

VALTS ERNŠTREITS (Riga—Tartu)

DEVELOPMENT, RESEARCH, AND SOURCES OF WRITTEN LIVONIAN*

Abstract. Written Livonian started forming in the mid-19th century, when the first more comprehensive language studies as well as editions containing language samples began to be published. Today written Livonian is the main carrier of the tradition of Livonian usage. One of the main problems in the development of a written language is the choice of its base dialect. Beginning with the publication of the first Livonian reader (LL 1921), East Livonian has clearly taken the leading role in the written language; the only exceptions are the editions published by the Livonian Friends Society in Latvia (Līvõd sõbrad selč Letmās) in the early 1930s, which are based on Central Livonian. However, the differences in dialects were attempted to be reduced using orthographic means. Today texts with a different dialectal background are presented in a more authentic manner, if possible. As far as phonology is concerned it can be seen that the orthography of written Livonian uses the principle of phonetic notation and, as the written language develops, it has moved towards usage comfort, conforming to user skills. The same applies to morphology, which has been moving from accurate representation of usage towards a preference of such features that are easier to use and characterize the system better. As for lexis, the development of written Livonian displays an easily traceable tendency to purify the language from alien influences, while examples from kindred languages are widely used. In a nutshell, the development of the Livonian written language can be periodized as follows: 1) 19th century tradition (1863—1880); 2) 20th century tradition (1920 —). The 20th century written language tradition can in turn be divided even further: a) the research period of the 1920s (1920—1929); b) the "Līvli" period (1931—1972); c) the period of functional changes (1972 —).

Keywords: Livonian, literary language, phonology, morphology, lexis.

Formation of written Livonian

The written Livonian language emerged in the middle of the 19th century when the first more comprehensive language studies and publications of language samples started to appear. However, more active work began in the 1920s when the first secular periodicals were founded, encouraged by Finnish and Estonian researchers. The periodicals, secular literature, and translations of religious literature were published until 1940. Subsequently, various changes as a consequence of the Second World War halted this work for an extended period of time. However, even during the Soviet period the development of the written language continued.

Written Livonian saw radical functional changes at the beginning of the 1970s when the number of speakers of Livonian began to drop rapidly. The Livonian

* This study was supported by the Estonian Science Foundation grant No. 8409.

song groups formed in Riga and Ventspils in 1972 proved that most of their members lacked the necessary language skills, and written Livonian of that time did not fully and accurately represent spoken Livonian. This means that since the 1970s the written language, which had initially been created with the intention to enable the speakers of Livonian to express themselves with ease in writing and reading, had developed into a written language, whose goal was to enable non-speakers of the Livonian language to interpret spoken Livonian better and to comprehend more clearly the grammatical principles of the Livonian language, thus, simplifying acquisition of the language.

At the end of the 1980s and especially after Latvia regained its independence, interest in Livonians and the Livonian language grew rapidly, which resulted in active learning of the Livonian language, and after a long pause, new publications appeared in written Livonian. The authors of these publications hesitated between previously used different principles, not taking into account that many of them had been abandoned and were not in accordance with the real use of the Livonian language. However, the first conference on written Livonian in 1995 allowed putting the situation in order, and the previously interrupted traditions of the Livonian language continued.

At present mostly written sources of Livonian continue the traditions of Livonian-language usage because the language is no longer passed on from parents to children, from those whose mother tongue language is Livonian to those who want to learn the Livonian language. Even the process of teaching and learning the Livonian language occurs mainly through the written language — publications and educational materials, which increases responsibility for the preservation and development of the language.

When comparing Livonians to their neighbours — Latvians and Estonians, one can see that most sources of written Livonian are very compact — from 1863 to 1982 only 29 publications or their manuscripts were prepared. Even in the past three decades the number of written sources is not much larger. However, one should not regard the relatively small amount of publications and manuscripts as a shortcoming from the perspective of studying written Livonian because each source is unique in its own right and offers new ideas and principles, which their authors carefully contemplated in the long intervals between the sources.

When discussing publications and their manuscripts where the Livonian language is used, one should differentiate between two different types of sources, which are closely related to authenticity of the language, the function of written Livonian, and its change. The first group comprises publications or manuscripts, which were written by Livonians whose mother tongue is Livonian or those that were written with their participation and are primarily intended for other Livonians whose mother tongue also is Livonian. The development of the written language in these sources was dictated by the opinions of the language speakers or their advisors on what written Livonian should be like, so that those whose mother tongue is Livonian could fully express themselves and read in Livonian. Due to their authenticity these sources constitute the most significant part of written Livonian sources.

The second group is made up of publications or their manuscripts, which were written during the period from the end of the 1980s until today, right after the changes in written Livonian in the 1970s. These sources are primarily intended for those who are still learning or have studied the Livonian language. The people involved in the writing of these sources are mostly non-native users of Livonian. The quality of the Livonian language is often unstable which can be explained by the insufficient level of knowledge and understanding of the compiler or the writer.

The compact source materials of written Livonian enable us to track the development of a written language from its emergence until today over a time

period of 150 years. Furthermore, the development of written Livonian is closely related to the Livonian cultural processes and history in Latvia over the past two centuries.

