THE BORDER BETWEEN PRODUCTIVITY AND NON-PRODUCTIVITY – ARE LIVONIAN FREQUENTATIVE VERBS DERIVATIVES OR LEXICALISED?

Santra Jantunen
University of Helsinki

Abstract. This paper takes a look at productive part of derivation of verbs in Finnic languages, frequentative verbs that have an *l*-derivational suffix in Livonian and how they occur and are constructed. The research is based on data of 15 different *l*-suffix verbs. The paper investigates how formally frequentative verbs are constructed in Livonian and if they are frequentative in their meaning. An essential criterion to interpret a verb as a derivative is that it has a derivational base, typically an underived word stem, and the paper attempts to find out if Livonian *l*-suffix verbs have one. Additionally, the paper aims to study if frequentative derivation is still productive in Livonian and to what degree frequentative *l*-derivatives have been lexicalised. Also other Finnic languages are taken into consideration when examining the derivational base and distribution for Livonian *l*-suffix verbs.

Keywords: Livonian, Finnic languages, verbal derivation, frequentative derivatives, productivity, lexicalisation

1. Introduction

Frequentative verb derivational suffixes are common and widely distributed among the Finnic languages. Livonian, however, seems to be an exception to this general Finnic pattern, as its frequentative derivatives seem to be less productive than in other Finnic languages. There is also a strong tendency for the frequentative derivatives to be lexicalised. In Livonian, the lexicalisation of the frequentative derivatives seems to be even more regular and general than in the other Finnic languages. For instance, in the following example (1), interpreting the verb *vaṇțļõ* 'look' as a frequentative is not all that clear:

(1) *jemā*   *vied-īz*   *tūlda*   *un*   **vaņţ-ļ-iz***:*
     mother   pull-PST.3SG   fire.PART   and   look-FREQ-PST.3SG

     min   *mag,*   *kus*   *doktār*   *vȯļ*
     I.GEN   stomach   where   doctor   be.PST.3SG

     pan-d   *krūs*   *pā̄-lõ,*   *se*   *kūož*   *vȯļ*
     put-PTCP.PST   pot   on-ALL   it   spot   be.PST.3SG

     tikkiž   *tūorõz,*   *se*   *vȯļ*   *no-kittõ-d.*
     completely   fresh   it   be.PST.3SG   ASP-burn-PTCP.PST

   'Mother lit the fire and looked: the spot on my stomach, on which the
   doctor had put the pot, was completely raw; it had burnt.' (SUST 250:
   22)[1]

The verb *vaņţļõ* 'look' in the example appears to be a frequentative
derivative; it seems to be formed by the stem and the suffix *-l-*, but in
order to be a frequentative derivative, it also should have a stem from
which the frequentative is derived. Such a stem is not found, however,
so it is unclear whether it should be interpreted as a frequentative
derivative.

In this article, I aim to clarify Livonian frequentative suffix verbs
and their character with the help of the following questions:
1. How are formally frequentative verbs constructed in Livonian and
   why are they frequentative in their meaning?
2. If frequentative suffix verbs are frequentative in their meaning, is
   the derivational base to be found for them?
3. Is the frequentative derivation in Livonian still productive, and to
   what degree have frequentative derivatives been lexicalised?

I assume that, in fact, frequentative verbs in Livonian are lexi-
calised forms. This hypothesis will be discussed from a diachronic and
comparative perspective.

In principle, the derivative type can be considered as productive if
new derivatives can be produced into it. A new derivative can also be
produced from whatever underived stem specific to that derivative
type. Derivative types that are productive are transparent in their
structure and meaning; that is, the derivative is to be understood as a
whole, a combination of the word and the derivational suffix. To pro-
ductivity is added also the predictability of the meaning: very pro-

---

1 Because the *l*-element can be segmented, I have separated it in the glosses from stem-
   and other final elements. The same naturally applies to other segmentable elements,
   such as inflections of nouns and verbs, as well as postpositions and adverbs, whose
   structure is transparent.

ductive suffixes must have a predictable meaning when they are being used productively. Productive types of derivatives also do not have a tendency to lexicalise, so productive types of derivatives only have a few lexicalisations. Exceptions to this case, however, are especially the Finnish frequentatives with suffix *-le-*, which are widely distributed as lexicalisations, even though the derivative type is still productive. On one hand, this can be explained in that lexicalisation still describes the actual derivative itself, whereas productivity describes the whole derivative type. For example, to derive frequentative verb derivatives with the suffix *-le* is a very productive derivative type, but morphologically, an individual derivative belonging to this derivative type may also lexicalise, as in the Finnish *tapella* 'fight' (< *tappaa* 'kill') and the Estonian *taplema* id. New words can be connected to even the non-productive derivative type, because the already existent derivative type serves as a model for the formation of the new words. On the other hand, productivity is a gradual phenomenon in that the amount of productivity varies, and one process is more productive than the other or, in some cases, non-productive. It is not possible, however, to measure the degree of productivity. (Bauer 1983: 95, 1994: 57, 59–60, ISK 2004: § 164, Kangasmaa-Minn 1981: 32–33, Kasik 2004: 26, and 2013: 43.)

When discussing productivity, analogy needs to be taken into consideration: when is a certain lexeme an analogical form (i.e. modelled on the basis of the analogy of another lexeme) and when is its modelling productive in derivation or inflection? This difference is not at all clear in all cases. The analogical form is the new word form that is formed on the basis of the model of an already existent lexeme, yet it does not produce a productive series. It remains possible for the analogical form to function as an impetus for a series of new formations, with the first ones being analogically modelled, and subsequently modelling has become productive. The word formation based on an analogical process is taking place through a pattern. The word figure representing one of the derivative types serves as the pattern (i.e. the phonological form of the word, such as the Finnish verb *vedättää* 'have something pulled by somebody' with the suffix *-ttA-*). The pattern shows what kind of structure a particular word derived with a suffix has to have. The pattern is constructed from the end part of the stem (*-ttA-*), which often is a (derivative) suffix, in addition to the stem, which can be either the lexical stem or some other phonological element. Based on the pattern, new derivatives can be formed as well as other words with same figures. The same pattern can be represented by words with different basis, such as loan words, derivatives, and other words formed according to the same model. All the words of an

individual derivative type can be formed according to a single pattern (for instance, the two-syllable *e*-noun derivatives in gradation of the Estonian that have been formed from a two-syllable verb stem, such as *hinn-e* 'grade', *tek-e* 'birth, origin'). On the basis of this pattern many new words have thus been formed, which are exceptional from the point of view of derivation: for instance, the word *selve* 'self-service' does not have an underived variant, so one cannot really describe it as a derivative type. (Bauer 1983: 96, 1994: 64, ISK § 147–148, and Kasik 2013: 41–42.)

Frequentative derivatives have a strong tendency to lexicalise in the Finnic languages. Lexicalisation is both a synchronic and a diachronic phenomenon; in the context of lexicalisation of frequentative derivatives, it is a diachronic process. The form is lexicalised when it can no longer be explained according to regular grammatical rules. The semantic and morphological transparency of the derivative decreases gradually, until the derivative loses its derivative-like quality and its frequentative character and it is considered to be a non-derived word. Non-transparency is not a necessary prerequisite for lexicalisation, however, and some of the lexicalised forms have remained completely transparent, such as many of the frequentative derivatives (for instance, *tapella* 'fight' in Finnish and *taplema* id. in Estonian). The meaning of the lexicalised derivative develops so that it is no longer a combination of the meanings of the word and derivational suffix, but instead it is distinct and simultaneously different from what would be expected on the basis of other derivatives derived with the same suffix. The meaning is often more abstract than the initial meaning. The semantics of the lexicalised lexeme cannot necessarily be presupposed in advance. Lexicalisation is a gradual phenomenon that unfolds in stages; in other words, the level of lexicalisation varies with different words. These kinds of lexicalised frequentative derivatives are, for example, *ajatella* 'think' (< *ajattaa* 'have something driven by somebody' < *ajaa* 'drive') and *kävellä* 'walk' (< *käydä* 'go, walk') in Finnish and *võitlema* 'fight' (< *võitma* 'win') in Estonian. (Bauer 1983: 49–50, 95, Brinton and Traugott 2005: 18, 21, ISK 2004: § 166, Kasik 2013: 46–47, and Laakso 1989: 64.)

