

METHODS FOR EXPANDING THE LIVONIAN LEXICON

Valts Ernštreits

Līvõ Kultūr sidām, University of Tartu

Abstract. This article explores opportunities for expanding the vocabulary of Livonian through compounds, borrowings, derived words, and calques. It is clear that these methods have been effectively used already throughout the entire period of development of the modern Livonian literary language and, therefore, specific traditions have evolved in forming neologisms in Livonian. So, in forming compounds, one has to pay special attention to whether the singular or plural form is used for each component, the historical genitive is used in select types of compounds, or one or both components must be declined. Borrowings in Livonian are largely connected with internationalisms borrowed through Latvian, but adapted to fit with the unique demands of Livonian pronunciation and morphology. Derivation using suffixes is quite productive, while derivation using prefixes is distinctly limited, despite views to the contrary which are sometimes encountered. Many new concepts have actively entered Livonian through the use of calques. Two major groups of calques can be distinguished, which are those formed based on Latvian and those formed based on Estonian. Word formation in Livonian is still a little studied topic where more in depth studies are needed; however, already existing research into the expansion of the Livonian lexicon ensures the existence of a rich source of material for future study in this area.

Keywords: Livonian, language contact, lexicon, word formation, neologisms, borrowing, derivation, prefixes, suffixes, calques

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.12697/jeful.2016.7.1.09>

1. Introduction

With the passage of time and the changes affecting society and the world in general on a continuous basis, our everyday lives come to be filled with ever newer technologies and information, while earlier ones lose their meaning and gradually pass out of circulation. Every modern language must endeavor to keep up with these changes on an ongoing basis and not fall behind. It must keep up with the times and continue to find new means for the expansion of the lexicon in order to describe the new information and concepts entering that language.

In this sense, Livonian, though little used and developed utilizing fairly meager resources, is no exception. Livonian researchers, literary figures, and other language specialists have worked rather actively in finding and forming new Livonian words. This work is still continuing, therefore, it is very important to understand the means, which have been traditionally employed and are also employable in the future for expanding and modernizing the Livonian lexicon.

Two of the least studied Livonian linguistic topics are neologism formation and syntax. Much as with studies of syntax, individual publications do partially examine how neologisms are formed in Livonian; however, these studies are generally less systematic and are most often fairly narrowly focused. Thus, for example, Finnish linguist Seppo Suhonen discussed the most recent Latvian borrowings into Livonian in his doctoral dissertation (1973), French researcher Fanny de Sivers examined prefixes borrowed from Latvian (1971ab), Estonian scholar Eduard Vääri devoted his dissertation to the topic of suffixes autochthonous to Livonian (1974), German linguist Eberhard Winkler turned his attention to the most ancient layers of borrowing in Livonian (2011, 2013), and linguist Valts Ernštreits, who is of Livonian origin, examined the formation of neologisms in several examples of published written Livonian in his monographs devoted to the Livonian written language (2012, 2014).

It should be noted that some of these aforementioned studies are already confusing just based on their names alone and do not reflect a complete view of the Livonian language situation – both in terms of the sources used for these studies and in terms of the time periods included in each study. One arrives at notably different impressions when examining the results of these studies in light of the processes affecting the formation of the Livonian literary language in the early 20th century and in the late 20th century up to the present day. This latter period is most completely shown in the Livonian-Estonian-Latvian Dictionary (Viitso and Ernštreits 2012) published in 2012, the contents of which also served as the source for the examples given in this article. In this article, the traditions and methods associated with word formation in Livonian are discussed precisely in this context.

Taking into account that the principles of Livonian word formation have not yet been suitably summarized, this article, too, provides only an introduction to this topic, by describing initial observations and problems, examining Livonian word formation in some detail, and by showing its possible application for the future expansion of the Livonian language.

2. Traditions for expanding the lexicon

Neologisms can already be found in the earliest larger collections of Livonian vocabulary. For example, in connection with the improvements made by consultant Jāņ Prints Sr. to the Livonian vocabulary found in the Livonian-German Dictionary (SjW ab) published in 1861, one of the dictionary's authors, Ferdinand Johann Wiedemann, wrote the following: “[.] of course, one cannot forget that some ancient Livonian words, which old Prints used due to his purism and his love of his native language, have been replaced with Latvian words, as he himself acknowledged, also in his Pizā [Miķeļtornis] dialect, and that the neologisms he has suggested in places of these Latvianisms, which he has formed in the spirit of the Livonian language, the people, it seems, do understand, but do not use.” (Videman 1870: 140) An especially noteworthy example of the neologisms created by J. Prints is mentioned by the researcher of Livonian cultural history, Tõnu Karma: “For example, when Sjögren asked how you say ‘capital’ in Livonian, he received the answer – ro (rā) tšupā, i.e., money pile /..!” (Karma 1998: 72).

More active and wide-ranging work seeking to expand the Livonian lexicon began with the appearance of the first modern publications in Livonian in the early 1920s (LL I, II, III; AK, Loorits 1923, etc.). This continued with later publications or the writing of their manuscripts and brought with them the inescapable need for continuing to expand and modernize the Livonian lexicon. This work has continued without almost any break until the present day.

Examining the expansion of the lexicon in the context of the Livonian written language, it can be seen that the resources available to those developing Livonian have always been very limited. For this reason, the process of expanding the Livonian lexicon has been directed not by regular language maintenance and expansion work, but by the needs of particular periods, which have been the impetus for innovating missing words at those times.

So, for example, legal terminology was developed in preparing the statutes of the Livonian Association (AK) or in translating the Constitution of the Republic of Latvia into Livonian (LRS); political terminology was extensively developed to meet the needs of the first newspaper to be published in Livonian (Līvli ab), which published articles about current events in Latvia and elsewhere in the world; scientific terminology came into being along with articles, manuscripts, and other publications about the Livonians and the Livonian language (LKG,

Damberg 1978, Šuvcāne and Žagare 1991, ESUKA, and others); the religious lexicon was expanded in the 1930s accompanying the first use of Livonian in churches and for the purposes of religious publications (KTK, ŪT ab, LR); the stratum containing Soviet terminology appeared in Livonian thanks to the Livonian-Latvian-Esperanto Dictionary (ČDG) and the Livonian reading book written in the 1960s (PDL); contemporary computer-related terminology came into being in the process of developing the web portal *Livones* (Livones).

The Livonian lexicon has been expanded on a continuous basis during the last century using all possible methods, including borrowing, word derivation, compounds, use of dialect terms, expanding the meaning of existing words, and forming calques (Ernštreits 2011: 29). The way in which a particular method is chosen and the way in which it has been applied has often been determined by personal choice and the individual characteristics of the person making these decisions; these include the degree of language proficiency, contacts, education, and so on. In the next sections the various methods for expanding the Livonian lexicon are grouped and discussed according to type.