Principles used in written Livonian

Choice of dialect

One of the principal problems in the process of developing written Livonian has been the choice of dialect, which serves as the basis of written language. The first publications in Livonian — the Gospel of Matthew — avoided this problem by using two separate books (Mt 1863a; Mt 1863b). The Gospel of Matthew published in East Livonian in 1880 (Mt 1880), which was based on previous books, was the first attempt to create a unified variety of written Livonian by marking the East Livonian phoneme / \bar{o} / as a compromise with letter \bar{a} in order to make it closer to the Western Livonian / \bar{a} /, thus eliminating the most significant difference between the dialects. Also, the long a (\bar{a}), which was used to mark / \bar{o} /, is clearly separated from the long \bar{a} (ah), which refers to the principle of marking / $\bar{a} \sim \bar{\bar{a}}$ / and / $\bar{o} \sim \bar{\bar{o}}$ / used in books published in 1863 ($\bar{a} > \bar{\bar{a}}$; $\bar{\bar{a}} > a$; $\bar{o} > \bar{\bar{o}}$; $\bar{\bar{o}} > o$).

Since the publication of the first Livonian reader (LL 1921), East Livonian has clearly taken a leading role in written Livonian; peculiarities referring to dialects in texts with different dialect backgrounds have mostly disappeared. An exception, however, is publications of the Society of Livonian Friends in Latvia (Līvõd sõbrad sel'č Letmās) in the first half of the 1930s (RĀ 1932; RĀ 1933), where Central Livonian was used.

At the same time, differences between the dialects were decreased by applying the principles of orthography (see also Ernštreit 2007). This mainly refers to the marking of the phonemes / \bar{o} / and / \bar{a} /, which since the publication of the newspaper "Līvli" have been marked with the letter \bar{a} , as in the 1880 Gospel of Matthew (Mt 1880). Interestingly enough, the opposite principle was used in the first reader (LL 1921), where the letter \bar{o} is used to mark West Livonian / \bar{a} / . In the 1970s, when the orthography of written Livonian was changed due to the need to show more accurately real pronunciation, the principle of using \bar{a} for the phoneme / \bar{o} / was abandoned. Nowadays texts with different dialect backgrounds are reproduced as authentically as possible, preserving the initial language peculiarities and using the form marking / $\bar{o} \sim \bar{\bar{a}}$ / two different letters — \bar{o} and \bar{a} , accordingly.

Phonology

In addition to the marking of vowel phonemes along with dialectal differences and the previously described / $\bar{o} \sim \bar{\bar{a}}$ /, finding letters for the phonemes / $\bar{ä}$, \bar{e} , \bar{o} , $\bar{\delta}$, $\bar{ü}$, $\bar{ö}$ / has been problematic, too. As regards the phonemes / $\bar{ä}$, $\bar{ü}$, $\bar{ö}$ /, a natural choice has mainly been letters used also in German and Estonian. An exception is books published in 1863 (Mt 1863ab), in which the letters \bar{a} , \bar{o} and \bar{u} have been used. Also, starting with the newspaper "Līvli" the Finnish y ¹ has been used for the phoneme / $\bar{ü}$ / . As regards the phonemes / \bar{o} / and / $\bar{ü}$ /, one has to mention that they were still common in everyday speech in the 19th century. In the 20th century, most probably due to the influence of Latvian, in most cases they changed to e and i , accordingly. Their use in the newspaper *Līvli* can be explained by the wish to reintroduce them in Livonian. However, this practice was abandoned after the 1970s, and these phonemes can only be found in publications of older Livonian texts.

¹ O. Loorits had suggested y for the marking of / $\bar{ü}$ / as early as in 1923 (Ernštreits 2011 : 76–77).

To mark the phoneme /*ɛ*/ in the orthography of written Livonian, since 1880 (Mt 1880) the Estonian character *õ* has been used (in Mt 1863ab one can find *ɔ* in this position). The marking of this phoneme is also closely connected with the marking of the phoneme /*ɔ̂*/, which occurs in non-initial syllables. In the publications of the 19th century /*ɛ*/ and /*ɔ̂*/ are not separated², and they are marked with the same character — with *ɔ* or *õ*, respectively. Whereas in the first publications of the 20th century (LL 1921; LL 1922; LL 1923) they were treated as separate phonemes, and /*ɔ̂*/ was marked with the character *ɔ*, which had been borrowed from the phonetic transcription. However, starting with the second half of 1923 (completion of the LKG manuscript), the separation of /*ɛ*/ and /*ɔ̂*/ was abandoned, and both phonemes were marked with the character *õ*. The only exception is the publications of the Society of Livonian Friends in Latvia (RĀ 1932; RĀ 1933), in which the phonemes were once again separated in order to show them in greater phonetical detail, and /*ɔ̂*/ was marked as *ɔ*.

Since the 1970s, in order to make the transcription of Livonian pronunciation easier, the phoneme /*ɔ*/ has been marked separately with the character *ó*. In the earlier publications, when there was no such need, the phoneme was mainly marked with the usual *o*. However, two observations can be made with regard to the transcription of /*ɔ*/ — in the publications of the year 1863 (Mt 1863a; Mt 1863b), due to the phonetic transcription the phoneme was shown separately with the character *o*, and in the publications of the Society of Livonian Friends in Latvia (RĀ 1932; RĀ 1933) it is surprisingly marked with *o* — the same character that was also used to mark /*ɔ̂*/.

Vowel length was marked in all the publications in Antiqua in accordance with the phonetic transcription (thus, similarly to Antiqua of Latvian language (new) writing) with the macron above the letter (*ī, ē, ā, ō, ā, ō, ū, ō, ū, ō*). The only exception is the 1880 Gospel of Matthew (Mt 1880), which is the only source in Fraktur in the history of written Livonian. There vowel length was marked by means of the letter *h* (*ī = ih; ē = õh*), as it had been used in the Latvian Fraktur (old) writing on which the orthography of this source is based.

