

## NOTES ON AN OBSOLETE TENSED NEGATIVE PRONOUN CONSTRUCTION IN LIVONIAN

**Rogier Blokland**

*Uppsala University, SE*

rogier.blokland@moderna.uu.se

**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., *äbkülzit* 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., *äb 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.

**Keywords:** Livonian, indefinite pronouns, negation, tense, prefixoid, language contact

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.12697/jeful.2022.13.1.02>

### 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,<sup>1</sup> 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 tods* (*tads*) 'was es wolle' ['whatever']', *mis volds* '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.

*ab ukš* ‘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’, *seļļi-tūoļi* ‘such and such’, *set* ‘many’, *tuoi* ‘other’, *tūoļi* ‘other kind of’) are not found in Wiedemann, at least not as indefinite pronouns.<sup>2</sup> 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 *āb* of the negative auxiliary (see Table 1) to calque Latv. *ne-* ‘un-, -less’, creating forms such as, e.g., *ābjeldzi* NEG.alive ‘lifeless’ (calqued on Latv. *nedzīvs* NEG.alive ‘id.’), and *ābjõvā* 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., *ābkūlzit* NEG.obedience ‘disobedience’, calqued on Latv. *nepaklausība* NEG.obedience ‘id.’), and nine adverbs (e.g., *ābknaššõ* 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 *āb* has lost its status as a function word, and is now an affix; on this grammaticalisation cline *āb* 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 *āb jõvdi* NEG good.PL.PART ‘not good’. Ernštreits (2011: 44; 2013: 44) adds that *āb* was not perceived as the caritive prefix *āb-* ‘un-, -less’, but as the word *āb* ‘no’. This claim concerning the orthography, however, where *āb* 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...<sup>3</sup> (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, *āb* is not limited to adjectives, nouns, and adverbs, as the 1861 grammar also has indefinite pronouns with this same negative prefixoid, listing the following: *āb ūkš* ‘kein, Niemand’ [‘no, nobody’], *āb kis* ‘kein, Niemand’ [‘no, nobody’], *āb kumbi* ‘keiner von beiden’ [‘neither’], *āb midāgid* ‘nichts’ [‘nothing’], *āb midāgist* ‘nichts’ [‘nothing’], *āb miŋgi* ‘kein, keinerlei’ [‘no, no ... whatsoever’], and *āb mis* ‘nichts’ [‘nothing’] (Wiedemann 1861a: 123).<sup>4</sup> As one can see, *āb* is written separately; these pronouns are therefore not listed in the 1861 dictionary under *āb*-.

These pronouns are also found in Salis Livonian: *ab juks* ‘kein, Niemand’ [‘no, nobody’], *ab mili* ‘kein, nichts’ [‘no, nothing’], *ab midagist ~ midagit* ‘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; *ā’bkunagid* ‘never’ and *ā’bmiŋgi* ‘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. *epänormaali* NEG.normal ‘abnormal’; for more examples see, e.g., Savijärvi 1977: 24–28, Kehayov 2017: 118). Matthews (1956: 314) writes that, e.g., Liv. *äbsieldõ* NEG.clear ‘unclear’ need not necessarily be a calque from Latv. *neskaidrs* NEG.clear ‘id.’ as Ariste (1954: 298) claims, pointing to Est. *ebaselge* NEG.clear ‘id.’, which cannot be a calque from Latvian. However, the pronouns with the formative *äb* 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*:

*äb üks* NEG one ‘kein, Niemand’ ~ *neviens* NEG.one ‘nobody, no one; neither’  
*äb kis* NEG who ‘kein, Niemand’ ~ *nekāds* NEG.some ‘no, none, not any’

*äb kumbi* ‘keiner von beiden’ ~ *ne otrs* NEG second ‘neither’

*äb midāgid (midāgist)* ‘nichts’ ~ *nekas* NEG.what/who ‘nothing; nobody’  
*äb mis* ‘nichts’  
*äb mīngi* ‘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-* ~ *ni-* borrowed from Russian *ни-* (cf. e.g., Veps *ni-ken* NEG.who ‘nobody’; cf. Russ. *никто* 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’ (< *nezinu kas* NEG. know who ‘I do not know who’).