Derivation of words is a common method of word formation among the Finnic languages, as well as the formation of compound words. By means of derivation from a derivational base, or for instance from a descriptive stem, a new lexeme is formed with one or more suffixes. A simple word and a derivative and even a compound word can act as the derivational base. The meaning of derivatives is commonly formed through the semantics of the word and the derivational suffix. New nouns, verbs and adverbs are formed through deri-

vation. Verbs can be derived from nouns and from other verbs. (ISK 2004: § 155, § 157, § 303.)

When describing the derivational suffixes of Finnish and Estonian, as well as of the other minor Finnic languages, Eeva Kangasmaa-Minn's way of dividing derivational suffixes into three classes – changers, transformers and modifiers [translated from Kangasmaa-Minn's concepts in Finnish] – is often used (see Kasik 2004, Kytömäki 1992, Laakso 1989, and Puura 2007). The changers change the category of the underived word, the transformers transform the valency of the underived word, and the modifiers modify the semantics of the underived word in order to thus express a quality of an action or of an event. Frequentative suffixes are modifiers. The Finnish grammar *Iso suomen kielioppi* (ISK 2004: § 303) does not separate the verbal derivational suffixes but instead the verbal derivatives into three groups: the derivative changers, the derivative transformers and the derivative modifiers. The derivative changers are the causative derivatives, the derivative transformers are the reflexive, automative and translative derivatives, and the derivative modifiers are the frequentative and momentative derivatives. In addition, outside of these groups remain the essential and sensive derivatives.

Frequentative suffixes modify the quality of the action or the event that is expressed by the verb. Frequentative derivatives express the frequency and continuation of an event, action or situation. The process that they express is often irregular and aimless, and an accidental and dismissive quality can often be noted in them (compare the Finnish verbs *kulkea* 'go, travel' ~ *kuljeksia*, *kuljeskella* 'roam, wander'). A typical example of the frequentativity is that the derivative expresses repetition of an event expressed by the underived word, which means that the event is iterative. The usage of the frequentative derivative is not compulsory, as it is common for both the derivative as well as its derivational base to work in the same context of usage. (ISK 2004: § 351, § 353 and Kangasmaa-Minn 1982: 58.)

This may also be expected in the context of Livonian frequentatives. But in light of the following examples and when dealing with the derivational bases of frequentative derivatives, this may not necessarily be the case with Livonian.

There is some earlier research on Livonian verbal derivational suffixes. They have been dealt with most extensively by Eduard Vääri in his doctoral thesis and articles based on that (Vääri 1974a, 1974b, 1975, 1976, 1980a, 1980b, 1981, 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985, 1986, and 1987.) Vääri has dealt with the Livonian verbal suffixes of both Courland and Salaca, but the style of the articles closely resembles a list. For his sources, Vääri uses both printed publications (for instance,

E.N. Setälä's language specimen collection *Näytteitä liivin kielestä* (1953) and the Livonian dictonary *Livisches Wörterbuch mit gram-matischer Einleitung* (1938) by Lauri Kettunen) as well as manuscript data, such as E.N. Setälä's material that deals with Livonian. The verbal suffixes have been introduced according to the appearances of verbs in the material, and for each appearance of a suffix there are listed examples and possible equivalents in cognate languages, as well as possible reconstructions and loan backgrounds. In other words, the introduction to the usage of derivatives is restricted to a listing of examples in already existent sources, and no attention is paid to the semantics, productivity or lexicalisation of the derivatives.

2. Frequentative derivatives in the Finnic languages

The derivation of verbs is an essential part of the grammar of the Finnic languages. In Veps in particular, the derivation of frequentative verbs is very productive and also connected to the expression of the aspect. When working with Livonian frequentative derivatives, one has to rely on research done on Finnish and Estonian verb derivatives. This is because these are the most explicated immediate cognates of Livonian, and the frequentative derivatives have not been researched as systematically and broadly in Livonian. There is also some research on verb derivatives in Veps and Karelian. For Veps, research on its verbal suffixes has been done by Marija Zajceva (1978) and research on its momentative and frequentative derivatives, along with their usage when expressing the aspect, by Ulriikka Puura (2007 and 2010); for Karelian, research has been done on Karelian verbs by Ljudmila Markianova (1985).

Among the Finnic languages, there are several different frequen-tative suffixes, whose productivity varies. However, those frequen-tative suffixes that include the element *l* are distributed among the whole Uralic language group, and the suffix *-le-* has equivalents in the whole of Finnic. The *le*-derivatives of Finnic are mostly deverbials that have either a frequentative or continuative meaning. (Hakulinen 2000: 261 and Laanest 1975: 183.)

In Finnish, frequentative derivatives are an open-class verb group, in that new frequentative derivatives can be continuously formed both through the conscious creation of terms and during the course of lan-guage users creating them. They can be formed from both verbs and nouns, though not from all verbs and nouns, especially not from those consisting of three syllables or more. According to the ISK, the most important frequentative suffixes in Finnish are *-le-, -i-, -ksi-, -hti-* and

the non-productive *-O-*. The most common suffix is *-le-*, which has four subcategories: *-ele-*, *-ile-*, *-(i)Ctele-* and *-ske(nte)le-*. In Finnish, in addition, there is the frequentative suffix *-ise-* and the stem-final suffix *-U*, which gives a frequentative context to the verb. These are only joined with descriptive stems (e.g. *kolista* 'rattle, clatter', *hölskyä* 'shake'). In addition, Lauri Hakulinen (2000: 265) presents a non-productive suffix *-nt-*, which appears as such in some words (*oksentaa* 'throw up', *rakentaa* 'build') and as part of a compound suffix, such as *-skentele-* and *-ntele-*. The ISK introduces these in connection with the suffix *-ske(nte)le-*. Suffixes describing continuation, such as *-i-*, have also been called continuatives. However, the ISK presents all suffixes as frequentatives, because even the verbs of same derivative type can have both meanings, and it is not always so easy to separate the concepts of frequentative and continuative from one another. (ISK 2004: § 164, § 340, § 351, § 357, § 366, § 367.)

According to the Estonian grammar *Eesti Keele Grammatika* (EKG), there are several verbal suffixes in Estonian with which frequentative verbs can be formed. For some of these suffixes, the only meaning is frequentative, while for some this is but one meaning among others. Such suffixes are *-u-*, *-i-*, *-ki-*, *-gi-*, *-ku-*, *-gu-* and *-le-*, as well as its more rare variants *-skle-* (*-skele-*), *-dle-* and *-tle-* (*-tele-*). According to Kasik (2004: 41), the most important frequentative suffixes are *-le-* (e.g. *lendlema* 'fly around' < *lendma* 'fly') and its variants *-skle-* (e.g. *jookslema* 'run around' < *jooksma* 'run') and *-tle-* (*loetlema* 'list' < *lugema* 'read'), as well as *-i-* and *-u-*. Of these, the productive instances in the modern language are *-le-* and *-u-*. With the suffixes *-ki-*, *-gi-*, *-ku-*, *-gu-*, frequentatives are formed from onomatopoetic stems, and they are no longer productive. As is the case with the Finnish frequentative derivative *-le-*, the Estonian equivalents similarly have many lexicalisations, such as *käsitlema* 'deal with' and *osalema* 'participate'. (EKG: 441, 443–444, 447–450 and Kasik 2004: 42, 45, 47.)