In further non-initial syllables, in regard to the lengthened separate vowel that occur in the next syllable after a short stressed syllable, in most cases the quantity of the source vowels is not marked. It could be explained by adoption of this principle from Estonian orthography as early as with the first source of the 20th century (LL 1921). In 19th century sources the lengthened vowel was always marked, although this practice was common only in closed syllables.

The lengthened vowel in the syllable after a short stressed syllable was marked also in the newspaper "Līvli",³ but only in the first issue (Līvli 1931). In contemporary written Livonian in the interests of a more accurate transcription of the pronunciation, the lengthened syllable, which follows a short syllable, started to be marked again in 1980 in an anthology of Livonian folk songs (LTDZ 1980).

Especially in the earlier stages of the development of written Livonian, it was very complicated to mark the diphthongs (*ie* and *o*) and the triphthongs (*õi, õj, õk*, and *iẽu, iẽv*) with extra short initial components. In the first publications of the Livonian language (Mt 1863ab), the diphthong *ie* was shown as a separate vowel *e* preceded by palatalization of the letter; the same principle was used with regard to the polyphthongs (*Çe, Çie* where *Ç* is a palatalized consonant) in the 1920s (LL 1922; LL 1923; AK 1923). In order to mark the triad *ieu*, in the first books the final component *u* was removed or replaced with the semivowel *v* (*iev ~ ie*). The practice of marking the last component of the triad *ieu* with the semivowel (*iev*) can

² The phoneme /*ɛ*/ occurs in Livonian only in the first syllable and /*ɔ̂*/ only in non-initial syllables.

³ Evidently after a proposal of K. Stalte. In foreign words, the occurrence of long vowels in non-first syllables can be observed also in some other sources.

also be observed in the sources that appeared in the first half of the 1930s (Līvli A; RĀ 1932, 1933; LKL 1933) and in manuscripts that were prepared after the Second World War (ČDG 1966; LL s.a.).

In the sources from the mid-1920s (LKG; LL 1924; LL 1926; Stalte 1924) the diphthong *ie* and the first component of the triphthong *ieu* was interpreted as a semivowel. Also, the last component of the triphthong (*je*, *jev*) was regarded as a semivowel.

For the first time all the components of the diphthong *ie* and the triphthong *ieu* were fully marked (*ie*, *ieu*) only in a song anthology that was published in 1929 (LKL 1929). After a long interval of several years they appeared once again in this shape in the Mazirbe period (Līvli B) of the newspaper "Līvli" and since then up to now in most sources.

In connection with the polyphthongs, which start with an extra short first component ^h, most components are marked (*uo*, *uoi*). An exception is all the readers which were published in Tartu by the Academic Mother Tongue Society (Akadeemiline Emakeele Selts) (LL 1921; LL 1922; LL 1923; LL 1924; LL 1926) and other sources of the first half of the 1920s, where *o* (*o*, *oi*) was used instead of *uo*; in some words the same principle can be observed in the publications of the Society of Livonian Friends in Latvia (RĀ 1932; RĀ 1933). In post-war sources (ČDG 1966; LL s.a.) the last component of the triphthong *uoi* was partially interpreted as the semivowel *j* (*uoj*).

Until the beginning of the 1930s a polyphthong with a broken tone and the component *i*, which is followed by *ž*, *i* is usually marked, even though its marking lacks consistency. In publications of the 19th century a diphthong in polysyllabic and monosyllabic words is also separated — in the first case *i* is not marked, even though the first component of the diphthong is marked as long. However, in the publications of the Society of Livonian Friends in Latvia (RĀ 1932; RĀ 1933) and other sources, starting from the Mazirbe period (Līvli B) of the newspaper "Līvli", the marking of *i* marking was abandoned altogether. The only exception was the reader by P. Damberg (JL 1935).

The interpretation of *u* as a vowel or a semivowel in diphthongs without the broken tone with the last component *u* (in closed syllables) gave rise to serious problems, and one can see extensive variations. In 19th-century sources the semivowel *v* appears systematically; in the first publications of the 1920s (LL 1921; LL 1922; LL 1923) it was replaced by the vowel *u*, which starting with the 1923 manuscript of O. Loorits (LKG) was once again replaced by the semivowel *v*. However, but in the poetry anthology by K. Stalte (Stalte 1924) *u* was used, and in the 1929 song anthology (LKL 1929) both options — *u* and *v* — were used at the same time. Starting with the publication of "Līvli" (Līvli A; Līvli B), the vowel *u* was used despite the fact that in the publications of the Society of Livonian Friends in Latvia and in the 1933 song anthology (LKL 1933) *v* was used. In other sources of the 1930s *u* was used, but the Esperanto dictionary, which was prepared after the Second World War, used *v*, and the manuscripts of the readers that were compiled shortly after that (ČDG s.a.; LL s.a.) the digraph *uv* of a vowel and a semivowel was used, which occurs also in several words in the 1936 catechism (Katkismus 1936). The 1970s witnessed a comeback of the use of *u*, which is also used in contemporary written Livonian.

There is also considerable variation in the marking of quantity in polyphthongs with a lengthened first component. In the 1863 Gospels of Matthew (Mt 1863a; Mt 1863b) only the diphthong *ūo*⁴ was marked as long while in the 1880 Gospel of Matthew (Mt 1880) the marking of the lengthening was abandoned altogether, which is reasonable considering the fact that the letter *h* serves as a macron.

