

LOANWORD STRATA IN LIVONIAN

Eberhard Winkler

University of Göttingen

Abstract. The article deals with loanword strata in Livonian. The first part of the article compares loanword strata in Courland Livonian to those of Salaca Livonian with regard to source language (Middle Low German, Latvian, High German, and Russian) and parts of speech. The second part of the article examines semantic fields in Salaca Livonian in which the influence of Latvian is particularly strong or weak. Finally, historical conclusions are drawn based on the data presented.

Keywords: Livonian, loanword strata, semantic fields of Latvian loanwords

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.12697/jeful.2014.5.1.11>

1. Introduction

The first detailed descriptions of the Livonians date back to the 17th century, when the Livonian language area had already split into two parts, the smaller Livonia and the larger Courland. Sjögren, who visited the Livonians in 1846, is the only researcher to have come into contact with both populations and both language variants, since Salaca Livonian, the last Livonian dialect spoken in Livonia, disappeared soon after his visit.

Up until the beginning of the second millennium A.D., the area inhabited by the Livonians extended around the entire Gulf of Livonia, from the modern-day Estonian-Latvian border in the east to Ventpils in the west. The splitting of the Livonians' homeland evidently began with the relocation of German merchants and missionaries (the so-called *Aufseglung*) to the east coast of the Baltic Sea. As is known, they founded the city of Riga in the year 1201 at the mouth of the Daugava River. These Germans were the first who came into contact with the Livonians. Although one of the reasons for the splitting of the Livonian language area was clearly German expansion, it appears that the dramatic withdrawal of the Livonians to the aforementioned fringe areas in the 17th century was caused also by other factors – above all Latvian expansion into the Livonian territory, but also the plague and the consequences of the war.

This independent existence of distinct Livonian language forms descended from the same proto-Livonian language lasted for 500 years in the case of Livonia Livonian and Salaca Livonian, and 650 years for the now-disappearing Courland Livonian. It appears that contact between the different forms of Livonian during this time was merely sporadic.

As is the case for many Finno-Ugric languages, the history of written Livonian is quite short, beginning in 1665 for Salaca Livonian and nearly 100 years after that for Courland Livonian. Pre-Sjögren language samples presented the two language forms separately, but researchers beginning with Sjögren examined both forms of Livonian together without drawing particularly sharp boundaries between them. This sort of situation is extremely unfavorable for linguistic studies. In order to be able to carry out a precise investigation of the historical linguistic questions at hand, Karl Pajusalu and Eberhard Winkler separated out all of the Salaca Livonian material from the combined Livonian lexicon and compiled a dictionary from it (Winkler, Pajusalu 2009).

The resulting overall picture of the Livonian lexicon is as follows: 1) The Salaca Livonian lexicon consists of a total of 8500 word forms (including inflected forms), which can be traced etymologically to roughly 1425 headwords; 2) The entire Courland Livonian lexicon, as presented in Kettunen's 1938 dictionary, consists of just over 10000 lexemes, which can similarly be reduced to about 5500 headwords.

The oldest loanword strata in Livonian are those that exist also in other Finnic languages, namely Baltic, Germanic, and Slavic loan strata. The younger strata, consisting of words borrowed into Livonian itself, include Middle Low German, Latvian, High German, Baltic German, and Russian loanword strata. These younger loanword strata clearly entered Livonian *after* the division of the parent Livonian language into Courland Livonian and Livonia Livonian, i.e. beginning from approximately the year 1300, and their formation took place in both Livonian language forms in parallel. As mentioned, contact with Middle Low German speakers began even before the time of the Livonian language split, but it's doubtful whether Middle Low German actually began to influence Livonian during that time. In any case, there is currently no clear linguistic evidence demonstrating the borrowing of Middle Low German or even Old Low German words into the Livonian parent language.

A more detailed examination shows the following breakdown: Salaca Livonian contains approximately 530 words from the new loan strata, accounting for 37% of the entire lexicon, and Courland Livo-

nian contains about 2050 such loan words, again representing roughly 37% of the lexicon.