Veps has three frequentative suffixes: *-(e)le-*, *-nde-* and *-ske-*. From these can be formed the compound suffixes *-ndele-*, *-skende-*, *-skeľe-*, *-eľeskeľe-* and *-skendeľe-*. Their appearance varies, according to the different dialects of Veps. In addition, Veps has the suffix *-i-/-oi-*, which can be either frequentative or continuative. Of these, the suffix *-(e)le-* is very productive in Veps; it appears for example in verbs *ľähtelta* < *ľähtta* 'leave', *tegelta* < *tehta* 'do', *ľendelta* 'fly around' < *ľeta* 'fly'. (M. Zajceva 1978: 28, 68, 76, 95–99 and N. Zajceva 2003: 119–120.) Furthermore, it has been claimed that Russian would have affected the system of verb derivation in Veps and the other eastern Finnic languages. Consequently, the usage of frequentative and

momentative suffixes increased once they also started to be used to express the aspect (Laakso 1989: 66).

3. Livonian frequentative derivatives

In terms of quantity, there are far fewer verbal suffixes in Livonian than in other Finnic languages. According to Vääri (1974b: 35), there are around twenty, as well as several suffixes loaned from Latvian. For instance, according to ISK (§ 304), there are about forty verbal suffixes in Finnish. There are no equivalents in Livonian for many of the suffixes that appear in other Finnic languages. An example of such suffix is *-i-*, which was already mentioned earlier in the context of the Finnish and Estonian frequentative suffixes. Livonian has only one frequentative suffix, *-l-*. The Finnish suffix *-nt-* and the equivalent Veps suffix *-nde-* may, however, have a correspondence in Livonian. This may occur, for instance, in the word *oksnõ* 'throw up'. In addition, many of the verbal suffixes of Livonian are lexicalised or in other ways non-productive, and suffixed verb derivation has been replaced in Livonian by verbal prefix loans from Latvian, especially when aspectual relations are being expressed. See the following example (2), where a loaned prefix *iz-* from Latvian is connected to the verb *luggõ* 'read', which, when connected to the Latvian verb with the equivalent meaning *lasīt* 'read' expresses the perfective aspect. (Laakso 1989: 58–59, 61, 66.)

(2) | *vanāmiez* | *kīt-s,* | | *ku* | *ne* | *āt* | *kuolm* | *nēḷa* | *kõrd* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| old man | say-PST.3SG | | that | they | be.3PL | three | four | time |

iz-luggõ-nd		*bībõl*		*lebbõ*	*un*	*vel*
ASP-read-PTCP.PST		bible.GEN		through	and	still

tō-b	*ikškõrd*	*luggõ*	*lebbõ.*
want-3SG	once	read.INF	through

'The old man said that they had read through the Bible three or four times and would like to read through it once more.' (SUST 250: 42)

To examine the Livonian frequentative verbs, I have collected data from two language specimen collections: Julius Mägiste's collection *Muistoja Liivinrannasta: Liivin kieltä Ruotsista* (SUST 250; 2006) and Seppo Suhonen's collection *Liivin kielen näytteitä* (CT 5; 1975). While collecting the data, I have used as a support the list of *l*-suffix verbs in Livonian presented by Vääri in his article (1974b). I have included all the *l*-suffix verbs in my data, regardless of their origin or

their possible divergent interpretations concerning the frequentativity. In my data, altogether 15 different *l*-suffix verbs appear. Occurrences vary widely, from a single or two or three occurrences to several tens of occurrences, as can be seen in Table 1:

Table 1. *l*-suffix verbs in the data.

Verb	Number of occurrences
ailõ 'run; drift'	21
imlõ 'wonder'	2
mõtlõ, mitlõ, mütlõ, mutlõ 'think'	57
mādlõ 'remember'	19
pīerslõ 'fart'	2
raļļõ, raillõ, raiļļõ, raďļõ 'hit, beat, chop up'	11
rīďļõ 'scold; argue, quarrel'	8
sõulõ 'itch, tickle'	1
sūrslõ 'exaggerate, boast'	1
taplõ 'fight'	3
tõmbšlõ 'tug'	1
umblõ 'sew'	3
vaņţļõ, vankļõ 'look'	54
vȯdlõ 'wait'	26
võikslõ 'fight, compete'	1

Reciprocal verbs include *taplõ* and *võikslõ*, as well as possibly *rīďļõ*, at least with the meaning 'argue, quarrel', of which there is only a single example in my data. In other instances, its meaning is 'scold'.

4. Productivity of the Livonian frequentative derivation

According to morphological theory, productivity means the formation of new word forms from any suitable word stem, in this case frequentative derivatives. Among the Finnic languages, the derivational bases of the *le*-frequentatives can be words from different word classes. In Finnish, both verb- and noun-based frequentative verbs are formed with the frequentative *le*-suffix, such as *muistella* 'remember, reminisce, recall' < *muistaa* 'remember', *riidellä* 'argue' < *riita* 'a

quarrel, an argument', *arkailla* 'be timid, shy' < *arka* 'timid, shy'. In addition, there are *le*-derivatives without any derivational base, such as *kuunnella* 'listen', *rukoilla* 'pray'. (ISK 2004: § 358, § 359, § 360). In Estonian also, deverbial and denominal frequentative verbs can be formed with the *le*-suffix. Most often the suffix is connected to a verb or a noun (e.g. *tegelema* 'occupy oneself' < *tegema* 'do' and *sõnelema* 'argue' < *sõna* 'a word'), but sometimes also to an adjective (e.g. *arglema* 'be timid, shy' < *arg* 'timid, shy') (EKG: 447, 449). Here Veps is an exception to Finnish and Estonian, as in Veps the frequentative suffix -(*e*)*le*- can only be connected to the verb (for instance, *anďelta* < *antta* 'give') (Puura 2007: 58–59 and M. Zajceva 1978: 76–77).

Pinpointing the derivational base for Livonian *l*-suffix verbs is difficult, in some cases even impossible. Accordingly, it is possible to assume that frequentative derivation in Livonian does not fulfil the demands of productivity. In the following, I will examine them as word-specific forms. To date, Livonian frequentative suffix verbs have typically been treated as single cases. This kind of treatment is of course natural in a dictionary setting, such as *Livisches Wörterbuch mit grammatischer Einleitung* by Kettunen (1938) as well as in the list-like work presented by Vääri (1974b) where he examines Livonian *l*-suffix verbs.

Vääri (1974b: 57) states at the end of his treatment of *l*-suffix verbs that when comparing the dictionary of A.J. Sjögren with verbs used in modern Livonian, it can be observed that there are fewer *l*-suffix verbs in modern Livonian. According to him, it is characteristic of modern Livonian that it is no longer possible to form new verbs with the suffix -*l*-, and therefore the usage of the suffix -*l*- is restricted to the verbs he listed earlier in the same paper.

According to Kettunen's dictionary (1938), there are four verbs that appear in my data, which have a derivational base: *ailõ*, *sõu(v)lõ*, *taplõ* and *tõmbšlõ*.

The verb *ailõ* is linked by Kettunen (1938: 3–4) to *aijjõ*, *ajjõ* 'drive', which have equivalents throughout the Finnic languages (for example, in Finnish *ajaa* 'drive' and Estonian *ajama* id.). SSA 1 (62) also connects the verbs *ailõ* and *aijjõ*, but does not mention their possible derivative relationship. Regarding historical sound utterances, connecting the verbs *ailõ* and *aijjõ* does not necessarily work. According to my data, *ailõ* would be the only frequentative derivative to originally have a short first syllable, and it would thus be an exception in its structure, compared with other frequentative derivatives. At least with some of the other Finnic languages, it is possible to form a *le*-derivative based on equivalents of the verb *aijjõ* (for instance, Finnish and Karelian *ajella* 'drive, cruise', Vote *ajõlla*, *ajella* id.) (KKS 1: 24

and VKS: 115). On the basis of this, the frequentative derived from the verb *aijjõ* would also be possible in Livonian. It is still possible, however, for *ailõ* to be a German loan from the verb *eilen* 'rush', in which case it certainly would not be a frequentative derivative, even though the ending implies that. Thus, with certain presuppositions both interpretations of the origin of the verb *ailõ* are feasible.

