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

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

When the systematic documentation of the Estonian dialects began in the early 1920s, the South Estonian language – with a few exceptions – was no longer in active use in the Leivu villages. Paulopriit Voolaine (1899–1985) was sent on a scholarship expedition funded by the Mother Tongue Society (Emakeele Selts) to document Leivu in 1921. However, he observed that there were no speakers with sufficient Leivu language proficiency remaining in Dūre (present-day Lejasciems parish) or Līves (present-day Vireši parish), also no such speakers were found in Kalnamuiža parish (earlier Kalncempji [8], presently Stāmeriena parish [10]) or in Alsviķi parish (Germ Alswig) [7] (Koltsu or Kolcu and Tsiduli or Siduli villages), see Fig. 1). Therefore, it was only possible to document the language of the villages of Ilzene (Voolaine 1981: 101–106).

The material that was collected and later comprehensively analysed by linguist Valter Niilus (1913–1978) during his language documentation expeditions also comes from the villages of Ilzene parish (Āžamuguri or Āžmugura, Brūniņi, Ilzene, Kārklupe, Melnupe, Paikeni, Siveci, Onti) which he described being “like the strongest Leivu fortress” (kui leivude kõvema kantsi). In order to expand his circle of language informants, Niilus visited Andriņi, Lapati, and Majāni villages in Lejasciems parish as well as Zeltiņi and Melnupe villages in 1936, but these efforts were largely unsuccessful (Niilus 1936). Other Estonian dialect researchers (Aili Univere, Salme Tanning, Mari Must, Salme Nigol, and others) were also using informants from Ilzene or – according to Valter Niilus – from the strongest Leivu fortress. The last known speaker of Leivu was Antons Boks [1908–1988] from Kārklupe village in Ilzene parish (Vaba 1997: 50).
Figure 1. Historical South Estonian settlements in Vidzeme (marked with numbers in square brackets on a map of Latvian parishes). Map design and technical implementation: Väino Klaus.
Written sources, local oral tradition, and place names suggest that the South Estonian island-like settlements in Eastern Vidzeme had a considerable population. There are groups of South Estonians in Vidzeme of which the only known traces in the present day are possible local place names of Estonian origin or sometimes also a brief ethnographic description jotted down by a former local pastor. For example, in 1784, Detlev Georg Meyer, pastor of the Atzele congregation (Gaujiena, [5] in Fig. 1), described the head coverings of the Estonian women and girls in his mixed Latvian-Estonian congregation: Estonian women wear high fur hats with round bottoms all year round, while Estonian girls wear straw wreaths decorated with tinsel and spangles (Stepermanis 1960: 228).

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

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

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

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

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

Lv std a > Ltg o: but Kadejs, Kadeja pūrs swamp, Kīlpāni village, cf. Ilzene kadaja’ pl, V katāj : kadaja ‘juniper’; Lāmbas plava meadow, Andriņi village, cf. Ilzene lambda pl, Et lammas : lamba ‘sheep / Schaf’; Palana pūrs swamp Salaki village, cf. Ilzene palanu, V palanu ‘burned out (place)’; Samēlū pūrs swamp, Kručki village, cf. V sammal : samba ‘moss’; Sarapi farmstead, Lapatī village, cf. Et sarap ‘hazelnut tree’; Sāviku plava field, Ķipāti village, cf. Et savi ‘clay’; Vanateri farmstead, Lapati village, cf. Ilzene vāna ~ vona, Et vana : vāna ‘old’; Vāchceteri farmstead, Salaki village, cf. Ilzene vāstsā : vahtsā, V vahtsānā : vahtsā ‘new’;

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

Lv std ė [ä] > Ltg a: Janeze field, Majāni village, cf. Et jānes : jānese ‘hare’; Māģi hill, Salmaņi village, cf. Et māģi : māe ‘hill’; Makra kōls ~ Makarkōls pasture, Kručki village, cf. Ilzene mākr : māgra, Et māger : māgra ‘badger / Dachs’; Parānda (? < *pērend-) pūrs swamp Kīlpāni village, ? cf. M pōrend : pōrendi ‘fire for clearing land for farming (slash-and-burn agriculture), large fire’ Tanning 1958: 109; Vāratkōls hill, Ķipāti and Lembji villages, cf. Ilzene plg vāre, V vārehti : vārehti ‘gate’, but Lēpans ~ Lēpans hill slope, Majāni village, ? cf. Et lepp : lepa ‘alder’;

---

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

Lv std ī > Ltg ī: Lēives village, Lēivirga field, Dukuļi village, cf. Et liiv : liiva ‘sand’; Pērenīca, but Pireņīca ~ Pīra meadow, Salaki village, ? cf. V piīr : piiri ‘border, boundary’; Tēigurga meadow, Lapati and Ķilpāni villages, Tēigurga river, Lapati village, ? cf. V tiik : tiigi ‘pond / Teich’, but Lincelmola field, Lembji village, ? cf. V liīn : liīna ‘town; hill fort’;

Lv std ū > Ltg ou: but Sūretere farmstead, Salaki village, cf. Ilzene sour : sourô, V suur : suurô ‘large’).