3. Compounds

The formation of compounds is one of the simplest and most natural methods for creating terms for new concepts using the resources available in a language. Livonian also employs this method for creating new words. This is also a very productive method; out of approximately the 12,000 entries in the Livonian-Estonian-Latvian Dictionary (LELD), almost one quarter is made up of compounds.

When examining the formation of compounds in the closest neighboring languages to Livonian, it can be seen that the use and principles for the formation of compounds are quite similar in Latvian and Estonian (*jõņ|bo'ŗ* ‘firefly’ [lit. John’s worm], cf. lv *jāņ|tārpiņš*, ee *jaani|uss*; *vanā|pōis* ‘bachelor’ [lit. old boy], cf. lv *vec|puisīis*, ee *vana|poiss*; *kūoršōn|pūstiji* ‘chimney sweep’ cf. lv *skursteņ|slauķis*, ee *korstna|pūhkija*; *mūnda|kōrd* ‘sometimes’, cf. lv *dažreiz*, ee *mōnikord*). However, Livonian compound formation does have several unique features, which should be taken into account when forming new words.

First of all, it should be noted that compound formation in Livonian and Estonian is noticeably more productive than in Latvian. In these languages compounds are also used in situations where a word

group suffices in Latvian (*rōda|na'ggōl* 'iron nail', cf. lv *dzelzs nagla*, *ee raud|nael*; *filts|sōpkōd* 'felt boots' cf. lv *filca zābaki*, *ee vilt|saapad*).

Unlike in Estonian, however, in Livonian, compounds where a present passive participle functions as the dependent component of the compound are used extensively (*ē'kōrtōb|nō'ggōl* 'crochet needle' [lit. crocheting needle], *glōibdōb|lōja* 'life boat' [lit. saving boat], *optōb|āigast* 'school year' [lit. learning year]; the LELD contains more than 100 such words). Many compounds formed in this way correspond semantically in large part to word groups which are actually or possibly formed in Latvian using declinable present passive participles (*je'ltōb|tubā* 'living room', cf. lv *dzīvojamā istaba*, *pū'gdōb|lil* 'wind instrument' [lit. blowing instrument], cf. lv *pūšamais instruments*, *sīedōb|lōda* 'dining table', cf. lv *ēdamgalds*). The deep contacts with Latvian have had, most likely, a large role in the formation process and wide use of this type of compound.

Another unique feature related to Livonian language contacts can be observed in the compounds, which distinguish a concept semantically from the rest of a particular group (*dattōld|palm* 'date palm', *na'ggōrd|kuoņ* 'potato sack', *nārv|kudām* 'nerve tissue', etc.). This type of compound is traditionally formed in the Finnic languages with the dependent component in the genitive singular, while, in Latvian, the genitive plural is used in the corresponding compounds and word groups.

In principle, both patterns for forming this type of compound have become mixed in Livonian. For this reason, this type of compound can be formed with the dependent component in the genitive singular (*jelāj|vōzā* ~ *sūr|jelāj|vōzā* 'beef' [lit. (large) animal meat], cf. lv *liellopu gaļa*, *ee loomaliha*; *o'v|pū|pīsk* 'conifer resin' [lit. needle tree resin], cf. lv *skujkoku sveķi*, *ee okaspuuvaik*), as well as in the genitive plural (*piņūd|bo'ugō* 'dog house' [lit. dogs' shack], cf. lv *suņubūda*, *ee koerakuut*; *dattōld|palm* 'date palm' [lit. dates' palm], cf. lv *date|palma*, *ee datlipalm*; *na'ggōrd|kuoņ* 'potato sack' [lit. potatoes' sack], cf. lv *kartupeļu maiss*, *ee kartulikott*; *kanād|taļ* 'hen house' [cf. hens' house], cf. lv *vīstu kūts*, *ee kanakuut*; *kindōd|pōr* 'pair of mittens' [lit. mittens' pair], cf. lv *cimdu pāris*, *ee kindapaar*). It is not unusual for compounds formed according to both patterns to be used in parallel (*kanā|kuļ* and *kanād|kuļ* 'chicken hawk', cf. lv *vīstu vanags*, *ee kanakull*; *jelāj|vagōn* 'cattle car', cf. lv *lopu vagon*, *ee loomavagun*, and *jelājd|bīetōz* 'beet used for animal feed', cf. *ee loomapeet*).

The co-existence of both patterns for forming compounds of this type most likely exists in Livonian as a result of Latvian influence. However, this also makes it effectively impossible, without further studies into this topic, to clearly separate the semantic functions for which the singular and plural forms are each used. Therefore, in creating new compounds of these types, individual preference will still play a large role in determining whether singular or plural is used for the dependent component.

Compounds in which the historical genitive ending **-n* is still present in the ending of the dependent component is another unique feature of Livonian. Individual relic forms of this type have also been preserved in Estonian (*maantee* ‘highway’ < *maa* ‘land’ + *tee* ‘road’; *Soontaga* < *soo* ‘swamp’ + *taga* ‘behind’); however, such forms are found in Livonian more often, even forming an entire sub-group of their own.

This historic genitive ending can be found in such ancient compounds as *sīemn|āiga* ‘food, provisions’, *jūomn|āiga* ‘drink, beverage’, *sitān|ouk* ‘anus’, *mōn|vizāntimi* ‘serfdom’, *mūn|āigast* ‘in a different year’). Along with these, there exists a rather large group of compounds formed from independent components, in which the ancient genitive ending is almost always found. Compounds of this group are formed using the location-specifying components *-aigā* ‘edge’ (*jōran|aigā* ‘edge of a lake’, *jo’ugn|aigā* ‘edge of a river’, *koun|aigā* ‘edge of a well’; *kōnkan|aigā* ‘edge of dunes’, *mā’gn|aigā* ‘slope, hillside’, *mie’rn|aigā* ‘seashore’, *mōtsān|aigā* ‘edge of a forest’, *rāndan|aigā* ‘beach’, *tu’ln|aigā* ‘edge of a fire’), *-aigi* ‘of an edge’ (*mie’rn|a’igi* ‘of a seashore’), *-a’lli* ‘under, a place underneath’ (*pān|a’lli* ‘pillow, head of the bed’, *pūolan|a’lli* ‘hollow of one’s knee’, *ulān|a’lli* ‘shed, awning, lean-to’, *mōn|a’lli* ‘underground’ *āitan|a’lli* ‘space under a granary’, *kūondan|a’lli* ‘something to be scorned’, *labān|a’lli* ‘sole [of a foot]’, *lōdan|a’lli* ‘space under a table’, *lovān|a’lli* ‘space under a bed’), *-alā* ‘underside’ (*mōn|alā* ‘underworld’), *-e’đđi* ‘front [side]’ (*āitan|e’đđi* ‘porch of a granary’; *tubān|e’đđi* ‘entrance hall, anteroom, lobby’), *-pēli* ‘top [side]’ (*tubān|pēli* ‘attic’).

