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Abstract. In language contact situations indefinite pronouns are susceptible to borrowing and/or calquing, and Livonian, which has been under strong influence of Latvian, is no exception. The negative prefixoid äb, originally the third person singular of the negative auxiliary äb, and calqued on Latvian ne- NEG, has been used to form nouns (e.g., äbkūlzit NEG.obedience ‘disobedience’), adjectives (e.g., äbjõvā NEG.good ‘bad’) and adverbs (e.g., äbknaššõ NEG.nicely ‘nastily’), but in a number of 19th century sources one also finds indefinite pronouns with this same negative prefixoid, e.g., gb midāgid ‘nothing’. However, due to the synchronous identity of äb as a tensed negative auxiliary (present tense: äb, past tense: iz), in past tense clauses the negative prefixoid of indefinite pronouns was then also inflected, leading to forms such as is midāgid. For a brief period in the 19th century Livonian therefore had a tensed negative pronominal construction.
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1. Introduction

Indefinite pronouns are interesting for a number of reasons. They are often a mishmash of forms that do not easily fit into any of the other pronoun subtypes (cf. Haspelmath 1997: 11–13, Aikhenvald 2015: 195), and they have a greater tendency than other pronoun subtypes to be prone to borrowing, either through (partial) direct borrowing or calquing (cf. Haspelmath 1997: 184, Matras 2009: 58). Due to this second reason they are especially rewarding topics for research on language contact, and it is therefore no coincidence, with the status of most Uralic languages as minority languages, that many of the studies on indefinite pronouns in these languages have uncovered instances of language contact. Thus, e.g., Paul Alvre wrote prolifically on Finnic indefinite
pronouns, paying special attention to Russian and Latvian influence (cf. Alvre 1975, 1982, 1983, 1985 1986, 2002), Hienonen (2010, 2019 [as Karjalainen]) wrote articles on indefinite pronouns in Veps, also taking the influence of Russian into account, and the newest relevant article is Markus Juutinen’s and Jukka Mettovaara’s (2021) article on borrowed or calqued indefinite pronouns in Saamic languages.

Livonian, where the influence of Latvian has been especially strong (this was already pointed out by Sjögren more than 170 years ago; cf. Sjögren 1849: 549), is no exception. The Latvian influence on the pronominal system of Livonian has often been mentioned in the literature (e.g., Wiedemann 1861a: 117, 118, 121, Alvre 1982: 51, 1983: 293), though there are as yet no in-depth studies of the topic. The present article looks at one specific indefinite pronoun construction in Livonian,¹ now no longer in use and also undoubtedly a calque on Latvian, but which seems, at least partially, to have a typologically unusual structure.

2. Indefinite pronouns and negative prefixes

If one peruses the existing grammars and grammatical sketches of Livonian it is in fact not a simple endeavour to obtain a clear overview of what the indefinite pronoun system of Livonian looks like. The indefinite pronouns found in the newest source, Tiit-Rein Viitso’s and Valts Ernštreits’ (2012) matchless Livonian-Estonian-Latvian dictionary, look very different from the system in the massive Wiedemann grammar from 1861. This is perhaps not so unexpected, given that indefinite pronouns are often the result of relatively recent grammaticalisation processes, and therefore the indefinite pronoun systems of even closely related languages can be very different (cf. Haspelmath 1997: 235).

The existing literature therefore gives a relatively heterogeneous picture of what are considered indefinite pronouns or pronominal constructions. Thus, e.g., Wiedemann (1861a: 122–125) lists 24 forms, a number of which do not occur elsewhere (e.g., mis ṯods (tgds) ‘was es wolle’ [‘whatever’], mis v̱olds ‘was es auch sei [‘whatever (it is)’].

¹ ‘Livonian’ here refers to Courland Livonian; if reference is made to Salis Livonian it will be mentioned as such.
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ab ūkš ‘kein, Niemand [‘nobody’]’), whilst Viitso (2008: 333) has 17, of which nine (a’mti ‘all kinds of’, je’nnõ ‘many’, mingisu’ glimi ‘some kind of’, mits ‘several’, mõiti ‘other kind of’, selši-tüoši ‘such and such’, set ‘many’, tuoši ‘other’, tüoši ‘other kind of’) are not found in Wiedemann, at least not as indefinite pronouns. Especially interesting, we find, are the negative indefinite pronouns in Wiedemann’s grammar formed with the negative prefixoid ab.