Among the Latvian loans in both forms of Livonian are a large number of Low German loans, which came to Livonian via Latvian, as evidenced by the fact that most of them exhibit Latvian phonological substitutions. A smaller percentage of these words could theoretically have been borrowed directly from Low German, since there are no phonological facts ruling out that possibility. Table 1 summarizes the number of loanwords of different origins in Livonian.

Table 1. Loanword totals in Salaca and Courland Livonian.

	Salaca Livonian		Courland Livonian	
words (total)	1425		5500	
loanwords (total)	531	37.1%	2 050	37.2%
among which:				
Middle Low German	35	6.6%	50	2.4%
Latvian	486	91.6%	1 875	91.4%
originally from Latvian	330	62.2%	1 200	58.5%
possibly from Low German	156	29.4%	675	32.9%
High German	7	1.3%	100	4.8%
Russian	3	0.5%	< 40	< 1.9%

Two aspects of these results are particularly eye-catching. 1) The differences between the two forms of Livonian are quite small with regard to both the proportion of borrowed words in the overall lexicon and the individual, parallelly developed loanword strata. However, owing to the similar historical conditions in Livonia and Courland, this is not particularly surprising. 2) Considering that Salaca Livonian was practically dying out at the time of Sjögren's visit, the proportion of loanwords there is shockingly small, matching almost exactly their proportion in Courland Livonian, which in the middle of the 19th century was still alive and well. There are of course some minor differences: a) the proportion of direct Middle Low German loans is smaller in Courland Livonian, although this is partially compensated for by the number of indirect loans; b) strikingly, albeit unsurprisingly, the proportion of direct High German and Russian loans is higher in Courland Livonian, which after all was under the influence of those two languages for about 100 years longer.

Almost half of the Salaca Livonian loanwords (about 250 words) also appear in Courland Livonian, which on the one hand serves to

illustrate the independence of the two forms of Livonian, but on the other hand reflects the similar conditions in which they developed.

Breaking down the largest loanword stratum (Latvian loans together with Middle Low German and High German loans borrowed via Latvian) by part of speech yields the following picture (Table 2):

Table 2. Borrowings from Latvian by part of speech.

	Salaca Livonian		Courland Livonian	
Nouns	299	62.8%	1196	63.7%
Adjectives	35	7.2%	145	7.8%
Pronouns	0	0	0	0
Numerals	0	0	0	0
Verbs	125	26.5%	486	25.9%
Particles	17	3.5%	48	2.6%
Total	476		1875	

Here as well, there are no significant differences between the two forms of Livonian. The most frequent parts of speech – nouns, adjectives, and verbs – are represented more or less as expected: the most loanwords are found among nouns, the fewest among adjectives. There are no borrowed numerals or pronouns. The only evidence pointing to Salaca Livonian being more heavily influenced is the larger percentage of borrowed particles. The category of particles here also includes adverbs, modal particles, prepositions, conjunctions, and interjections.

Looking at this data raises the question of which semantic fields are most heavily represented among the Latvian borrowings. Only the Salaca Livonian lexicon has been thoroughly examined.

2. Nouns

VIRTUALLY UNAFFECTED by borrowing are

1) the semantic field PERSON:

- a) BODY PARTS: the only loans are the words ‘temple’ (*deni*), ‘gum’ ([*ammud*] *džuokžed*), ‘face’ (*ģīm*), ‘chin’ (*k’inn*).
- b) ORGANS, EXCREMENT, BODILY FLUIDS: here too, most of the borrowings refer to peripheral items, such as ‘blood vessel’ (*dzīzl*), ‘spleen’ (*lies*) and ‘bladder’ (*pūsl*), also ‘phlegm’ (*puņk’i*).

