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Abstract. Knowledge about the South Estonian language spoken in the parts of Livonia where Latvian prevailed is based on materials collected from the Leivus residing in Ilzene parish (Lv pagasts) of eastern Vidzeme. Very little language or none at all has been recorded from the South Estonian speakers who are known to have lived in the parishes bordering Ilzene. The article introduces and analyses the works of Latvian place name and dialect researchers focusing on Lejasciems and Kalnamuiža as well as Madona municipality (Lv novads) located in the southeastern corner of Vidzeme where South Estonians have historically lived.
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1. Introduction

Knowledge about the South Estonian language spoken in Vidzeme is based on materials collected at greater or lesser intervals for more than a century from the Leivu community residing in the villages of Ilzene parish (Germ Ilsen) (see [1] in Figure 1) located in eastern Vidzeme. The foundations for reliable documentation and scientific analysis of the Leivu language were laid by Ferdinand Johann Wiedemann in his study “Die Ehsteninseln in den lettischen Kirchspielen Marienburg und Schwaneburg in Livland” (The Estonian islands in the Latvian church parishes of Marienburg (Alūksne) and Schwaneburg (Gulbene) in Livonia) when he had the opportunity to interview a local church-warden (Et vöörmünder) of Leivu origin about the Ilzene Leivus in the summer of 1866 (for more see Vaba 1997: 52–53). From the other
parishes bordering Ilzene, where the Leivu people are known to have also lived, there is very little, if any, recorded language material. A few text examples recorded by Finnish linguist Heikki Ojansuu in Andriņi village in Lejasciems (Germ Aahof) parish (see [2] in Fig. 1) in 1911 are the exception. Most of these have now been published in the Estonian dialect series (Mets et al. 2014: 33–37). As part of this research expedition, Ojansuu also visited Ate village (Germ Ottenhof) in Anna parish (Germ Annenhof) [9] as well as Zeltiņi (Germ Selinghof) [3] and Siduli village in Alsviķi parish (Germ Alswig) [7] (see Fig. 1), though nothing significant was recorded there (Ojansuu 1912, Grünthal 1912: 325–326, Niilus 1937).

When the systematic documentation of the Estonian dialects began in the early 1920s, the South Estonian language – with a few exceptions – was no longer in active use in the Leivu villages. Paulopriit Voolaine (1899–1985) was sent on a scholarship expedition funded by the Mother Tongue Society (Emakeele Selts) to document Leivu in 1921. However, he observed that there were no speakers with sufficient Leivu language proficiency remaining in Dūre (present-day Lejasciems parish) or Līves (present-day Vireši parish), also no such speakers were found in Kalnamuiža parish (earlier Kalmcempji [8], presently Stāmeriena parish [10]) or in Alsviķi parish (Germ Alswig) [7] (Koltsu or Kolcu and Tsiduli or Siduli villages), see Fig. 1). Therefore, it was only possible to document the language of the villages of Ilzene (Voolaine 1981: 101–106). The material that was collected and later comprehensively analysed by linguist Valter Niilus (1913–1978) during his language documentation expeditions also comes from the villages of Ilzene parish (Āžamuguri or Āžmugura, Brūniņi, Ilzene, Kārklupe, Melnupe, Paiķeni, Siveci, Onti) which he described being “like the strongest Leivu fortress” (kui leivude kõvema kantsi). In order to expand his circle of language informants, Niilus visited Andriņi, Lapati, and Majāni villages in Lejasciems parish as well as Zeltiņi and Melnupe villages in 1936, but these efforts were largely unsuccessful (Niilus 1936). Other Estonian dialect researchers (Aili Univere, Salme Tanning, Mari Must, Salme Nigol, and others) were also using informants from Ilzene or – according to Valter Niilus – from the strongest Leivu fortress. The last known speaker of Leivu was Antons Boks [1908–1988] from Kārklupe village in Ilzene parish (Vaba 1997: 50).
Figure 1. Historical South Estonian settlements in Vidzeme (marked with numbers in square brackets on a map of Latvian parishes). Map design and technical implementation: Väino Klaus.
Written sources, local oral tradition, and place names suggest that the South Estonian island-like settlements in Eastern Vidzeme had a considerable population. There are groups of South Estonians in Vidzeme of which the only known traces in the present day are possible local place names of Estonian origin or sometimes also a brief ethnographic description jotted down by a former local pastor. For example, in 1784, Detlev Georg Meyer, pastor of the Atzele congregation (Gaujiena, [5] in Fig. 1), described the head coverings of the Estonian women and girls in his mixed Latvian-Estonian congregation: Estonian women wear high fur hats with round bottoms all year round, while Estonian girls wear straw wreaths decorated with tinsel and spangles (Stepermanis 1960: 228).