Another, more interesting aspect of these negative pronoun forms with *äb-* concerns its use in clauses in the past tense. Within Finnic, tense can be expressed on the negative auxiliary only in South Estonian<sup>5</sup> (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’.

per-son	personal pronoun	affirma-tive	negative auxiliary	+ connegative	+ affirmative
1	<i>ma</i>	<i>um</i>	<i>äb</i>	<i>üo</i>	–
2	<i>sa</i>	<i>üod</i>	<i>äd</i>		
3	<i>ta</i>	<i>um</i>	<i>äb</i>		
1	<i>mēg</i>	<i>üomõ</i>	<i>äb</i>	–	<i>üomõ</i>
2	<i>tēg</i>	<i>üotõ</i>	<i>ät</i>		<i>üotõ</i>
3	<i>ne</i>	<i>attõ</i>	<i>äb</i>		

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 *üotõ* 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’.

per-son	personal pronoun	affirma-tive	negative auxiliary	+ connegative	+ affirmative
1	<i>ma</i>	<i>võļ</i>	<i>iz</i>	<i>üo</i>	–
2	<i>sa</i>	<i>võļd</i>	<i>izt</i>		
3	<i>ta</i>	<i>võļ</i>	<i>iz</i>		
1	<i>mēg</i>	<i>võļmõ</i>	<i>iz</i>	–	<i>üomõ</i>
2	<i>tēg</i>	<i>võļtõ</i>	<i>izt</i>		<i>üotõ</i>
3	<i>ne</i>				

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 üo*  
s/he NEG.PRS.3SG be.CNG  
'S/he is not.'

(2b) *ta vól*  
s/he PST.3SG  
'S/he was.'

(2b) *ta iz üo*  
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 *äb-* of the negative auxiliary (*äb* in modern Livonian). An interesting aspect of these negative pronoun forms with *äb-* concerns its use in clauses in the past tense found in a number of texts from the 19th century.<sup>6</sup> Where these *äb-*pronouns occur in the present tense, the negative prefixoid is also in the present tense, which is as expected:

(3) *ma äb' nae äb üto 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 *äb* 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 *āb* can have; e.g., *āb<sup>a</sup>* (negative prefixoid of the negative pronoun *āb ūkš* ‘nobody’), *āb<sup>b</sup>* (negative prefixoid of the negative adverb *ābka* ‘also not’), and *āb<sup>c</sup>* (third person singular present tense of the negative auxiliary):

- (4) *Sie*            *perāst* *se*    *nei*    *um, ku*    *āb<sup>a</sup>*            *ūkš*  
 that.GEN    why    it    like    is    when    NEG.PRS.3SG    one  
*jemmit*    *eñtš*            *izzō*            *ūb<sup>b</sup>*    *ka*    *jemmō*  
 more        own.GEN    father.PART    NEG    also    mother.PART  
*āb<sup>c</sup>*                    *ārmastō* [...].  
 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),<sup>8</sup> and gives the following examples: *āb ūkš seda poigo āb tund* ‘Niemand kennt den Sohn’ [‘Nobody knows the son.’], *is midāgist (midāgid) is lieda* ‘er fand nichts’ [‘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) *ta*    *is*                    *roḱānd (roḱānd)*    *is*                    *midāgist (midāgid)*  
 he    NEG.PST.3SG    say.PTCP                    NEG.PST.3SG    anything.PART  
 ‘He said nothing.’  
 (‘er sprach nichts’; Wiedemann 1861a: 123)
- (6) *Ma*    *kūldōs*    *kūlis,*                    *aga*    *is*                    *midāgid*  
 I    listen.CVB    listen.PST.1SG    but    NEG.PST.3SG    anything.PART  
*is*                    *moista*  
 NEG.PST.3SG    understand.CNG  
 ‘I listened and listened, but understood nothing.’  
 (‘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<sup>9</sup> 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 nant ažd Jēzōs sie rouvō pāl*  
 all these thing.PL Jesus that people on  
*rukāndis leb tazāndōkst, un bās*  
 say.PST.3SG through comparison.PL.GEN and without  
*tazāndikši ta is rukānd 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.’<sup>10</sup> (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  
*seldist 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 nāe [...]*  
 anything.PART NEG.PST.3SG see.CNG  
 ‘[...] as he did not see anything in there [...]’  
 (‘[...] denn er sah darin nichts [...]’; Wiedemann 1861a: 439)

<sup>10</sup> English translations are from the New King James Version of the Bible.