Taking into account its decidedly broad and systematic use in creating new compounds containing these components, in individual cases the use of the historical genitive ending could be considered, in order for such neologisms to be better integrated into Livonian as a whole.

Likewise, there is a group of compounds in which both components are declined (NSg *kakš||kimdō* : GSg *kōd||kimdō* ‘twenty’, NSg

pivā||*kuodā* : PSg *pivvõ*||*kuoddō* ‘church’, NSg *iļli*||*skūol* : GSg *iļiz*||*skūol* ‘university’, NSg *alli*||*tas* : GSg *alīz*||*tas* ‘saucer’, NSg *Ūž*||*kilā* : GSg *Ūd*||*kilā* ‘Jaunciems [name of a village on the Livonian Coast]’, and others; 56 such words are found in the LELD). A similar phenomenon can be observed in Estonian (NSg *üks*|*ainus* : GSg *ühe*|*ainsa* ‘one alone, just one’; NSg *kuus*|*kümmend* : GSg *kuue*|*kümne* ‘sixty’; NSg *kaks*|*sada* ‘two hundred’ : GSg *kahe*|*saja*), in Finnish, where this is a fairly widespread phenomenon (NSg *kaksi*|*kymmentä* : GSg *kahden*|*kymmenen* ‘twenty’, NSg *Uusi*|*kaupunki* : *Uuden*|*kaupungin*) as well as in rare cases in Latvian, for example, in place names (NSg *Skaņaiskalns* : GSg *Skaņākalna*, NSg *Baltaiskrogs* : GSg *Baltākroga*).

Four groups of this type of compound are found in Livonian. Compounds in the first group, much as in Estonian and Finnish, contain a numeral (*vīž*||*kimdō* ‘five hundred’, *kūž*||*sadā* ‘six hundred’, *kakš*||*tuoistōn* ‘twelve’) or other compounds containing numerals. Compounds of the second group contain pronouns or the independent component *-īž* ‘self’ (*se*||*īž* ‘[the] same’, *se*||*li*||*īž* ‘of the same type’). The third group is formed by compounds in which the dependent component is an adjective in its nominative form and is joined with a noun (*pivā*||*kuodā* ‘church’, *vizā*||*kuodā* ‘prison’, *mustā*||*pīlgōz* ‘chokeberry’, *sindī*||*kōrand* ‘birth home’; *piškizt*||*maškōd* ‘measles’, and others.). The fourth group contains compounds with a location-specifying component: *a’lli-* (‘the one underneath’; *a’lli*||*serk* ‘undershirt’), *e’đđi-* (‘the one in front’; *e’đđi*||*tubā* ‘entrance hall, anteroom, lobby’), *i’ļli-* (‘the high one’; *i’ļli*||*skūol* ‘university’), *pēli-* (‘the top one’; *pēli*||*ke’ž* ‘upper hand, advantage’), *u’ļli-* (‘the outer one’; *u’ļli*||*sāina* ‘exterior wall’), *va’ili-* (‘the one in between’; *va’ili*||*sāina* ‘partition’ [lit. between wall]).

The third and fourth groups of compounds display semantic parallels with the use of definite adjectives in corresponding word groups in Latvian (*a’lli*||*serk* = *a’lli* ‘one which is under’ + *serk* ‘shirt’, cf. lv *apakšējais kreklis* ‘undershirt’; *u’ļli*||*sāina* = *u’ļli* ‘one which is outer’ + *sāina* ‘wall’, cf. lv *ārējā siena* ‘exterior wall’; *pivā*||*kuodā* = *pivā* ‘holy’ (lv *svēts*) + *kuodā* ‘building’, cf. lv *svētais nams* ‘the holy building’; *mustā*||*pīlgōz* = *mustā* ‘black’ + *pīlgōz* ‘rowan tree’, cf. lv *melnais pīlādzis*). This semantic influence could underlie the dependent component being in its nominative form and both components of the compound being declined in a manner analogous to that observed for corresponding word groups in Latvian.

Compounds in which both components are declined are few in number; however, due to the absence of sufficient studies identifying

other examples of such compounds, it is quite believable that their total number is larger than currently known. Also, in forming neologisms, the unique principles of declining compounds should be taken into account, especially those of the fourth group. This was also the practice of earlier figures working in developing Livonian (*uļļi||mō* ‘foreign country’, *e’dđi||mīez* ‘chairman’, and others).

The most significant problem associated with this group of compounds is that the principles for declining the dependent components of these compounds have not been as of yet sufficiently studied. It seems possible that this may not be done for all noun cases, but to be certain of this, an extensive survey of Livonian text corpus is necessary. This work is additionally complicated by the fact that such compounds are also fairly rare in texts, especially in certain noun cases.

In concluding this discussion of compounds, it should be noted that compounds are closely connected in Livonian with calques, which are discussed later in this article. However, the status of compounds as a unique productive method for expanding the Livonian lexicon is evidenced by the many original neologisms, which have been formed in Livonian without analogous constructions in Latvian or Estonian (*lā’nd|āīga* ‘past’, cf. lv *pagātne*, ee *minevik*; *jei|rōdad* ‘ice skates’, cf. lv *slidas*, ee *uisud*; *kaim|kuodā* ‘embassy’, cf. lv *vēstniecība*, ee *saatkond*; *jemā|kuodā* ‘uterus’, cf. lv *dzemde*, ee *emakas*, etc.).

4. Derived Words

Various types of derivation play a large role in the expansion of the Livonian lexicon. Their amount is quite sizeable, therefore, a few examples are provided here for the possibilities of forming new nouns, adjectives, adverbs, and verbs.

4.1. Suffixes

There is a string of traditional derivational suffixes in Livonian, which have been mostly cataloged by E. Vääri in his doctoral dissertation (1974), which is based on the materials used for Lauri Kettunen’s dictionary (LW). Comparing it with the LELD and with various Livonian written sources, one can observe differences in the productivity of various suffixes. For example, the nominalizing suffix *-it* is shown in E. Vääri’s dissertation as being non-productive; however, many written

sources demonstrate the exact opposite (Ernštreits 2011: 143). This suffix is widely used in nouns describing characteristics or inherent qualities, which are derived from adjectives (*ōigit* ‘fairness’; *pivālit* ‘holiness’; *kōzzit* ‘ire’, *laigit* ‘width, breadth’, *rōkkit* ‘talkativeness, loquaciousness’). The suffix *-m*, which is borrowed from Latvian, has a similar function (*knaššōm* ‘beauty’, *alāstōm* ‘mercy’, *sangdōm* ‘thickness, denseness’).