Considerably richer information is offered by Latvian sources on the South Estonians living in Lejasciems and Kalnamuiža as well as in Madona municipality (Bērzaune, Lazdona, and Mārciena) located in southeastern Vidzeme.

2. What can Estonian place names tell us in Daina Zemzare’s study Valodas liecības par Lejasciema novadu

There are early ethnographic descriptions (from 1841) and rather sparse language descriptions from Līves village (Germ Liewe) in the former Lejasciems parish (for more see Vaba 1997: 50–52). The visits to the Lejasciems villages by Ojansuu, Voolaine, and Niilus were not fruitful for collecting language materials. Therefore, in my view Latvian linguist Daina Zemzare’s study “Valodas liecības par Lejasciema novadu” (Language testimony about the Lejasciems region) (Zemzare 1940) deserves attention which, if carefully analysed, can provide important additional information about the Leivu language which has been extremely scarcely recorded at Lejasciems. The place name file of the Institute of the Estonian Language contains a rather modest Leivu slip file (290 slips), the majority of which consists of names from Ilzene with only a small number recorded in Lejasciems, primarily in Līves village. It should also be noted that the quality of the Leivu place name collection is rather variable. Unfortunately, Zemzare’s work has not gained the attention of researchers of Estonian or other Finnic languages. Zemzare (1911–1971) was a versatile and prolific Latvian researcher,
who, among other things, wrote studies on Latvian dialect vocabulary as well as place names and personal names. Zemzare began her field work in Lejasciems in the summer of 1935. She travelled through the villages of what was Lejasciems parish at that time (also Līves which was not a part of Lejasciems parish then or now) and documented names related to settlements, nature, and cultivation as well as the stories on the same topics. However, Zemzare paid greater attention to the villages of the Lejasciems region on the lands of the former Lejasmuiža state manor which are found in inventory books (Germ Wackenbuch) listing manor farms and their encumbrances dating from 1738, 1750, 1757 (Zemzare 1940: 31). The collected material was then supplemented by Zemzare with the help of the Domēņi parish archives (from 1821 onward) and student notes from 1932 (stored at the Archives of Latvian Folklore (Latviešu fokloras krātuve)).

Zemzare writes that the people living along the Gauja River in Lejasciems parish as well as those in Ilzene parish and a part of those in Kalnciems parish can be considered descendants of Estonians. During her fieldwork, Zemzare met only a few older people who knew that their grandparents had spoken Estonian and that they also could not understand real Estonians either. Her Latvian-speaking informants assured Zemzare that Estonian had formerly been spoken in the villages of Andriņi, Kībasi, Kīlpāni, Kručki, Majāni, Salaki, Suži, and Lapati. With the end of Estonian language knowledge, Estonian place names would either disappear completely or in the best case be replaced with translations, but in general Estonian place names are still well preserved, observes Zemzare (1940: 107). The part of Lejasciems where the descendants of Estonians live is referred to by other people in Lejasciems as “the black end” (māllais gòls, i.e., Lv std melnais gals); Zemzare theorises that this name may have come from the predominance of black colour in the clothing of the people there (Zemzare 1940: 3–4). À propos, a similar oral tradition survived in Kalnamuiža in the last century where “the black end” referred to the Estonians who lived there who wore darker clothing, had darker complexions and hair colour compared with Latvians (Balode & Jansone 2017: 7). According to Zemzare, it is unclear whether the Lejasciems (and Ilzene) Estonians are native to this area or immigrants (Zemzare 1940: 5).