- (10) *Un sie pāva ma kavž jennō mūtšti*  
 and that day I go.PST.1SG many bush.PL.PART  
*leb vuotšqs, aga is ūt is*  
 through search.CVB but NEG.PST.3SG one.PART NEG.PST.1SG  
*või 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 sa*  
 but NEG.PST.3SG NEG.PRT far NEG.PST.1SG get.CNG  
*lāenōks, ma kūlis sūr muḡa ummōn taga*  
 go.PTCP.INS I hear.PST.1SG big noise self.DAT behind  
*tulm.*  
 come.INF.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’.

- (13) [...] *leb sie ku ne mą jelāji-d*  
 through that.GEN as these land animal.PL  
*neišti is miņgist juvvo tātō*  
 they.PL.ELA NEG.PST.3SG anything.PART good.PART sign.PART  
*is nāet*  
 NEG.PST.3PL see.PRS.3PL  
 ‘[...] because the animals of the country did not see anything good  
 (coming) from them [...]’  
 (‘[...] weil die Thiere des Landes von ihnen gar kein gutes Zeichen sahen  
 [...]’; Wiedemann 1861a: 466)

### 3.2. The 1863 *Das Evangelium Matthäi* (in Eastern and Western Livonian) and the 1880 *Püwa Matteus Ewangelium*

#### Matthew 13:34

- (14) *Ammo sellist Jēzōs ruķāndis sie rouvo*  
 all such.PL Jesus said.PST.3SG that.GEN people.GEN  
*pāļo ļob līdzib-ōd, un bās*  
 on through comparison-PL and without  
*līdzib-idi ta nantōn is kīt*  
 comparison-PL.PART he they.DAT NEG.PST.3SG say.CNG  
*itt is midāgid.*  
 at.all NEG.PST.3SG anything.PART  
 ‘All these things Jesus spoke to the multitude in parables; and without a  
 parable He did not speak to them.’<sup>11</sup> (EMÖ 1863)

#### Matthew 21:19

- (15) *Un ta nāis ūd vīgo pū rek*  
 and he see.PST.3SG one.GEN fig tree.GEN road.GEN  
*aigās un lekš jūrō, un is lieda*  
 side.INE and go.PST.3SG to and NEG.PST.3SG find.CNG  
*sie jūstō is midāgid mūdō ku*  
 that.GEN from NEG.PST.3SG anything.PART other.PART than

11 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  
*pālō: ..*

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 ūkš is muoista*  
 And NEG.PST.3SG one NEG.PST.3SG understand.CNG  
*taṃṃon 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 neišti*  
 And when he get.PST.3SG accuse.PASS.PTCP those.PL.ELA  
*ūldist papīst un vanīmist, ta is*  
 high.PL.ELA priest.PL.ELA and elder.PL.ELA he NEG.PST.3SG  
*roḱānd 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 Pilātoš 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)<sup>12</sup>

Livonian:

- (19) *un ku ta ni vel'' k̄āzgiini nojuond,*  
 and when he now be.PST.3SG wedding.PL.PART drink.PTCP  
*siz ta iz mittə kunāgist iz*  
 then he NEG.PST.3SG NEG.PRT ever NEG.PST.3SG  
*sie tām' īn*  
 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 *mittə* 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 *āb* is very clear: as Ernštreits & Kļava (2014: 85) state, the third person singular of the negative auxiliary *āb*, 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

<sup>12</sup> 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 *āb 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 *āb* 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.<sup>13</sup> Faced with clauses such as, e.g., *neweens ne runna* NEG.one NEG.speak.PST.3SG (mod. Latv. *neviens nerunā* NEG.one NEG.speak.PST.3SG) ‘no one speaks’ it is then only to be expected that this was translated as *āb ūkš āb rōkānd*. In addition, (older) Latvian provided additional reasons to write *āb* 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 *āb 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 *āb* as a tensed negative auxiliary (present tense: *āb*, 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.