The suffix *-nikā* is very typically associated with trades and referring to groups of people (*tarānikā* ‘gardener’, *datōrnikā* ‘computer specialist’, *vainikā* ‘intermediary’). It corresponds to the Latvian suffix *-nieks* and the Estonian suffix *-nik* (*mōiznikā* ‘manor lord’, cf. lv *muižnieks*, ee *mōisnik*). The suffix *-(i)ji* is likewise productive in deriving agent nouns from verbs, which are used with derived forms for more broadly describing occupation, trade, or function (*mōtīkšiji* ‘thinker’, *daņtšiji* ‘dancer’, *bombiji* ‘bomber’). Similarly, nouns describing processes are derived from verbs with the suffix *-imi*. These nouns often describe not just the action itself, but also its result (*ārmakstimi* ‘saving, frugality’, *mā’dlimi* ‘remembering, frugality’, *sōidami* ‘rowing (process), rowing (a type of sport)’).

There is an entire series of suffixes ending in *-i*, which is especially popular for forming adjectives. These suffixes are *-i* (*konstanti* ‘constant’, *kīņdōli* ‘teary’, *nādīli* ‘week-, a week old, a week long’, *kō’dōks|stunđi* ‘eight-hour-’), *-li* (*āigali* ‘timely’, *ka’zli* ‘useful’, *kēņigli* ‘royal’, *kīelli* ‘language-’, *tāudli* ‘complete’), *-limi* (*strīplimi* ‘striped’, *tī’eslimi* ‘court-’, *set|zilblimi* ‘polysyllabic-’). It is also traditional to use words derived using the suffix *-(i)ji* as adjectives (*keppiji* ‘sticky’, *ki’lliji* ‘sonorous’, *kīviji* ‘quarrelsome’).

For the purposes of deriving adverbs, the following suffixes are productive in Livonian: *-ld* (*ja’ggōld* ‘partly’, *murāgōld* ‘in a manner full of worries’, *qōrald* ‘rarely’, *sangdōld* ‘densely’), *-(ō)st* (*pī’ldzist* ‘constantly, invariably’, *rumālist* ‘in an ugly manner’, *tuožīņōst* ‘seriously’), *-stiz* / *-stōz* (*a’lmstiz* ‘cheap’, *rikāstiz* ‘richly’, *tazāstiz* ‘quietly’, *vegīstiz* ‘mightily, strongly’, *tāudzistōz* ‘thoroughly, in its entirety’, *vōzālistōz* ‘partly’).

Many productive suffixes are also available for forming new verbs. The most popular are *-tō* / *-dō* (*rikāztō* ‘to enrich’, *sizāltō* ‘to inspire’, *skūoltō* ‘to school, to send to school’, *pāgiņtō* ‘to multiply’, *astāmtō* ‘to increase’, *irdtō* ‘to accustom’, *pōtōgtō* ‘to whip’, *sigāstō* ‘to behave in a loutish manner’, *grūoiptō* ‘to groove, to carve grooves’, *tōurimtō* ‘to become more expensive’), (*madāldō* ‘to decline, to land’, *pāgiņdō*

‘to multiply’, *pūoldō* ‘to agree, to be on a particular side’, *sizāldō* ‘to contain’, *a’lmōldō* ‘to become less expensive’), *-ntō* / *-ņtō* / *-ndō* (*kazāntō* ‘to develop’, *pīliņtō* ‘to become overcast’, *tuoistiņtō* ‘to differ, to be different’, *tāutōndō* ‘to improve oneself, to perfect oneself’, *vagāndō* ‘to become silent’, *va’indō* ‘to be an intermediary’, *tōvāndō* ‘to delve into, to immerse oneself’), *-stō* (*nīskistō* ‘to become moist’, *vanāstō* ‘to grow old’), *-mtō* (*veitōmtō* ‘to lessen, to diminish’).

4.2. Prefixes

Prefixes and prefixoids can be used to a limited extent in Livonian for the purposes of word derivation. However, it must be noted here that the existence of prefixes and the degree to which they can be used is one of the most controversial questions concerning Livonian word derivation. Fanny de Sivers devoted her doctoral dissertation (de Sivers 1971ab) to prefixes borrowed from Latvian; however, the actual language situation, especially with respect to the principles worked into the written language, shows a somewhat different picture.

Latvian prefixes are found in examples of spoken Livonian; however, their use suggests that these prefixes are used as partial barbarisms and not as integrated and fully-functioning components of Livonian (*sa|mōistō* ‘to understand’ pro *mōistō*, cf. lv *sa|prast*, ee *mōistma*; *ie|lādō* ‘to go into’ pro *lā’dō*). It seems that these prefixes borrowed from Latvian are a somewhat new phenomenon, which gained popularity among Livonian speakers with the increase of Latvian-Livonian bilingualism and a decrease of Livonian language use in everyday life – especially as a result of the disruption caused by the two world wars. The considerable ability for these prefixes to differentiate semantic nuances in Latvian can be given as a factor for their use in Livonian.

However, examining language data more carefully, one cannot but notice that in the villages where there was less Latvian influence, in Vaid and Stkrōg, for example, the use of Latvian prefixes was noticeably less in evidence and the use of these Latvian prefixes was perceived by the language speakers as being associated with incorrect use of Livonian. One of the authors of the Livonian-Estonian-Latvian Dictionary, Tiit-Rein Viitso, described exactly one such occurrence: “[...] one day I’d started to believe that the Latvian verb prefixes are systematically used in correct modern Livonian and I decided to also start using them myself. Already the day after next, Emma Hausmaņ said to me: *Sa*

rōkāndōd nei ku leļli. Alā nei rōkānd! – ‘You’re talking like a Latvian. Don’t talk like that!’” (Viitso and Ernštreits 2012: 12). Individuals working to develop Livonian in the 20th century also gradually began to reject the Latvian prefixes in the 1920s, fully eliminating them from their writing in the beginning of the 1930s with the beginning of the publication of the Livonian-language newspaper “Līvli” (Ernštreits 2011: 199, 202–203).

One prefix, however, has developed in Livonian. This is the negative prefix *āb-* ‘not’, which is used to create antonyms. The use of *āb-* is not as pervasive as *ne-* in Latvian, under whose influence *āb-* developed; however, the use of *āb-* is broad and productive. Much as with its Latvian analog, the Livonian prefix can be used with both adjectives and adverbs as well as nouns, and more rarely also with verbs (*ā’b|ōigi* ‘incorrect’, *ā’b|konsekvent* ‘inconsistent’, *ā’b|knaššō* ‘in an ugly manner’, *ā’b|lu’gdōb* ‘illegible’, *ā’b|ōigōm* ‘injustice’, *ā’b|kūolimi* ‘immortality’, *ā’b|vōņštō* ‘to fail, to fall through’). This prefix could also be used productively in the future in forming new antonyms in Livonian.