- c) names of ILLNESSES.
 - d) TEMPER AND MOOD: it is striking that the only words denoting ‘joy’ (*priek*) and ‘enjoyment’ (*lust*) are loans, while negative feelings are expressed almost without exception by native words: ‘distress, woe’ (*irm*; there is also a loanword: *bāda*), ‘worry, sadness’ (*mur*), ‘shame’ (*vuid*), ‘suffering’ (*vaive*). Perhaps Latvians had a more positive outlook on life than Livonians did?
 - e) KINSHIP terminology is dominated by native words: the only borrowings from Latvian are ‘bride’ (*brūt*) and ‘brother-in-law’ (*švager*).
- 2) the semantic field NATURE AND ENVIRONMENT:
- a) CARDINAL DIRECTIONS.
 - b) NATURAL PHENOMENA: Latvian borrowings include ‘steam’ (*tvaik*), notably also ‘rainbow’ (*varvīks*) and ‘lightning’ (*ziben*, as also found in Krewinian).
 - c) TIME AND SEASONS: only words for smaller units of time: ‘hour’ (*tuññ*) and ‘minute’ (*minut*), as well as the abstract concept ‘time’ (*laiks[-aig]*), for which a native word exists as well: *āig*) have been borrowed.
 - d) LANDSCAPE vocabulary: the only Latvian borrowings are ‘grove’ (*birz*), ‘pond’ (*dihki*), ‘pebbles’ (*grāmzad*), ‘ditch’ (*grāv*), ‘path’ (*laipe*) and ‘bank’ (*krast*).

STRONG FOREIGN INFLUENCE is seen in the following semantic fields:

1) SOCIETY:

- a) PROFESSIONS: only the words ‘peasant’ (*tal mies*) and ‘smith’ (*sep*, cognate to Finnish *seppä*) are of native origin, all other names of professions are borrowed from Latvian, which in its turn borrowed them from German.
- b) SOCIAL LIFE: Words of Latvian origin include ‘friend’ (*draug*), ‘tavern’ (*kruog*), ‘pretender’ (*liek*), ‘neighbor’ (*nāberga*, also a native word: *t’ulali*), ‘assets/property’ (*mant*) and ‘peace’ (*mier*); *oññ* ‘luck, good fortune, happiness’ is a native Livonian word, while *nālain* ‘misfortune, accident’ and *puost* ‘perdition, ruin’ come from Latvian. The concept of ‘quarrel, conflict’ is denoted by one Livonian word (*rīd*) and two Latvian loans (*plump*, *naid*). The lexicological evidence indicates that the coexistence of these two peoples was not exactly problem-free.
- c) LAW AND ORDER: the words denoting the concepts of ‘law’ (*bousl*), ‘nation’ (*taut*), ‘testimony’ (*lietsib*), ‘honor’ (*guode*), ‘mark, sign’ (*zīm*), ‘emperor’ (*k’eizer*, originally from German),

‘gallows’ (two different words: *lais*, *karata*), ‘prison’ (*tsietum*) and ‘robber’ (*plītņika*) are of Latvian origin; native words are used for ‘thief’ (*salaji* and *var*), ‘truth’ (*eigus*), ‘justice, verdict’ (*kuode*) and ‘freedom’ (*vald*). It is striking that the word for the concept ‘violent death’ (*surm*) is autochthonous, while ‘normal death’ (*nā*) is a loanword. Significant life events are denoted by native words, e.g. ‘birth’ (*šunumi*), ‘engagement’ (*kīled*), ‘wedding’ (*kāzned*, but also a borrowing: *guode pāvad*), ‘wake’ (*peijed*) and the semantically related ‘grave’ (*ka^olme*); it seems that such events were the Livonians’ private affairs.

2) the semantic field TOOLS AND INSTRUMENTS:

There are relatively few native words in this domain, for example ‘oar’ (*air*), ‘brush’ (*are*), ‘pole-axe’ (*k’iru*) and ‘shovel’ (*liņ*). The majority of this lexicon, e.g. ‘hammer’ (*āmer*), ‘chain’ (*k’ād*), ‘funnel’ (*lekter*), ‘spade’ (*k’ipil*), ‘wedge’ (*kihls*), and ‘rope’ (*strikk*), is of German origin, having come to Livonian via Latvian or (rarely) directly.

