns the question of what type of correlations constitutes a *Sprachbund*. Since *Sprachbunds* were invoked by Trubetzkoy to account for the correlations not due to common inheritance in mutually related languages, a *Sprachbund* area has been defined in terms of common structural traits in a group of genealogically unrelated languages (at least since Jakobson 1931; cf. Masica 1971; Campbell 1994). Thus, most of the chapters in the two volumes of Dahl and Koptjevskaja-Tamm (2001a; 2001b) elucidate language-contact phenomena between two languages that are entirely unrelated, such as Latvian and Livonian or Estonian, or only remotely related. However, the requirement for the languages of a *Sprachbund* to be genealogically unrelated is problematic for the CB area, since it primarily contains only two unrelated families: Uralic and Indo-European, in addition to the marginal Karaim, which is Turkic. Moreover, the Indo-European branches of the area are related: the Slavic, Baltic, and Germanic subfamilies exhibit in general more genealogical correlations among one another than with other Indo-European subfamilies. The same applies to the Finnic subfamily of Uralic.

Yet, the requirement that the languages of an area be largely unrelated does not seem to be meaningful if our goal is to understand how and why linguistic traits may cluster in geographically contiguous languages as opposed to more remote languages. The reason for this is that not only may entirely unrelated languages develop homogeneity as a result of language contact but also the retention of a high degree of homogeneity between closely related languages need not be an unmotivated process. Contact-induced retention is a phenomenon *sui generis* that is different from drift retention, i.e., unmotivated retention of features, and from retention of universally preferred patterns due to universal pressures (as in Seržant 2021a). In this respect, areal linguistics comes close to dialectology. Without intensive mutual contacts, dialects would diverge from one another by retaining somewhat distinct sets of inherited traits. Contact-induced retention, therefore, is an important mechanism that maintains homogeneity of closely related languages or dialects. A jointly retained set of traits – if it can be shown to be persistent in related languages within but not outside an area – should also be part of the description of a *Sprachbund*. What is more, the degree of retention can also be contact induced (see Seržant 2021b on retention of indexes in Slavic).

The same applies to contact-induced innovations in closely related languages of an area. It is methodologically much more difficult to provide solid evidence for the dispersion of a trait in closely related than in entirely unrelated languages because the null hypotheses for these two situations are mutually opposite. The easier it is for a pattern to replicate, the more difficult it is for the researcher to argue for a borrowing event, and vice versa. Note that dispersion of linguistic traits is certainly easier across languages with a higher degree of homogeneity (due to inheritance) than across structurally very diverse languages. For example, Low German certainly had a much higher impact on the Scandinavian languages than it had on Baltic or Finnic. Thus, not only words but also the wholesale system of prefixes (*an-*, *be-*, *för-/for-*, *und-*, *miss-*, etc.) and several suffixes, such as *-agtig*, *-bar*, *-er*, *-eri*, *-erske*, *-he(i)t* or *-else*, were borrowed from (Low) German into the Scandinavian languages (Eliasson 2017: 2100). High structural and lexical similarity of (Low) German with Scandinavian languages must have considerably enhanced borrowing here.

Furthermore, another factor that brings about convergence effects, and that is traditionally considered complementary to genealogical and areal correlations, is universal pressures (*universals* in Greenberg 1966). Certain patterns are simply generally preferred in languages, such as, for example, subject-before-object word order as opposed to the reverse combination. Traditionally, an accumulation of such features in an area is considered trivial and, thus, not subject to areal influence (Dahl 2001: 1457). However, it can be argued that even these traits are to be considered when describing an area. First, universals are only probabilistic tendencies that may be violated. Moreover, universally preferred patterns are easier to borrow than typological quirks. Universal pressures create patterns that are particularly efficient in language processing and production. They are, therefore, easier to accommodate in a recipient language, and thus a transfer event is more likely with this type of traits than with typological quirks. Since areal linguistics in general, and the research on *Sprachbunds* in particular, primarily focuses on transfer phenomena, it is an important question to ask how universally preferred patterns may be copied, and how they expand across an area.

Finally, universal linguistic traits exist only on the level of coarse-grained cross-linguistic comparison that is the methodological standard in linguistic typology for good reason. However, this is not the standard in areal linguistics, which takes many more details into account. At a certain degree of granularity, there will be no universal traits anymore, because universally preferred patterns may vary considerably with respect to their frequency, selectional input restrictions, etc., across languages. An illuminating example is the basic transitive construction. Languages of the world show considerable areal effects in the degree of expansion of the basic transitive pattern into different semantic types of predicates, as has been demonstrated by Say (2014). According to Say (2014), Standard Average European (as discussed in Haspelmath 2001) scores lower in the expansion of the transitivity pattern than many other languages of Eurasia. Moreover, Baltic, Russian, Polish, and Finnic form an even more closely knit unit and score even lower in this respect than Standard Average European (Say 2014: 138; see also Seržant 2015a). Finally, different kinds of methods of profiling a category in usage-based linguistics (cf., among others, Gries and Divjak 2009), and in areal typology (cf. Say 2014) may elucidate areal diffusion of universally preferred patterns.