Zemzare’s research indicates that the Estonians at the area left a noticeable mark on the place names of Lejasciems. This is especially
evident in the word stems of place names of Estonian origin and perhaps also in derivational suffixes and topoformants. Lejasciems as well as Ilzene and Kalnamuiža are situated in the deep Latgalic subdialect area (Lv dzīļā latgaliskā izloksne). Compared to Standard Latvian and the Central Dialect on which it is based, the most important innovations in the local subdialect have occurred in vocalism which also reached the Ilzene Leivu dialect and that are not, however, regular (Vaba 1997: 47–42, 54 etc.). The Estonian place names of Lejasciems have acquired the phonetic characteristics of the local Latvian subdialect; however, the changes in the vocalistic characteristics of the Latvian Eastern subdialects are not regular in Lejasciems. Some examples:


Lv std ā > Ltg ņ > uo: but Āva(s) kōlls hill, Salaki and Andriņi villages, cf. V haab : haava ‘aspen (tree)’; Lānpes kōlls hill, Lānpes drova field, Salaki village, cf. V laas : laane ‘a large dense forest / dichter Laubwald auf feuchtem Boden’; original ā developed into a diphthong which varies considerably in the local subdialect: ‘ā (Lejasciems), uo ~ ua (Zeltiņi), see Endzelīns 1951: 125;


6 Estonian dialect examples without a referenced source are from the following publications: EMS, Kāis 2011, MES, Pall 1982–1989. Examples are presented in the Estonian orthography; palatalisation is also marked.
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Lv std ĕr > Ltg ĕr [ăr], ĕr [ăr]: Vēra kōlls ~ Vēru kōlls field, hillock, mound, Umari village, cf. V vīr : veere ‘edge, shore’;


Lv std ā > Ltg ou: but Sūretere farmstead, Salaki village, cf. Ilzene sour : sourõ, V suur : suurõ ‘large’).

The reasons for these two different patterns in vocalism are not yet completely understood. In Zemzare’s opinion, place names in which the expected dialectal vowel changes do not occur belong to a somewhat newer stratum (Zemzare 1940: 108). I think, however, that more likely the main reason is the Standard Latvian influence which at that time had already become familiar and known to local people at school and church. Zemzare also agrees with this. Also, we should not disregard the fact that the interviews with the informants probably took place in Standard Latvian (the interviewers were not speakers of the local subdialect) – a situation which, as is well known, always inclines the informants towards the standard language. In dialects the preservation of the original vocalism may be a result of the sound environment. For example, in the Eastern Latvian dialect, original dialectal a can be maintained in front of v, front vowels, and elsewhere which might explain the persistence of a in the names Saviki, Saviku plava, Sāvika pūriņš, Kadeja pūrs, Samēlpūrs (about Eastern Latvian dialect vocalism see Rudzīte 1964: 267, etc.). Paul Ariste (1931: 175–179) attempted to explain the differences in the innovations in Ilzene and Lejasciems Leivu vocalism. In Ariste’s approach, the relatively consistent diphthongisation of the original long vowels ī and ū that are characteristic of Eastern Latvian occurred differently in Ilzene (Zeltiņi parish) than in Lejasciems, because the Estonians had lived there for a longer period of time and had been in intensive contact with Latvians for longer than the Estonians in the neighbouring area. In Ariste’s opinion, the contradiction that accompanies this hypothesis – why Estonian language survived the longest in Ilzene – is explained by the fact that Ilzene was
separated from Latvian settlements by forests and swamps. However, if the starting point of the discussion is that the local Estonians are indigenous inhabitants, then, of course, Ariste’s view is not correct.

Zemzare feels that the vowel o [ŏ] in Lejasciems place names may be of diagnostic value in determining whether a name is of Finnic origin (Zemzare 1940: 108), though the structurally unusual o in this Latvian subdialect is not constant, also because original a > Ltg o: Kòlgamasas pûrs (swamp), Kònčura kòlls (hill), etc., Konukòlls (hill, meadows), Oja [ō] meadow, Čoruze ~ Čorize [ō] river, field.