⁴ In the word *kuōra* 'ear', as an exception, length is indicated on the second component of the diphthong.

In the first reader of the Academic Mother Tongue Society (LL 1920) a diphthong with a lengthened first component was partially marked with the help of a grave accent, which was adopted from phonetic transcription, above the letter (*ði*); however, in triphthongs lengthening was not shown. In the other sources of the 1920s, except for the last one (LKL 1929), length in polyphthongs was not shown, excluding the cases where the second component of the diphthong is interpreted as a semivowel. In such cases the marking of length is already a result from a separate vowel and not from the marking of the length of a polyphthong. The same principle is also used in the publications of the Society of Livonian Friends in Latvia (RĀ 1932; RĀ 1933).

In the 1929 song anthology by K. Stalte (LKL 1929), all polyphthongs were marked as long, including those without any long components. According to this principle, all the Livonian polyphthongs are long. As a result, written Livonian started the practice of showing the quantity of the lengthened first component of a polyphthong (but not in all polyphthongs as K. Stalte), and since the publication of the newspaper "Līvli" (Līvli A) the length of the polyphthongs was systematically marked (*īe*, *ūo*, *āi*, *ūoi*). The only exceptions are the sources by K. Stalte (Līvli B; Abēd), where only the diphthongs *īe* and *ūo* were marked as long. The idea of not showing the length in other polyphthongs also comes from K. Stalte, who claimed that in Livonian all the polyphthongs are long. Nevertheless, in a book of spiritual songs by K. Stalte (Loulrāntōz 1939) all diphthongs were marked as long.

Diphthongs with a broken tone, which start with *i* and *u*, were usually marked as short (*ie*, *uo*). The only exceptions are once again the work of K. Stalte (LKL 1929; Līvli B; Loulrāntōz 1939), secular sources of the 1930s (JL 1935; Abēd; LJ), and contemporary written Livonian, where such diphthongs have been marked as long (*īe*, *ūo*).

In consonant phonemes the main issue has been the marking of palatalization. In the 1863 Gospels of Matthew (Mt 1863a; Mt 1863b) palatalization was marked with an acute above the letter or after it (*í*, *d'*) in accordance with the phonetic transcription used by the Livonian researchers A. J. Sjögren and F. J. Wiedemann. In the 1880 Gospel of Matthew in Fraktur (Mt 1880) palatalization was marked by striking through the letter, as it had been done in the Fraktur (old) Latvian script. However, taking into consideration its peculiarities the palatalization of *d* and *t* remained unmarked.

Similarly to the sources of 1863, but now already following the principles of the Finno-Ugric phonetic transcription used by L. Kettunen and O. Loorits, palatalization started to be indicated in all the readers prepared by the Academic Mother Tongue Society (LL 1921; LL 1922; LL 1923; LL 1924; LL 1926) and in the sources of the first half of the 1920s (AK 1923; LKG).

The 1924 collection of poetry by K. Stalte (Stalte 1924) made for the first time use of the palatalization style that is characteristic of the Latvian language with a comma underneath the respective letter (*r*, *ŋ*, *ļ*); because of the limitations of printing technology palatalization of *d* was not marked. This principle was also used in the 1929 song anthology by K. Stalte (LKL 1929) and — possibly following Stalte's suggestion — in the first issue of the newspaper "Līvli" (Līvli 1931).

Some people who were involved in the development of written Livonian did not accept the new way of marking palatalization. In the issues of the Jelgava periodical (Līvli A) of the newspaper "Līvli" and in the publications of the Society of Livonian Friends in Latvia (RĀ 1932; RĀ 1933) palatalization continued to be marked as before in accordance with the phonetic transcription. K. Stalte continued to mark palatalization in accordance with the Latvian style in the song anthology published in 1933 (LKL 1933) and in the Mazirbe periodical (Līvli B) of the newspaper "Līvli" when he became its editor. Since then the marking style suggested by K. Stalte

secured its positions in written Livonian and it started to be used in the second half of the 1930s, as well as in the sources compiled later and in contemporary written Livonian.

Another problem of marking consonant phonemes was how to mark the phonemes /š, ž, ŋ/. As regards /š/ and /ž/, the same characters were used both in the phonetic transcription and as the Antiqua (new) orthography of Latvian and Estonian (š, ž). The only exception is the 1880 Gospel of Matthew (Mt 1880), in which /š/ and /ž/ are marked with a set of letters according with the Fraktur (old) script of the Latvian language. In most sources the phoneme /ŋ/ is marked with *n*, with the exception of the publications of 1963 (Mt 1863ab), where a separate character *ñ* was used for the unpalatalized phoneme.

In different periods the group of consonant characters used in written Livonian has been increased by additional letters. In 19th-century publications they were *k̄, ũ, ś, p̄*, which showed the following partial palatalization, which is determined by *i* (the 1880 Gospel of Matthew (Mt 1880) reveals only *k̄* because it is the only character that can be used also in the Latvian Fraktur (old) orthography); in the second reader of the Academic Mother Tongue Society (LL 1922) *m̄, p̄, ś* perform the same function; the third reader of the Academic Mother Tongue Society (LL 1923) reveals *m̄, p̄, ś, ũ*; the rules of the Livonian Society (AK 1923) have *p̄* and *ś*.

The manuscript of grammar terminology by O. Loorits (LKG) and in the publications of the Society of Livonian Friends in Latvia (RĀ 1932; RĀ 1933) reveal the characters *c* and *č*, which were used instead of the consonant combinations *ts* and *tš*. However, in the former publication *c* and *č* were used only for the purpose of illustrating the incorrect way of writing, whereas in the latter one they were used on a regular basis. In the 1929 song anthology, in accordance with the length marking principle used by K. Stalte, the group of consonant characters is joined by the following signs *v̄, l̄, n̄, r̄, ŋ̄, m̄, ĩ*.