To summarize the discussion above, the following definition of a *Sprachbund* (or linguistic area) can be given:

3 Definition of a *sprachbund* / linguistic area

A Sprachbund represents an idiosyncratic clustering of linguistic traits in a geographical area (containing more than one lect) as opposed to the wider geographical background.

The definition in (3) is very general, but it allows for *Sprachbunds* that consist solely of related languages and even of dialects, because, crucially, contact-induced retention of linguistic traits and the expansion of universally preferred patterns in an area may also be due to language contact, especially if their particular properties accumulate in the area. Methodologically, areally induced retention and areally induced expansion of universally preferred patterns represent a challenge for the researcher, because the null hypothesis is, of course, that there are no areal effects in these cases. Nevertheless, research should not exclude such cases only because they are methodologically challenging.

Methodological issues

As argued in the previous section, areal linguistics should study clusters of linguistic traits in a geographic area independently from the point of view of historical-comparative linguistics and typology. That is, it should operate as an independent discipline in its own right since its main goal is to understand how the distribution of linguistic traits in the world correlates with geography and with sociological and political constellations.

The definition in (3) challenges the traditional heuristics. For example, if the languages of the area are genealogically related, then the null hypothesis is that any correlations are due to common inheritance, whereas any areal effect conserving shared traits has to be convincingly shown. The same applies to universally preferred patterns. By contrast, if a trait frequently found in the area is typologically rare, then no additional evidence is needed to claim an areal impact. For example, adjectival case **agreement** (cf. the above section) is typologically rare across the world's languages. Thus, the case agreement on adjectives in the Finnic languages, in contrast to other Uralic languages (Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli 2001: 692–693), is sufficient evidence to claim an impact from the Indo-European languages of the area. By contrast, if correlations are found with universally preferred patterns, then, again, the null hypothesis is that this is exclusively due to universal pressure. To disprove the null hypothesis, one needs to argue convincingly for an areal effect. In other words, a more granular approach is necessary in the study of correlations that may alternatively be explained with reference to universal pressure or drift retention (as opposed to contact-induced retention and retention of universally preferred patterns). This approach can rely on tools such as corpus frequency and more fine-grained profiling of traits. Corpus frequency – both type and token frequency – has not yet been applied to the CB area.

The distinction between “MAT(erial)” and “PAT(tern)” transfers (Sakel 2007; Matras and Sakel 2007) highlights an important aspect: grammatical domains are typically affected by PAT transfers (in the CB area). In other words, we observe different kinds of historical processes toward unification of the functional and structural aspects of grammar in the CB area with almost no concomitant MAT borrowing of grammatical items. While traditional research on linguistic areas in general, and on language contact in particular, concentrates on these two types of transfer, i.e., PAT and MAT transfers, there is at least one more transfer type, namely, “FREquency” transfer (cf. “feature selection” in Friedman 2008: 37). This type of transfer entails no superficial changes in the structure of the recipient language, because the pattern is already existent in both the donor and the recipient languages. It forces the recipient language toward adjusting the frequency of the trait to the frequency of the corresponding trait in the donor language. This type of transfer seems to be particularly frequent not only among closely related languages, but also with universally preferred patterns.

Corpus frequency should be understood in a broad sense as encompassing different kinds of frequency-based measurements such as *n*-gram-based probabilities (e.g., ‘Shannon’s surprisal’ or the overall offline informativity; Piantadosi et al. 2011). There are other methods for the behavioral profiling of a category in usage-based linguistics (cf., e.g., Gries and Divjak 2009), and in areal typology (cf. Say 2014). Furthermore, statistical research into parallel corpora of the languages of the CB area remains a desideratum despite the availability of a number of relevant

parallel corpora (Russian, Polish, and Belarusian in *ParaSol: A Parallel Corpus of Slavic and other languages*; Russian, Belarusian, Polish, Swedish, and Latvian in the parallel subcorpus of the Russian National Corpus). Thus, areal linguistics in general, and research on the CB area in particular, must integrate methods from usage-based linguistics in order to address the challenges posed by the null hypotheses.

