

Юрий Константинович Кузьменко, **Ранние германцы и их соседи. Лингвистика, археология, генетика** [Early Germanic peoples and their neighbours. Linguistics, archeology, genetics], Санкт-Петербург: Нестор-История, 2011, 265 p.

This recently published book on the prehistory of the old Germanic peoples is a great event for everybody dealing with comparative linguistics, and the origins and homeland of Germanic peoples. The book is a logical result of many years of research; the author is a well known specialist in Germanic and Scandinavian linguistics.¹ The aim of the book, as stated in the introduction, is to establish how correlative could be linguistic, archeological and genetic data when dealing with the question of the formation of the common Germanic language, the common Germanic ethnos / ethnicity and the gene pool of the early Germanic peoples; and how the comparison of this data can contribute to the question of their homeland. The title shows the wide scope and recalls previous books of such type with correlation of isoglosses (though without archeology and genetics)².

¹ The bibliography of works by J. K. Kusmenko up to 2006, including over 120 publications, see Antje Hornscheidt, Kristina Kotcheva, Tomas Milosch, Michael Rießler (eds.), *Grenzgänger. Festschrift zum 65. Geburtstag von Jurij Kusmenko*, Berlin, 2006.

² Cf. e.g. Porzig when dealing the Indo-European: Walter Porzig, *Die Gliederung*

The book is comprised of the following chapters:

1. Introductory notes (Archeological culture and language. Ethnos and language).
2. Self designation of Germanic peoples.
3. Innovations of proto-Germanic in comparison with similar innovations in other Indo-European languages and in Finno-Ugric languages.
4. Results of comparison of common innovations.
5. The origin of the Germanic peoples according to archeological data.
6. Comparison of archeological and linguistic data.
7. Data of population genetics concerning the origin and early contacts of Germanic peoples.
8. Conclusion.

The book is accompanied by an extensive bibliography (over 600 items) and an index verborum.

The book contains rich linguistic material, a very useful survey of the existing archeological data, and incorporates the new data which has been introduced

des indogermanischen Sprachgebiets, Heidelberg, 1954; or e.g. Chemođanov when dealing the Germanic: Nikolaj S. Chemođanov [Николай Сергеевич Чемоđанов], *Sravnitel'naja grammatika germanskih jazykov* [Comparative Grammar of Germanic Languages] 1, Moskva, 1962. Among recently published one should name Wolfram Euler, Konrad Badenheuer, *Sprache und Herkunft der Germanen*, Hamburg, London, 2009, which includes archeological data.

into research in the last decades – the results of the vigorous development of genetics which brought about a fundamental change in our understanding of populations' characteristics.

In the introductory notes the author discusses the correlation between archeological culture and language, ethnos and language. The main methodological problem of interdisciplinary historical research is the question of correlation between archeological, ethnographical, anthropological and linguistic data.

A small but very important separate chapter is devoted to the self designation of the Germanic peoples and the question, if such a common self designation did exist³. Kusmenko suggests that the ethnonym *sue(b)os* (reflected in toponyms *Sweden* and *Schwaben*) could have been the original self designation.

Chapter 3 comprises a) a description of phonological and morphological innovations in proto-Germanic in comparison with similar innovations in other languages, like: 1) *sr* > *str* which Germanic shares partly with Baltic, Slavonic, Illyric (and Albanian), Thracian and partly with Celtic; 2) /a/ – /o/ > /a/ (Germanic, Baltic, Albanian, Hittite, Indo-Iranian); 3) /ā/ – /ō/ > /ō/ (Germanic, Baltic,