Lejasciems place names of Estonian origin have mostly been adapted to the Latvian morphological system, but there are several interesting exceptions. Zemzare has recorded place names where the suffix contains the final vowel i which is unusual in the Latvian context and can be interpreted as a masculine plural nominative in this specific context, e.g., Jāņišūc (the morphologically adapted parallel form is Jânušōuk(s)) [-n- sic!] field, Pēki kòlls (the morphologically adapted parallel form is Pēka kòlls) field, Maģi kòlls hill, Ruvi čelš road, Sāŋķi kòlls hill. The suffixes of Latvian compound names are in genitive (either singular or plural), therefore, morphologically the Latvian versions of these examples would have been *Maģu kòlls, *Ruva čelš, *Sāŋķu kòlls. In the Livonic dialect of Latvian, compound words with nominative suffixes have been recorded and these follow the same Finnic word formation model (see Rudžite 1964: 202). Zemzare explains the instability of the grammatical gender of Lejasciems compound word suffixes (e.g., Āva <m> ~ Āvas <f> kòlls hill) as well as the dominance of the masculine gender with the influence of Estonian (Zemzare 1940: 108). Zemzare correlates kene-ending place names with Estonian kene-compound appellatives: e.g., Lāudakenes kokts an area in Salaki village, ? cf. Et laudakene dim. ‘cattle-shed’; Palukene meadow, forest, cf. Et palukene dim. ‘dry pine forest’; Tamakene thick pine forest, meadow, cf. Et tammekene dim. ‘oak’. In my opinion, Ilzene (and South Estonian) linguistic innovations include abundant use of diminutives, analysis of Lejasciems names cannot ignore the highly productive Latvian iņš-noun formation model (< *-inis) which may have been used as a model in Lejasciems, because in the modern language, Latvian iņš-words coincide with diminutives with the same ending.

In studying the etymology of Lejasciems place names, Zemzare has promoted the view that each place name had a meaning at the time
it was given which seeks to describe the object that is being named. For Lejasciems names unclear in the Latvian (Baltic) context, Zemzare attempted to find sound structural correspondences or similar Estonian appellatives, occasionally also using (South) Estonian place names or first names to support the proposed appellative. When attempting to determine the etymology of place names, hypotheses always need to be viewed with a reasonable degree of scepticism and make me think of walking on thin ice; however, the approach that a place name is formed directly from an appellative does not always give a sufficiently convincing result. I find comparisons such as these offered by Zemzare questionable: Isa field, meadow, Ïsas pùriņš swamp, cf. Et isa, Ilzene esä ‘father / Vater’, Ivika ~ Ïvika pûrs swamp, cf. Et ivikas : ivika ‘grainy / körnig, körnreich’, Kakľica kakts an area in Līves village, cf. Et kaklus : kakluse ‘quarrel, scuffle, brawl / Streit, Balgerei, Rauferei’, Kamāldina river, cf. Et kamal ‘double handful / Gäspe’, kammal ‘cupted hands / Faust mit beyden Händen’, Kë’èriki village, cf. Et kerik, kirik, Ilzene Kë’èrik ‘church’, Kilpani village, cf. Et kilp : kilbi ‘shield / Schild’, Kuţiks ~ Kuţika, Kuţika pûrs meadow, cf. Et kuün : kuźni ‘a small, cylindrical piece of wood / kleines, zylinderförmiges Holzstück, kuźniks ‘how long / wie lange’, Silmists field, cf. Et silmist āra ‘blind / blind’, etc. By slightly correcting and adjusting the etymologies proposed by Zemzare as well as adding new ones, I can propose based on the preliminary analysis that the place names collected and published by Zemzare contain over a hundred appellative word stems of possible Estonian origin. It is important to emphasise that in most cases they have a corresponding appellative in the South Estonian (V) dialect.