To give an example on how corpus frequency may be applied, cf. the findings in Seržant (2014: 305) on the genitive-under-negation rule in Russian. In short, Russian allows for the direct object under predicate negation to be in the (partitive) genitive instead of the regular accusative case. A similar property is also found in all Finnic languages with the exceptions (a) that these languages have a dedicated partitive case that is distinct from the genitive and (b) that this rule is not optional as in Russian, but obligatory. That is, all direct objects must be in the partitive case if the verb is negated. It is likely that this rule is subject to areal effects. Indeed, the north Russian dialects that have the most intensive contacts with the Finnic population of Russia (in terms of substrate and adstrate) attest a much higher corpus frequency of this rule than standard Russian (Pearson's chi-square $p < 0.001$):

Table 2: Frequency of the genitive-under-negation rule in the Ustja subdialect of north Russian (Ustja corpus 2013) vs. spoken standard Russian (Russian National Corpus) (Seržant 2014: 305)

	genitive	accusative or nominative	total, sentences with negated predicate
north Russian (Ustja region)	92 (78%)	26 (22%)	118
spoken standard Russian	54 (46%)	64 (54%)	118

More generally, dialectal variation in the CB area, especially in the domain of grammar, is extremely understudied. This is despite the fact that substandard varieties generally are more flexible in accommodating language-contact effects.

Another tool is a more fine-grained profiling of traits (cf. “cumulative evidence of complex properties” in Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli 2001: 732), which often reveal idiosyncratic correlations even with typologically frequent patterns. The burden of proof is heavier in such cases, since the null hypothesis is always that typologically frequent patterns may emerge spontaneously and need not an external trigger.

To give an example of a more fine-grained profiling of typologically frequent traits, consider dative-like experiencers in the CB area. These are very frequent among those languages that have more elaborate flagging systems (e.g., [prepositions](#) or [case](#)). However, the eastern CB languages show correlations with dative-like experiencer constructions that make the assumption of entirely independent developments in the languages of the area less probable. Thus, Seržant (2015a) argues that dative experiencers show several common properties in the area that make them diverge from dative experiencers in other languages. First, several predicates involving dative-like experiencers are lexical borrowings from a language of the area. For example, the following adverb-like predicates taking a dative or dative-like experiencer are MAT borrowings: Lt *žēl* ‘pity’, and Fi *sääli* ‘pity’ are old borrowings from OESl **žālī* (modern Ru *žal’*). Moreover, none of the dative-like experiencers of the area shows a development toward acquiring syntactic subjecthood, which those dative-like experiencers often undergo elsewhere (cf. Seržant 2013).

Furthermore, there are striking correlations in the coding of the dative domain itself that are not randomly distributed across the eastern CB area. These are languages with the new strategy of encoding dative-related meanings based on the expression of the spatial relation in the form of ‘at a place’ (allative, adessive), and language with the old, nonspatial dative.

Table 3: Diachronic changes in the encoding of the dative domain (Seržant 2015a: 328)

	old dative strategy	new dative strategy
		(based on a locative expression)
Russian	<i>dative</i>	<i>adessive prepositional phrase</i>
Finnish	<i>genitive</i>	<i>adessive and allative</i>
Estonian	–	<i>adessive and allative</i>
Livonian / NE Salis dialect	–	<i>dative ← adessive and allative</i>
Livonian / SW Curonian dialect	<i>dative ← genitive</i>	–
Latvian	<i>dative</i>	–
Lithuanian	<i>dative</i>	–

The original strategy to encode typical dative-like meanings (e.g., the recipient) in Finnic was to use the genitive case. This option is no longer available in Estonian and northeast Livonian. In Livonian / northeast Salis dialect, the original genitive is often referred to as dative in grammatical descriptions.

Observe that the cutoff point exactly maps these languages into two geographically contiguous areas. (i) The languages with the renewed marking of the dative domain by way of a case form expressing ‘at a place’ or an adposition are further to the north of the northeastern dialect of Livonian. (ii) The languages retaining the old strategy to mark datives lie to the south of this dialect. While there is nothing special per se in marking the dative-like meanings via a spatial ‘at’ case, it is certainly striking that the same strategy has expanded into a geographically continuous territory. Finally, within the European subcontinent, Polish and Russian, as well as Baltic, tally with Finnic by having many more deviations from the transitive pattern for various predicates and, thus, deviate considerably from Standard Average European (Say 2014: 138).

Another underestimated issue in methodology is that an areal treatment should not confine itself to contacts between two languages in an area. Many studies that mean to address the CB *Sprachbund* actually focus on contacts between a small subset of the CB languages (cf., e.g., various articles in Dahl and Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2001a; 2001b). By contrast, large-scale research embracing a large part of the languages of the area is still very rare. The synthesis by Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli (2001) is one of the few exceptions.