13 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.

There are a number of similar-looking constructions in Uralic where the negative auxiliary is repeated, namely in (colloquial) Finnish<sup>14</sup> (20), in North Saami (21–22), and Lule Saami (23–24):

Finnish:

- (20) *On minullakin vaikeuksia syödä maksaa, se ei maistu ei millään*  
 be.PRS.3SG I.ADE.CL difficulty.PL.PART eat.INF  
 liver.PART it NEG.3SG taste.CNG NEG.3SG nothing.ADE  
 ‘I also have difficulties eating liver; it does not taste like anything.’  
 (Korp)

North Saami:

- (21) *ī ād'dam ī mǎi'dege*  
 NEG.3SG give.PTCP NEG.3SG anything  
 ‘He did not give anything.’  
 (‘han gav ingenting’; Nielsen 1926: 169)

- (22) *mon in oaidnán doppe in maidege*  
 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) *tat nīpē ī pastēh ī masik*  
 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)

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:<sup>15</sup>

- (24) ?*ittjiv*            *dagá*            *ittjiv*            *majdik*  
 NEG.PST.1SG    do.CNG        NEG.PST.1SG    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<sup>16</sup> 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 *itt* or *mittõ* in prepronominal position (cf. 3A, 5A, 6A, 15A, 19A in Appendix 1). The only exception is (17A): *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 *is*+PRON. However, clauses such as *is kūt 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 kīt is itt midāgid* 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-tfimari-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*      *asēsioq-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) *waḍu*      *ga:ndi*      *baļu-baļu*  
 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 Glui (Khoë; 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.

## Acknowledgments

Many thanks to Torgny Hedström (Uppsala), Petar Kehayov (Regensburg), Olle Kejonen (Uppsala), Tuuli Tuisk (Tartu), and to the two anonymous reviewers for many useful comments.

## Abbreviations

CL – clitic, CNG – connegative, CVB – converb, DAT – dative, ELA – relative, Est. – Estonian, Fin. – Finnish, ILL – illative, INF – infinitive, INS – instrumental, Latv. – Latvian, Liv. – Livonian, NEG – negative, PART – partitive, PASS – passive, PL – plural, PRS – present, PRT – particle, PST – past, PTCP – participle, SG – singular, TAM – tense–aspect–mood

## Sources

EMÖ 1863 = *Das Evangelium Matthäi in den östlichen dialect des Livischen zum ersten Male übersetzt von dem Liven N. Pollmann, durchgesehen von F. J. Wiedemann, Mitglieder der Kaiserl. Akad. d. Wissenschaften in St. Petersburg*. London: [Strangeways & Walden], 1863.

EMW 1863 = *Das Evangelium Matthäi in den westlichen dialect des Livischen, übersetzt vom dem Liven I. Prinz und dessen Söhnen P. Prinz und I.P. Prinz; durchgesehen von F.J. Wiedemann, Mitglieder der Kaiserl. Akad. d. Wissenschaften in St. Petersburg*. London: [Strangeways & Walden], 1863.

JD 1830 = *Ta Jauna Derriba muhsu kunga Jesus Kristus jeb Deewa swehti wahrdi*. Jelgawa: Steffenhagen.

PME 1880 = *Püwa Matteus Ewangelium lihbisckhi*. Drukkõ pandõd England un wõhrõ mã bihbõl seltsch perahst. Pehterburgs: [s.n.].

ÜT 1942 = *Üž Testament*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

## References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2015. *The art of grammar. A practical guide*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199683215.001.0001>.

Alvre, Paul. 1975. Über eine Neubildung in den finnisch-ugrischen Sprachen auf dem Hintergrunde der pronominalen Typologie. *Sovetskoje Finnougrovedenije* 11. 235–241.