In a string of cases, there is a corresponding appellative in the Mulgi dialect (M), but none in the Võro dialect: *Ivika pûrs* ~ *Ivika pûrs* swamp: M *jõhvik* ‘sedge, marsh carex (*Carex acutiformis*): a swamp grass reminiscent of horsehair; hardy fescue (a hardy grass that grows on dry meadows); bristle oat (*Avena strigosa*), the source of the loan *ìviks* ‘mållgalvîši, lit., black heads (a type of plant)’ recorded in the Lejasciems Latvian subdialect is the same as the plant name *jõhvik* given here, not, as Zemzare thought *ivikas* ‘grainy / körnig, körnreich’, *ivike* ‘grain, seed / das Körnchen, der Same’; *Loisi* field, cf. M *loisk*: *loisu* ‘a low-lying, wet place; water puddle’; *Makra kòlls* ~ *Makarkòlls* pasture, cf. Ilzene *mäkr*: *mägrä*, M *mäger*: *mägrä* ‘badger’; *Parànda pûrs* swamp, ? cf. M *põreńd* : *põrendi* ‘fire for clearing land for farming (slash-and-burn agriculture), large fire’ Tanning 1958: 109; *Ruuvi* ceļš road, cf. *ruhi*: V *rohe* ~ M *ruhvi* ‘dugout boat’; *Tilgasa pûrs*, *Tilka(s)* pûrs and *Kìlka* (*? < tilka*) pûrs ~ *Škùsta pûrs* swamp, cf. M *tilk*: *tilga*: *kesätilk* ‘spring shoots of the field horsetail’, Lv *skûste* ~ *škûste* ‘field horsetail (a type of plant)’ / Schachtel, Schafthalm’

Zemzare tried to highlight the Estonian derivational suffixes found in the Lejasciems place names (Zemzare 1940: 108); however, due to the researcher’s modest knowledge of language and limited understanding of Estonian word derivation, the analysis is mechanical, and the result is more than questionable. Some derivational suffixes characteristic of Estonian place names, i.e., topoformants, can be identified, however, with considerable certainty:

-ik: *Kuņiks* ~ *Kuņika*, *Kuņika pûrs* meadow, *Làudiķis* forest, *Nistîķis* field, forest, *Nùrneķis* ~ *Nurmîķis* field, meadow, *Pîļika kràujs* ravine, *Saviks*, *Savika kòlls* field;


Further careful analysis may reveal the contents of these place names as well as appellatives, derivational suffixes, topoformants, etc., which have escaped attention up until now.
3. Estonian language material in the Kalniena (Kalnamuiža) subdialect dictionary

August Wilhelm Hupel was the first to describe the Leivu people in print, while also being the first to assert correctly that they are South Estonians, not Livonians. In 1782, he wrote the following about the Estonian settlements in the area of Kalnamuiža or Kalniena (Kalncempji, in present-day Stāmeriena parish) in his well-known work “Topographische Nachrichten von Lief- und Ehostland” (Hupel 1782: 212–213): “In dieser Gegend geht ein Strich ehstnische Wohnungen mitten durch die Letten, von Kalnamuisch zwischen Seltinghof und Marienburg über Treppenhof und Adsel nach Walk, der einige tausend Bewohner hat, lauter wahre Ehsten, die sich unvermischt zusammen halten. Ihre Weiber schneiden wie die am Peipus-See, die Haare ab, sobald sie verheirathet sind. Wenn sich diese dahin gezogen und dort niedergelassen haben, ist mir unbekannt.”

In 1815, the Alūksne pastor Otto Friedrich Paul von Prühl compiled a list of Kalnamuiža farmsteads inhabited by Estonians (34 farmsteads) who also understood Latvian but spoke it poorly. August Bielenstein (1892: 19–20) confirmed this information about the Kalnamuiža Estonians explaining that in Kalnamuiža, which belongs to the Zeltiņi filial church, there is a certain number (“eine Anzahl Ehsten”) of mostly Latvianised Estonians. According to the 1811 Livonian governorate revision lists (Lv dvēseļu revīzijas, lit. soul revisions), there were 66 farmsteads in Kalnamuiža, therefore, Estonians had to have lived in more than half of these households (Balode & Jansone 2017: 6–7). According to Ojansuu, who also visited Kalnamuiža during his 1911 expedition, only very few still spoke Estonian by that time: he reports a total of 9 men and women who lived in the villages of LauĎi (Lv Lauķi), Lūgbā, Gotliba (Lv Gotlupi) (Ojansuu 1912: 7–26, quoting a source in Estonian: Grünthal 1912, 322, 325). Communities classified by Voolaine in 1921 as Leivu villages in Kalnamuiža parish included Uranužõ (Lv Uranaži), Palži, Mõtspalži, Bulki (Lv Melderpuļķi, also,