Conclusions

The CB area displays several common traits – 27 are listed above – that go beyond just a pair of languages. However, there is considerable cross-linguistic variation with respect to such factors as corpus frequency, the degree of grammaticalization, selectional input restrictions, and the degree of diachronic persistence of a contact-induced trait. Two selected examples (vowel harmony and spatial cases) demonstrate that this variation is due to later geographical and historical diversification of various hotbeds in the later, historical period. In turn, the earliest common traits emerged from assimilating parts of the Uralic population – that is, Finnic and Saami people, leaving traces in the Indo-European languages on both sides of the Baltic Sea.

Finnic and Saami, as well as Low and, later, High German, were the donor languages that left traces in all languages of the area. By contrast, other donor languages, such as Polish, Russian, and Swedish, had effects that were rather

local and confined to a particular subarea. Moreover, while the Finnic and Saami impact was primarily due to extensive bilingualism and substrate effects, the impact of Low and, later, High German was rather based on cultural and political dominance of the language.

Areal linguistics should not be viewed as an account of correlations between languages that is complementary to retention-based and universalist typological accounts. Rather, areal linguistics is orthogonal to these. It should be viewed as a separate discipline in its own right. Its goal is to explain why linguistic traits cluster in particular areas and why they are more randomly distributed elsewhere. In contrast to the tradition, it is argued that areal linguistics should extend its focus to all kinds of geographical clusters of linguistic traits, including those that are potentially ascribable to genealogical relations and universal pressure. However, in order to exclude phenomena that are not due to language contact, a more advanced methodology is necessary. Thus, integration of methods developed in usage-based linguistics, including different corpus-frequency measures, as well as heuristics based on parallel corpora, is highly desirable.

Nonstandard abbreviations used in this article

CB Circum-Baltic

Ltg Latgalian

OLi Old Lithuanian

PLt Proto-Latvian

Ilja Seržant

Bibliography

Ambrazas, Vytautas. 2001. On the development of the nominative object in East Baltic. In: Dahl, Östen, and Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.), *The Circum-Baltic languages: Typology and contact*, vol. II. Amsterdam, 391–412.

Arkadiev, Peter. 2014. Towards an areal typology of prefixal perfectivization. *Scando-Slavica* 60/2, 384–405.

Arkadiev, Peter [Arkad'ev, Petr]. 2017. Ob"ektnyj genitiv otricanija: Areal'no-tipologičeskaja perspektiva. In: Plungjan, Vladimir A. et al. (eds.), *Differencirovanoe markirovanie argumentov: Materialy k tipologii*. Saint Petersburg, 194–243.

Arkadiev, Peter. 2018. Borrowed prefixes and the limits of contact-induced change in aspectual systems. In: Benacchio, Rosanna et al. (eds.), *The role of prefixes in the formation of aspectuality: Issues of grammaticalization*. Florence, 1–21.

Arkadiev, Peter, and Kirill Kozhanov. forthcoming. Object partitive of negation: An areal perspective. In: Wiemer, Björn, and Peter Arkadiev (eds.), *Convergence and divergence in the eastern Circum-Baltic Area: A triangulation approach*. Berlin.

Balode, Laimute, and Axel Holvoet. 2001. The Lithuanian language and its dialects. In: Dahl, Östen, and Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.), *The Circum-Baltic languages: Typology and contact*, vol. I. Amsterdam, 41–80.

Breu, Walter. 1994. Der Faktor Sprachkontakt in einer dynamischen Typologie des Slavischen. In: Mehlig, Hans Robert (ed.), *Slavistische Linguistik 1993*. Munich, 41–64.

Campbell, Lyle. 1994. Grammar: Typological and areal issues. In: Asher, Ron (ed.), *The encyclopedia of language and linguistics*, vol. III. Oxford, 1471–1474.

Campbell, Lyle et al. 1986. Meso-America as a linguistic area. *Language* 62/3, 530–570.

Careva, Lidija I. 1962. Akan'e i jakan'e v govorax jugo-zapadnoj časti Pskovskoj oblasti. In: Boris A. Larin (ed.), *Pskovskie govory I: Trudy pervoj Pskovskoj dialektologičeskoj konferencii 1960 goda*. Pskov, 58–77.

Čekmonas, Valeriy. 2001. Russian varieties in the southeastern Baltic area: Urban Russian of the 19th century. In: Dahl, Östen, and Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.), *The Circum-Baltic languages: Typology and contact*, vol. I. Amsterdam, 81–100.