In the following spheres of life, the core vocabulary consists of native Livonian words, whereas words for special, fashionable or luxury items have been borrowed.

3) the semantic field FURNITURE/FURNISHINGS:

Essential objects have native Livonian names, e.g. ‘oven’ (*aoj*), ‘pot, cauldron’ (*katl*), ‘lid’ (*kāons*), ‘table’ (*loud*), ‘pillow’ (*pade*), but words such as ‘mirror’ (*spiegel*), ‘tub’ (*tuovar*), ‘box, chest’ (*kast*, *šk’irst*), ‘chair’ (*krāsl*), ‘blanket’ (*dekk*), ‘cupboard’ (*kaep*) and others have been borrowed, being often German loans in Latvian as well.

4) the semantic field CLOTHING:

Basic clothing items – e.g. ‘coat’ (*ame*), ‘shirt’ (*sārk*), also ‘wool’ (*vill*) – have native names, while the words for special and fashionable items are borrowings, for instance ‘belt’ (*juotum*), ‘fur’ (*kāš*), ‘collar’ (*kātunķi*), ‘jacket’ (*kamzol*), ‘vest’ (*vest*), ‘dress’ (*aran*), ‘doublet’ (*vams*), ‘eardrop’ (*uorist*), ‘comb’ (*k’em*), certain ‘footwear’ (*pastal*) and all kinds of ‘scarves’ (*vadmal*) – again, many of these loans can ultimately be traced back to German.

5) the semantic field FOOD:

Loanwords are used for pleasure substances: ‘liquor’ (*brandim*), ‘wine’ (*vīn*), ‘tobacco’ (*tabak*), and the associated ‘pipe’ (*pīp*), as well as then-luxuries ‘cream’ (*kreim*), ‘kringle’ (*kriņgil*), ‘pepper’

(*pippird*), ‘sugar’ (*sukkur*), ‘blubber’ (*trāņ*) and ‘lard’ (*spiek*). Basic food items – e.g. ‘bread’ (*leib*), ‘milk’ (*sēmd*), ‘honey’ (*mes*) and ‘beer’ (*ol*) – are denoted by native words.

6) the semantic field SPIRITUAL CULTURE:

Religious services were held in Latvian beginning in the 16th century, and therefore biblical knowledge was imparted in that language. Of 22 essential concepts, the only ones with native names are ‘mercy’ (*arm*), ‘god’ (*jumal*), ‘devil’ (*pagan*), ‘sin’ (*patt*), ‘cross’ (*rist*) and ‘guilt’ (*vūlg*).

MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS: all names of musical instruments are loanwords, e.g. ‘bagpipes’ (*dūk*), ‘harp’ (*kuokl*) and ‘trumpet’ (*struonat*), as well as ‘ink’ (*tint*) and ‘letter of the alphabet’ (*buokster*). Only the word family relating to writing, e.g. *k’iri* ‘letter’, *k’irit* ‘to write’, is originally Livonian.

SOCIETY, TOOLS AND INSTRUMENTS, FURNITURE AND FURNISHINGS, CLOTHING, FOOD and SPIRITUAL CULTURE are thus spheres of life where new objects, or new social factors in general, played significant roles. Most of the names for new objects and professions come originally from German (most of the Middle Low German words in Latvian and Estonian also come from these semantic fields). German words came into use in Latvian because the objects and professions they denoted were new and unfamiliar in Latvian society, and these words then entered Livonian as well. As for social factors, many loanwords reflect the position of the Livonian minority with respect to the Latvian majority.