On the basis of my examples, the verb has a certain amount of polysemy: its meaning can be either 'drift' (example 3) or 'run (also for horses, fish)' (example 4), or possibly even the more active 'sail'. The meaning of the verb also has some continuativity, even though in some of its meanings the typical vagueness or randomness of the frequentative derivatives can be observed, such as in example (3):

(3) *kuoig-īd*   *pimdõ-s*   *āttõ*
     ship-PL   dark-INE   be.PST.3PL

     ai-lõ-nd   *kūolka*
     drift-FREQ-PTCP.PST   Kolka.GEN

     nanā   *pā̄-lõ.*
     nose. GEN   on-ALL

     'Ships have drifted ashore to Cape Kolka.' (SUST 250: 78)

(4) *un*   *nei*   *kīeru-b*   *teggiž*   *se*   *ibbi*
     and   now   turn-3SG   again   the   horse

     un   **ai-lu-b**   *mā*   *taggiž.*
     and   run-FREQ-3SG   ground   back

     'And so the horse again turns and runs back down.' (SUST 250: 99)

Kettunen (1938: 361) connects the verb *sõu(v)lõ* (example 5) to the verb *sõuvvõ, sõvvõ* 'itch'. SSA 3 (233–234) connects the verbs *sõuvvõ* and *sõuvlõ* to the Finnish, Ingrian, Karelian, Lude and Estonian word-family *syyhyä* 'itch' or to the Estonian verb *sügada, sügeleda* 'itch', which do not have any direct contact with each other. In Kettunen's dictionary, there are also two examples of the usage of the verb *sõuvvõ, sõvvõ*; see example (6):

(5) *ta*   *irmõz*   **sõu-lõ-b**.
     it   terribly   itch-FREQ-3SG

     'It itches terribly.' (SUST 250: 44)

(6) *sigā*   ***sõvā-b***   *sälgõ.*
     pig   scratch-3SG   back.PART

     'A pig scratches its back.' (Kettunen 1938: 361)

The verb *taplõ* is a frequentative derivative from the verb *tappõ* 'kill, slaughter' (Kettunen 1938: 409). The verb *tappõ* has correspondences in throughout the Finnic languages, and aside from Livonian the frequentative derivative also occurs in Finnish (*tapella* 'fight'), Ingrian (*tapella* id.), Karelian (*tapella* 'kill; abuse, bully; fight') and Estonian (*taplema* 'fight') (SSA 3: 269–270). The verb *taplõ* is lexicalised in Livonian as well as in Finnish (*tapella* < *tappaa* 'kill') and in Estonian (*taplema*). In all these three languages it has the meaning 'fight'; see example (7):

(7) *mȭk,*   *mis*   *izā izā*
     sword   which   father's father

     võḷ   *tūo-nd*   *īņõ*   *kuod-āj,*
     be.PST.3SG   bring-PTCP.PST   with   home-ILL

     kis   võḷ   *rūoțšliz-t-õks*
     which be.PST.3SG   Swede-PL-INS

     kub-sõ   ***tap-lõ-n,***   *krīevõ-d-õks*
     together-INE   fight-FREQ-PTCP.PST   Russian-PL-INS

     vandzõ-n   *immõr.*
     wander-PTCP.PST   around

     '…sword, which had been brought home by grandfather, who had fought with Swedes and wandered around with Russians.' (SUST 250: 155)

The meaning of the underived verb *tappõ* is 'kill, slaughter'. In conjunction with this underived verb, it seems that the particle *mō(zõ)* 'towards the earth' is often used to express the perfective nature of the action, in this case, killing or slaughtering (see example (8)).

(8) ***Tapā-m***   ***mā***   *piškīz*   *tikāpūoga.*
     kill-1PL   ground.ILL   little.GEN   goatling.GEN

     'We will kill a little goatling.' (SUST 250: 114)

In his dictionary, Kettunen has three examples of the verb *tappõ* where the particle *mō(zõ)* does not appear. From among the examples, however, especially example (9), where the tense is perfect, seems to be perfective. Furthermore, Kettunen (1938: 409) has *mō(zõ) tappõ*, whose meanings he gives as 'kill, beat to death, murder'.

(9)   *sigā-d,*   *nīem-õd*   *attõ*   **tap-tõd,**
      pig-PL   cow-PL   be.3PL   slaughter-PTCP.PST

      set   *sīezõr-d*   *attõ*   *īe-nõd*
      only   flea-PL   be.3PL   remain-PTCP.PL

      bäz   *tappām-õd.*
      without   kill-PART

      'The pigs and cows have been slaughtered. Only fleas remain.'
      (Kettunen 1938: 409)

The verb *tõmbšlõ* is derived from the verb *tõmbõ* 'wrench, drag, pull'. The frequentative derivative *tõmbšlõ* (example 10) is formed with the help of a compound suffix, where a *sk*-suffix appears in front of the frequentative suffix *-l-*. From the same derivational base is formed *tõm(b)lõ*, which includes the plain suffix *-l-*, of which there are no examples in my data. The verb could also have continuative meaning.

(10)   **tõmb-šlõ-nd**   **tõmb-šlõ-nd**   *sīe*   *lōja*
      pull-FREQ-PTCP.PST   pull-FREQ-PTCP.PST   it.GEN   boat.GEN

      jūs,   *äb*   *lā*   *mierrõ.*
      beside   NEG   go   sea.ILL

      'They pulled and pulled the boat. It does not move to the sea.' (CT 5: 20)

The distribution of the verb *tõmbõ* (example 11) covers the whole of Finnic (e.g. the Finnish, the Ingrian and the Karelian *temmata* 'wrench, drag, pull', as well as the Estonian *tõmmata* id.). In addition to Livonian, the frequentative derivative with the suffix *-le-* formed from it occurs in Finnish and Estonian as well: *tempoilla* and *tõmblema*. In example (11), there also occurs the aforementioned verb *ailõ* (in the meaning of 'run'); compare example (4). (Kettunen 1938: 414–415, SSA 3: 282, and Vääri 1974b: 52–53.)

(11) *no*   *siz*   *kargõ-nd*   *ilz,*   **tõmbõ-nd**
      well   then   jump-PTCP.PST   up   pull-PTCP.PST

      rētšõ-d   *sälgõ*   *ja*
      fish basket-PL   back.ILL   and

      ai-lõ-nd   *randõ.*
      run-FREQ-PTCP.PST   shore.ILL

      'Well then, they jumped up, took the fish baskets, put the baskets on their backs and ran to the shore.' (CT 5: 18)

Moreover, four verbs in my data (*imlõ, raḷḷõ, raillõ, raiḷḷõ, raḍlõ, rīḍḷõ* ja *sūrslõ*) may, according to Kettunen (1938), be derived from a noun. Of these, *imlõ* and *sūrslõ* are clear cases.