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

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

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

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

Some examples: Janeze field: Ilzene dännen : däneza, V jānešs : jänese ‘hare’; Ceri(k)pulda field: Ilzene V põllu ‘field’; Kadejs ~ Kadeja pûrs swamp: Ilzene kadaja pl, V katai ‘kadaja ‘juniper’; Kašenīca ~ Kašenica meadow, Kašinite meadow: Ilzene kašš : kaši, V kašs : kaši ‘cat’; Kugru kõlls field, flax retting pool: Ilzene kugrõ, V kogõr : kogrõ ‘crucian carp (Carassius carassius)’; Nakrims field, pasture: Ilzene nakr : nakrõ, V nakõr : nakrõ ‘turnip’; Palana pûrs swamp: Ilzene palanu, V palanu ‘burned out (place)’; Punaču kõlli hills, Punača pûrs swamp: V punadõ ‘reddish-brown’; Sūlgūtajs ~ Sūlģūtis ~ Sūlga pûrs swamp: Ilzene suļu- ‘flax retting pool’, V sulg : suļu ‘sluice, barrier, dam; Suža pļava meadow and Suža pûrs swamp: Ilzene suži : soe, V susi : soe ‘wolf’.
In a string of cases, there is a corresponding appellative in the Mulgi dialect (M), but none in the Võro dialect: *Ivika pūrs ~ Ìvika pūrs* swamp: M *jõhvik* ‘sedge, marsh carex (*Carex acutiformis*): a swamp grass reminiscent of horsehair; hardy fescue (a hardy grass that grows on dry meadows); bristle oat (*Avena strigosa*), the source of the loan *ìviks* ‘mållgalvîši, lit., black heads (a type of plant)’ recorded in the Lejasciems Latvian subdialect is the same as the plant name *jõhvik* given here, not, as Zemzare thought *ivikas* ‘grainy / körnig, körnreich’, *ivike* ‘grain, seed / das Körnchen, der Same’; *Loisi* field, cf. M *loisk* : *loisu* ‘a low-lying, wet place; water puddle’; *Makra kòlls ~ Makarkòlls* pasture, cf. Ilzene *mäkr* : *mägrâ*, M *mäger* : *mägrâ* ‘badger’; *Parànda pùrs* swamp, ? cf. M *põreñd* : *põrendi* ‘fire for clearing land for farming (slash-and-burn agriculture), large fire’ Tanning 1958: 109; *Rüvi ceļš* road, cf. ruhi : V *rohe* ~ M *ruhi* ‘dugout boat’; *Tîlgasa pùrs, Tilka(s)* pùrs and *Kìlka* (? < *tilka*) pùrs ~ *Škùsta pùrs* swamp, cf. M *tilk* : *tilga*: *kesätïlk* ‘spring shoots of the field horsetail’, Lv *skûste ~ škûste* ‘field horsetail (a type of plant)’ / Schachtel, Schafthalm’.

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

- *-ik*: *Kuņïks ~ Kuņika*, *Kuņika pûrs* meadow, *Làudiķis* forest, *Nïstiķis* field, forest, *Nûrneķis ~ Nurmiķis* field, meadow, *Pïļika kràujs* ravine, *Saviks, Savika kòlls* field;

- *-m* and *-m(a)*: *Magim(a)* meadow, *Mâïgima kòlls* field, *Matuma kòlls* hill, *Pîtèrma* meadow, *Nakrïms* field, pasture, *Sùrums* swamp; *-ndV*: *Kàvànda-sûlg* brook;

- *-st(V)*: *Kaņïsta kàlliñš, Kaņïsts* meadows, *Kîvïsts ~ Kîvèsts* pasture, *Palastene*, *Șîlmïsts* field; *-ts(V)*: *? Tînaçš ~ Tînaçâ* brook, flax retting pool.

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

5. Conclusion

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

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

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

**Abbreviations**

dim. – diminutive; Et – Estonian; eS – South Estonian; f – feminine; std – standard language; Lv – Latvian; Ltg – Latgalian; m – masculine; M – Mulgi dialect; pl – plural; plg – plural genitive; Germ – German; V – Võru dialect; Ru – Russian
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EMS = Eesti murrete sõnaraamat. http://www.eki.ee/dict/ems/.

MES = Mulgi sõnastik. http://www.eki.ee/dict/mulgi/.

**Kokkuvõte. Lembit Vaba: Läti kohanimed ja murded: asjakohane allikas Vidzeme lõunaestesi keele uurimiseks.** Teadmised lätikeelel Liivimaal könel-dud lõunaestesi keelest rajanevad ainestikul, mida on kogutud Vidzeme ida-osas Ilzene valla külades elanud leivudelt. Ilzenega piirnevatest valdades, kus teadaolevalt elas samuti lõunaestlasti, on keeleainest talletatud napilt või üldse mitte. Artiklis analüüsitakse neid Läti kohaneime- ja murdeuurijate töid, mis on seotud Lejasciemi ja Kalnamuiža ning Vidzeme kagunurga Madona piirkonnaga, mida ajaloosis on elanud lõunaeestlasti.