In the case of other signs, which are connected with showing consonant phonemes, the principles have been used regularly. To mark palatalization in consonant clusters, only actually palatalized consonants were marked systematically as palatalized. An exception is a song book from 1929 (LKL 1929) and P. Damberg's article about taking care of the Livonian language (Damberg 1978), which aimed at creating a unified marking system for palatalized consonant clusters as only the first components of palatalized clusters were been marked as palatalized. In most sources a word-final long consonant was marked with one consonant, and double marking was used only in the 19th-century publications and in some sources which were edited or prepared by K. Stalte (LKL 1929; Līvli B; Abēd; Loulrāntōz 1939).

It has not become a tradition to mark the broken tone in written Livonian. The first attempts to mark it were made in the publications of the Society of Livonian Friends in Latvia (RĀ 1932; RĀ 1933), but the complicated marking system did not cover all the cases where the broken tone appeared. The broken tone was marked everywhere only in a folk song anthology published in 1980 (LTDZ 1980), where its occurrence was marked with an apostrophe ('). It has been suggested that in contemporary written Livonian the broken tone should be marked in those texts which have been created for studying the language.

Morphology and use of the morphological principle

When choosing between the morphological and phonetical principle in the combinations of voiced and silent consonants (consonant pairs *g ~ k, b ~ p, d ~ t, z ~ s, ž ~ š*), starting from the second reader of the Academic Mother Tongue Society (LL 1922), there has been a clear preference for the morphological principle. In case forms the morphological principle has been used in almost all sources (the

only exception being the first reader of the Academic Mother Tongue Society (LL 1921), where in case forms the phonetic principle was used fully), unless one takes into account the consonant clusters *-zt-/-žt-* (*-st-/-št-*), which in most sources have been marked as voiceless. In the publications of 1863 (Mt 1863ab) and in the second reader of the Academic Mother Tongue Society (LL 1922) the phonetic principle was more widely used in those consonant clusters where *z* and *ž* occur. In the dictionary of Esperanto (ČDG 1966) the phonetical principle was used only with the noun ending of the nominative case *-i* in the case forms and also partially in those verbs where the the past is indicated with *-z-*.

The morphological principle for consonant clusters in case forms has been followed fully in the 1880 Gospel of Matthew (Mt 1880), in the publications of the Society of Livonian Friends in Latvia (RĀ 1932; RĀ 1933), and in contemporary written Livonian.

For those nouns in the partitive case, where *t* in the partitive ending *-ta*, joining the genitive stem, replaces *d* in the ending, mostly the phonetical principle has been used where the connection with the genitive stem is not shown (*-ta*). The only exception is the ABC book prepared by K. Stalte (Abēd).

The choice of the declension paradigm of an agent noun clearly shows that the declension type ending in *-i*, where *i* does not join the *z* in the case forms, has almost totally disappeared. The declension paradigm with *-z-* was adopted as late as in 1923 in the manuscript of grammar terminology compiled by O. Loorits (LKG), possibly in order to unify the declension paradigm for nouns ending in *-i*, and it was also used in the last two readers of the Academic Mother Tongue Society (LL 1924; LL 1926). Later sources shows use of the paradigm without *-z-*, or the paradigm without *-z-*, and the paradigm with *-z-* indication. In contemporary written Livonian, in the interest of regularity of declension paradigms, the paradigm without *-z-* is not used fully, and it has been used only in a few cases.

The 1930s witnessed attempts to revive use of the negative supine *-môt* and external local cases. As separate forms they had already appeared in written Livonian earlier – in the publications of the 19th century, as well as in several sources of the 1920s. Nevertheless, regular use of both phenomena was ensured only in the reader by P. Dambergs (JL 1935) and the sources that have been published since the end of the Second World War.

Lexicon

The proportion of loanwords among the neologisms, which were suggested to replenish written Livonian, is higher in those sources where the subject matter required plentiful use of neologisms (LKG; Līvli AB; ČDG 1966; LL s.a.). Internationalisms that have come into Livonian through Latvian as an intermediary language constitute the largest part. Some new words have been borrowed through Estonian, more rarely from other languages.

By comparison with other languages, Estonian has been used extensively to enrich written Livonian. In written Livonian loans from Estonian were often preferred in comparison with recent loans from Latvian, which in the earlier development stages of written Livonian were mainly seen in the publications where they were regarded as language examples in which the colloquial language is reflected more directly (e.g. Mt 1863a; Mt 1863b; Mt 1880; LL 1921; LL 1922; LL 1923).

During the development of the written language, the proportion of neologisms created on the basis of the Livonian language has continually increased, and these new words replace the former and more recent widely used loanwords from Latvian. Neologisms appear as a result of reviving the use of older words and creating new word stems and new meanings, as well as creating compounds and complex words with affixes. The latter method when creating new words has been very produc-

tive, especially after the 1930s. When creating neologisms, Estonian and Latvian have often served as examples.