partly Osco-Umbrian) and so forth, all together 32 innovations; b) among them exclusively Germanic innovations; c) late common Germanic innovations; d) a scheme of innovations and e) a relative chronology of phonological innovations. The author's description of innovations contains a number of original interpretations – particularly when it deals with morphological and phonetic isoglosses. One can find in Kusmenko's book many new suggestions, cf. e.g. *pt*, *kt* > *ft*, *χt*, – the correlation between Germanic and Osco-Umbrian (innovation nr. 16d); generalization of accusative ending as infinitive marker – correlation between Germanic and Osco-Umbrian and partly Greek (innovation nr. 17); similarity with segmental prosodics – correlation with Saami (innovation nr. 13) and others. As mentioned Kusmenko ascertains 32 phonological, morphological and morphonological innovations. In aggregate these innovations make Germanic distinct from other IE languages. It is this period of the formation of innovations that Kusmenko calls proto-Germanic. For many of these innovations parallels can be found either in separate IE languages or in neighboring Finno-Ugric languages and their comparison, together with similar lexical and word-formation innovations, allows one to determine with which languages proto-Germanic had contact in the period of its formation.

In the next chapter Kusmenko presents the results of the comparison of common innovations within language groups: Germanic – Armenian, Ger-

³ As mentioned by Kusmenko himself, this issue is very important for historical ethnography, because the existence of such notion is one of the most important features of ethnos. It is also very important to bear in mind how the archeologists, ethnologists, and geneticists together with anthropologists interpret the word *Germanic*.

manic – Greek, Germanic – Indo-Iranian, Germanic – Illyric and Albanian, Germanic – Baltic and Slavic, Germanic – Italic and Celtic, Germanic – Saami and Baltic Finnic, supplying lexical and word-formation parallels. Kusmenko also provides a survey of Saami – Baltic Finnic lexical borrowings from Germanic. A short survey of possible lexical borrowings into Germanic from an unknown substrate is of special significance.⁴ Adduced morphological, phonological and lexical isoglosses show that Germanic languages had been in long contact with Italic, Baltic and Saami – Baltic Finnic languages (cf. 20 common innovations with Baltic and 18 with Italic) by the time the distinctive Germanic features were being formed. In essence the author's main conclusion confirms the traditional supposition that Germanic is somewhere in between Italo-Celtic and Baltic-Slavic.

Rich linguistic data and new interpretations of morphological and phonetic isoglosses will no doubt cause special attention among linguists. The biggest problem is and always has been when dealing with such kind of research: the

⁴ This question merits a special discussion. Kusmenko's new book will stimulate researchers to revisit this one of the most debated questions in Germanic historical linguistics. The existing linguistic and archaeological material combined with the emerging genetic data can provide an impetus for further research, cf. Erika Sauserde, *Sea-words and possible substrate in the Baltic Sea region – a new approach?* In press.

absolute dating of linguistic innovations.

Chapters 5 and 6 set out to correlate linguistic material with archeological data, e.g. to try to determine, with which archeological culture (or cultures) one can correlate Germanic and its direct neighbours – Italic, Baltic and Saami–Baltic Finnic.

When Indo-Europeans appeared in Northern Europe, they did not come to an empty place. There are at least 8 hypotheses about the origin of the Germanic peoples based on archeological data. Kusmenko provides a very useful survey of the archeological data. It can be summarized as follows:

1. Germanic peoples were the first population in Northern Europe after the retreat of glaciers (10 000–5000 B.C.), the paleolithic continuity theory.
2. Germanic peoples appeared at the time of the Funnel Beaker culture (TRB) (4500–2700 B.C.):
 - a) as a result of the gradual transition of the local Ertebølle culture into TRB;
 - b) as a result of the migration of population from the south.
3. Germanic peoples are the result of a merger of the (IE) Globular Amphora Culture with the autochthonic cultures of Northern Europe (3600–2150 B.C.). The result of merger of this culture with earlier Funnel Beaker culture (TRB) and Pit–Comb Ware culture (and afterwards with Corded Ware and Battle-axe cultures) Kusmenko considers to be the start of formation of Germanic peoples.
4. Germanic peoples are the result of the merger of (IE) Corded Ware

culture with autochthonic cultures of Northern Europe (3000–2200 B.C.). The merger of TRB and Corded Ware culture during the Neolithic period appears to be the prevailing hypothesis at present.