Similarly, new prefix formation has occurred in Livonian due to the influence of Latvian resulting in several prefixoids. Verbs in the Finnic languages do not have prefixes. Instead “joint verbs” are used, which are constructions consisting of a verb and an adverb in a free position within the sentence. Together these function either to add a different nuance or otherwise change the semantics of the original verb. In participles and derived words, this adverb largely appears alongside the verb forming a compound (*lā’dō* ‘to go’ and *ulzō* ‘out(side)’, *ulzō lā’dō* ‘to go out’, *ulzō|lēmi* ‘departure’; ee *minema* ‘to go’ and *vālja* ‘out(side)’, *vālja minema* ‘to go out’, *vālja|minekud* ‘expenses’). However, in individual cases in Livonian, the adverb accompanying the verb has attached itself to the verb in a manner similar to a prefix also changing its form in the process. These new prefixoids include *ilz-* (from *ilzō* ‘up(ward)’; *il’z|nūzō* ‘to get up’, *i’lz|pūgō* ‘to hang (a person)’, *i’l-* (from *i’l ~ i’l’ō* ‘over’; *i’l|andō* ‘to hand over’, *i’l|astāmi* ‘transgression’, *i’l|lā’dōb* ‘passing, transitory, transitional’, *ulz-* (from *ulzō* ‘out(side)’; *ulz|mōtlō* ‘to think of, to think out’, *ulz|la’gtō* ‘to separate’, *ulz|vōtšō* ‘to investigate’, *ulz|sōtōks* ‘exile’), and others.

In examining derivation in Livonian as a whole, it can be seen that just as in other areas of word formation, there are many uncertainties here; for example, there is a need for broader studies concerning the function of suffixes, the grammatical principles of word derivation, and

so on. However, it can be concluded that derivation is a very productive method for expanding the lexicon and there is a broad selection of already existing derived forms in Livonian, which can be used as grammatical and semantic models for further derivation of new words.

5. Borrowings

The passage of borrowings into Livonian is closely linked with language contact. The most active connection for Livonian speakers, almost at the level of general bilingualism, has been with Latvian; however, during the course of the last two centuries, the speakers of Livonian have also come into contact with German, Russian, English, Estonian, Swedish, Romany, Yiddish, and, more recently, also with Finnish. The influence of these languages on the Livonian lexicon would be an additional topic, but for the context of this article it is important to recognize the processes connected with borrowing into Livonian from the perspective of the written language and the present day.

To gain an adequate picture of the passage of borrowings into the Livonian lexicon, it would first be necessary to distinguish two fundamentally different layers of borrowing: borrowings, which have come into Livonian and have stabilized as part of the lexicon in general use, and “quick” borrowings, or barbarisms, which speakers have largely included into the lexicon on an individual basis due to an inability to find or remember a corresponding word in Livonian. Barbarisms are especially characteristic of spoken Livonian texts; however, they are not unusual in more casually written materials such as personal letters.

The origins of the widespread distribution of barbarisms in Livonian are found in the circumstances of the Livonian speech community; already since the middle of the 19th century, bilingualism has been widespread among Livonian speakers and only has become more established during the last century. As a result, in spoken, and more rarely in written, language, Livonianized Latvian words and other elements are not infrequently included with these Latvian elements seeming natural and comprehensible to other participants in the conversation. This situation is illustrated by excerpts from the memories of Livonian consultant Alfons Bertholds: *pūd vōļtō rāndas sa-kraudōt* ‘trees were **piled up** on the beach’, cf. lv. *koki bija sakrauti jūrmalā* pro *pūd vōļtō rāndas sāltōd*; *tūr um selļi nodalīņīmi* (*nei ku teātōrōs tselien*) ‘a tour

is a division of a sort (like a theater act)’ (Vääri 1987: 152), cf. lv *tūre ir tāds nodalījums* (*tāds kā teātrī cēliens*) pro *tūr um sellī jag* (*nei ku teātōrs kabāl*).

Researchers, who did not have sufficient knowledge of Latvian, have had difficulties in distinguishing barbarisms from borrowings, which have become entrenched in the lexicon in general use (for example, in the previous paragraph, distinguishing the barbarism *tselien* from the borrowing *kabāl*). As a result, individual studies devoted to the Livonian lexicon give an insufficient conception of the Livonian lexicon. So, for example, specifically barbarisms form the largest part of the collected index of borrowings in S. Suhonen’s dissertation “The most recent Latvian borrowings in Livonian” (1974), which creates an incorrect impression concerning the extent of Latvian borrowings in Livonian.

There have been clear efforts in the last one hundred years to remove these types of barbarisms from Livonian and to separate off Livonian from the dominating influence of Latvian; this is quite similar to the parallel process in Estonian and Latvian where unnecessary German and later also Russian and English elements have been removed. This can be especially seen when examining the changes, which occurred during this time period in literary as well as everyday Livonian. For this reason, the intentional and also unintentional inclusion of barbarisms into the future expansion of the Livonian lexicon should continue to be avoided.

Historically, borrowings have played a very large role in the expansion of the Livonian lexicon. However, in the most recent period, borrowing, which is one of the fastest and simplest, though not the best quality, method for expanding the lexicon, has begun to lose its dominance and for the aforementioned reasons it has begun to be displaced by other methods for expanding the lexicon such as derivation, semantic widening, and calques. One semantic domain where borrowing is still very productive for generating neologisms is that of expanding the lexicon with internationalisms (more than 500 entries in the LELD, Zeibārts 2015: 23).

Though a portion of these foreign words may have come into Livonian directly from larger international languages, the majority of internationalisms have entered Livonian through Latvian and, more rarely, Estonian (*kumūod* ‘chest of drawers’, cf. lv *kumode*, ee *kummut*, de *Kommode*; *puliertō* ‘to polish’, cf. lv *pulēt*, ee *poleerida*, de *polieren*; *eksām* ‘exam’, cf. lv *eksāmens*, ee *eksam*, de *Examen*).

Often, internationalisms are borrowed from Latvian with only minimal changes. For example, simply adjusting the spelling of the word so that it fits the Livonian orthography or by removing the Latvian nominative ending (*hārtsog* ‘duke’, cf. lv *hercogs*; *akadēmij* ‘academy’, cf. lv *akadēmija*; *televīzij* ‘television’, cf. lv *televīzija*). However, in the majority of cases the changes necessary for a word to fit Livonian pronunciation are noticeably larger.