Purification of written Livonian from foreign influences is well illustrated by the total removal of the verb prefixes of Latvian origin from written Livonian, starting with the publication of the newspaper "Līvli" (Līvli A)⁵, and replacement of the conjunctions and prepositions of Latvian origin *un* 'and', *bet* 'but', *bās* 'without', *pa* (translative preposition) with Livonian counterparts. In this way the use of *pa* was rejected in those publications of the 1920s that were prepared by K. Stalte (Stalte 1924; LKL 1929), as well as in the newspaper "Līvli" (Līvli A). Since the 1929 song book from (LKL 1929) the conjunction *un* has been replaced with the conjunction *ja*, which follows the pattern of the kindred languages. The same is true of the preposition *bās*, which was replaced by *ilmõ* (also *ilm*, *ilma*).

The Estonian loanword *aga* had been suggested instead of the conjunction *bet* of Latvian origin in West Livonian in the 1863 Gospel of Matthew 1863 (Mt 1863a), from where it was adopted also in the 1880 publication (Mt 1880). However, regular use of this word in written Livonian started only with the publication of the newspaper "Līvli" (Līvli A). Nevertheless, the publication edited by P. Dambergs (JL 1935; ČDG 1966; LL s.a.; Damberg 1978) continued to use *bet*, probably in order to avoid overlap of the new conjunction *aga* 'but' and the inherited Livonian conjunction *agā* 'or'. In the contemporary written language both *bet* and *aga* are used, depending on the choice of individual writers.

Use of the inflectional form of the verb *võlda* 'to be' in the first and the third person of the present singular, as well as in the third person plural, reflects the individual approach of each writer to the use of the lexicon. In the third person plural mainly *ātõ* and its variants *at*, *āt*, *atõ*, *attõ* are used. Some exceptions include the 1863 Gospel of Matthew in East Livonian (Mt 1863b) and a related publication from 1880 (Mt 1880), as well as several authors in the Mazirbe period (Līvli B) of the newspaper "Līvli" and in the 1939 anthology of spiritual songs (Loulrāntõz 1939), which used the less popular form *umād*. Thus, the choice of the word in has been determined in most cases by personal preference of the writer or the peculiarity of the text. Several sources reveal a number of different options at the same time.

A more systematic approach has been taken when choosing the word for the declension of the first and the third person singular. For the third person singular *um* has always been used, and the same word is common also in the first person and the singular forms of the first and the third person usually coincide in Livonian. Nevertheless in the written language one can see a clear wish, at least in connection with the verb *võlda*, to separate the forms of the first and the third person. For the first time this principle was applied deliberately or unknowingly already in the 1863 Gospel of Matthew in West Livonian (Mt 1863a), where *vuob* (in later sources also *uob*, *ūob*) was used in the first person. From there it spread to the publication of 1880 (Mt 1880), in which it was used as a parallel form in brackets (*um* (*vuob*)).

It could well be that this principle as applied in the 1880 Gospel of Matthew (Mt 1880) for the purposes of grammatical terminology (LKG 1923) was adopted by O. Loorits, who also used it in two subsequent edited books — in the fourth and fifth readers of the Academic Mother Tongue Society (LL 1924; LL 1926). K. Stalte also started the separation of the first person singular from the third in the Mazirbe periodical (Līvli B) of the newspaper "Līvli" and other later publications translated or edited by him (Abēd; ŪT 1942; Loulrāntõz 1939). Evidently, under his influence the first and the third person forms were separated in the last calendar issued by

⁵ Prefixes of Latvian origin are absent also in several sources of the 1920s, even though in all of the readers of the Academic Mother Tongue Society the prefixes of Latvian origin are still used.

the Society of Livonian Friends in Latvia⁶ (RĀ 1933), the catechism published in 1936 (Katkismus 1936), and in the Esperanto dictionary (ĈDG), which is also the last occasion when this principle was applied. Nowadays the verb *võlda* does not reveal any difference between the first and the third person.

From the point of view of standardizing written Livonian, there has been a problem how to render foreign proper nouns as editors and authors had to choose between keeping the original form characteristic of the kindred languages or transliteration of foreign words according to Latvian, which for Livonians who were in close contact with Latvian was a rather natural choice. Evidently, both choices have been equal as the principle concerning the rendering of foreign words has changed almost with every subsequent source. Some sources reveal even a mix of both principles. The wish to keep the original form has been somewhat more popular, and nowadays this principle is used in written Livonian.

When speaking of general development of written Livonian, one could claim that the changes mainly emerge from a functional need (e.g. marking of vowel length in non-initial syllables), the need of a compromise regarding dialects (e.g. West Livonian /*ō*/ and East Livonian /*ā*/ marking with one letter), the wish to show phonetical details (e.g. the system used in the publications of the Society of Livonian Friends in Latvia to mark the broken tone), the need to simplify written Livonian (e.g. marking of /*š*/ and /*ġ*/ with by means of a single character; phoneme /*o*, *o*/ marking by means of one character), the wish to purify the language from Latvian superstratum (rejection of Latvian prefixes and replacement of Latvian conjunctions), the wish to revive some phenomena that have disappeared from the language (marking of the historical vowels *y* and *ö* and revival of external local cases), and individual interpretation of linguistic phenomena (e.g. marking of the quantity of consonants by means of a macron).

In phonology one can see that the marking of phonemes in the orthography of the written language using the phonetic marking principle and, as the written language develops, has moved towards convenience of usage, by taking into account the user's skills. Thus, Fraktur orthography was created on the basis of first 19th-century sources, which were based on the phonetical transcription. It corresponds to the most common writing by Livonians of those times – the Latvian Fraktur (old) orthography. Also, in the first sources of the 20th century the adapted phonetic transcription supplemented with elements borrowed from Estonian was used, which in the course of time has been changed to make it more suitable for users, introduction of the marking of additional quantity with a macron, which is common for Finno-Ugric phonetic transcription and Latvian Antiqua (new) writing, also the marking of palatalization which corresponds to the new orthography of Latvian with a comma underneath the letter and other principles that facilitated the use of orthography for Livonians.