7 Translation: In this area, there is a line of Estonian settlements right through the middle of the Latvians, from Kalnamuiža between Zeltiņi and Alūksne over Trapene and Adzele to Valka which have a few thousand inhabitants, all true Estonians, who stick together unmixed. Their women cut their hair as soon as they are married, just like those by Lake Peipsi. When they moved and settled there, is unknown to me.
Pułki), Spriuli or Preili (Lv Sprīvuļi), Lauki (Lv Lauki), Gotlubi (Lv Gotlupi), and Lügābā; Voolaine found “barely five people who knew a little bit of the Leivu dialect” in this parish (Voolaine 1981: 106).

The Kalnamuiža Estonians have left a significant impression on the local Latvian subdialect, as can be seen from the analysis of the recently published “Kalnienas izloksnes vārdnīca” (Dictionary of the Kalniena subdialect) (Balode & Jansone 2017) compiled by Sarmīte Balode and Ilga Jansone. The Kalniena subdialect belongs to the High Latvian Vidzeme subdialect group but its speakers appear to distance themselves and sharply contrast with the Latgalians: čangaļi jāu ir ātras dabas, ātri suōk kaūtīs, čangaļus navār kāitīnāt ‘the čangaļi (Latgalians) have a moody character, they are quick to fight, the čangaļi should not be irritated’ (sub čangalis). The Kalniena subdialect is characterised in particular by a number of developments in vocalism, many of which can also be seen in the linguistic novelty encountered in the Leivu spoken in Ilzene, for example, a > o, ė > ie, i > ei, ū > ou, in some words i > u. Most of the material in the Kalniena dictionary was collected during 1977–2013. The dictionary includes specific local vocabulary and a significantly wider range of dialect and shared vocabulary. Finnic, including South Estonian, influence can be detected at all levels of language. In this article I highlight the vocabulary that are possible (South) Estonian loan words (i.e., substrate words) which have not yet been noted in Latvian lexicographic sources or not identified as loans, for example, cekecs ‘s-shaped iron for cutting up grass’, cf. eS tsagiraud ‘s-shaped iron for chopping or hacking (feed); chopper’, tsagama ‘to chop up finely’, ēgos pl ‘pressed berry waste; pressed flax seeds’, cf. Et soga ‘mud, muck’, sagu ‘remains at the bottom of a pot, dregs in some kind of a liquid at the bottom of a pot, draff’, ičiks ‘chicken (or other bird) gizzard’, cf. eS (h)õdsik id., kirdavacka ‘flat round bread made of course-ground wheat or barley (Lv karaša)’, cf. eS kôrd: kōrdleib ‘bread with stripes made from other ingredients’ + vatsk ‘wheat, barley, or rye flat cake (which often contained potato or groat porridge, split hemp seeds, etc.)’, sobiņas: iēst s ‘to eat something better than others’, cf. Et sobi ‘fraud, deception’. Other substrate phenomena include abstract nouns as well as nominals with other semantics which, following the example of Estonian, can occur in the dialect as singular forms instead of the expected plural forms, e.g., bāda ‘sorrow, suffering, misfortune’, Lv std bēdas pl, brisma ‘very large, terribly large’,
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Lv std briesmas pl ‘danger, horror’, šausma ‘very large, terribly large’, Lv std šausmas pl ‘horror’. Like Latvian more broadly, in addition to prefix verbs, the Kalniena subdialect is also characterised by verb and adverb units (phrasal verbs) and prefix verbs which are accompanied by adverbs of the same meanings. The Finnic influence is clear in speech, e.g., apkiort abgrīza motus ‘the hair was cut around’, ār tīm [rijas] grūbeklīn nūkratija sōlmus nūst ‘with those [threshing barn] rakes, the straw was shaken off, piadīt kluo ‘to knit on to’, sadzina graūdus kūpā ‘pushed the grains together’, viersā uzliēja cimānta javu ‘poured the cement mortar onto (it)’ (see Vaba 2018: 151–153).