Christen, Simon. 1998. Unpersönliche Konstruktionen und sekundäre Personifizierung. *Linguistica Baltica* 7, 51–61.

Christen, Simon. 2001. Genitive positions in Baltic and Finnic languages. In: Dahl, Östen, and Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.), *The Circum-Baltic languages: Typology and contact*, vol. II. Amsterdam, 499–522.

Creissels, Denis, and Céline Mounole. 2011. Animacy and spatial cases: Typological tendencies, and the case of Basque. In: Kittilä, Seppo et al. (eds.), *Case, animacy and semantic roles*. Amsterdam, 155–182.

Dahl, Östen. 2001. Principles of areal typology. In: Haspelmath, Martin et al. (eds.), *Language typology and language universals: An international handbook*. Berlin, 1456–1470.

Dahl, Östen, and Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm. 1992. *Language typology around the Baltic Sea: A problem inventory*. Stockholm.

Dahl, Östen, and Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.) 2001a. *The Circum-Baltic languages: Typology and contact*, vol. I. Amsterdam.

Dahl, Östen and Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.) 2001b. *The Circum-Baltic languages: Typology and contact*, vol. II. Amsterdam

Danylenko, Andrij. 2005. Impersonal constructions with the accusative case in Lithuanian and Slavic: A reply to Axel Holvoet. *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 50/2, 147–160.

Daugavet, Anna. 2015. The lengthening of the first component of Lithuanian diphthongs in an areal perspective. In: Arkadiev, Peter et al. (eds.), *Contemporary approaches to Baltic linguistics*. Berlin, 139–202.

Daugaviete, Anna. 2008. Secondary stress in Latvian compared to Lithuanian and Estonian. In: Niewulis-Grablunas, Jowita et al. (eds.), *Perspectives of Baltic philology*. Poznań, 41–48.

Décsy, Gyula. 1973. *Die linguistische Struktur Europas. Vergangenheit-Gegenwart-Zukunft*. Wiesbaden.

Drinka, Bridget. 2017. *Language contact in Europe: The periphrastic perfect through history*. Cambridge UK.

Eliasson, Stig. 2017. Language contact outside Scandinavia I: In the Baltic. In: Bandle, Oskar et al. (eds.), *The Nordic languages: An international handbook of the history of the North Germanic languages*. Berlin, 2048–2057.

Falkenhahn, Viktor. 1963. Die Bedeutung der Verbalreaktion für das Problem eines litauisch-polnischen Sprachbundes. *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 8, 893–907.

Friedman, Victor A. 2008. Balkan object reduplication in areal and dialectological perspective. In: Kallulli, Dalina, and Liliane Tasmowski (eds.), *Clitic doubling in the Balkan languages*. Amsterdam, 25–63.

Greenberg, Joseph. 1966. *Universals of language*. Cambridge MA.

Gries, Stefan T., and Dagmar Divjak. 2009. Behavioral profiles: A corpus-based approach to cognitive semantic analysis. In: Evans, Vyvyan, and Stéphanie Pourcel (eds.), *New directions in cognitive linguistics*. Amsterdam, 57–75.

Haarmann, Harald. 1976. *Aspekte der Arealtypologie. Die Problematik der europäischen Sprachbünde*. Tübingen.

Haspelmath, Martin. 1987. *Transitivity alternations of the anticausative type*. Cologne.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2001. The European linguistic area: Standard Average European. In: Haspelmath, Martin et al. (eds.), *Language typology and language universals: An international handbook*, vol. II. New York, 1492–1510.

Heine, Bernd. 2012. On polysemy copying and grammaticalization in language contact. In: Chamoreau, Claudine, and Isabelle Léglise (eds.), *Cross-linguistic tendencies in contact-induced change: A typological approach based on morphosyntactic studies*. Berlin, 125–166.

Heine, Bernd, and Tania Kuteva. 2005. *Language contact and grammatical change*. Cambridge UK.

Holvoet, Axel. 1993. On the nominative object in Latvian, with particular reference to the debitive. *Linguistica Baltica* 2, 151–161.

Holvoet, Axel. 2001. Impersonals and passives in Baltic and Fennic. In: Dahl, Östen, and Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.), *The Circum-Baltic languages: An areal-typological approach*, vol. II. Amsterdam, 363–390.

Jakobson, Roman. 1931. Über die phonologischen Sprachbünde. *Travaux du cercle linguistique de Prague* 4, 234–240.

Kardelis, Vytautas, and Björn Wiemer. 2002. Ausbildung von Aspektpaarigkeit in litauischen Grenz- und Inseldialekten (am Beispiel von Sprechverben). *Linguistica Baltica* 10, 51–80.