Other observations worth mentioning:

a) FLORA:

- native words are used for all GRAINS.
- words for VEGETABLES are primarily taken from Latvian: ‘cucumber’ (*agurt*), ‘carrot’ (*burkan*), ‘potato’ (*kartup*), ‘garlic’ (*knipluok*), ‘leek’ (*luoka*), ‘bean’ (*puba*), ‘radish’ (*rutk*) and ‘onion’ (*sīpel*); the only native words for vegetables are ‘turnip’ (*nāgr*), ‘pea’ (*jārn*) and ‘cabbage’ (*kāpst*). Latvian words are also used for other plants used by people (including medicinal plants): ‘fern’ (*pāperd*), ‘burdock’ (*gušn*), ‘caraway’ (*kiemil*), ‘juniper’ (*paegel*, native word: *kadagi*), ‘hazel’ (*riekst*), ‘vetch’ (*lādz*) and ‘absinth’ (*kanni*).
- names of BERRIES are divided fairly evenly between native words and loans: Latvian words include ‘raspberry’ (*avat mared*), ‘cowberry’ (*brūklin*, *sprādzen mared*), ‘cranberry’ (*dzerul mared*), ‘blueberry’ (*glāzen mared*), and ‘goose-

berry' (*stikker mared*), native words are used for e.g. 'strawberry' (*mā mared*), 'rowanberry' (*pīlag mared*) and 'cranberry' (*kūrg mared*).

b) FAUNA:

- a) DOMESTIC ANIMALS have native Livonian names. Loanwords are either parallel alternative words – for instance, there is both a native word (*aani*) and a loanword (*kuaš*) for 'goose' – or more specific versions of existing names, e.g. Latvian 'boar' (*kuil*) versus Livonian 'pig' (*šiga*), Latvian 'female dog' (*kuņa*), 'puppy' (*kutšk'i*) versus Livonian 'dog' (*pinn*), Latvian 'tomcat' (*ruņts*) versus Livonian 'cat' (*kašs*), Latvian 'mare' (*k'eu*) versus Livonian 'horse' (*ūbi*).
- b) Latvian words are used primarily for BIRDS and FISH, but also for MAMMALS – 'deer' (*irš*), 'mole' (*kurm*), 'bat' (*sikspārn*), 'roe deer' (*stirn*), 'beaver' (*vābr*), 'badger' (*āps*), 'ferret' (*dukir*), 'lynx' (*lūs*), 'ermine' (*sermil*), 'marten' (*tsaun*) and 'otter' (*ūdr*). Word taboos may play a role here, as Oskar Loorits describes them among Livonian fishermen: while fishing, certain animals – especially mammals – were not to be named at all, or if they had to be mentioned, alternative names from neighboring languages (Estonian, Russian, or Swedish) were used.

3. Adjectives

The most essential spheres of meaning have remained virtually unaffected by loans: COLORS (only 'brown' has been borrowed), TEMPERATURE, SPACE and TASTE. There are clear foreign influences in only two spheres:

- a) CHARACTER: here are found mostly parallel loans: 'stupid' (*rumal – mult*), 'friendly' (*vaga – laipnīga*), 'diligent' (*k'erd – druoš*), 'sprightly/spry' (*tārab – muodrig*), 'wicked, evil' (*kure, üül – nāgant*), 'merciful' (*armig – tsienig*). It is striking that there is no native Livonian word for the concept 'joyful' (the words 'joy' and 'enjoyment' are also Latvian borrowings, as previously mentioned). The remaining loans concern secondary characteristics, such as 'patient' (*patsietig*) and 'innocent' (*nānoziedzig*).
- b) BODILY CONDITION: with the lone exception of 'blind' (*sogd*), words for physical disabilities or defects have been borrowed: 'lame' (*kliba*), 'ugly' (*nājōks*), 'mute' (*mām*) and 'deaf' (*kurli*); this may be connected to the fact that native names for such

characteristics, if they were present at all, existed only as non-finite verb forms, i.e. ‘non-hearing’ and ‘non-speaking’. Similarly, only borrowed forms are known for the concepts ‘starving’ (*nuoalken*) and ‘dead’ (*nelaik*).

Furthermore, it is worth mentioning that formations with the negative prefix *eba-* (as found in Estonian, cognate to Finnish *epä-*) are not found in the Livonian vocabulary, but the Latvian prefix *ne-*, *nā-* does appear. Also noteworthy is the German origin of several essential adjectives: *riktig* ‘right, correct’, *slikt* ‘bad’ and *smukk* ‘beautiful’.