Alvre, Paul. 1982. Läänemeresoome indefiniitpronoomeneist. In: Iivonen, Antti & Suhonen, Seppo & Virtaranta, Pertti (eds). *Voces amicorum Sovijärvi. In honorem Antti Sovijärvi septuagesimum annum agentis die XXII mensis aprilis anno MCM-LXXXII*. (Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran toimituksia 181), 45–55. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Alvre, Paul. 1983. Az uráli nyelvek névmásainak igei komponense. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 85. 291–295.

Alvre, Paul. 1985. Vom ostseefinnischen Indefinitpronomen. In: Leskinen, Heikki (ed). *Ostseefinnische Untersuchungen. Ergebnisse eines finnisch-sowjetischen Symposiums* (Studia Fennica 28), 17–26. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

- Alvre, Paul. 1986. Läänemeresoome pronoomenite tüpoloogiat. *Fenno-Ugristica* 13. 5–20.
- Alvre, Paul. 2002. Russische Lehnelemente in Indefinitpronomen und -adverbien der ostseefinnischen Sprachen. *Linguistica Uralica* 38(3). 161–164. <https://doi.org/10.3176/lu.2002.3.01>.
- Ariste, Paul. 1954. K voprosu o razvitii livskogoazyka. *Trudy Instituta jazykoznanija AN SSSR*. Tom 4. 254–307.
- Blokland, Rogier. 2012. Borrowability of pronouns: evidence from Uralic. *Finnisch-Ugrische Mitteilungen* 35. 1–34.
- Blumberga, Renāte. 2006. *Lībieši dokumentos un vēstulēs: Somijas zinātnieku ekspedīcijas pie lībiešiem*. Rīga: Latvijas vēstures institūta apgāds.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1985. *Tense*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139165815>.
- Ernštreits, Valts. 2011. *Lībiešu rakstu valoda*. Rīga: Latviešu valodas aģentūra & Līvõ Kultūr sidām.
- Ernštreits, Valts. 2013. *Liivi kirjakeel*. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.
- Ernštreits, Valts & Gunta Kļava. 2014. Grammatical changes caused by contact between Livonian and Latvian. *Eesti ja soome-ugri keeleteaduse ajakiri. Journal of Estonian and Finno-Ugric Linguistics* 5(1). 77–90. <https://doi.org/10.12697/jeful.2014.5.1.05>
- Hamari, Arja & Regina Ajanki. 2022. Mordvin (Erzya and Moksha). In Marianne Bakró-Nagy, Johanna Laakso & Elena Skribnik (eds). *The Oxford guide to the Uralic languages*, 392–431. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1997. *Indefinite pronouns*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hienonen, Heini. 2010. The implicational semantic map for Veps indefinite pronouns. *Linguistica Uralica* 46(4). 281–292. <http://doi.org/10.3176/lu.2010.4.04>.
- Juutinen, Markus & Jukka Mettovaara. 2021. Saamelaiskielten indefiniitpronominien jäljillä. In Mika Hämäläinen, Niko Partanen & Khalid Alnajjar (eds). *Multilingual facilitation. Honoring the career of Jack Rueter*, 104–127. Helsinki: University of Helsinki Library. <http://doi.org/10.31885/9789515150257.11>.
- Kallio, Petri. 2016. Historical phonology from Proto-Finnic to Proto-Livonian. *Eesti ja soome-ugri keeleteaduse ajakiri. Journal of Estonian and Finno-Ugric Linguistics* 7(1). 39–65. <http://doi.org/10.12697/jeful.2016.7.1.02>.
- Karjalainen, Heini. 2019. Borrowing morphology: the influence of Russian on the Veps system of indefinite pronouns. In Sofia Björklöf & Santra Jantunen (eds.). *Multilingual Finnic. Language contact and change* (Uralica Helsinkiensia 14), 55–87. Helsinki: Finno-Ugrian Society. <https://doi.org/10.33341/uh.85033>.
- Kehayov, Petar. 2017. *The fate of mood and modality in language death* (Trends in Linguistics 307). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110524086>.
- Korp = Aller Media Oy (2019). Suomi24 virkkeit-korpus 2001–2017, Korp-versio 1.2 [tekstikorpus]. Kielipankki. <http://urn.fi/urn:nbn:fi:lb-2020021803> (19 April, 2022).
- Matras, Yaron. 2009. *Language contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511809873>.
- Matthews, William Kleesmann. 1956. The Latvian element in modern Livonian. In Margaret Woltner & Herbert Bräuer (eds). *Festschrift für Max Vasmer zum*