The range of possible changes is quite vast – from corrections in vowel length (*palatalizatsij* ‘palatalization’, cf. lv *palatalizācija*; *februār* ‘February’, cf. lv *februāris*; *direktor* ‘director’ cf. lv *direktors*; *kerāmik* ‘ceramics’, cf. lv *keramika*) to larger sound changes in the word root (*orkestōr* ‘orchestra’, cf. lv *orķestris*; *astōr* ‘aster’, cf. lv *astere*; *aptēk* ‘pharmacy’, cf. lv *aptieka*; *balzōm* ‘balsam’, cf. lv *balzāms*; *doktār* ‘doctor’, cf. lv *doktors*; *koreandōr* ‘coriander’, cf. lv *koriandrs*; *mudīl* ‘model’, cf. lv *modelis*). The rules determining when such changes are, or conversely are not, made must still be determined; however, in borrowing new internationalisms into Livonian, the form of existing internationalisms should be taken into account with new borrowings being formed analogically to existing forms. Therefore, *direktor* should be the model for *redaktor* ‘editor’ (instead of *redaktōr*; cf. lv *redaktors*) and *orkestōr* should be the model for *semestōr* ‘semester’ (instead of *semestr*, cf. lv *semestris*), and so on.

Unique adaptation traditions can also be seen in the borrowing of international verbs. The majority of these verbs end in *-īerō* and *-īertō* in Livonian, which correspond to the Estonian ending *-eerida* and the German ending *-ieren* (*provotsīertō* ‘to provoke’, cf. lv *provocēt*, ee *provotseerida*, de *provizieren*; *restaurīertō* ‘to restore’, cf. lv *restaurēt*, ee *restaureerida*, de *restaurieren*), though the corresponding Latvian verbs, which are the source of the Livonian forms, end in *-ēt*.

This is likely associated not with the borrowing of these words from German or Estonian (although in individual cases this could also be an explanation), but instead with the historical principles of verb borrowing. At one time, the ending of international verbs borrowed through German was also *-ierēt* in Latvian (de *spazieren*, cf. lv arch. *špacierēt*), which later was replaced by the shortened form *-ēt*. This is similar to Estonian where a similar process can occur sometimes for verbs where the ending *-eerima* is replaced with a shorter ending (ee *kontrollima* ‘to control’, cf. de *kontrollieren*). In Livonian, this kind of shortening would be difficult, therefore the ending *-īerō* / *-īertō* continues to be used when adapting international verbs borrowed from

Latvian. Therefore, the Livonian form of the Latvian word *konvertēt* ‘to convert’ would be *konvertīerõ* or *konvertīertõ*, and for the Latvian word *kontrolēt* ‘to control’ it would be *kontrolīerõ* or *kontrolīertõ*, and so on.

As can be seen, borrowings have a large, albeit narrow, role in the expansion of the Livonian lexicon. The successful use of borrowings is somewhat complicated by the changing and still unclear principles for the adaptation of foreign words in Livonian; however, there exist sufficient known analogs in the Livonian lexicon, which can be used as the basis for borrowing new words. At the same time, researchers must continue their work in understanding the principles of the borrowing process in Livonian.

6. Calques

Calques have been widely used for the introduction of new concepts into Livonian. These calques are formed according to two main methods – either following the example of Latvian or Estonian. Forming calques in Livonian using Latvian as a model seems a natural choice based on the close and ancient contacts between these two languages; however, beginning in the 1920s, calques based on Estonian began to actively enter Livonian, which could have two main reasons. The first could be associated with the politics associated with the Livonian written language, which sought to decrease the amount of Latvianisms in Livonian. From this perspective the use of Estonian as a model seems like a very well-founded choice, as it is a closely related language to Livonian with which the Livonians share close contacts on a number of levels. In addition, during the last one hundred years it has been specifically Estonian linguists from Estonia who have been the most active researchers and advancers of Livonian. However, the other reason may be much more prosaic – the grammatical tools of Livonian are much more like those of Estonian and therefore the formation of calques based on the model of Estonian is at times technically simpler.

Examining the domains where calques are formed, a strict division cannot be established; however, it seems that the calques based on the example of Latvian encompass more everyday concepts (*kõr* ‘wheel, bicycle’, cf. lv coll. *ritenis*, ee *jalgratas*; *eņš*|*kudātõd* ‘home-spun’, cf. lv *paš|austs*, ee *kodu|kootud*; *linda*|*mašīn* ‘airplane’, cf. lv *lid|mašina*, ee *lennuk*; *ä'b*|*kūldzit* ‘disobedience’, cf. lv *ne|paklausība*, ee *sõna|kuulmatus*), while those based on Estonian are more

specific and more relatable to institutional and cultural language (*a'b|jelāmi* ‘marriage’, cf. lv *laulība*, ee *abi|elu*; *se|tš|mīez* ‘comrade’, cf. lv *biedrs*, ee *seltsi|mees*; *eđđi|mīez* ‘chairman’, cf. lv *priekš|sēdētājs*, ee *esi|mees*; *kassō|pidāji* ‘cashier’, cf. lv *kasieris*, ee *kassa|pidāja*; *kubbō|tulmi* ‘meeting’ cf. lv *sapulce*, ee *koos|olek*, also *kokku|tulek*; *ro'vvōd|va'ili* ‘international’, cf. lv *starp|tautisks*, ee *rahvus|vaheline*; *pā|ažālistōz* ‘mainly’, cf. lv *galveno|kārt*, ee *pea|asjalikult*). It should be noted that calques formed according to the model of Latvian compounds or word groups containing participles are very productive in Livonian (*lugdōb|rōntōz* ‘reader, reading book’ cf. lv *lasām|grāmata*, ee *lugemik*; *sīedōb|kōj* ‘tablespoon’, cf. lv *ēdam|karote*, ee *supi|lusikas*, *kēratōb|mašīn* ‘typewriter’, cf. lv *rakstām|mašīna*, ee *kirjutus|masin*, *je'ltōb|tubā* ‘living room’, cf. lv *dzīvojamā istaba*, ee *elutuba*).