In addition to the well-known case of the verbal prefixes borrowed from Latvian (cf. de Sivers 1971), Livonian has also calqued prefixes. Specifically, it has used (a lexicalised form of) the third person singular present tense form äb of the negative auxiliary (see Table 1) to calque Latv. ne- ‘un-, -less’, creating forms such as, e.g., äbjeldzi neg.alive ‘lifeless’ (calqued on Latv. nedžīvs neg.alive ‘id.’), and äbijõvā neg.good ‘bad’ (calqued on Latv. nelabs neg.good ‘id.’). The Viitso & Ernštreits (2012) dictionary has 62 adjectives with this prefix, 13 nouns (e.g., äbkūlzit neg.obedience ‘disobedience’, calqued on Latv. nepaklausība neg.obedience ‘id.’), and nine adverbs (e.g., äbknaššõ neg.nicely ‘nastily’, calqued on Latv. neglīti neg.nicely ‘id.’ or nesmuki neg.nicely ‘id.’). Ernštreits & Kļava (2014: 85) state that in such words the negative auxiliary äb has lost its status as a function word, and is now an affix; on this grammaticalisation cline äb is assumed to have passed through a stage as a clitic, and they claim the orthography in older sources is proof of this. Thus for example the Gospel of Matthew in (Eastern) Livonian from 1863 has äb jõvţi neg.good.pl.part ‘not good’. Ernštreits (2011: 44; 2013: 44) adds that äb was not perceived as the caritive prefix äb- ‘un-, -less’, but as the word äb ‘no’. This claim concerning the orthography, however, where äb is separated from its headword and therefore cannot be a prefix, may not be as incontestable as Ernštreits & Kļava postulate, as the 1863 Livonian translations of the Gospel of Matthew were both revised by F.J. Wiedemann (cf. the title pages of EMÖ 1863 and EMW 1863), and in the Livonian grammar it is said (with regard to verbal prefixes, but the principle was probably valid for composite pronouns too): ‘Bei einem grossen Theile der besprochenen Zusammensetzungen ist es ziemlich gleichgültig, ob man sie auch zusammen schreibt oder nicht. [...] Ich habe es daher

---

2 Whether they are in fact all indeed indefinite pronouns according to the modern definitions (cf. e.g., Haspelmath 1997: 10–13) need not concern us here.
im Livischen vorgezogen, zur leichteren Erkennung der einzelnen Theile, durchgängig getrennt zu schreiben, ausser wo der eine Theil der Verbindung oder beide im Livischen gar nicht für sich besonders vorkommen... (Wiedemann 1861a: 45). This was almost certainly written by Wiedemann, who wrote the grammar based on material collected both by Sjögren and himself (cf. Vääri 1989; Ernštreits 2013: 37), and it is therefore not unlikely he also applied the same principle to his revision of the translations of the Gospel of Matthew into Eastern and Western Livonian, the very first books in Livonian, which appeared in 1863, so only two years after the grammar.

Interestingly, however, åb is not limited to adjectives, nouns, and adverbs, as the 1861 grammar also has indefinite pronouns with this same negative prefixoid, listing the following: gb yks ‘kein, Niemand’ ['no, nobody'], gb kis ‘kein, Niemand’ ['no, nobody'], gb kumbi ‘keiner von beiden’ ['neither'], gb midāgid ‘nichts’ ['nothing'], gb midāgist ‘nichts’ ['nothing'], gb miŋgi ‘kein, keinerlei’ ['no, no ... whatsoever'], and gb mis ‘nichts’ ['nothing'] (Wiedemann 1861a: 123). As one can see, gb is written separately; these pronouns are therefore not listed in the 1861 dictionary under gb-.

These pronouns are also found in Salis Livonian: ab jüks ‘kein, Niemand’ ['no, nobody'], ab mili ‘kein, nichts’ ['no, nothing'], ab midagit ~ midagist ‘nichts’ ['nothing'] (Wiedemann 1861a: 123, Winkler & Pajusalu 2018: 98–99). Since the split between Salis and Courland Livonian is dated to approximately the 13th century (cf. Kallio 2016: 61) there are two theoretical possibilities: either this pronominal construction goes back to before the split, or they are separate but identical developments (which is not at all unlikely taking into account how widespread negative pronouns with a negative formative are in the world’s languages; cf. Haspelmath 1997: 31).

The abovementioned adjectives and nouns with this negative prefix are in many cases certainly calques from Latvian, but negative prefixes occur in other Finnic languages too (cf. e.g., Est. ebausk NEG.

---

3 ‘For a large number of the compounds discussed it is of no matter whether they are also written together or not. […] For Livonian I have therefore preferred, for the sake of easier recognition of the individual elements, to write them separately throughout, except where one or both parts of the compound do not occur separately in Livonian....’

4 These occur only in this grammar; åb kunagid ‘never’ and åb mungi ‘various’ are listed in the Viitso & Ernštreits dictionary, but are classified as an adverb and an adjective.
belief ‘superstition’, Veps ī-bohat NEG.rich ‘poor’, Fin. epānormaali NEG.normal ‘abnormal’; for more examples see, e.g., Savijärvi 1977: 24–28, Kehayov 2017: 118). Matthews (1956: 314) writes that, e.g., Liv. ābsieldō NEG.clear ‘unclear’ need not necessarily be a calque from Latv. neskaidrs NEG.clear ‘id.’ as Ariste (1954: 298) claims, pointing to Est. ebaseľge NEG.clear ‘id.’, which cannot be a calque from Latvian. However, the pronouns with the formative āb are very likely to be calques from Latvian negative pronouns, which have as their first element either the negation prefix ne- or the negation particle ne:

\[
\text{āb ykš NEG one ‘kein, Niemand’} \sim \text{neviens NEG.one ‘nobody, no one; neither’}
\]

\[
\text{āb kis NEG who ‘kein, Niemand’} \sim \text{nekāds NEG.some ‘no, none, not any’}
\]

\[
\text{āb kumbi ‘keiner von beiden’} \sim \text{ne otrs NEG second ‘neither’}
\]

\[
\text{āb midāgid (midāgist) ‘nichts’} \sim \text{nekas NEG.what/who ‘nothing; nobody’}
\]

\[
\text{āb mis ‘nichts’}
\]

\[
\text{āb miṅgi ‘kein, keinerlei’}
\]

Negative pronouns based on the model with a negative prefix and an indefinite pronoun are not uncommon in other Finnic languages; cf. the relatively recent Est. eikeegi ‘(a) nobody’, eimiski ‘nothingness; nothing’ (Alvre 1975: 237); also common in the eastern Finnic languages (and further afield) are forms with the negative prefix ni- ~ ňi- borrowed from Russian Ṉi- (cf. e.g., Veps ňi-ken NEG.who ‘nobody’; cf. Russ. ňi kto NEG.who ‘id.’) (cf. Blokland 2012: 4). Another Finnic negative pronoun calqued on Latvian is South Estonian edikea ‘nobody’ (< ei tea kea NEG know.CNG who ‘do not know whom’) (Alvre 1975), based on Latv. nez kas ‘whoever, I do not know who’ (< nežinu kas NEG. know who ‘I do not know who’).