Kettunen (1938: 72–73) connects the verb *imlõ* (example 12) to the verb *immõ*; he gives the meaning 'sich wundern' ('wonder') for both of these verbs and proposes a correspondence between them, not a derivative relationship. He suggests that the noun *im* 'a wonder' is a derivational base for the verb *immõ*. Vääri (1974b: 38) connects both the noun *im* and the adjective *imli* 'wonderful' to the verb *imlõ*, but he does not suggest a derivative relationship between the pair; instead he states that they are words closely connected to the verb *imlõ*. The noun *im* has a wide distribution in Finnic; it occurs in all Finnic languages, except Veps (SSA 1: 221). Concerning Livonian, SSA 1 (221) gives only the noun *im* itself, compared to other languages (except Lude, for which only the verb is presented) with both the noun and the verb derived from it (for instance, from the Karelian *imeh* 'a wonder, strange; smiling, laughing' comes *imehtie* 'wonder, smile, laugh', and from the Estonian *ime* 'a wonder' comes *imestada, imetleda* 'wonder'). Nowhere in the all of the data I have researched does *immõ* appear, nor does Kettunen has any examples of it. According to Vääri (1974b: 38), *imlõ* has changed into an archaic and has been replaced by the loan verb *brīŋõ, brīnõ* from Latvian. This would explain why there are only two examples of that in my data.

(12)   *mōnikka*   *lā̆-nd*
       inlander   go-PTCP.PST

       jūrõ,   *lōja*   *jūr*   *ja*
       to-ILL   boat.GEN to   and

       vaṇṭ-ḷõ-n   *ja*   **im-lõ-n**:
       look-FREQ-PTCP.PST   and   wonder-FREQ-PTCP.PST

       "ōi   *jumāl*   *kui*   *pā̆giŋ*
       oh   god   how   much

       täs   *um*   *kaḷḍi".*
       here   be.3SG   fish.PART.PL

       'A person who lives inland had gone to the boat and looked and wondered, "O God, how much there is fish here!"' (CT 5: 22)

The derivational base of the verb *sūrslõ* (example 13) is the adjective *sūr, sūṛ* 'big'. The distribution of the adjective covers the whole of Finnic languages (for example, the Finnish *suuri*, the Veps *suŕ, sūŕ*

and the Estonian *suur*). (Kettunen 1938: 388–389 and SSA 3: 224–225.)

(13)   *no*   *bet*   *se*   *pā̀*   *rõ̀m-ssõ*
        well   but   it   head.GEN   joy-INE

        vȯļmi   *ka*   *vȯļ*   *nei*
        being   also   be.PST.3SG   so

        sūr,   *ku*   *īrg-izt*
        big.NOM-GEN   that   begin-PST.3PL

        jõvā   **sūrs-lõ**.
        already   brag-FREQ.INF

        'Well, but sometimes people were so drunk that they started to brag.'
        (CT 5: 70)

Kettunen (1938: 340) connects the verb *rīḑļõ* to the noun *rīd* 'a quarrel, an argument', which according to his dictionary appears only in Salaca Livonian. In the newer dictionary, *Līvõkīel-ēstikīel-leţkīel sõnārõntõz*, the word *rīd* does not appear at all; for the meaning of 'a quarrel, an argument' the word *rīdļimi* appears, which is connected to the verb *rīḑļõ* (Viitso & Ernštreits 2012: 267). The counterparts of both the noun *rīd* and the frequentative derivative *rīḑļõ* occur in all of Finnic languages (for instance, in the Finnish *riita* 'a quarrel, an argument' and *riidellä* 'argue, quarrel', in the Estonian *riid* 'a quarrel, an argument' and *riidlema* 'argue, quarrel', and in the Veps *ṛid* 'a quarrel, an argument, a dispute' and *rīḑelta* 'dispute, argue, quarrel). The frequentative derivative seems to have lexicalised in the whole of Finnic. (SSA 3: 76.) In example (14), the meaning of the verb is 'scold', as in most appearances of my data.

(14)   *minā*   **rīḑ-ļ-iz**   *eņtš*   *nāiz-ta,*
        I   chastise-FREQ-PST.1SG   own   wife-PART

        mikš pierākst   *ta*   *ānda-b*   *krūz-õks*
        why   she   give-3SG   tankard-INS

        krīevõ   *zõldatõ-d-õn*   *vȯl-tõ*
        Russian-GEN   soldier-PL-INS   beer-PART

        juodõ,   *ku*   *säb*   *uo*   *knaššõ.*
        drink.INF   that   it.NEG   be.3SG   pretty.PART.SG

        'I chastised my wife that it is not nice to give beer to Russian soldiers in a tankard.' (SUST 250: 16)

Regarding the meaning 'argue, quarrel', which is common to other Finnic languages, there is only one example. Here *rīḑḷõ* corresponds completely to its Finnic counterparts in both meaning and reciprocity; see example (15).

(15) *...un*   *ni*   *se*   *knaš*   *nai*
     and   now   it   beautiful   wife

     rīḑ-l-iz   *sie*   *mie-kõks...*
     quarrel-FREQ-PST.3SG   it.GEN   man-INS

     '…and now that beautiful wife quarrelled with that man…'
     (SUST 250: 112)

The fourth verb (*raḷḷõ*, *raillõ*, *raiḷḷõ*, *raḑḷõ*) is more unclear. It is an interesting verb, because it has correspondences in the other Finnic languages (for example, in the Estonian *raiuma* and the Vote *raďjoa*), but with a frequentative suffix it only appears in Livonian (Kettunen 1938: 328 and Vääri 1974b: 46–47). Kettunen (1938: 311, 328) suggests the possibility of combining it with the noun *raigā* 'thigh, pelvis, hip', which corresponds to the Finnish *raaja* 'limb' (with a similar contextual meaning as, for instance, the Finnish words *potkia*, *potkaista* 'kick' and *potka* 'knuckle'). This is uncertain, however, so it remains unclear whether the verb *raḷḷõ*, *raillõ*, *raiḷḷõ*, *raḑlõ* has a derivational base. SSA 3 (31) connects the Livonian verb *raḷḷõ*, *raillõ*, *raiḷḷõ*, *raḑlõ* with the aforementioned Estonian and Vote verbs, as well as with the Finnish noun *raaja* 'a limb' and the verb *raajoa* 'chop up a slaughter animal; cut, bruise' derived from it, with the Karelian word *roakie* 'the hind appendage of a (slaughter) animal; a trot', and with the Veps word *ragj*: *jokseb ragjal* 'trot'. A verb correlate could be found in the other Finnic languages. In light of my examples, the verb *raḷḷõ*, *raillõ*, *raiḷḷõ*, *raḑlõ* could at least in some cases have a frequentative meaning (compare example 16), but the irregularity and aimlessness typical of the frequentative derivatives is not necessarily present. In example (17), it is not so easy to interpret the verb as frequentative:

(16) *ja*   *siz*   *vanā*   *mīez*   *vȯḷ*
     and   then   old   man   be.PST.3SG

     väggi   *murāgõl*   *ja*   *itk-īz:*
     very   sad   and   cry-PST.3SG

"kus	*min*	*kīraz,*	*miss-õks*
where	I.GEN	axe	what-INS

ma	*ni*	** raḷ-ḷõ-b?"**
I	now	chop-FREQ-3SG

'And then the old man was very sad and cried: "Where is my axe? What will I now use to chop wood?"' (SUST 250: 180)

(17)	*ta*	*võḷ*	*nei*	**rai-l-tõd**		*pū*
	it	be.PST.3SG	so	chop-FREQ-PTCP.PST		tree.GEN

sizzõl,	*pitkālt*	*sizzõl,*	*pitkā*	*vait.*
into	much	into	long	gap

'A long gash had been cut deep into the wood.' (SUST 250: 65)

Based on these examples from my data, it would seem as though both deverbial and denominal frequentative derivatives would be natural in Livonian. In addition to the derivatives that have a derivational base, there still remain the seven verbs with the *l*-suffix (*mõtlõ, mādlõ, pīerslõ, umblõ, vaņţḷõ, vȯdlõ, võikslõ*), for which I have not been able to find a derivational base in Livonian. Based on the other Finnic languages, derivational bases or correlates are to be found for the verbs *mõtlõ, pīerslõ* and *vȯdlõ*.