4. Verbs

Essential domains exhibit only weak foreign influence.

- a) SENSE EXPERIENCE (e.g. ‘to see’, ‘to hear’ etc) – the only borrowings in this domain are ‘to taste’ (*fchmeckeb*) and ‘to bite, smart’ (of smoke) (*grouž*).
- b) Among basic PHYSICAL NEEDS (e.g. ‘to eat’, ‘to drink’), the only Latvian borrowings are for less essential concepts such as ‘to consume, use up’ (*isnītsind*) and ‘to sneeze’ (*fchkeudib*).

The same applies to the following verb groups as well:

- c) VERBS OF MOTION: the only Latvian loans are ‘to saunter, stroll’ (*slendert*), ‘to walk’ (*sier*), ‘to roam about’ (*glābd*), ‘to stagger’ (*strepuld*), but also the far more important ‘to travel by conveyance’ (*brouts*), no doubt used to refer to motion with fashionable horse-drawn vehicles such as carriages;
- d) VERBS OF TALKING AND THINKING: Latvian loans relate primarily to abstract notions such as ‘to explain’ (*isnīž*), ‘to evaluate’ (*spried*), ‘to acknowledge’ (*aplientsintub*), and ‘to clarify’ (*skubint*), although in parallel to the native word there is also a loanword for the central concept ‘to say, speak’ (*teits*) – evidently, verbal communication was of primary importance in the coexistence of the two groups.

The areas most heavily influenced by Latvian are emotions, social activity, manual labor and business activity, as well as descriptive expressions:

- a) EMOTIONS: Here it is striking that Latvian loans appear not for verbs describing emotional experiences in a particular social context (the only such example being ‘to love’, where a loanword is found in parallel to two native words: *arnt*, *armasta* – *mīl*), but

rather for verbs which require no such context and express more “subtle” feelings, such as ‘to tire, be weary’ (*apsnīkub*), ‘to marvel, be amazed’ (*brīn*), ‘to miss, long for’ (*kār*), ‘to sulk’ (*ņurd*), and ‘to please, appeal to’ (*patīk*).

- b) As nouns relating to SOCIAL LIFE exhibit a strong Latvian influence, it is no surprise that the same holds for verbs as well; it is particularly clear in the case of verbs with negative connotations: ‘to insult, offend’ (*abēdin*), ‘to torment’ (*aistiek*), ‘to take revenge’ (*atrieb*), ‘to hate’ (*ienīd*), ‘to irritate’ (*kaitind*), ‘to track, pursue’ (*newub*), ‘to lock up’ (*ieslurg*), ‘to deceive, betray’ (*blēdib*; there is also a native word: *pett*), while words such as ‘to lie’ (*vādļ*), ‘to quarrel’ (*rīdļ*) and ‘to beat’ (*tāks*, *tapp*) are of Livonian origin. However, the Latvian influence prevails among words with positive connotations as well: ‘to keep’ (*apglābd*), ‘to spare, economize’ (*taup*), ‘to console’ (*iepriezit*), ‘to count on smb.’ (*palaid*) etc.
- c) As the semantic fields of PROFESSIONS and TOOLS are clearly dominated by loanwords, it is of course no surprise that the same is true for verbs denoting activities associated with those fields, e.g. ‘to treat, cure’ (*arstub*), ‘to numb, tranquilize’ (*tīrp*), ‘to carve’ (*drāst*), ‘to turn (on a lathe)’ (*dreij*), ‘to maintain, service’ (*kuop*), ‘to plug up’ (*piestomp*), ‘to mill, full’ (*puostub*), ‘to clean’ (*puoist*), ‘to saw’ (*sād*), ‘to starch’ (*stārk*) etc. The word ‘to knit’ is native (*kud*), but ‘to weave’ (*pēn*) and ‘to spin’ (*vērks*) are Latvian loans. Verbs of primary importance, such as ‘to do’ (*tieda*), ‘to hit, strike’ (*pāks*), ‘to chop, hew’ (*rab*), ‘to break’ (*murd*) and ‘to tear’ (*k’isk*), are as expected autochthonous. The situation in BUSINESS LIFE is similar: names of specific activities are borrowed, e.g. ‘to haggle’ (*ding*), ‘to procure, obtain’ (*gād*), ‘to lend, borrow’ (*lien*), ‘to earn’ (*pell*), ‘to spend’ (*tēr*) and ‘to rent’ (*īr*), while native names exist for more basic activities: ‘to pay’ (*maks*), ‘to buy’ (*ost*), ‘to sell’ (*mūd*) and ‘to hold’ (*pidd*).
- d) DESCRIPTIVE EXPRESSIONS: a remarkably large percentage of such words are of Latvian origin: ‘to snore’ (*krāts*), ‘to bang’ (*krakš*), ‘to grunt’ (*rokš*), ‘to bawl, bellow’ (*rutsb*, although there are also two native words: *mour*, *mürz*), ‘to whimper’ (*smilgst*, native word *ull*), ‘to creak’ (*tšīkst*) and ‘to hum, buzz’ (*tšūkst*).