Another, more interesting aspect of these negative pronoun forms with āb- concerns its use in clauses in the past tense. Within Finnic, tense can be expressed on the negative auxiliary only in South Estonian⁵ (Pajusalu et al. 2018: 119–120) and in Livonian (cf. e.g., Metslang, Pajusalu & Viitso 2015: 435–436); for Livonian see Tables 1 and 2.

---

⁵ In old Kodavere Estonian (< East Estonian < North Estonian) tense could also be expressed on the negative auxiliary (Univere 1996: 11–15).
Table 1. Present indicative affirmative and negative forms of the verb võlda ‘to be’.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>person</th>
<th>personal pronoun</th>
<th>affirmative</th>
<th>negative auxiliary</th>
<th>+ connegative</th>
<th>+ affirmative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>um</td>
<td>äb</td>
<td></td>
<td>ūo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>sa</td>
<td>üod</td>
<td>äd</td>
<td></td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ta</td>
<td>um</td>
<td>äb</td>
<td></td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>mēg</td>
<td>ūomõ</td>
<td>äb</td>
<td></td>
<td>ūomõ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>tēg</td>
<td>ūotõ</td>
<td>ät</td>
<td></td>
<td>ūotõ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ne</td>
<td>attõ</td>
<td>äb</td>
<td></td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows that in the affirmative the first and third person singular forms have coalesced, and that there is also syncretism in the negative auxiliary verb, where the form äb is used for the first and third person singular and plural. Additionally, and unusually for a Finnic language, in the plural negative the affirmative (rather than the connegative) of the lexical verb is used with the negative auxiliary, though in the negative the original second person plural form ūotõ is used for both the second and third person plural. The system is the same in the past indicative (see Table 2); the main difference is here that tense is expressed on the negative auxiliary.

Table 2. Past indicative affirmative and negative forms of the verb võlda ‘to be’.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>person</th>
<th>personal pronoun</th>
<th>affirmative</th>
<th>negative auxiliary</th>
<th>+ connegative</th>
<th>+ affirmative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>võļ</td>
<td>iz</td>
<td></td>
<td>ūo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>sa</td>
<td>võļd</td>
<td>istani</td>
<td></td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ta</td>
<td>võļ</td>
<td>iz</td>
<td></td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>mēg</td>
<td>võlmõ</td>
<td>iz</td>
<td></td>
<td>ūomõ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>tēg</td>
<td>võltõ</td>
<td>istani</td>
<td></td>
<td>ūotõ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ne</td>
<td>võltõ</td>
<td>istani</td>
<td></td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To recap, the third person singular affirmative and negative forms in the present and past are therefore:

(1a)  \( ta \ um \)
s/he  be.PRS.3SG
‘S/he is.’

(1b)  \( ta \ äb \ ūo \)
s/he  NEG.PRS.3SG  be.CNG
‘S/he is not.’

(2b)  \( ta \ ĭz \ ūo \)
s/he  NEG.PST.3SG  be.CNG
‘S/he was.’

(2b)  \( ta \ ĭz \ ūo \)
s/he  NEG.PST.3SG  be.CNG
‘S/he was not’

As mentioned above, Livonian has calqued a number of indefinite pronouns from Latvian, using the present tense form \( ĥb- \) of the negative auxiliary (\( āb \) in modern Livonian). An interesting aspect of these negative pronoun forms with \( ĥb- \) concerns its use in clauses in the past tense found in a number of texts from the 19th century.\(^6\) Where these \( āb-\)pronouns occur in the present tense, the negative prefixoid is also in the present tense, which is as expected:

(3)  \( ma \ ĥb'\)  \( nge \ ĥb \ ūõ \)  \( rištīnt \)
I  NEG.PRS.1SG  see.CNG  NEG.PRS.3SG  one.PRT  person.PART
‘I don’t see a single person.’
(‘ich sehe keinen Menschen’; Wiedemann 1861a: 123)

---

\(^6\) I have not been able to find any examples in material collected after 1888.