4. Estonian names in Bērzaune, Lazdona, and Mārciena parish place names?

In the study mentioned earlier, Bielenstein briefly described three other groups of Estonians known to him: the Estonian-speaking Ilzene parish, the approximately 500 Estonian inhabitants of Lejasciems, and the residents of Mārciena (see [13] on Fig. 1) manor in Bērzaune (see [11] on Fig. 1) parish, “who differ considerably in terms of physiognomy, clothing, and character from their neighbours living around them, but whom they still call Tschūdi (cf. Ru Чудь, Tschude, Eestlane ‘Estonian’) even though they speak and have long spoken Latvian” (Bielenstein 1892: 19–20). As is known, чудь refers to all Estonians in Russian chronicles beginning in the 11th century. Little is known about the Estonians who lived within the boundaries of what are now the Mārciena and Bērzaune parishes, located in the southern part of the Selonic subdialect area in Madona municipality in the southeastern corner of Vidzeme. Latvian place name researcher Ojārs Bušs considers the place names Kaisītis (lake), Subra, Üsmani, perhaps also Parkas and Īreļi (farmstead names) as possible evidence of Estonian settlement in Mārciena. According to Bušs, there is a great likelihood that the village names Siksala, Raksala or Rāksola, Čibestēni (< *Ķibestēni) and the forest name Riste – located across the Aiviekste River in Barkava parish (see [14] in Fig. 1) in Latgale – are of Estonian (Finnic) origin. Bušs has also found and highlighted possible traces of Estonian settlement in Lazdona (see [12] in Fig. 1) parish. These are: Sāmalas or Sāmalu purvs (swamp), Niras or Ņiras ezeriņš (lake), and perhaps Kuja (river).
which earlier Latvian place name researchers have also considered to be place names of Finnic origin (Bušs 2006; see also Vaba 2019: 60). Traces of an Estonian or more general Finnic substrate in the phonetics of the Selonic subdialects which, according to Latvian dialect researcher Maija Poiša (1985: 191), are particularly evident from the presence of transitional vowels at the beginning of words facilitating pronunciation and less often also within word-internal consonant sequences (anaptyxis), seem to support the Estonian, i.e., Finnic, origin of these place names. Poiša’s hypothesis concerning observable Estonian (Finnic) traces in the phonetics of the Selonic subdialects would require the presence of significant past South Estonian (Finnic) settlement in this area. A migration hypothesis, however, would mean a considerable migration to this area in the past. Niilus has also played with the notion that the southern boundary of the Leivu-inhabited region may also have reached that far south in antiquity, i.e., approximately 110 km from the border of Estonia and 60–70 km from the Gauja Estonians. He added that “perhaps research into old place names will give a precise answer regarding the area formerly inhabited by the Leivus” (Niilus 1935: 368, 370). According to the archaeological data, the extent of the South Estonian-inhabited region, e.g., in the Early Iron Age (1st–5th centuries A.D.), extended only into present-day northern Latvia (Jaanits et al. 1982: 245). Systematic study of the Selonic subdialects and place names of this dialect area, especially that of Mārciena, Lazdona, and also neighbouring parishes, would undoubtedly reveal new Estonian (Finnic) place names and would make it possible to provide a clearer picture of the extent of possible Estonian (Finnic) settlement in the region and perhaps also of its linguistic character.

5. Conclusion

In this article I introduced and presented a preliminary analysis of the print materials published by Latvian place name and dialect researchers with a focus on Lejasciems, Kalnamuiža, and the southeastern corner of Madona municipality which were historically inhabited by South Estonians. My aim was to show that the work of Latvian linguist Daina Zemzare on the place names of the Lejasciems region offers an important contribution to Estonian dialect research on the Leivu language spoken in the area. One of the key questions is the occurrence of two
different patterns in the vocalism of the place names of Estonian origin in Lejasciems, the reasons for which are not completely clear. By correcting and adjusting the etymologies proposed by Zemzare as well as adding new ones, it is possible to conclude that the place names of Lejasciems contain over a hundred appellative word stems of possible Estonian origin. In most cases they have a corresponding form in the South Estonian (Võro) dialect.