5. Germanic peoples formed in the early Bronze Age in Central Germany as a result of a separation from the Unetice culture (2300–1600 B.C.).
6. Germanic peoples formed in the Bronze Age within the culture of the Nordic Circle (Nordischer Kreis) (1800–800 B.C.) or more broadly within Nordic Bronze Age.
7. Germanic peoples formed in the Iron Age within the Jastorf culture (600–100 B.C.).
8. Germanic peoples formed during the Roman Empire

One can observe tremendous variety in dating the origin of the Germanic peoples. Recent years saw the debate between archaeologists ascribing the changes of cultures to the migrations (traditional point of view) and archaeologists explaining changes of cultures by internal developments, gaining new impetus with the emerging theory of continuity of cultures since the Paleolithic period.⁵

⁵ Cf. e.g. Mario Alinei, An alternative model for the origins of European peoples and languages: the continuity theory, *Quaderni di semantica* 21, 2000, 21–50; Idem, Towards a generalized continuity model for Uralic and Indo-European languages, in Kyösti Julku (ed.), *The roots of peoples and languages of Northern Euroasia* 4, Oulu, 2002, 9–33.

When linking linguistic and archaeological data one should always bear in mind that a change of culture is not necessarily accompanied by language change and vice versa. Kusmenko is extremely careful while comparing linguistic material with archaeological data and discussing the neighbours of Germanic tribes from the South-West, South-East and the North (Chapter 6).

One of the biggest achievements of the book is the deployment of the genetic data concerning the origin and early contacts of the Germanic peoples. Tremendous achievements in genetic research of the last decades allow us to define genetic characteristics of a population, including ancient populations.⁶ Space constraints do not allow us to go into the details of the relevant genetic research results. But the most pertinent idea is the following⁷: the prevalence of chromosome haplogroups R1a and R1b – most common haplogroups in modern Europe – indicates that genetically part of the Germanic-speaking

⁶ It is done by ascertaining the spread of mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA or mDNA), genes which are inherited only through the female line and chromosome Y-DNA (genes which are inherited only through the male line).

⁷ Cf. Distribution of European Y-chromosome DNA (Y-DNA) haplogroups by country in percentage, http://www.eupedia.com/europe/european_y-dna_haplogroups.shtml (last update October 2012) and survey on genetic research results in Kusmenko's book, p. 187–218.

population (about 30%) is characterised by haplogroup R1b, which is typical first of all for the population of Germany, Netherlands and Belgium, – compare common Germanic and Italo-Celtic innovations in Kusmenko’s book. A part of population (23–26% in Northern Germany and South of Scandinavia) is connected to the population of Eastern Europe (Latvians, Lithuanians, Poles, cf. haplogroup R1a) – compare the respective common Germanic-Baltic-Slavic innovations. A part (11% for Swedes, 5.5% for Norwegians) is connected to Finno-Ugric peoples, cf. haplogroup N1c, cf. also mitochondrial haplogroups U5, V⁸ – compare common Germanic-Finno-Ugric innovations. However, for a considerable part of Germanic-speaking population (from 27% to 60% in Northern Germany and the South of Scandinavia) the haplogroup I1 is characteristic and is considered to be autochthonic, –

⁸ Spread of mitochondrial DNA is a separate question. It should be at least mentioned that for the modern population of Europe in some cases along with migrations of men there remained autochthonic population of women (cf. in Kusmenko’s book, p. 196, 206–214)..

compare presumed non-Indo-European vocabulary in the Germanic. The most relevant idea is that the concentration of the haplogroup I1 is extremely high in the Southern Sweden, Denmark and Northern Germany. Traditionally, this area is believed to be the homeland of the Germanic-speaking peoples.

Jurij Kusmenko using extremely rich and relevant material, compares in his book linguistic, archaeological and genetic data. He does so in a suitably cautious manner. One can suggest that the greatest achievement of this book is the bringing together of linguistic and genetic data. It opens a new avenue of scholarly enquiry and will no doubt inspire further research. The only regret is that this book, for now, is available only to Russian readers. Its translation into English will be a very useful addition to the field of Germanic research.

Ērika SAUSVERDE

Skandinavistikos centras

Vilniaus universitetas

Universiteto g. 5

LT-01513 Vilnius

Lithuania

[erika.sausverde@flf.vu.lt]