Kazlauskas, Jonas. 1968. *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika*. Vilnius.

Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria. 2001. A piece of the cake and a cup of tea: Partitive and pseudo-partitive nominal constructions in the Circum-Baltic languages. In: Dahl, Östen, and Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.), *The Circum-Baltic languages: Typology and contact*, vol. II. Amsterdam, 523–568.

Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria. 2002. The Circum-Baltic languages: A coastal contact-superposition zone in the European periphery. In: Ramat, Paolo, and Thomas Stolz (eds.), *Mediterranean languages: Papers from the MEDTYP Workshop, Tirrenia, June 2000*. Bochum, 209–222.

Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria, and Bernhard Wälchli. 2001. The Circum-Baltic languages: An areal-typological approach. In: Dahl, Östen, and Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.), *The Circum-Baltic languages: Typology and contact*, vol. II. Amsterdam, 615–750.

Kožanov, Kirill. 2011. Balto-slavjanskije glagol'nye prefiksy v baltijskix dialektax cyganskogo jazyka. *Acta linguistica petropolitana* 7/3, 311–315.

Lehiste, Ilse. 1978. Polytonicity in the area surrounding the Baltic Sea. In: Gårding, Eva, et al. (eds.), *Nordic prosody: Papers from a symposium*. Lund, 237–247.

Lehiste, Ilse. 1983. Prosodic change in progress: Evidence from Estonian. In: Rauch, Irmengar, and Gerald F. Carr (eds.), *Language change*. Indiana, 10–27.

Lehiste, Ilse. 1988. *Lectures on language contact*. Cambridge MA.

Masica, Colin P. 1971. *Defining a linguistic area: South Asia*. Chicago.

Mathiassen, Terje. 1985. A discussion of the notion "Sprachbund" and its application in the case of the languages in the eastern Baltic area. *International journal of Slavic philology* 21–22, 273–281.

Matras, Yaron, and Jeanette Sakel. 2007. Investigating the mechanisms of pattern replication in language convergence. *Studies in language* 31/4, 829–865.

Mazzitelli, Lidia Federica. 2017. Predicative possession in the languages of the Circum-Baltic area. *Folia Linguistica* 51/1, 1–60.

Nau, Nicole. 1996. Ein Beitrag zur Arealtypologie der Ostseeanrainersprachen. In: Boretzky, Norbert (ed.), *Areale, Kontakte, Dialekte, Sprachen und ihre Dynamik in mehrsprachigen Situationen*. Bochum.

Pakerys, Jurgis, and Wiemer, Björn. 2007. Building a partial aspect system in East Aukštaitian Vilnius dialects of Lithuanian: Correlations between telic and activity verbs. *Acta linguistica Lithuanica* 57, 45–97.

Piantadosi, Steven T. et al. 2011. Word lengths are optimized for efficient communication. *PNAS* 108/9, 3526–3529.

Range, J.D. 1995. Allativ und Adessiv in altlitauischen Texten des 16. Jahrhunderts. *Linguistica Baltica* 4, 93–103.

Sakel, Jeanette. 2007. Types of loan: Matter and pattern. In: Matras, Yaron, and Jeanette Sakel (eds.), *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*. Berlin, 15–30.

Sarhimaa, Anneli. 1992. Karelian Sprachbund? Theoretical basis of the study of Russian/Baltic- Finnic contacts. *Finnisch-Ugrische forschungen* 50/3, 209–219.

Say, Sergey. 2014. Bivalent verb classes in the languages of Europe: A quantitative typological study. *Language dynamics and change* 4, 116–166.

Schrammel, Barbara. 2005. Borrowed verbal particles and prefixes in Romani: A comparative approach. In: Schrammel, Barbara et al. (eds.), *General and applied Romani linguistics: Proceedings from the 6th International conference on Romani linguistics*. Munich, 99–113.

Seržant, Ilja A. 2004a. Einige Bemerkungen zur Geschichte des Illativs. *Baltu Filologija* 13/1, 113–121.

Seržant, Ilja A. 2004b. K voprosu ob obrazovanii adessiva. *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 50, 49–57.

Seržant, Ilja A. 2004c. Zur Vorgeschichte des Inessivs im Urostbaltischen. *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 50, 59–67.

Seržant, Ilja A. 2005. Otnositel'naja xronologija osnovnyx fonetičeskix izmenenij v istorii verxnelatyškogo dialekta. *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 53, 39–90.

Seržant, Ilja A. 2006. Vermittlungsrolle des Hochlettischen bei den altrussischen und litauischen Entlehnungen im Lettischen. *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 55, 89–105.