The recently published Kalniena subdialect dictionary provides an opportunity to obtain information about the South Estonian substrate spoken in the area. A preliminary analysis of the dictionary makes it possible to state that the Kalnamuīža Estonians have left a significant mark on the local Latvian subdialect.

There is an indisputable Estonian, i.e., Finnic, layer in the place name inventory of Madona municipality located in the southeastern corner of Vidzeme. This fact is supported by the occurrence of transitional vowels at the beginning of words facilitating pronunciation, and less often also within word-internal consonant sequences which is characteristic of the subdialect spoken in the municipality. However, it is not clear whether this is an old South Estonian, i.e., Finnic population, or the result of a later migration.

Abbreviations

dim. – diminutive; Et – Estonian; eS – South Estonian; f – feminine; std – standard language; Lv – Latvian; Ltg – Latgalian; m – masculine; M – Mulgi dialect; pl – plural; plg – plural genitive; Germ – German; V – Võru dialect; Ru – Russian
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Lejasciemi eestipärased kohanimed on enamasti kohanenud läti morfo-

loogilise süsteemiga, kuid on huvitavaid erandeid. Zemzare on registeerinud

kohanimesid, kus täiendaosal on läti kontekstis ebahariliku lõpuvokaaliga i, mida

saab tõlgendada maskuliinide pluurali nominatiiviks. Nominatiivse tääendi-

osisega sõnastõnedad kiiratavad läänemereseemne sõnamoodustus-

malli, mis on hästi tuntud läti liivipärases murdekeeltes. Lejasciemi liitnimede

täiendoistes grammatilise soo on kiirendatud, sealjuures meessoo domineerimist,

seletab Zemzare õigesti eesti keele mõjuga.

Lejasciemi kohanimed etümoloogiseerimisel on Zemzare tööside lähete-

kohast, et igal kohanimel on nimeandmise hetkel tähendus, mis püüab kirjeldada objekti, millele nimi antakse. Zemzare on kõigile läti (balti) kontekstis

läbipaistmatutele Lejasciemi nimele püüdnud leida häälkutehiselt kokku-

langevaid või tähendatud eesti üldnimesid, tuues mõnikord üldnime toeks (lõuna)

eesti kohta või ka eesnimesid. Zemzare etümoloogiaid mõneti parandades ja

täpsustades ning uusi lisades või provisoorse analüüsiga tõeda, et Zemzare

kogutud ja publitseeritud kohanimed kätkevad üle saja võimaliku eesti pärit-

olust apellatiivse sõnäühenduse olulise sõnaühenduse on oluline rõhutada, et enamasti on neil apellatiivne vaste lõunaeesti (Võru) murdekeeltes. Real juhtudel apellatiivne vaste Võru

murdekeeltes puudub, kuid on registreeritud Mulgist. Zemzare on püüdnud esile

tuua Lejasciemi kohanemedes esinevaid eesti tuletusliiteid, kuid uurija tagasi

hoidliku keeleoskuse ja eesti sõnalisvastuse vähese tundmise tõttu on analüüs

meanaanalyse ja tulemus teinekord küsitav.

Edasine hoolikas analüüs toob tõenäoliselt esile kohanemedesse kätkevad ja seni tähelepanuta jäänud apellatiive, tuletusliiteid, topoformante vms.

Alüksne koguduse õpetaja Otto Friedrich Paul von Prühl on 1815. a paiku

koostanud loendi Kalnamuiža taludest, kus elavad eestlased (34 talu). Heikki

Ojansuu teatel, kes 1911. auriimisreisil käis ka Kalnamuižas, oskasid veel

vaid vähese mingil määral eesti keelt. Ometi on Kalnamuiža eestlased jäänud

nimetamisväärse jälje kohalikkust läti murdekeelde, kui provisoorseltki ana-
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