The verb *mõtlõ* is connected to the noun *mõtkõz* 'a thought', from the same underived word stem, and it corresponds to the Estonian verb *mõtlema* in its usage as well (Kettunen 1938: 221). According to SSA 2 (166–167), the Estonian *mõtlema* would be derived from the Germanic loanword *mõõt* 'measure', and the Livonian *mõtlõ* would additionally be from the same base. Both of these describe mental activity without an actual frequentative meaning, as in examples (18) and (19):

(18)	*bet*	*pȯis*	**mõt-l-iz***:*
	but	boy	think-FREQ-PST.3SG

"mis	*ma*	*ni*	*tie-b?"*
what	I	now	do-3SG

'But the boy thought: "What do I do now?"' (SUST 250: 186)

(19)	*bet*	*mäddõn*	*rek*	*pā̀-l*	*iz-tuḷ*
	but	we.DAT	road.GEN	on-ADE	ASP-come.PST.3SG

pavissām	*mõitiz*	*äpku*	*mēg*
completely	differently	than	we

vȯ̦*lmõ*   **mõt-lõ-nd**.
be.PST.1PL   think-FREQ-PTCP.PST

'But our journey went completely differently than we had thought.'
(SUST 250: 60)

For the verb *pīerslõ* (example 20), correspondences can be found throughout Finnic (for instance, the Finnish and Karelian *pierrä* 'fart' and the Veps *perda* id.). In addition to Livonian, however, the derivative with -*le*- occurs only in Finnish (*piereskellä*) and in Ingrian (*pēreskellä*). The word in question is onomatopoeic. (SSA 2: 349.)

(20)   *no*   *siz*   *lēba*   *ōj*
        well   then   bread.GEN   owen.NOM-GEN

        eittõs   *iz*   *tuoit*
        throw.INF   NEG.PST   dare.3SG

        piers-lõ.
        fart-FREQ.INF

        'Well then, you better not fart when you put the bread into the oven.'
        (CT 5: 76)

The verb *vȯdlõ* (examples 21 and 22) also has underived correspondences throughout Finnic (for instance, the Finnish *odottaa* 'wait', the Veps *vottatada* id. and the Estonian *oodata* id.). Verbs with the *le*-suffix occur in all Finnic languages, with the exception of Estonian and Veps (such as the Finnish *odotella* 'wait around', the Karelian *vuotella* id. and the Vote *ōtẹlla* 'wait around, wait'). (SSA 2: 258.)

(21)   *se*   *ȭdõg*   *vanā-d*
        it   night.NOM-GEN   old-PL

        līvliz-t   **vȯd-l-izt**
        Livonian-PL   wait-FREQ-PST.3PL

        mārttidi.
        martti.PART.PL

        'That night the old Livonians were awaiting marttis (cf. Estonia *mardisandid*).' (SUST 250: 40)

(22) *amād* *vȯḷṭṭõ* *vāgiž* *un*
      all   be.PST.3PL   silent   and

      vȯd-l-iztõ, *ku* *nā̀-ks*
      wait-FREQ-PST.3PL that see-COND.3SG

      mingīz-t *mō-dõ*.
      some-PART land-PART

'Everyone was quiet and waited that they would see some land.'
(SUST 250: 62)

Actually, verbs lacking a derivational base, which appear to be frequentative *le*-derivatives, seem to be formed from the stem, and the frequentative suffix, are *mā̄dlõ*, *umblõ*, *vaṇṭḷõ* and *võikslõ*.

According to Vääri (1974b: 44–45), *mā̄dlõ* is a case of metathesis. Originally, *-l-* would have been a part of the stem, and the verb without a frequentative suffix would have been transferred through metathesis over to the group of frequentative verbs (compare the Estonian *mäletama* 'remember'). Kettunen (1938: 240) also suggests the possibility of metathesis; he presents two reconstructions (**mähtel-*, **mälehtel-*) and connects the verb to the Estonian verb *mäletama* and the Finnish verb *märehtiä* 'chew (the cud)'. E. N. Setälä (1899: 353) and Lauri Posti (1942: 247–248) have presumed metathesis as well. The presumption of metathesis, however, does not seem plausible. It does not explain the long vowel of the first syllable, which, in any case, does not appear in the aforementioned correspondences of the cognate languages. However, according to Setälä (1899: 353), the long *ā̄* would be the result of the original confluence of *äh*. The verb *mā̄dlõ*, and especially its consonant cluster *-dl-*, might be an analogical form from the verb *mõtlõ*. Evidence of the frequentative derivativeness of the verb *mā̄dlõ* is the case of its object: usually the case of the object of the frequentative derivatives is partitive (ISK 2004: § 352) (for instance, in the Estonian *mäletan teda* 'I remember him' and in the Livonian *siedā* and *mīnda* in examples (23) and (24)). In its meaning, however, *mā̄dlõ* is more continuative than frequentative.

(23) *siedā* *ma* **mā̄d-lõ-b**, *se*
      se.PART   I   remember-FREQ-3SG   it

      vȯḷ *sūr* *salāndõm*.
      be.PST.3SG big   theft

'I remember that it was a great theft.' (SUST 250: 195)

(24) *bet*   *sinnõn*   *sīepierāst*   *ku*   *sinā*
 but   you.DAT   therefore   that   you

 jõga   *kõrd*   *ūod*   *mīnda*
 every   time   be.2SG   I.PART

 mā̄d-lõ-n   *ja*   *minnõn*   *punīz*
 remember-FREQ-PTCP.PST   and   I.DAT   red.GEN

 lānga   *zied*   *and-õn…*
 thread.GEN   offering.NOM-GEN   give-PTCP.PST

 'But for you, because you have remembered me every time and given
 me red thread as an offering…' (CT 5: 104)

It is not possible to find a derivational base for the verb *umblõ*
(example 25), but it occurs through the whole of the Finnic area with
the *le*-suffix (for instance, in the Finnish, Ingrian and Karelian
ommella 'sew', in the Veps *ombelta*, *ombōda* id. and in the Estonian
õmblema id.) (SSA 2: 266). The verb seems to have lexicalised
throughout Finnic languages. A further indication of that is that it is
found in dictionaries as a reference of its own (see, for example, SSA
2: 266 and KKS 4: 40).

(25) *…vaņšti*   *kind-ist*   *agā*   *sukk-īst*
 old.ELA.PL   mitten-ELA.PL   or   sock-ELA.PL

 umb-l-iz   *seļļiz-t*
 sew-FREQ-PST.3SG   such-PL

 nēļa-kantlimiz-t   *luppātõ-d…*
 square-PL   rag-PL

 '…those kinds of square rags were sewn from old mittens or socks…'
 (CT 5: 8)

SSA 3 (385) connects the verb *vaņțļõ* (examples 26 and 27) pos-
sibly to the Finnish verb *vaania* 'stalk', which also has a Germanic
loan etymology. According to Kettunen (1938: 470), however, this
connection is certain. Definite correspondences are, however, the
Erzya *vanoms* and the Moksha *vanâms* 'look at, observe; look after
somebody, protect' (SSA 3: 385).