70. *Geburtstag am 28. Februar 1956*, 307–318. Veröffentlichungen der Abteilung für Slavische Sprachen und Literaturen des Osteuropa-Instituts. Berlin: Osteuropa Institut.
- Metslang, Helle, Karl Pajusalu & Tiit-Rein Viitso. 2015. Negation in Livonian. In Matti Miestamo, Anne Tamm & Beáta Wagner-Nagy (eds). *Negation in Uralic Languages* (Typological Studies in Language 108), 433–456. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.108.16met>.
- Nielsen, Konrad. 1926. *Lærebok i lappisk I. Grammatikk. Lydlære, formlære, ord-dannelseslære og syntaks samt tillegg*. Oslo: A.W. Brøggers boktrykkeris forlag.
- Nordlinger, Rachel & Louisa Sadler. 2004. Nominal tense in crosslinguistic perspective. *Language* 80(4). 776–806. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2004.0219>.
- Pajusalu, Karl, Tiit Hennoste, Ellen Niit, Peeter Päll & Jüri Viikberg. 2018. *Eesti murded ja kohanimed*. 3., kohendatud ja täiendatud trükk. Tartu: EKSA.
- Savijärvi, Ilkka. 1977. *Itämerensuomalaisten kielten kieltoverbi* (Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia 333). Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Setälä, Emil Nestor & Väinö Kyrölä. 1953. *Näytteitä liivin kielestä* (Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran toimituksia 106). Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Sivers, Fanny de. 1971. *Die lettischen Präfixe des livischen Verbs*. Nancy.
- Sjögren, Anders Johan. 1849. Bericht über eine im Auftrag der russischen geographischen Gesellschaft während der Sommermonate des Jahres 1846 nach den Gouvernements Livland und Kurland unternommene Reise zur genauern Untersuchung der Reste der Liwen und Kreewingen. *Denkschriften der russischen geographischen Gesellschaft zu St. Petersburg I*, 453–605. Weimar.
- Svonni, Mikael. 2018. *Modern nordsamisk grammatik*. Giron/Kiruna: Ravda lágádus Univere, Aili. 1996. *Idamurde tekstid*. Eesti murded IV. Tallinn: Eesti Keele Instituut.
- Vääri, Eduard. 1989. Ferdinand Johann Wiedemann liivi keele uurijana. In Seppo Suhonen (ed.). *Ferdinand Johann Wiedemannin muisto. Suomalais-virolainen Wiedemann-seminaari Helsingissä 5.–6.10.1987* (Castrenianumin toimitteita 31), 64–88. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Viitso, Tiit-Rein. 2008. *Liivi keel ja läänemeresoome keelemaastikud*. Tartu–Tallinn: Tartu Ülikooli eesti ja üldkeeleteaduse instituut, Eesti Keele Instituut.
- Viitso, Tiit-Rein & Valts Ernštreits. 2012. *Līvõkīel-ēstikīel-leļķīel sōnārōntōz. Liivi-eesti-lāti sōnaraamat. Lībiešu-igauņu-latviešu vārdnīca*. Tartu: Tartu Ülikool/Rīga: Latviešu valodas aģentūra.
- Wagner-Nagy, Beáta & Sándor Szeverényi. 2022. Samoyedic. In Marianne Bakró-Nagy, Johanna Laakso & Elena Skribnik (eds.). *The Oxford guide to the Uralic languages*, 659–673. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wiedemann, Ferdinand Johann. 1861a. *Joh. Andreas Sjögren's Gesammelte Schriften. Band II. Theil I. Livische Grammatik nebst Sprachproben*. St. Petersburg: Eggers.
- Wiedemann, Ferdinand Johann. 1861b. *Joh. Andreas Sjögren's Gesammelte Schriften. Band II. Theil II. Livisch-deutsches und deutsch-livisches Wörterbuch*. St. Petersburg: Eggers.
- Wiklund, Karl Bernhard. 1915. *Lärobok i lapska språket*. Uppsala: A.-B. akademiska bokhandeln.