5. Conclusions

To summarize all of the aforementioned observations concerning the Latvian influence on the Livonian lexicon, the following areas can be identified where the Latvian influence is strongest:

- a) non-linguistic innovations, for which the word was borrowed along with the concept it denotes;
- b) specifications and additional nuances of items present in the native lexicon;
- c) vocabulary which was necessary in order to co-exist with non-Livonian-speaking Latvians;
- d) luxury loans, i.e. borrowings of words for concepts which were present in the native lexicon, but which acquired a particular meaning in Livonians' co-existence with Latvians;
- e) and possibly some loans motivated by cultural taboos.

To conclude, a brief comparison with German loanwords in Latvian. Sehwers collected and in his dissertation analyzed approximately 1500 originally Middle Low German and Low German (and only a few High German) loanwords in Latvian (cf. Sehwers 1918 and 1953). Comparing the two loan strata, Latvian loans in Livonian (including Low German loans which came to Livonian through Latvian) and German loans in Latvian, some clear similarities and differences can be identified.

5.1. Similarities

- a) Even more so than Livonian, Latvian has borrowed concepts related to non-linguistic innovations and activities associated therewith; this applies to all tools and devices as well as to crafts, business, home furnishings, clothing, foodstuffs, fruit and vegetables. It is words from precisely these domains that have been borrowed from Low German into Latvian and then (in smaller numbers) onward into Livonian as well.
- b) As in Livonian, foreign influence in Latvian is weak in the following domains: grains, body parts and organs, nature and the surrounding environment, as well as significant life events. Relatively few adjectives have been borrowed into Latvian, although as in Livonian, some of these denote central concepts, e.g. such as 'right, correct', 'bad', and 'beautiful'.

5.2. Differences

- a) On the basis of Sehwers' work, the following domains in Latvian exhibit no foreign influence or at least less foreign influence than Livonian: berries, birds, fish, large mammals, domestic animals; adjectives referring to bodily condition; verbs of thought and speech; and descriptive verbs.
- b) One important domain in which the lack of loanwords in Latvian is particularly striking is that of social life in general, including feelings, emotions, and personality traits. Since loanwords in Latvian denote mostly concrete objects and items along with corresponding activities, it is fruitless to search Sehwers' list for words like 'fortune, luck', 'pretender', 'joy', 'joyful', 'friendly', or 'sad', among verbs 'to marvel, be amazed', 'to tire, be weary', 'to offend, insult', or 'to aggrieve'. With the exception of the words 'fun/gleeful' and a few others (total under 10 words), this very large domain has remained uninfluenced by German. This strongly suggests that the influence of Latvian on Livonian runs deeper than the influence of German on Latvian, which in turn indicates closer social contacts between Livonians and Latvians than between Latvians and Germans. The mentioned loanwords also illustrate that the coexistence of Latvians and Livonians was not entirely problem-free. However, the fact that this analysis does not reveal contact between Germans and Latvians does not necessarily mean that there was no such contact. Rather, there was a clear social separation between Germans and Latvians (and Livonians), and their interaction was limited and organized, while Latvians and Livonians were in more or less the same social class (although clearly in a lower position than Germans), and Livonians were below Latvians only due to their smaller numbers. The fact that a hierarchy developed within the lower class in such a situation – a society with a homogeneous upper class and a heterogeneous lower class – can be easily observed to this day. And it is reflected in the loanwords used in both languages.