(26) *ne* *vēl-id*   *laskõ-bõd*
   those brother-PL   let-3PL

   sīn   *tubbõ,*   *laz* *ta*
   there   room.ILL IMP he/she

   ni **vaṇt-ḷ-õb**   *siedā*
   now look-FREQ-3SG   it.PART

   muḷkkiz-t   *veḷḷõ.*
   stupid-PART   brother.PART

   'Those brothers let her enter the room, so that she would now look at
   the stupid brother.' (SUST 250: 102)

(27) *paṇṭṭõ*   *molmõd*   *eṇš*
   put.PST.3PL   both   own

   flīnt-id   *tubā*
   gun-PL   room.GEN

   nurkkõ   *un*   **vaṇt-ḷ-izt**,
   corner.ILL   and   look-FREQ-PST.3PL

   kus   *sō-b*   *ap-istõ.*
   where   can-3SG ASP-sit.INF

   'Both of them put their guns in the corner and looked around to see
   where they could sit.' (SUST 250: 14)

  The verb *võikslõ* (example 28) has a correspondence in Estonian
only: *võistlema* 'compete, fight'. As well as the verb *tõmbslõ*, that has
a compound suffix that is formed from the suffixes *-sk-* and *-l-*. The
meaning of the verb, however, may be more continuative than fre-
quentative. (Vääri 1974b: 55.)

(28) *ja* *siz* *iz-t*   *ūotõ*   *nei*
   and then NEG.PST-PL   be.3PL so

   või-nõd   *lainõ-d* *vastõ*
   can-PTCP.PST   wave-PL against

   võik-slõ   *ja*   *lainõ-d* *õṛad*
   struggle-FREQ.INF and wave-PL sandbank.GEN

   pā̈-l   *visk-īzt*   *lõja*
   on-ADE   toss-PST.3PL boat.GEN

immõr	*ja*	*mied*
over	and	man.PL

upānd-izt	*järā.*
drown-PST.3PL	away

'…and then they couldn't struggle against the waves and the waves tossed the boat over on the sandbank and the men drowned.' (CT 5: 40)

5. Conclusions

At the beginning of the article, I presented rather transparent criteria, according to which the frequentative derivation of Livonian does not seem to be very productive, even though on the basis of the other Finnic languages one might presume that to be the case. Evaluating the productivity of Livonian *l*-suffix verbs and the lexicalisation of individual verbs, the derivational base criterion of the verb works rather well: among the verbs of my data, seven verbal stems (the deverbial derivatives *sõu(v)lõ*, *taplõ* and *tõmbšlõ* and the denominal derivatives *imlõ*, *rīḑlõ* and *sūrslõ*, and possibly also *raḷḷõ*) can be found in Livonian. Additionally, the verbs *mõtlõ*, *pīerslõ* and *vódlõ* (also *raḷḷõ* may belong to this group) do not have an underived stem in Livonian, but such can be found in other Finnic languages. The verb *ailõ* remains obscure in its origin: it has been derived either from the verb *aijjõ*, which means that *ailõ* has a derivational base, or it is a German loan, in which case it only appears to be a frequentative derivative in its form. The verbs without derivational bases are *mādlõ*, *umblõ*, *vaṇṭlõ* and *võikslõ*.

In particular, the verbs *mõtlõ*, *rīḑlõ*, *taplõ* and *umblõ* seem to have lost their frequentative character in Livonian as well as in other Finnic languages. The changed meaning 'scold, tell off' might also indicate the lexicalisation of the verb *rīḑlõ* in Livonian. In sum, this demonstrates the decreased productivity of the investigated category in connection of the mentioned verbs.

Frequentative derivatives are not very widely encountered in Livonian. For instance, it is difficult to indicate aspectual meaning in their usage (in comparison with, for instance, the expression of aspect in Veps by means of frequentative derivatives). In Livonian, the aspect is primarily expressed through particle adverbs (see *tapām mā* in example 8) and verbal prefixes of Latvian origin (see examples 1, 2, 19 and 27). For its own part, this certainly diminishes the frequency of occurring frequentative derivatives.

Compared with the other Finnic languages, this category (frequentative derivation as well as to a greater extent verbal derivation) is clearly more marginal in Livonian. This may represent one change that has taken place in the language, and one can reflect whether this may, to a greater extent, be related to the typological shift that has taken place in Livonian.

Address:
  Santra Jantunen
  Department of Finnish,
  Finno-Ugrian and Scandinavian Studies
  P.O. Box 24
  00014 University of Helsinki
  E-mail: santra.jantunen@helsinki.fi
  Tel.: +358 445 723 728

Abbreviations

1, 2, 3 – persons, ADE – adessive, ALL – allative, ASP – aspect, COND – conditional, DAT – dative, ELA – elative, FREQ – frequentative, GEN – genitive, ILL – illative, IMP – imperative, INE – inessive, INF – infinitive, INS – instrumental, NEG – negation, NOM – nominative, PART – partitive, PL – plural, PST – past, PTCP – participle, SG – singular

References

Bauer, Laurie (1983) *English word-formation*. (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bauer, Laurie (1994) *Introducing linguistic morphology*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Brinton, Laurel J. and Elizabeth Closs Traugott (2005) *Lexicalisation and language change*. (Research Surveys in Linguistics.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

CT 5 = Suhonen, Seppo (1975) *Liivin kielen näytteitä*. (Castrenianumin toimitteita, 5.) Helsinki.

EKG = Mati Erelt et al., eds. (1995). *Eesti keele grammatika I: Morfoloogia. Sõnamoodustus.* Tallin: Eesti Teaduste Akademia Keele ja Kirjanduse Instituut.

ISK = Hakulinen, Auli, Maria Vilkuna, Riitta Korhonen, Vesa Koivisto, Tarja Riitta Heinonen and Irja Alho (2004) *Iso suomen kielioppi*. (Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran toimituksia, 950.) Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Hakulinen Lauri (2000) *Suomen kielen rakenne ja kehitys*. Viides, muuttamaton painos. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopiston suomen kielen laitos.

Kangasmaa-Minn, Eeva (1981) "Derivaatiopuun pudonnaiset". In *Sananmuodostuksen ongelmia. Seminaari Seilissä 3.–4.9.1981*, 29–33. (Suomen kielitieteellisen yhdistyksen julkaisuja, 7.) Turku.

Kangasmaa-Minn, Eeva (1982) "Derivaatiokielioppia I: verbijohdokset". *Sananjalka* 24, 43–63.

Kasik, Reet (2004) *Eesti keele sõnatuletus*. Teine, täiendatud ja parandatud trükk. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.

Kasik, Reet (2013) *Komplekssete sõnade struktuur*. (Tartu Ülikooli Eesti keele osakonna preprindid, 3.) Tartu.

Kettunen, Lauri (1938) *Livisches Wörterbuch mit grammatischer Einleitung*. (Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae, 5.) Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

KKS 1 = Virtaranta, Pertti, ed. (1968) *Karjalan kielen sanakirja*. Ensimmäinen osa A-J. (Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae, XVI, 1.) Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

KKS 4 = Koponen, Raija, ed. (1993) *Karjalan kielen sanakirja*. Neljäs osa O-P. (Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae, XVI, 4, Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskuksen julkaisuja, 25.) Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Kytömäki, Leena (1992) *Suomen verbiderivaation kuvaaminen 1600-luvulta nykypäivään*. (Turun yliopiston suomalaisen ja yleisen kielitieteen laitoksen julkaisuja, 40.) Turku.

Laakso, Johanna (1989) "Muodon ja funktion suhteesta itämerensuomen verbinjohtimistossa". *Virittäjä* 93, 50–69.

Laanest, Arvo (1975) *Sissejuhatus läänemeresoome keeltesse*. Tallinn: Eesti NSV teaduste akadeemia Keele ja kirjanduse instituut.

Markianova, Ljudmila Fedorovna (1985) *Glagol'noe slovoobrazovanie v karel'skom jazyke*. Petrozavodsk: Karelija.

Posti, Lauri (1942) *Grundzüge der livischen Lautgeschichte*. (Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia, 85.) Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Puura, Ulriikka (2007) *Vepsän kielen momentaaniset ja frekventatiiviset verbijohdokset. Johdosten rakenteen, merkityksen ja käytön tarkastelua*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto, Suomalais-ugrilainen laitos.