In the context of lexicon, the development of the written language has an easily traceable tendency to purify the language from alien influences, thus trying to affect the use of the Livonian language in a wider sense. Furthermore, because of similar language structures, examples from kindred languages are widely used.

Periodization of the written language

There have been previous attempts to periodize the Livonian written language. E. Vääri in his 1948 study divides the orthography of written Livonian into the following periods: 1) Sjögren's principles, 2) Sjögren-Wiedemann's period, 3) Latvian-German written variety, 4) the Kettunen-Loorits period, 5) principles of Livonian

⁶ The first calendar (RĀ 1932) was published even before the newspaper "Livli" started to be edited by K. Stalte.

Friends in Latvia (*Līvõd sõbrad selč Letmās*), 6) literary principles of later periods (sources from 1930s; Vääri 1948 : 131–132).

In his classification of written Livonian, P. Damberg focused on the orthography and offered three different written varieties: Wiedemann's written form, which complied with the phonetic transcription of the time, Lepste-Rudzītis' written form, and the written form by L. Kettunen and O. Loorits, created in the 1920s (Damberg 1978 : 81). The same classification was also provided by T. Karma (Karma 1998 : 44).

However, the previous classifications did not accurately reflect the development periods of written Livonian. One can focus solely on orthography or the written language in a narrower context, as an exit point, which allows the boundaries to be clearly defined. However, apart from the orthographic principle and choosing the written form, other important factors in the development of written Livonian include choice of the dialect, principles of language maintenance, orthographical details that are not related to the notation of phonemes, etc.

When looking at the problem from a broader perspective, the history of written Livonian can be clearly divided into two written language traditions: the 19th century and the 20th century. Namely, all the 19th-century sources are closely related; however, for the preparation of the 20th-century sources, the traditions of the Livonian written language of the 19th century sources were not directly continued. The written language of the 20th century is based on the principles that were developed from scratch, even though, in the orthographic sense, the roots of both the 20th-century and 19th-century written traditions can be traced in different periods, using the phonetic transcription rules, and, thus, they are similar.

Similarly to the origin from the phonetic transcription, the principles are also used in the Latvian written language, which has been the reason for the widespread incorrect opinion that the writing principles used in the Livonian written language traditions of the 20th century arise from the Antiqua (new) orthography of Latvian. It is clear that the initial Livonian written language comes from the Finno-Ugric phonetic transcription, and the convenience of its use has been simplified and later adjusted to the Latvian written form. However the orthography of written Livonian, first of all, in the context of using palatalization marks, became more Latvian-like with the help of K. Stalte, due to his consistency in applying his orthographical principles.

Several periods can be singled out in the 20th-century tradition. The first one consists of all the editions of the 1920s. The second 20th-century period clearly begins with the start of publication of the newspaper "Līvli", when the written language started to systematically use a number of innovations, including the principles first suggested in the 1920s. Even though at the beginning of this period many of the innovations were met with distrust, the principles used in the written language remained more or less homogeneous until the late 1960s.

The third development period of the 20th century, which is still going on, is related to the decrease of the number of native speakers of the Livonian language, and the emergence of a new Livonian generation not speaking the Livonian language and the resulting functional changes.

To sum up, the development of written Livonian can be classified into the following periods: 1) 19th-century written language tradition (1863–1880); 2) 20th-century written language tradition (1920 – to date). The 20th-century written language tradition, on the other hand, can be divided even further into the following stages: a) research period of the 1920s (1920–1929), b) the newspaper "Līvli" period (1931–1972), and c) the period of functional changes (1972 – to date).