Both of the aforementioned tendencies – the formation of calques based on Estonian and Latvian – often are not clearly separable, because many such concepts are formed similarly in both languages (*a'b|skūol* ‘special school’, cf. lv *palīg|skola*, ee *abi|kool*; *rōda|riek* ‘railroad’ *dzelz|ceļš* *raud|tee*; *rō'|tē'd* ‘banknote’ cf. lv *naudas|zīme*, ee *raha|täht*; *ro'v|kuodā* ‘community hall’, cf. lv *tautas|nams*, ee *rahva|māja*; *jelāmiz|vīť* ‘lifestyle’ cf. lv *dzīves|veids*, ee *elu|viis*; *sūr|kabāl* ‘cannon’, cf. lv *liel|gabals*, ee *suur|tūkk*; *jeij|mūrdaji* ‘icebreaker’, cf. lv *led|lauzis*, ee *jää|lōhkuja*). At the same time, some parallel forms, which have been formed according to different models, can be observed (*jei|kāp* and *kīlma|kāp* ‘refrigerator’, cf. lv *ledus|skapis*, ee *kūlm|kapp*; *ažā|mūoštaji* and *ažā|tundiji* ‘expert, specialist’, cf. lv *liet|pratējs*, ee *asja|tundja*).

Taken together it can be seen that the use of calques is a very productive method for expanding the Livonian lexicon and it has a broad potential for future use. Still, in forming new calques, the model on whose basis it is formed should certainly be considered, so that newly formed calques are better and more naturally integrated into Livonian.

7. Conclusion

It can be seen that a wide array of tools is available for the expansion of the Livonian lexicon. It is important that a large part of these can ensure the development of the Livonian lexicon avoiding unnecessary borrowings, especially barbarisms, and in this way further ensure the quality of the language also in the future.

Of course, only the main tools for language expansion have been discussed in this article. Along with these, one can also use word groups

(for example, forming reflexive verbs using *ēņtšta* ‘oneself’; *ēņtšta piezzõ* ‘to wash oneself’), semantic widening (*īr* ‘mouse’ + ‘(computer) mouse’; *vizāstõ* ‘to harden’ + ‘to confirm’; *võ’lmi* ‘existence’ + ‘state, situation’), and many other tools. However, that would be a subject for another article.

There is much yet to be learned and much work yet to be done in the realm of Livonian language expansion. This introduction should serve as a source for further studies and work.

Acknowledgements

This study was supported by the projects IUT2-37 and Livonian grammar and databases financed by the Estonian Ministry of Education and Research.

Address:

Valts Ernštreits
Rožu 7, Carnikava
LV-2163 Carnikavas nov. Latvia
E-mail: valts@niceplace.lv

Abbreviations and additional markings

de – German, ee – Estonian, fi – Finnish, lv – Latvian, N – nominative, G – genitive, Sg – singular, Pl – plural, P – partitive, | – component boundary within compounds, || – component boundary within compounds where both components are declined, ’ – broken tone (*stõd*), coll. – colloquial language.

References

- AK = *Līvõd Īt alizkēra*. Tartu: Trükikoda K. Mattiesen, [1923].
 ČDG = Čače, Ints, Pēteris Dambergs and Hilda Grīva (1966). *Esperantisto en Latvio ĉe livoj*. Unpublished manuscript. Pumpuri.
 Damberg Pētõr (1978). “Līvõ kīel kõrdõlpanmi”. *Emakeele Seltsi Aastaraamat*, 23 (1977), 83–92. Tallinn: Eesti Raamat.
 Ernštreits, Valts (2011) *Lībiešu rakstu valoda*. Rīga: Latviešu Valodas aģentūra.

- Ernštreits, Valts (2013) *Liivi kirjakeel*. Tartu: TÜ Kirjastus.
- ESUKA = *Studies on Livonian*. (Journal of Estonian and Finno-Ugric Linguistics, 5 (1).) Edited by Valts Ernštreits and Karl Pajusalu. Tartu: University of Tartu Press, 2014.
- Karma Tenu (1998) ” Jānis Princis, seniors, un viņa literārais devums”. *Latvijas Zinātņu Akadēmijas vēstis, A daļa, sociālās un humanitārās zinātnes* 3, 71–72. Rīga: Latvijas Zinātņu Akadēmija.
- KTK = *M. Luther. Piški katkismus*. Helsinki, 1936.
- LELD = *Līvōkīel-ēstikīel-leļkīel sōnārōntōz. Liivi-eesti-lāti sōnaraamat. Lībiešu-igauņu-latviešu vārdnīca*. Rīgō: Līvō kultūr sidām. Available online at <<http://lingua.livones.net>>. Accessed on 1.06.2016.
- Līvli a = *Līvli* [newspaper]. Jelgava: Em. Štāler, 1931–1933.
- Līvli b = *Līvli* [newspaper]. Mazirbe: M. Stalte, 1933–1939.
- Livones = *Livones*. Web portal. Rīgō: Līvō kultūr sidām. Available online at <<http://www.livones.net>>. Accessed on 1.06.2016.
- LL I = *Esimene Liivi lugemik. Kokkusäädnuud Lauri Kettunen ja Oskar Loorits. Ežmi Līvəd lugdābrōntēz. Sasādānd Prof. Lauri Kettunen un Štud. Oskar Loorits* (Akadeemilise Emakeele Seltsi toimetused I.) Tartu: Akadeemiline Emakeele Selts, 1921.
- LL II = *Teine liivi lugemik. Toi līvəd lugdābrōntēz*. (Akadeemilise Emakeele Seltsi toimetused, V.) Tartu: Akadeemiline Emakeele Selts, 1921.
- LL III = *Kolmas liivi lugemik. Kolmēz līvəd lugdābrōntēz. Sasādān August Skadiā*, (Akadeemilise Emakeele Seltsi toimetused, IX.) Tartu: Akadeemiline Emakeele Selts, 1923.
- Loorits, Oskar [1923] *Līvō kiel grammatika termīnōd*. Unpublished manuscript. [EKM EKLA, 175. f., 27: 14. m., 21 l.]
- LR = *Līvlist vaimli loulrāntōz*. Helsinki, 1939.
- LRS = (2012) *Latvijas Republikas Satversme. Leļmō Republik Pūojpandōks*. Rīga: Latvijas vēstnesis.
- LW = Kettunen Lauri (1938) *Livisches Wörterbuch mit grammatischer Einleitung*. (Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae, V). Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- PDL = *Pētōr Dambergi koostatud Liivi lugemik, mida oli nōu vālja anda Eestis eri rmt-na 1960-ndail aastail (post 1967) < PD 150874*. Unpublished manuscript. [1967]
- de Sivers, Fanny (1971a) *Die lettischen präfixe des livischen Verbs. Les prefixes lettons du verbe live*. Paris.
- de Sivers, Fanny (1971b) *Die lettischen präfixe des livischen Verbs. Les prefixes lettons du verbe live. Wörterverzeichnis. Vocabulaire*. Paris.
- Suhonen, Seppo (1973) *Die jungen lettischen Lehnwörter im Livischen*. (Suomalais-ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia 154.) Helsinki: Suomalais-ugrilainen Seura.
- SjW a = Wiedemann, Ferdinand Johann (1861a) *Joh. Andreas Sjögren's Livische Grammatik nebst Sprachproben*. (Joh. Andreas Sjögren's Gesammelte Schriften, Band II, Theil I.) St. Petersburg.