\(^7\) As the negative auxiliary is identical in the first person and third person (see Table 1), a glossing choice had to be made; in (3) the first instance of \( ĥb \) has been glossed as a first person form, as it clearly functions as the negative auxiliary in a verbal construction referring to the first person, whilst in the second instance it functions as a negative prefixoid in a pronominal construction, and has therefore been glossed as a third person singular.
One easily finds in the 1863 Gospel of Matthew sentences which transparently show the different functions äb can have; e.g., \(gb^a\) (negative prefixoid of the negative pronoun \(gb\ yk\)'nobody'), \(gb^b\) (negative prefixoid of the negative adverb \(äbka\) ‘also not’), and \(gb^c\) (third person singular present tense of the negative auxiliary):

(4) \(\text{Sie } īpērāst \text{ se } nei \text{ um, } ku \ gb^b \ yk\̃\)
\(\text{that.gen why it like is when neg.prs.3sg one}
\text{jēmmīt eñtš izzō } \ gb^b \ \text{ka jēmmō}
\text{more own.gen father.part neg also mother.part}
\text{gb^c } ārmashtō [...].
\text{neg.prs.3sg love.cng}

‘That is why it is like that when somebody no longer loves their father or mother [...]’ (EMÖ 15:6)

Wiedemann (1861a: 266) already states that in negated clauses the indefinite elements are generally repeated (though not always),\(^8\) and gives the following examples: \(gb\ yk\̃\ \text{sedā poigō } gb\ \text{tund} \ ‘\text{Niemand kennt den Sohn}’ [‘\text{Nobody knows the son}.’], \text{is midāgīst (midāgid) is lieda} \ ‘\text{er fand nichts}’ [‘\text{He did not find anything}.’]. Wiedemann, however, does not point out specifically that when the verbal construction is in the past tense, i.e., when it consists of a negative auxiliary in the past tense and a connegative of the lexical verb, the negative auxiliary functioning as a negative prefixoid is also in the past tense (5–6):

(5) \(\text{ta is } řykānd (rykānd) is \text{ midāgīst (midāgid)}
\text{he neg.pst.3sg say.ptcp neg.pst.3sg anything.part}

‘He said nothing.’

(‘\text{er sprach nichts}’; Wiedemann 1861a: 123)

(6) \(\text{Ma kūldōs kūlis, aga is } \text{ midāgīd}
\text{I listen.cvb listen.pst.1sg but neg.pst.3sg anything.part}
\text{is } \text{ moista}
\text{neg.pst.3sg understand.cng}

‘I listened and listened, but understood nothing.’

(‘\text{Ich hörte und hörte, (aber) verstand nichts}.’; Wiedemann 1861a: 333)

\(^8\) ‘Im negativen Satze werden die darin etwa enthaltenen indefiniten Glieder in der Regel noch besonders verneint, jedoch nicht durchaus nothwendig [...].’
This past tense form of the negative auxiliary functioning as part of a pronominal construction has not previously been described in the literature.

3. The negative indefinite pronoun construction: all textual examples

This type of negative pronoun with the negative prefixoid äb in its past tense form, i.e., iz, is not common, and, as far as we have been able to ascertain, it occurs in five sources only: in the 1861 grammar (Wiedemann 1861a), in the 1863 Gospel of Matthew in its eastern and western variants (EMÖ 1863, EMW 1863), in the 1880 Gospel of Matthew in Eastern\(^9\) Livonian (PME 1880), and once in Setälä’s collection of Livonian texts, in the section he collected in 1888 (Setälä & Kyrölä 1952). All examples we have been able to find have been listed in the present article; as the verses from the Gospel translations from 1863 (in Eastern and Western Livonian) and from 1880 are often practically identical, only one example is shown in the body of the text; the others, including those cases where the corresponding verse in the other dialect or in the 1880 version does not show the negative indefinite pronoun construction, are listed in Appendix 1 (these are numbered as, e.g., (1A)). Some of the sentences have not been quoted in their totality as they were very long; the additional text was not of significance. The instances of the negative prefixoid have been bolded.

---

\(^9\) Ernštreits (2013: 44–53) shows convincingly that the 1880 Gospel of Matthew is based on Eastern Livonian, though with Western Livonian elements to make it more universally acceptable.
3.1. Wiedemann’s 1861 *Livische Grammatik nebst Sprachproben*

(7) *Amād* ngnt ažād Jēzos sie rouvō pāl
all these thing.PL Jesus that people on
rykāndis leb tazāndōkst, un bās
say.PST.3SG through comparison.PL.GEN and without
tazāndikši ta is rykānd is
comparison.PL.PART he NEG.PST.3SG say.PTCP NEG.PST.3SG
midāgid.
anything.PART

‘All these things Jesus spoke to the multitude in parables; and without a parable He did not speak to them.’¹⁰ (Wiedemann 1861a: 390)

This example is from Matthew 13:34; translated by Jāņ Prints junior, who, together with his father Jāņ Prints senior and his brother Pētōr, translated the whole of the Gospel of Matthew (cf. Ernštreits 2013: 33). See also example (14).

(8) *Sie* pāl izānd is midāgid
that.GEN on master NEG.PST.3SG anything.PART
śeldist is atkuost [...] clear.PART NEG.PST.3SG answer.cng

‘To that the master gave no clear reply [...]’.
(‘Darauf erwiderte der Herr nichts deutlich, [...]’; Wiedemann 1861a: 430)

(9) [...] jo ta sāl sizāl mūd is
as he there within other.PART NEG.PST.3SG
midāgid is nge [...] anything.PART NEG.PST.3SG see.cng

‘[...] as he did not see anything in there [...]’
(‘[...] denn er sah darin nichts [...]’; Wiedemann 1861a: 439)

¹⁰ English translations are from the New King James Version of the Bible.
(10) *Un sie pāva ma kvāž jennō myščiti*
and that day I go.pst.1sg many bush.pl.part
*leb vuotšo, aga is ģt is*
through search.cvb but neg.pst.3sg one.part neg.pst.1sg
*vøj lievd. can.cng find.inf*
‘And that day I went searching through many bushes, but could not find anything.’
(‘Und diesen Tag ging ich suchend viele Büsche durch, konnte aber nichts finden.’; Wiedemann 1861a: 452)