Winkler, Eberhard & Karl Pajusalu. 2018. *Salis Livisch II. Grammatik und Wörterverzeichnis. Mit einem Anhang zu den salis-livischen Sprichwörtern. Auf der Grundlage von J.A. Sjögrens Sprachmaterialien verfasst von Eberhard Winkler und Karl Pajusalu.* (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 89). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Wurm, Stephen A. & Louise Hercus. 1976. Tense-marking in Guṇu pronouns. *Papers in Australian Linguistics* 10. 33–55.

**Kokkuvõte. Rogier Blokland: Tähelepanekuid ajalisel määratletud eitusvormi sisaldava vana asesõnakonstruktsiooni kohta liivi keeles.** Keelekontaktisituatsioonis võidakse indefiniitseid asesõnu kergesti laenata ja/või tõlkida ning tugeva läti keele mõju all olnud liivi keel ei ole selles suhtes erand. Eitav prefiksoid *āb*, mis algselt on eituse ainsuse 3. pöörde abiverb, on tõlkelaen läti keelest: *ne-* NEG. Liivi *āb*-i abil moodustatakse nimisõnu (nt *ābkūlzit* NEG.sõnakuulelikkus ‘sõnakuulmatus’), omadussõnu (nt *ābjōvā* NEG.hea ‘halb’) ja määrsõnu (nt *ābknaššō* NEG.ilusasti ‘inetult’), kuid mitmest 19. sajandi allikast on leida ka indefiniitseid asesõnu sama eitava prefiksoidiga, nt *āb midāgid* ‘ei midagi’. Kuna *āb* on samal ajal ka eituse ajalisel määratletud abiverb (olevikus *āb*, minevikus *iz*), on mineviku ajavormis lausetes indefiniitse asesõna eitav prefiksoid olnud samuti muudetud mineviku ajale vastavaks: *is midāgid*. Seega esinesid liivi keeles 19. sajandil lühikest aega eituse ajalisel määratletud pronoomenikonstruktsioonid.

**Märksõnad:** umbmäärased asesõnad, eitus, ajavorm, prefiksoid, keelekontakt, liivi keel

**Kubbõvõttõks. Rogier Blokland: Tādõlpanmizt iļ vanā azūmsõnā konstruksij, mis sizāldõb āigas markiertõd kiēldõksformõ.** Kiēld kubbõpūtimiz situātsijs ābpīldzizt azūmsõnād vōibõd kievāmstiz sōdõ tāpīntõd ja/agā tulktõd ja nei se um ka līvõ kiēls, mis um vōnd viš leṭkiēl mōj alā. Kiēldõks prefiksoid *āb*, mis amā ežmõks um vōnd 3. pārsõn abverb iḏlug kiēldõks form, um kalk leṭkiēlstõ: *ne-* NEG. Līvõ kiēls sīe *āb* abkõks sōbõd lūodõd nimsõnād (nāgṭõbõks, *ābkūlzit* NEG.*kūlzit*), ummitsõnād (nāgṭõbõks, *ābjōvā* NEG.*jōvā*) ja vīṭsõnād (nāgṭõbõks, *ābknaššō* NEG.*knaššō*). Setmiṅst 19. āigatsadā ovātst ātõ lieudtõb ka ābpīldzizt azūmsõnād seļlizt eṅṭš prefiksoidõks, nāgṭõbõks, *āb midāgid*. Až *āb* sīel eṅṭš āigal um ka āigas markiertõd kiēldõks abverb (paldīnizāigas *āb*, lāndzāigas *iz*), siz lāndzāigas ābpīldziz azūmsõnā kiēldõks prefiksoid kītõmis um vōnd neiīž ka lāndzāiga vorms: *is midāgid*. Nei siz 19. āigatsadās līvõ kiēls lītizt aiḡõ ātõ vōnnõd āigas markiertõd azūmsõnā kiēldõks konstruksijd.