- SjW b = Wiedemann, Ferdinand Johann (1861b) *Joh. Andreas Sjögren's Livisch-deutsches und deutsch-livisches Wörterbuch*. (Joh. Andreas Sjögren's Gesammelte Schriften, Band II, Theil II.) St. Petersburg.
- Šuvcāne, Valda and Žagare Elfrīda (1991) *Latviešu-lībiešu sarunvārdnīca. Leļķīel-līvōkīel rōksōnarāntōz*. Rīga: Zvaigzne.
- ŪT a = *Ūž testament*. Helsinki, 1937.
- ŪT b *Ūž testament*. – Helsinki, 1942.
- Videman, Ferdinand Iogann (1870) *Obzor prežnej žizni i nynešnego sostojanija livov. – Sanktpeterburg*.
- Viiito, Tiit-Rein and Valts Ernštreits (2012) *Līvōkīel-ēstikīel-leļķīel sōnārōntōz. Liivi-eesti-lāti sōnaramat. Lībiešu-igauņu-latviešu vārdnīca*. Tartu, Rīga: Tartu Ūlikool, Latviešu valodas aģentūra.
- Vääri, Eduard (1974) *Algupārased tuletussufiksids liivi keeles*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. Tartu: Tartu Ūlikool.
- Vääri, Eduard (1987) “Alfon Bertholdi kirjapanekuid liivlaste varasemast elust, II”. *Fenno-ugristica 14 : Uurali keelte sōnavara ja grammatiline ehitus* (Tartu riikliku ūlikooli toimetised 776), 150–160. Tartu.
- Winkler, Eberhard (2011) “Laensōnakihtidest liivi keeles”. In Renāte Blumberga, Tapio Mäkeläinen, and Karl Pajusalu. *Liivlased. Ajalugu, keel ja kultuur*, 231–238. Tallinn: Eesti Keele Sihtasutus.
- Winkler, Eberhard (2013) “Par aizguvumu slāņiem lībiešu valodā.” In Renāte Blumberga, Tapio Mäkeläinen, and Karl Pajusalu. *Lībieši. Vēsture, valoda un kultūra*, 302–312. Rīga: Līvō Kultūr sidām.
- Zeibārts, Miķelis (2015) *Lībiešu, igauņu un latviešu kopīgā leksika*. Unpublished bachelor thesis. Rīga: Latvijas Universitāte, Humanitāro zinātņu fakultāte, Sastatāmās valodniecības un tulkošanas nodaļa.

Kokkuvõte. Valts Ernštreits: Liivi keele sõnavara rikastamise meetodid.

Artikkel on vaadeldud liivi keele sõnavara rikastamise viise – liitsõnu, laensõnu, tuletisi ja tõlkelaene. On täheldatav, et neid sõnavara laiendamise võimalusi on efektiivselt kasutatud juba kogu tänapäeva liivi kirjakeele kujunemise aja jooksul ning uudissõnade loomisel on liivi keeles kujunenud välja kindlad tavad. Nii tuleb uute liitsõnade loomisel pöörata tähelepanu ainsuse või mitmuse kasutusele sõltuvas osises, samuti liitsõnade eriliikidele, mis sisaldavad ajaloolist genitiivi lõppu või mille mõlemad osised on käänduvad. Laensõnad on liivi keeles peamiselt seotud internatsionalismidega, mille vahendajakeeleks on läti keel, ning laenatud sõnu tuleb kohaldada liivi keele häälduse ja morfoloogia iseärasustele. Väga produktiivsed on liivi keeles tuletised, mis on moodustatud sufiksiga, kuid prefiksiga kasutamine on vastupidiselt kohati levinud arvamusele tugevalt piiratud. Paljud uued mõisted tulevad liivi keelde tõlkelaenudena, seejuures saab eristada kaht suuremat tõlkelaenude rühma – eesti ja läti keele malli järgi loodud tõlkelaene. Liivi keele sõnaloomel on praeguse viisi võrdlemise viihe uuritud teema, mispärast töö tuleb sel alal jätkata.

Siiski annab juba tehtud töö keele rikastamisel mitmekülgset näidismaterjali edaspidiseks liivi sõnavara täiendamiseks.

Märksõnad: liivi keel, keelekontaktid, sõnavara, sõnaloome, uudissõnad, laensõnad, sõnatuletus, sufiks, prefiks, tõlkelaenu

Kubbõvõttõks. Valts Ernštreits: Līvõ kīel sōnāvīļa rikāstimiz metōdōd.

Kēra tuņšlōb līvõ kīel sōnāvīļa rikāstimiz vōimiži – lītsōņđi, liēnsōņđi, tãpīņtōkši, vō'ztōkši ja kãlkidi. Nēđi sōnāvīļa rikāstimiz metōdidi um mō'jlistiz kōlbatōd jōbã amã tãmpiz līvõ kērakīel kuojãbimizãiga ja līvõ kīelsō ãtō ka ūd sōnãd lūomiz viššōd tradītsijđ. Nei um ūd ītsōnãd lūomiz jūsō mōtlōmōst iļ īdlug ja pãgiņlug kōlbatimiz ītsōnã tãtjags ja neiž iļ ītsōnãd īžkizt kōrdad, mis sizãldōbōd istōrilizt genītiv lopãndōkst agã kus mōlmōd jagūd sōbōd nōtkãstōd. Liēnsōnãd līvõ kīelsō ãtō pããžãlistōz sidtōd rovdvailizt sōnãdōks, kus vainđijiks kīelkōks um leŕkēļ, ja liēndōd sōņđi um kōlbantōmōst Līvõ kīel iēldōmiz ja morfologij eņtšsuglitōks. Vãggi sagđizt ãtō līvõ kīelsō vōztōkst, mis ãtō viŕtōd sufiksōd abkōks, prefiksōd kōlbatimi um vastōpēđōn laigãld laggōnōn arrimizōn vegīstiz sūorantōd. Pãgiņđ ūd mōistōgōd tulbōd līvõ kīelō kui tulkōmlīēnōd; sīejūs vōib tūoistantō kōdtō sūrimt tulkōmlīēnōd jaggō – ēsti ja leŕkīel mudīļ pierrō lūodōd tulkōmlīēnidi. Līvõ kīel sōnãlūomi um veitō tuņšlōt tēm, kus um vajãg jemīņ tōvãtuņšlōkst Sīegid siedaigsōņđi tīe kēl rikāstimiz arãl ãndab setmiņkilgizt nãgŕbainō līvõ sōnāvīļa tulbiz kazãntimiz pierãst