(11) *Aga is mitkid kōgas is sg*
but neg.pst.3sg neg.prt far neg.pst.1sg get.cng
*lqenoks, ma kālis sūr myga ummōn taga*
go.ptcp.ins I hear.pst.1sg big noise self.dat behind
tulm.
*com.irc.ill*
‘But I had not gone far at all when I heard a great noise coming from behind me.’
(‘Aber ich war noch gar nicht weit gegangen, so hörte ich einen grossen Lärm hinter mir her kommen.’; Wiedemann 1861a: 453)

This example reveals the independence of *is*, as it does not occur immediately before the adverb *kōgas*. In the examples (7–10) shown up to now, *is* is part of a pronominal construction functioning as an object, whilst here it is part of a proadverb.

(12) *Un se is uo is mitkid kōgin.*
and it neg.pst.3sg be.cng neg.pst.3sg neg.prt long
‘And it did not take long at all.’
(‘Und es dauerte auch gar nicht lange.’; Wiedemann 1861a: 454)

Examples (11) and (12) are interesting in that they show how independent *is* still is; namely, it does not occur immediately before the adverb *kōgin*, but is separated from it by the negative particle *mitkid* ‘no’.
3.2. The 1863 Das Evangelium Matthäi (in Eastern and Western Livonian) and the 1880 Püwa Matteus Ewangelium

Matthew 13:34

‘All these things Jesus spoke to the multitude in parables; and without a parable He did not speak to them.’ 11 (EMÖ 1863)

Matthew 21:19

English translations are from the New King James Version of the Bible; these are not repeated for examples with the same meaning.
set lēdi ūd, un kītis sie pū
only leaf.PL.PART only and say.PST.3SG that.GEN tree.GEN
pātō: ..
on

‘And seeing a fig tree by the road, He came to it and found nothing on it but leaves, and said to it: …’ (EMÖ 1863)

Matthew 22: 46

(16) Un is ykš is muoista
And NEG.PST.3SG one NEG.PST.3SG understand.CNG
tammon mitt midāgid atkītō; he.DAT NEG anything.PART say.PST.3SG
‘And no one was able to answer Him a word, …’ (EMÖ 1863)

This is the only example where is occurs in a pronominal construction functioning as the subject of the clause. As here the tensed form, therefore, occurs outside of the predicate it is structurally more independent than when it occurs in an object pronominal structure as part of a verbal predicate.

Matthew 27:12

(17) Un ku ta sai kaibdōd neištī
And when he get.PST.3SG accuse.PASS.PTCP those.PL.ELA
yldist papīšt un vanīmist, ta is
high.PL.ELA priest.PL.ELA and elder.PL.ELA he NEG.PST.3SG
rōkānd itt is midāgid vastō.
say.CNG even NEG.PST.3SG anything.PART back
‘And while He was being accused by the chief priests and elders, He answered nothing.’ (EMÖ 1863)

Matthew 27:24

(18) Aga ku Pilātōs nāis, ku ta is
but when Pilate see.PST.3SG that he NEG.PST.3SG
midāgid is sōita, [...]
anything.PART NEG.PST.3SG be.able.CNG
‘When Pilate saw that he could not prevail [...]’ (EMW 1863)
3.3. Setälä’s Näyteittä liivin kielestä (1953)

Livonian:

(19) un ku ta ni vel’’ kāzgiűi nojuond,
and when he now be.pst.3sg wedding.pl.part drink.pTCP
siz ta iz mittò kunāgist iz
then he neg.pst.3sg neg.prt ever neg.pst.3sg
sie täm’ in
eat.cng she.gen with

‘And after celebrating the wedding she never ate with him.’

(‘Ja kun hän oli viettänyt häät, niin tämä ei koskaan syönyt hänen kanssaan.’; Setälä & Kyrölä 1952: 115)

In Setälä’s example iz is part of a proadverb and is in a sense redundant, as the negative particle mittò in principle suffices to express negation (cf. Metslang, Pajusalu & Viitso 2015: 446). The negative proadverb is, likely due to the unexpected fact of the newly-wed wife never eating with her husband after the wedding, strongly focused, which in turn triggers additional negation.

4. Discussion and conclusion

The term ‘indefinite pronoun’ is used here in its broad sense, both in that it includes proadverbs such as iz kunāgist neg.pst.3sg never ‘never’ (cf. (19)), and in that it subsumes under it expressions that perhaps approach the definition of ‘indefinite pronoun’ on a grammaticalisation cline, but have not yet attained it completely. Interesting in our case is that the origin of the pronouns with the prefixoid äb is very clear: as Ernštreits & Kļava (2014: 85) state, the third person singular of the negative auxiliary äb, emulating Latvian (where the prefix ne- is used both in verbs [e.g., runāt ‘to talk’ > nerunāt to not talk’], and in nouns and adjectives [labs ‘good’ > nelabs ‘bad’]), strayed from its original verbal function and was used with nouns and adjectives, to finally function as a general negative prefix. There was then nothing to

---

12 The text where this sentence occurs was written down by Setälä in 1888 (Setälä & Kyrölä 1953: 14).
prevent it from being used as a negative prefixoid in pronominal constructions such as *äb ūkš* ‘no one’ when the need was felt to mirror the negative prefix *ne-* in Latvian negative pronouns such as *neviens NEG. one* ‘no one’.