Puura, Ulriikka (2010) "Frequentative and momentative verbal derivation in Veps language". *Linguistica Uralica* 46, 261–280.

SSA 1 = Itkonen, Erkki and Ulla-Maija Kulonen, eds. (1992) *Suomen sanojen alkuperä*. Etymologinen sanakirja. 1. A-K. Helsinki: Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus ja Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

SSA 2 = Kulonen, Ulla-Maija, ed. (1995) *Suomen sanojen alkuperä*. Etymologinen sanakirja. 2. L-P. Helsinki: Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus ja Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

SSA 3 = Kulonen, Ulla-Maija, ed. (2000) *Suomen sanojen alkuperä*. Etymologinen sanakirja. 3. R-Ö. Helsinki: Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus ja Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Setälä, E. N. (1899) *Yhteissuomalainen äännehistoria*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjalli-
suuden Seura.

Setälä, E. N. and Väinö Kyrölä (1953) *Näytteitä liivin kielestä*. Suomentanut ja jul-
kaissut Väinö Kyrölä. (Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia, 106.) Helsinki:
Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Sjögren, J. A. (1861) *Joh. Andreas Sjögren's Livisch-deutsches und deutsch-livisches
Wörterbuch. Im Auftrage der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften bear-
beitet von Ferdinand Joh. Wiedemann.* (Joh. Andreas Sjögren's Gesammelte
Schriften, Band II. Theil I.) St. Petersburg.

SUST 250 = Mägiste, Julius (2006) *Muistoja Liivinrannasta. Liivin kieltä Ruotsista*.
Suomentanut ja julkaissut Anneli Honko. (Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Toimi-
tuksia, 250.) Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Viitso, Tiit-Rein and Valts Ernštreits (2012) *Līvõkīel-ēstikīel-leţkīel sõnārōntõz*.
Tartu, Rīga: Tartu Ülikool, Latviešu valodas aģentūra.

VKS = Grünberg, Silja, ed. (2013) *Vadja keele sõnaraamat*. Teine, täiendatud ja
parandatud trükk. Tallinn: Eesti Keele Sihtasutus.

Vääri, Eduard (1974a) *Algupärased tuletussufiksid liivi keeles*. Väitekiri filoloogia-
doktori teadusliku kraadi taotlemiseks. Tartu Riiklik Ülikool.

Vääri, Eduard (1974b) "Frekventatiivse ning retsiprookse *l*-liitega verbid ja algu-
päraste liidetega adverbid liivi keeles". (TRÜ toimetised, 323.) *Töid eesti keele
filoloogia alalt* 4, 35–108.

Vääri, Eduard (1975) "Liivi verbisufiksid -*b*- ja -*g*-". (TRÜ Toimetised, 344.) *Fenno-
Ugristica* 1, 371–379.

Vääri, Eduard (1976) "Liivi verbisufiks -*ikš*-". (TRÜ Toimetised, 382.) *Fenno-
Ugristica* 2, 67–91.

Vääri, Eduard (1980a) "Liivi verbisufiksid -*nd*- ja -*ž*-". (TRÜ Toimetised, 517.)
Fenno-Ugristica 6, 146–161.

Vääri, Eduard (1980b) "Liivi verbisufiksid -*n*- + *ì̀*-". (TRÜ Toimetised, 550.) *Fenno-
Ugristica* 7, 97–110.

Vääri, Eduard (1981) "Liivi verbisufiks (vokaal) + -*t̆t*-". (TRÜ Toimetised, 566.)
Fenno-Ugristica 8, 119–141.

Vääri, Eduard (1982) "Liivi verbisufiks -*r* + *ì̀*-". (TRÜ Toimetised, 611.) *Fenno-
Ugristica* 9, 99–115.

Vääri, Eduard (1983) "Liivi verbisufiksid -*m*- + *ì̀*-". (TRÜ Toimetised, 643.) *Fenno-
Ugristica* 10, 72–78.

Vääri, Eduard (1984) "Liivi verbisufiks -*s* (*š*) + *ì̀*-". (TRÜ Toimetised, 673.) *Fenno-
Ugristica* 11, 93–113.

Vääri, Eduard (1985) "Liivi verbisufiksid -*s* (*š*) + *ì̀*-". (TRÜ Toimetised, 690.) *Fenno-
Ugristica* 12, 159–181.

Vääri, Eduard (1986) "Liivi verbisufiks -*l* + *ì̀*- (d)-". (TRÜ Toimetised, 728.) *Fenno-
Ugristica* 13, 134–145.

Vääri, Eduard (1987) "Liivi verbisufiksid -*p*- + t-, -k + t-, -v + t-". (TRÜ Toimetised,
776.) *Fenno-Ugristica* 14, 119–135.

Zajceva, Marija Ivanovna (1978) *Suffiksal'noe glagol'noe slovoobrazovanie v vepsskom jazyke.* Leningrad: Nauka.

Zajceva, Nina (2003) *Vepsän kelen grammatik: teoretine openduzkirj 5.–9. klassoile.* Petroskoi: Periodika.

Kokkuvõte. Santra Jantunen: Piir produktiivsuse ja mitteproduktiivsuse vahel – kas liivi keele frekventatiivverbid on derivatiivsed või leksikaliseerunud? Artikkel vaatleb läänemeresoome keeltes produktiivset verbituletuse osa, frekventatiivseid *l*-tuletisi liivi keeles, kuidas nad esinevad ja on moodustatud. Uurimus põhineb andmetel 15 *l*-liitega verbi kohta. Artiklis jälgitakse, kuidas vormiliselt frekventatiivsed verbid on liivi keeles moodustatud ning kas need on frekventatiivid ka tähenduse poolest. Oluliseks kriteeriumiks verbi määratlemisel tuletisena on selle tuletusaluse olemasolu; artiklis püütakse selgitada, kas liivi *l*-liitelistel verbidel on alustüvi. Lisaks on artikli eesmärgiks uurida, kas frekventatiivide tuletamine on veel produktiivne liivi keeles ja millisel määral on frekventatiivsed *l*-tuletised leksikaliseerunud. Samuti on arvesse võetud teisi läänemeresoome keeli, uurides liivi *l*-tuletisega verbide tuletusaluseid ja levikut.

Märksõnad: liivi keel, läänemeresoome keeled, verbituletus, frekventatiivid, produktiivsus, leksikaliseerumine

Kubbõvõttõks. Santra Jantunen: Produktīvit ja äbproduktīvit vaili rubīž: või līvõ kīel frekventatīvtīemizsõnād ātõ derivatīvizt agā sõnāviḷḷõ lānõd? Kēra tuņšlõb mūši vāldamiersūomõ kēļši produktīvizt tīemizsõnātultõks jaggõ, īžkiz frekventatīvidi *l*-tultõkši līvõ kīelsõ, nänt jeddõtulmizt kui ne ātõ vīţõd. Tuņšlõks alīzõks ātõ tietõd iļ 15 *l*-tīedõksõks tīemizsõnā. Kēras vaņţlõb, kui frekventatīvõd tīemizsõnād formõd ātõ līvõ kīels vīţõd ja või ne ātõ frekventatīvõd ka tāntõks pūolst. Tīemizsõnā vizāks tīemizõks um tādzi täm tultõks alīz võlmi; kēra kõḷõb klīerõ või līvõ *l*-tultõksõks tīemizsõnādõn um alīztõv. Vel sõb tuņšlõd kēras se, või frekventatīvõd tultimi um līvõ kīels vel produktīv ja kui ātõ frekventatīvõd tultõkst sõnāviḷḷõ lānõd. Nei īž um vaņţõltõd mūḑi vāldamiersuomõ kēļi, tuņšlõs līvõ *l*-tīedõksõks tīemizsõnād tīedõksalīži ja laigtõkst pands tādõl mūḑi vāldamiersūomõ kēļi.