Seržant, Ilja A. 2007. Kontakty drevnerusskogo i latyšskogo jazykov v oblasti fonetiki. In: Ivanov, Vjačeslav V., and Peter M. Arkadiev [Petr M. Arkad'ev] (eds.), *Areal'noe i genetičeskoe v strukture slavjanskix jazykov: Materialy kruglogo stola*. Moscow, 90–101.

Seržant, Ilja A. 2008. Otnositel'naja xronologija processov palatalizacii prabalt. *k v latyšskom: Areal'naja interpretacija. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 2008/1, 121–129.

Seržant, Ilja A. 2010. Phonologische Isoglossen des Hochlettischen, Nord-Ost-Litauischen, Nord-West-Russischen und Weißrussischen. *Baltic linguistics* 1, 193–214.

- Seržant, Ilja A. 2012. The so-called possessive perfect in North Russian and the Circum-Baltic area: A diachronic and areal approach. *Lingua* 122, 356–385.
- Seržant, Ilja A. 2013. The diachronic typology of non-canonical subjects. In: Seržant, Ilja A., and Leonid Kulikov (eds.), *The diachrony of non-canonical subjects*. Amsterdam, 313–360.
- Seržant, Ilja A. 2014. The independent partitive genitive in North Russian. In: Seržant, Ilja A., and Björn Wiemer (eds.), *Contemporary approaches to dialectology: The area of North, Northwest Russian and Belarusian vernaculars*. Bergen, 270–329.
- Seržant, Ilja A. 2015a. Dative experiencer constructions as a Circum-Baltic isogloss. In: Arkadiev, Peter et al. (eds.), *Contemporary approaches to Baltic linguistics*. Berlin, 325–348.
- Seržant, Ilja A. 2015b. Independent partitive as a Circum-Baltic isogloss. *Journal of language contact* 8, 341–418.
- Seržant, Ilja A. 2016. Nominative case in Baltic in the typological perspective. In: Holvoet, Axel, and Nicole Nau (eds.), *Argument structure in Baltic*. Amsterdam, 137–198.
- Seržant, Ilja A. 2021a. Cyclic changes in verbal person-number indexes are unlikely. *Folia linguistica historica* 42/1, 49–86.
- Seržant, Ilja A. 2021b. Slavic morphosyntax is primarily determined by the geographic location and contact configuration. *Scando-Slavica* 67/1, 65–90.
- Seržant, Ilja A., and Valgerður Bjarnadóttir. 2014. Verbalization and non-canonical case marking of some irregular verbs in *-ē- in Baltic and Russian. In: Judžentis, Artūras et al. (eds.), *Balai ir slavai: Dvasinių kultūrų sankritos / Balty i slavjane: Peresečenija duxovnyx kul'tur*. Vilnius, 218–242.
- Šišigin, Kirill A. 2014. Polisituativnaja semantika prefiksals'nyx glagolov jazyka idiš: Na primere glagola *geyn* s nekotorymi prefiksami. *Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta* 6, 60–76.
- Smit, Merlijn de. 2006. *Language contact and structural change: An Old Finnish case study*. Stockholm.
- Sreznevskij, Izmail I. 1893. *Materialy dlja slovarja drevne-russkago jazyka po pis'mennymъ*, vols. I–III. Saint Petersburg.
- Stang, Christian S. 1935. *Die westrussische Kanzleisprache des Grossfürstentums Litauen*. Oslo.
- Stang, Christian S. 1966. *Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen*. Oslo.
- Stassen, Leon. 2001. Non-verbal predication in the Circum-Baltic languages. In: Dahl, Östen, and Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.), *The Circum-Baltic languages: Typology and contact*, vol. II. Amsterdam, 569–590.
- Stolz, Thomas. 1991. *Sprachbund im Baltikum? Estnisch und Lettisch im Zentrum einer sprachlichen Konvergenzlandschaft*. Bochum.
- Stolz, Thomas. 2001. On Circum-Baltic instrumentals and comitatives: To and fro coherence. In: Dahl, Östen, and Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.), *The Circum-Baltic languages: Typology and contact*, vol. II. Amsterdam, 591–614.
- Thomason, Sarah Grey, and Terence Kaufman. 1988. *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley.
- Timberlake, Allan. 1974. *The nominative object in Slavic, Baltic, and West Finnic*. Munich.
- Trubetzkoy, Nikolai S. 1923. Vavilonskaja bašnja i smešenie jazykov. *Evrazijskij vremennik* 3, 107–124.

Trubetzkoy, Nikolai S. 1928. Proposition 16. *Acts of the 1st International congress of linguistics*. Leiden, 17–18.