We have already referred to the orthographic issues with regard to the unjoined writing of *äb* and the indefinite pronoun and its possible clitic status. However, it seems obvious, when comparing the Livonian translations of the Gospel of Matthew with the Latvian translation, that the translators, unsurprisingly, closely followed the structure of the Latvian.\footnote{Blumberga (2006: 108) points out that Sjögren had personally sent Jāņ Prints senior copies of the New Testament in Finnish and Estonian, but the Livonian translation is much closer to the Latvian.} Faced with clauses such as, e.g., *neweens ne runna* NEG.one NEG.speak.PST.3SG (mod. Latv. *neviens negเนวีริเป็น NEG.one NEG.speak. PST.3SG*) ‘no one speaks’ it is then only to be expected that this was translated as *äb ūkš äb rōkānd*. In addition, (older) Latvian provided additional reasons to write *äb* separately when translating into Livonian: firstly, the negative prefix was often split from its headword (e.g., *ne neeka* NEG nothing [mod. Latv. *nenieka* ‘nothing’]), so this was also logically translated (and written) as *äb midāgid*; secondly, a matter with which the translators also will have been familiar with, in Latvian in negative pronouns the negative prefix *ne-* is separated from the pronoun when used with a preposition: e.g., *neviens NEG.one* ‘no one’ > *ne ar vienu NEG with one.INS ‘with no one’.

However, because of the synchronous identity in the language of *äb* as a tensed negative auxiliary (present tense: *äb*, past tense: *iz*), in past tense clauses the negative prefixoid of indefinite pronouns was then also inflected, leading to forms such as *is ūkš* ‘no one’, which morphologically could be analysed as *NEG.PST.3SG one* ‘no one’, but which functioned as a negative prefix(oid) of an indefinite pronoun. We can therefore claim that, at least for a short period in the 1860s–1880s, Livonian had a tensed negative pronominal construction, even if its use was marginal.
There are a number of similar-looking constructions in Uralic where the negative auxiliary is repeated, namely in (colloquial) Finnish\textsuperscript{14} (20), in North Saami (21–22), and Lule Saami (23–24):

**Finnish:**

(20) \textit{On minullakin vaikeuksia syödä}  
\textit{be.prs.3sg I.acl.difficulty.pl.part eat.inf}  
\textit{maksaa, se ei maistu ei millään}  
\textit{liver.part it neg.3sg taste.cng neg.3sg nothing.acl}  
‘I also have difficulties eating liver; it does not taste like anything.’  
(Korp)

**North Saami:**

(21) \textit{ī âd′dam ī māl′dege}  
\textit{neg.3sg give.ptcp neg.3sg anything}  
‘He did not give anything.’  
(‘han gav ingenting’; Nielsen 1926: 169)

(22) \textit{mon in oaidnán doppe in maidege}  
\textit{I neg.1sg see.ptcp there neg.1sg anything}  
‘I did not see anything there.’  
(‘Jag såg där inte någonting.’; Svonni 2018: 207)

**Lule Saami:**

(23) \textit{tat nīpē ī pastēh ī masik}  
\textit{this knife neg.3sg cut.cng neg.3sg anything.ill}  
‘This knife does not cut anything.’  
(‘den här knifven biter icke på någonting’; Wiklund 1915: 116)

---

\textsuperscript{14} That colloquial Finnish has such constructions was pointed out by one of the anonymous reviewers.
In Lule Saami this may even be possible in the past tense:\(^{15}\)

(24) \( \text{ittjiv} \quad \text{dagá} \quad \text{ittjiv} \quad \text{majdik} \)
\( \text{neg.pst.1sg} \quad \text{do.cng} \quad \text{neg.pst.1sg} \quad \text{anything} \)

‘I did not do anything.’

These constructions may at first sight look similar to those in 19th century Livonian, but we consider them to be of wholly different origin, for a number of reasons: firstly, the Livonian instances, despite their ostensible similarity, are provably 19th century literary calques from Latvian without any direct connection to these Finnish and Saamic examples; secondly, examples (22) and (24), where non-third person singular person is expressed on the negative auxiliary, show that the negative auxiliary belongs to the predicate and is not part of a pronominal construction; and thirdly, the Finnish and Saamic instances of negative auxiliary concord can also be explained by the information structure of the clauses where they occur as in these examples ‘anything’ can be deemed to be pragmatically marked as the focus of the clause, which leads to the negative auxiliary being repeated. These constructions do not seem to have been described for Finnish\(^{16}\) or North and Lule Saami; despite the fact that they are, in our opinion, not connected to the Livonian pronominal construction they obviously do merit further research (including their possible use elsewhere in Finnic and Saamic).

Wiedemann (1861a: 222; quoted above) already indicated that, in Livonian, negative concord was possible, but not obligatory. However, if there is no negative concord in the corresponding verses (i.e., in the 1863 and 1880 translations; the negative pronominal construction does not occur in the 1942 translation of the New Testament), there is at least a negative emphasiser \( \text{itt} \) or \( \text{mittõ} \) in prepronominal position (cf. 3A, 5A, 6A, 15A, 19A in Appendix 1). The only exception is (17A): \( \text{ta is kuosta midāgid he neg.pst.3sg say.cng anything ‘he did not say anything’} \), which shows that clausal negation never obligatorily triggered the form \( \text{is+pron.} \). However, clauses such as \( \text{is kīt itt is midāgid neg.pst.3sg say.} \)

\(^{15}\) One of Torgny Hedström’s Lule Saami-speaking informants said he was unsure if it was possible, but that it sounded normal (personal communication, Torgny Hedström, 29 January, 2022).