## Appendix

The appendix includes all the verses in the 1863 *Das Evangelium Matthäi* (in Eastern and Western Livonian) and the 1880 *Püwa 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 nant 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.’<sup>17</sup> (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 siedo Jēzus rōkandiz rov pāl leb*  
 all that Jesus said people on through  
*sādlōmd ja ilm sādlōmidi ta iz*  
 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 lihdsibahm us*  
 all these things Jesus through similarities on  
*teem laudim runnaja, un bes lihdsibahm*  
 those people speak.PST.3SG and without similarities  
*winsch ne runna ne neeka.*  
 he NEG speak.PRS.3SG NEG nothing  
 (JD 1830)

### Matthew 21:19

Livonian:

- (5A) *Un ta nāis ūd vīgo pū rek*  
 and he see.PST.3SG one.GEN fig tree.GEN road.GEN  
*aigās lekš tammõn jūrõ, un is*  
 side.INE go.PST.3SG it.DAT to and NEG.PST.3SG  
*lieda tam pāl mittõ midāgid ku*  
 find.CNG it.GEN on NEG.PRT anything.PART than  
*lēdi ūd, un utlis sie pāl: ....*  
 leaf.PL.PART only and say.PST.3SG that.GEN on  
 (EMW 1863)
- (6A) *Un ta nāis ūhd wiġõ-puh rek aigahs un*  
 and he see.PST.3SG one fig.tree road side and  
*lekšch juhrõ, un is lieda sie juhrstõ*  
 go.PST.3SG to and NEG.PST.3SG find.CNG that from  
*mittõ midāgid ku set lehdi ūhd, un kihtis*  
 NEG.PRT anything than only leaves only and say.PST.3SG  
*sie puh pählõ: ....*  
 that tree on  
 (PME 1880)
- (7A) *Ja ta neiz riekaigas yd vīgõpū lekš*  
 and he see.PST.3SG roadside one fig.tree go.PST.3SG  
*tām jūr, ja iz lieda tam pāl mūdõ*  
 it to and NEG.PST.3SG find.CNG it on other  
*midagid ku lēḡi yd, ta rōkandiz tam pāl*  
 anything than leaves only he say.PST.3SG it on  
 (ŪT 1942)

Latvian:

- (8A) *Un winsch redseja weenu wihges-kohku zellmallā,*  
 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 ukš is tied tammõn*  
 and NEG.PST.3SG one NEG.PST.3SG know.CNG he.DAT  
*miñgist sunno atkuostp ;*  
 some word say.PST.3SG  
 (EMW 1863)

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

- (11A) *Ja mitykš<sup>18</sup> is vōi vastatõ tämmõn*  
 and no.one NEG.PST.3SG can.CNG answer.INF he.DAT  
*mitytõ sõnnõ;*  
 any word  
 (ÜT 1942)

Latvian:

- (12A) *Un neweens ne sinnaja kahdu wahrdu 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 ūldist pāpīst un*  
 and when he those.PL.ELA high.PL.ELA priest.PL.ELA and  
*vanīmist sai kaibdōd, 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 kaibdōd neischt*  
 and when he get.PST.3SG accuse.PASS.PTCP those.PL.ELA  
*ūldist pāpihft 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 yļļist*  
 and when he get.PST.3SG accuse.PASS.PTCP high.PL.ELA  
*prīesterist ja vaņimist, 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 Pilātõs nāis, ku ta aḃ*  
 then Pilate see.PST.3SG that he NEG.PRS.3SG  
*sõita, aḃ midāgid tiedõ*  
 be.able.CNG NEG.PRS.3SG anything do.CNG  
 (EMÖ 1863)

- (18A) *Bet ku Pilatõs nāis, ku ta äb*  
 but when Pilate see.PST.3SG that he NEG.PRS.3SG  
*sõita äb midahgid tiedõ [...]*  
 be.able.CNG NEG.PRS.3SG anything do.CNG  
 (PME 1880)

- (19A) *Aga Pilatus nāds, ku ta mittõ midagid*  
 but Pilate see.PST.3SG that he NEG.PRT anything  
*iz või [...]*  
 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)