Address:

Eberhard Winkler
Finnisch-Ugrisches Seminar
Universität Göttingen
Heinrich-Düker-Weg 14
37073 Göttingen, Germany
E-post: ewinkle@gwdg.de

References

- Kettunen, Lauri (1938) *Livisches Wörterbuch mit grammatischer Einleitung*. Helsinki: Suomalais-ugrilainen seura.
- Loorits, Oskar (1939) “Gedanken-, Tat- und Worttabu bei den estnischen Fischern”. (Eesti Vabariigi Tartu Ülikooli toimetused B 54, 2.) Tartu.
- Sehwers, Johann (1918) *Die deutschen Lehnwörter im Lettischen*. Zürich: Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung der Doktorwürde der hohen philosophischen Fakultät I der Universität Zürich.
- Sehwers, Johannes (1953) *Sprachlich-kulturhistorische Untersuchungen vornehmlich über den deutschen Einfluss im Lettischen*. (Veröffentlichungen der Abteilung für slavische Sprachen und Literaturen des Osteuropa-Institut an der Freien Universität Berlin, 4.) Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Suhonen, Seppo (1973) *Die jungen lettischen Lehnwörter im Livischen*. (Suomalais-ugrilaisen seuran toimituksia, 154.) Helsinki: Suomalais-ugrilainen seura.
- Winkler, Eberhard (1998) “Über die Anfänge der Erforschung des Livischen”. *Latvijas Zinātnu Akadēmijas Vēstis* A 52, 3, 46–55.
- Winkler, Eberhard (2002) “Die Lehnwortschichten des Salis-Livischen und die Folgen”. In Rogier Blokland and Cornelius Hasselblatt, eds. *Finno-Ugrians and Indo-Europeans: Linguistic and Literary Contacts. Proceedings of the Symposium at the University of Groningen, November 22–24, 2001*, 428–433. (Studia Fenno-Ugrica Groningana, 2.) Maastricht: Shaker Publishing BV.
- Winkler, Eberhard and Karl Pajusalu (2009) *Salis-livisches Wörterbuch*. (Linguistica Uralica suppl. series, 3.) Tallinn: Teaduste Akadeemia Kirjastus.

Kokkuvõte. Eberhard Winkler: Liivi keele laensõnakihid. Artikkel käsitleb liivi keele laensõnakihte. Esimeses osas võrreldakse Kuramaa ja Salatsi liivi keele laensõnakihte, pidades silmas laenuandjat keelt (keskalamsaksa, läti, ülemsaksa ja vene), seejärel analüüsitakse laensõnu sõnaliigiti. Teises osas vaadeldakse salatsiliivi sõnavara semantilisi välju, milles läti keele mõju avaldub eriti tugevalt või piiratud. Lõpuks esitatakse keeleajaloolisi järeldusi.

Märksõnad: liivi keele, laensõnakihid, läti laensõnade semantilised väljad

Kubbõvõttõks. Eberhard Winkler: Līvõ kīel līensõnād kōrdad. Kēra tuņšlōb līensõnād kōrdidi. Ežmis jagsō ītlōb Kurāmō līvō kīel ja Salāts līvō kīel līensõnād kōrdidi līenāndajiz kīel pierrō (sidāmizalāmsaksā, leṭkīel, iļizsaksā, krīevō kēļ) ja sīetagān līensõnād sōnāvīṭiņ. Tuois jagsō vaņṭlōb Salāts līvō kīel sōnāvīļa semantiliži nūrmidi, kus leṭkīel mōj um vōnd ižkiz kangti agā suorndōd. Lopāndōksōks tīeb pierāldōkši iļ kīelistōrij.