Address

Valts Ernštreits
University of Tartu
valts.ernstreits@ut.ee
valts@niveplace.lv

Abbreviations

Abēd — Jelzi sōna. Abēd ja ȳrgandōks lugdōbrāntōz. Kubbōpand K. Stalte [1936]. (Ms). ERA F.R.-2362, N.3, S.1; **AK 1923** — Līvōd Īt alizkēra, Tartu [1923]; **ĀDG** — I. Čače, P. Dambergs, H. Grīva, Esperantisto en Latvio ĉe livoj, Pumpuri 1966 (Ms); **Fitoterapia** — [P. Damberg, I. Čače, Fitoterapia, s.a.] (Ms); **JL 1935** — P. Damberg, Jemakiel lugdōbrāntōz skūol ja kuod pierāst, Helsinki 1935; **Katkismus 1936** — M. Luther, Piški katkismus, Helsinki 1936; **Līvli** — Newspaper "Līvli" 1931–1939, Jelgava; **LJ** — Kus lāinōd mierstō vierōbōd ja rāndan sūdō āndabōd, s.a. (Ms.); **LJ 2007** — Līvōd jelāmi. Lībiešu dzīve. The Life of Livs, Rīga 2007; **LKG** — O. Loorits, Līvō kiel grammatika termīnōd, [1923] (Ms). EKM EKLA F175 M27: 14; **LKL 1929** — Līvōkiel lōlōd. Kubbōkuoņrōn Stalte kōrli, [Helsinki] 1929; **LKL 1933** — Līvōkiel lōlōd II. Kubbōkuoņrōn M. Stalte, [Helsinki] 1933; **LLA 1982** — [H. Skuja, T. Karma, P. Dambergs, P. Kļaviņa, H. Grīva, Lībiešu dzejas antoloģija, Rīga 1982] (Ms); **LL s.a.** — Livonian reader by Pētōr Dambergs. PD 150874 (Ms); **LL 1921** — Esimene Liivi lugemik. Kokkusādnud Lauri Kettunen ja Oskar Loorits. Ežmi Līvōd lugdōbrōntēz. Sasādand Prof. Lauri Kettunen un Štud. Oskar Loorits, Tartu 1921 (Akaemilise Emakeele Seltsi toimetused I); **LL 1922** — Teine liivi lugemik. Toi līvōd lugdōbrōntēz, Tartu 1922 (Akaemilise Emakeele Seltsi toimetused V); **LL 1923** — Kolmas liivi lugemik. Kolmāz līvōd lugdōbrōntēz. Sasādand August Skadiņ, Tartu 1923 (Akaemilise Emakeele Seltsi toimetused IX); **LL 1924** — Neljas liivi lugemik. Neļtōz līvōd lugdōbrōntēz, Tartu 1924 (Akaemilise Emakeele Seltsi toimetused X); **LL 1926** — Viies liivi lugemik. Vīdōz līvōd lugdōbrōntēz, Tartu 1926 (Akaemilise Emakeele Seltsi toimetused XV); **Loulrāntōz 1939** — Līvlist vaimli loulrāntōz, Helsinki 1939; **LTDZ 1980** — P. Dambergs, T. Karma, Lībiešu tautasdziesmas, Rīga 1980; **Mt 1863a** — Das Evangelium Matthäi in den westlichen Dialect des Livischen übersetzt von dem Liven J. Prinz und dessen Söhnen P. Prinz und J. P. Prinz, durchgesehen von F. J. Wiedemann, London 1863; **Mt 1863b** — Das Evangelium Matthäi in den östlichen Dialect des Livischen zum ersten Male übersetzt von dem Liven N. Pollmann, durchgesehen von F. J. Wiedemann, London 1863; **Mt 1880** — Pūva Matteus Ewangelium lihbischki, Pehterburgs 1880; **RĀ 1932** — [L. Rudzītis,] Rāndalist ājgarāntōz 1933. ājgastōn, kien at 365 pāvvo, Rīgōs 1932; **RĀ 1933** — [L. Rudzītis,] Līvōd Rāndalist ājgarāntōz 1934. ājgastōn, kien at 365 pāvvo, Rīgā 1933; **ŪT 1937** — Ūž testament, Helsinki 1937; **ŪT 1942** — Ūž testament, Helsinki 1942.

L I T E R A T U R E

- Damberg, P. 1978, Liivi keelekorraldusest. — ESA 23 1977, 71–82.
Ernštreits, V. 2011, Lībiešu rakstu valoda, Rīga.
— 2007, Livonian Orthography. — LU XLIII, 11–22.
Karma, T. 1993a, Liivi raamatukeel ja liivi raamat. — Keelereform ja raamat, Tallinn (Eesti Rahvusraamatukogu toimetised 3), 170–173.
— 1993b, Liivi raamatu bibliograafia. — Keelereform ja raamat, Tallinn (Eesti Rahvusraamatukogu toimetised 3), 174–176.
— 1998, Lībiešu valodas normēšanas pamati. — Latvijas Zinātņu Akadēmijas vēstis A 52 3, 41–45.
Stalte, K. 1924, Līvo lōlōd, Tallinna.
— 2011, Jelzi sōnā. Abēd ja ȳrgandōks lugdōbrōntōz, Tartu.
Vaaldapāā [O. Loorits] 1925, Liivikeelse "trūkitud paberi" ajalugu. — Postimees 13. (28.) 03.

V ä ä r i, E. 1948, *Liivi kirjakeele arenemine. auhinnatöö*, Tartu (Manuscript. University of Tartu).

ВАЛТС ЭРНШТРЕЙТС (Рига—Тарту)

РАЗВИТИЕ, ИССЛЕДОВАНИЕ И ИСТОЧНИКИ ЛИВСКОГО ЛИТЕРАТУРНОГО ЯЗЫКА

Формирование ливского литературного языка началось в середине XIX века, когда появились первые лингвистические исследования и собрания образцов ливской речи. При формировании литературного языка одной из важнейших и принципиальных проблем является выбор того диалекта, который должен лечь в основу литературного языка. После того, как увидела свет первая книга для чтения на ливском языке (L.L. 1921), в развитии литературного языка стал четко превалировать восточный диалект. Единственным исключением были издания Общества друзей ливов Латвии (*Līvõd sõbrad seļč Letmās*), опубликованные в первой половине 1930-х годов, которые опирались на центральный диалект ливского языка. При этом делались попытки сгладить диалектные различия с помощью орфографии. Если поначалу в обозначении звуков отдавалось предпочтение фонетическому подходу, то в ходе развития литературного языка произошел переход на более дружественный для пользователя способ письма. То же относится и к передаче морфологических явлений. В отношении лексики отмечалось стремление оградить литературный язык от чужих влияний, а в заимствовании предпочитались слова из близкородственных языков.

Подводя итог, можно отметить, что в развитии ливского литературного языка просматриваются два периода: 1) традиция литературного языка XIX века (1863—1880 гг.); 2) традиция литературного языка XX века (начиная с 1920 года до настоящего времени). В развитии литературного языка XX века в свою очередь выделяются а) период лингвистических исследований (1920—1929), б) период журнала «*Līvlī*» (1931—1972), в) период изменений функций ливского языка (начиная с 1972 года и до наших дней).