\(^{16}\) As pointed out by one of the anonymous reviewers.
CNG even neg.pst.3sg anything ‘did not say anything at all’ (cf. (14), (2A)) show that the construction is+pron was already strongly conventionalised. Although negative emphasisers are often used as the only negation element in connection with indefinite pronouns and they are therefore sufficient to express emphatic negation (cf. 7A, 10A, 15A), is kît is itt midâgid shows that the presence of the negative emphasiser could and did not, at least in some cases, inhibit the use of the negative pronoun.

The grammatical category of tense is commonly associated with verbs, and not with nouns (cf. e.g., Comrie 1985: 12). However, there are in fact numerous cases in the world’s languages where the traditional verbal categories of tense, aspect, and mood can occur on nominal constituents; in Uralic, this is well known in, e.g., Mordvinic (cf. e.g., Hamari & Ajanki 2022: 423) and Samoyedic (cf. e.g., Wagner-Nagy & Szeverényi 2022: 669).

Nordlinger & Sadler (2004: 776), in a much-cited paper on nominal tense, distinguish between two types of TAM marking on nominal constituents: ‘propositional nominal TAM’ and ‘independent nominal TAM’. In the first type, TAM expressed in a nominal constituent is relevant for the whole proposition, whilst in the second type it is only relevant for the nominal constituent itself, irrespective of tense expressed elsewhere. The second type can be exemplified by Tariana (e.g., wa-tʃimari-pena 1pl-son.in.law-fut ‘our future son-in-law’), where -pena is a fully productive suffix indicating future tense (there are also suffixes indicating past tense on nominals) (Nordlinger & Sadler 2004: 779); these are not dissimilar to the English prefix ex-, as in ex-president, though this is not as productive.

The first type, propositional nominal TAM, is more interesting, as here the TAM category or categories expressed on the nominal constituent are valid for the whole clause; tense may be expressed verbally as well (as it is in our Livonian examples), or tense may only occur on a nominal form, as in, e.g., (the Tupi-Guarani language) Sirionó:

(25) Kitóba eráo róo ašêsiŋ-rv
    Cristobal he.carry meat Ascension.perf
    ‘Cristobal took meat to Ascension.’
    (Nordlinger & Sadley 2004: 795)
Especially relevant to our case is the discussion on TAM-inflected pronouns. These are less common, but occur, e.g., in Kurnu (a dialect of Paakantyi, an Australian Aboriginal language):

(26) \[\text{wadu} \text{ ga:ndi } \text{ba.lu-ba.lu}\]  
3sg.pst  carry  small.child  
‘It was him that carried the small children.’  
(Wurm & Hercus 1976: 42)

Nordlinger & Sadler (2004: 801) list three other languages where TAM categories can be expressed on pronouns: Yag Dii (Niger-Congo; tense), Supyire (Niger-Congo; mood), and G|ui (Khoe; mood). However, these cases, including Kurnu, specifically refer to languages where tense is expressed only on the personal pronoun, and are in that sense not wholly comparable to our Livonian examples sketched above. The one which is perhaps closest to Nordlinger & Sadler’s examples is (16), where the pronominal construction functions as the subject of the clause, occurring outside of the predicate.

In general, the Livonian examples are clearly instances of propositional nominal TAM where tense is expressed both in the pronominal construction as well as on the verb, with tense agreement; such agreement is also not obligatory in independent nominal TAM. Another difference between these tensed pronouns and the use of the tensed pronominal construction in Livonian is that it was optional, as indicated by practically identical translations into Eastern and Western Livonian (cf. e.g., (6A) and (7A)). Nevertheless, the fact that a tensed pronominal construction did occur in Livonian, even if only briefly, merits inclusion in the hitherto short list of languages where comparable constructions are to be found and which show, each in their own way, that categories such as tense, aspect, and mood are not limited to verbs.
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Appendix

The appendix includes all the verses in the 1863 Das Evangelium Matthäi (in Eastern and Western Livonian) and the 1880 Pīwa Matteus Ewangelium where the tensed construction occurs in at least one verse; the 1942 Livonian translation (where it does not) and the 1830 Latvian translation are also given for comparison.

Matthew 13:34

Livonian:

(1A) Amād naṁt ažād Jēzōs sie rouvō pāl rūkāndis all these things Jesus that people on said leb tazāndōkst,] un bās tazāndikši ta through comparison and without comparisons he is rūkānd is midāgid. NEG.PST.3SG say.CNG NEG.PST.3SG anything ‘All these things Jesus spoke to the multitude in parables; and without a parable He did not speak to them.’ ¹⁷ (EMW 1863)

(2A) Ammō sellist Jehsōs rōkahndis sie rouw pāhlō leb all such Jesus said that people on through tasahndōkst, un bās tasahndikschi ta nāntōn comparison and without comparisons he they.DAT is kiht itt is midahgid. NEG.PST.3SG say.CNG at.all NEG.PST.3SG anything (PME 1880)

(3A) Ammō sieda Jēzus rōkandiz rov pāl leb all that Jesus said people on through sādlōmd ja ilm sādlōmidī ta īz similarities and without similarities he NEG.PST.3SG rōkand nānt pāl mittō midagist say.CNG they.GEN on NEG.PRT anything (ŪT 1942)