Vajda, Edward J. 2003. Review of Circum-Baltic Languages. Vol. 1: Past and present by Östen Dahl and Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm; Circum-Baltic languages. Vol. 2: Grammar and typology by Östen Dahl and Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm. *Language* 79/2, 432–433.

Vanags, Pēteris. 1992. Locative in the earliest Latvian writings. *Journal of Baltic studies* 23, 387–393.

Vanags, Pēteris. 1994. Die Entwicklungstendenzen der Kasusendungen in den ältesten lettischen Sprachdenkmälern. *Linguistica Baltica* 3, 121–130.

Veenker, Wolfgang. 1967. *Die Frage des finnougriischen Substrats in der russischen Sprache*. Bloomington.

Wälchli, Bernhard. 1998. Der Synkretismus der Lokalkasus im Lettischen und Livischen. *Linguistica Baltica* 7, 207–229.

Wande, Erling. 1982. Tornedalsfinskan och dess särdrag (Characteristics of Tornedalian). In: Klockare, Sigurd, and Erling Wande (eds.), *Finska språket i Tornedalen* (The Finnish language in the Torne Valley). Stockholm, 40–73.

Wiemer, Björn. 2000. Diffusität und Synkretismus in der diachronen Syntax. Ein Klärungsversuch anhand von Kasussystemen, insbesondere der Objektmarkierung im Nordslavischen und Litauischen. In: Breu, Walter (ed.), *Slavistische Linguistik XXV. Referate des XXV. Konstanzer Slavistischen Arbeitstreffens, Konstanz 7.-10.9.1999*. Munich, 277–313.

Wiemer, Björn. 2003. Dialect and language contacts on the territory of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania from the 15th century until 1939. In: Braunmüller, Kurt, and Gisella Ferraresi (eds.), *Aspects of multilingualism in European language history*. Amsterdam, 105–143.

Wiemer, Björn. 2004. Population linguistics on a micro-scale. Lessons to be learnt from Baltic and Slavic dialects in contact. In: Kortmann, Bernd (ed.), *Dialectology meets typology: Dialect grammar from a cross-linguistic perspective*. Berlin, 497–526.

Wiemer, Björn. 2009. Zu entlehnten Präfixen und anderen morphosyntaktischen Slavismen in litauischen Insel- und Grenzmundarten. In: Scholze, Lenka, and Björn Wiemer (eds.), *Von Zuständen, Dynamik und Veränderung bei Pygmäen und Giganten. Festschrift für Walter Breu zu seinem 60. Geburtstag*. Bochum, 347–390.

Wiemer, Björn, and Markus Giger. 2005. *Resultativa in den nordslavischen und baltischen Sprachen (Bestandsaufnahme unter arealen und grammatikalisierungstheoretischen Gesichtspunkten)*. Munich.

Wiemer, Björn, and Bernhard Wälchli. 2012. Contact-induced grammatical change: The diversity of grammatical transfer phenomena and the diversity of different perspectives on areas. In: Wiemer, Björn et al. (eds.), *Grammatical replication and borrowability in language contact*. Berlin, 3–64.

Wiemer, Björn et al. 2014. Convergence in the Baltic-Slavic contact zone: Triangulation approach. In: Besters-Dilger, Juliane et al. (eds.), *Congruence in contact-induced language change*. Berlin, 15–42.

Wiik, Kalevi. 1995. The Baltic Sea prosodic area revisited. In: Suhonen, Seppo (ed.), *Itämeren-suomalainen kulttuurialue – The Fenno-Baltic cultural area*. Helsinki, 75–90.

Wiik, Kalevi. 1997. On the Baltic Sea phonetic area. In: Lehiste, Ilse, and Jaan Roos (eds.), *Estonian prosody: Papers from a symposium*. Tallinn, 235–250.

Winge, Vibeke. 2017. Language contact outside Scandinavia VI: With Germany. In: Bandle, Oskar et al. (eds.), *The Nordic languages: An international handbook of the history of the North Germanic languages*. Berlin, 2096–2104.

Žilinskaitė-Šinkūnienė, Eglė. 2016. Why *byloti dievop* 'speak to God', but *prašyti dieviep* 'ask God'? The Allative and the Adessive with verbs of speaking in Old Lithuanian. *Baltic linguistics* 7, 37–174.

Websites

Parallel Subcorpus. *Russian National Corpus*: ruscorpora.ru/search-para-en.html.

ParaSol: A parallel corpus of Slavic and other languages: parasolcorpus.org.



[Terms and Conditions](#)

[Privacy Statement](#)

[Cookie Settings](#)

[Accessibility](#)

[Legal Notice](#)

Copyright © 2016-2024

Powered by PubFactory