¹⁷ English translations are from the New King James Version of the Bible; these are not repeated for examples with the same meaning.
Latvian:

(4A)  
Wissas schahs leetas Jeesus zaur lihsibahm us all these things Jesus through similarities on teem laudim runnaja, un bes lihsibahm those people speak.pst.3sg and without similarities winsch ne runna ne neeka.
he NEG speak.prs.3sg NEG nothing

(Matthew 21:19)

Livonian:

(5A)  
Un ta nãis ūd vîgo pû rek and he see.pst.3sg one.gen fig tree.gen road.gen aigãs lekš tâmmõn jûrõ, un is side.ine go.pst.3sg it.dat to and neg.pst.3sg lieda tâm pâl mittõ midâgid ku find.cng it.gen on neg.prt anything.part than lêdi ūd, un utlis sie pâl: .... leaf.pl.part only and say.pst.3sg that.gen on
(EMW 1863)

(6A)  
Un ta nãis ûhd wihgõ-puh rek aigahs un and he see.pst.3sg one fig.tree road side and leksch juhrõ, un is lieda sie juhrstõ go.pst.3sg to and neg.pst.3sg find.cng that from mittõ midâgid ku set lehdi ûhd, un kihtis neg.prt anything than only leaves only and say.pst.3sg sie puh pâhlõ: .... that tree on
(PME 1880)

(7A)  
Ja ta neiz riekaigas ūd wiğõpû lekš and he see.pst.3sg roadside one fig.tree go.pst.3sg tâm jûr, ja iž lieda tâm pâl müdõ it to and neg.pst.3sg find.cng it on other midagid ku lêdi ūd, ta rôkandiz tâm pâl anything than leaves only he say.pst.3sg it on
(ŪT 1942)
Latvian:

(8A) Un winsch redseja weenu wihges-kohku zellmallâ, and he see.PST.3SG one fig.tree roadside gahje pee ta, un ne attrade us ta come.PST.3SG to it and NEG find.PST.3SG to it neneeka, kà lappas ween, un us to sazzija: nothing as leaf only and to it say.PST.3SG (JD 1830)

Matthew 22: 46

Livonian:

(9A) Un is ükš is tied tāmmõn and NEG.PST.3SG one NEG.PST.3SG know.CNG he.DAT mingist synŋo atkuosto: some word say.PST.3SG (EMW 1863)

(10A) Un is üksch is muoista and NEG.PST.3SG one NEG.PST.3SG understand.CNG tāmmõn mitt midāgid atkihtõ; he.DAT NEG.PRT anything say.PST.3SG (PME 1880)

(11A) Ja mitykšis is vôi vastatõ tāmmõn and no.one NEG.PST.3SG can.CNG answer.INF he.DAT mitītõ sõnmõ; any word (ŪT 1942)

Latvian:

(12A) Un neweens ne sinnaja kahdu wahrdru tam and no.one NEG know.PST.3SG kind.of word that.DAT atbildeht say.INF (JD 1830)

18 Liv. mitikš ‘no one’ is also calqued on Latvian; cf. Latv. neviens NEG.ONE ‘no one’.
Matthew 27:12

Livonian:

(13A) Un ku ta neišti įldist papīst un and when he those.PL.ELA high.PL.ELA priest.PL.ELA and vanīmist sai kaibdod, sis ta is elder.PL.ELA get.PST.3SG accuse.PASS.PTCP then he NEG.PST.3SG kuosta midāgid. say.CNG anything (EMW 1863)

(14A) Un ku ta sai kaibdod neischt and when he get.PST.3SG accuse.PASS.PTCP those.PL.ELA įldist pāpihti un wanihmist, ta is high.PL.ELA priest.PL.ELA and elder.PL.ELA he NEG.PST.3SG rōkahnd itt is midahgid wastō. say.CNG even NEG.PST.3SG anything back (PME 1880)

(15A) Ja ku ta sai kaibdōt įl̄list and when he get.PST.3SG accuse.PASS.PTCP high.PL.ELA prīesterist ja vanīmist, ta iz vastat priest.PL.ELA and elder.PL.ELA he NEG.PST.3SG answer.CNG mittō midagist. NEG.PRT anything (ŪT 1942)

Latvian:

(16A) Un winsch no teem augsteem preestereem and he from those.PL.DAT high.PL.DAT priest.PL.DAT un wezzajeem tappe apsuhdsehts, ne and elder.PL.DAT become.PST.3SG accuse.PASS.PTCP NEG atbildeja neneeka answer.PST.3SG nothing (JD 1830)
Matthew 27:24

Livonian:

(17A) Sis Pilātōs nāis, ku ta gb
then Pilate see.pst.3sg that he neg.prs.3sg
sō̄ta, gb midāgid tiedō
be.able.cng NEG.PRS.3SG anything do.cng
(EMÖ 1863)

(18A) Bet ku Pilatōs nāis, ku ta āb
but when Pilate see.pst.3sg that he neg.prs.3sg
sōīta āb midahgī tiedō [...]
be.able.cng NEG.PRS.3SG anything do.cng
(PME 1880)

(19A) Aga Pilatus nāds, ku ta mittō midagid
but Pilate see.pst.3sg that he neg.prt anything
iz vöi [...] neg.prs.3SG can.cng
(ŪT 1942)

Latvian:

(20A) Bet, kad Pilatus redseja, ka winsch neneeka
but when Pilate see.pst.3sg that he nothing
spehje padarriht
be.able.pst.3SG carry.out
(JD 1830)