Lejasciemi vallast talletatud keeleaines on sedavõrd kasin, et eesti ja teiste läänemerese alamkeele uurijate huvi peaks väärima Läti keeleaastlase Daina Zemzare töö „Valodas liecības par Lejasciema novadu” (1940), mis hoolika analüüsi korral pakub olulist Lisa Lejasciemiis valla külades könelud leivu keele kohta. Liatigis sisaldab Eesti Keele Instituudi kohanimekartoteek väga tagasihoidliku ja ebäühtlase kvaliteediga Leivu sedelkogu (246 sedelit), kus Lejasciemiis nimesid on vaid vähesel määral, sealjuures peamiselt Līvesi külast. Välitöödel teadmised Zemzare keelejuhid kinnitada, et eesti keelt räägitud vanasti Andriņi, Ķībazi, Rīkiņi, Laupiņi, Salaki, Suži ja Lapiči külast. Zemzare võib siiski tõmeda, et eesti kohanimed olid tollal (1930ndate teine pool) Lejasciemis veel hästi säilinud. Zemzare arvates pole selge, kas Lejasciemi ja Ilzene eestlased on siinse piirkonna põlisasukad või sisserändajad.

Zemzare uurimus osutab, kui tähelepandava jälje on sealsed eestlased jätud Lejasciemis kohanimitusse. See ilmneb eelkõige kohanimedest esinevates eesti päritoludest ning võib-olla ka tulustusliidetes ja topo-formantides. Lejasciemiis on sügava latgali murdekeele (läti dzīļā latgaliskā izloksne) ala. Võrreldes läti ühiskeele ja selle baasis olnud keskmurdeega on siinse murdekeele olulisimad innovatsioonid toimunud vocalismis, mis tulevad esile ka Lejasciemiis eesti päritolude kohanimedest, kuid siiski mitte järjekindlalt. Vocalismis avalduva kahetise esinemise põhjused pole rõõmusel selged. Zemzare arvates esindavad kohanimed, milles ei ole ootuspäraseid murdeomaseid.
vokaaliimuutusi, suhteliselt uuemat nimetamishistust. Peapõhjuseks tuleb siiski pidada läti kirjakeele mõju, mis tollal oli kooli ja kiriku kaudu saanud siinsele rahvale omaseks. Ilzene ja Lejasciemi leivu keeleususe vokalismis esinevat lähknevust on püüdnud seletada ka Paul Ariste. Algupäraste pikkade vokaalide $\tilde{\imath}$ ja $\tilde{\imath}$ idalätipärane, suhteliselt konsekventne diptongistumine on tema arvates Ilzenes erinevalt Lejasciemi toimunud seetõttu, et sealed eestlased on varem täis sisserändajad ja olgu seega pikaaja aja juures lätlastega intensiivses kontaktis kui naaberala eestlased. Sellise oletusega kaasnev vastuoksus – miks eesti keel tuugast läti mõju hoolimata pidas Ilzenes kõige kauem vastu – on Ariste arvates seletatav sellega, et Ilzene oli läti asustusest eraldatud metsade- või lahnade- sööguga. Ent kui arutluse lähtekohaks on siinsete eestlaste põlisasustus, siis Ariste seisukoht ei päde.

Lejasciemi eestipärased kohanimed on enamasti kohanenud läti morfo-

loogilise süsteemiga, kuid on huvitavaid erandeid. Zemzare on registreerinud kohanimesid, kus täiendused on läti kontekstis ebahariliku lõpuvokaaliga $i$, mida saab tõlgendada maskuliinide pluraldi nominatiiviks. Nominatiivse täienduse süsteem on kohanimesid seostades kõiki edastavad läti kontekstis sõnamoodustusmalli, mis on näiteks talli möödustusi murdekeeluses. Lejasciemi liitnimede täiendosiste sõnamoodustus on seletatav alati, kui on etümoloogia mõnest parandades ja täpsustades ning uusi lisades või proovide eesti sõna- või eestlased või ka eesnimesid. Zemzare etümoloogia mõned parandades ja täpsustades ning uusi lisades või proovide eesti analüüside tõetud, et Zemzare kogutud ja publitseeritud kohanuned kätekavad üle sõna eestlaste põlisasustus. Olgu oluline rõhutada, et enamasti on neil apellatiivne vasta lõunaaestini (Võru) murdekeele. Real juhtudel apellatiivne vaste Võru murdekeeluses puudub, kuid on registreeritud Mulgist. Zemzare on püüdnud esile tuua Lejasciemi kohanimed esinevaid eestlaste liitnimeteid, kes uurija tagasihoidlik koguotsas kellel peatus eестlaste liite. Zemzare etümoloogia idate tõenäolise kohanenud kohanemest või kohanandet või tuletusliite kohanemest. Edasine hoolikas analüüs toob tõenäoliselt esile kohanenemisest kätkeudet ja eesti tulemusel ained apellatiivne, tuletusliiteid, topoformante vms.

Edasine hoolikas analüüs toob tõenäoliselt esile kohanenemisest kätkeudet ja seni tähelepanuta jäänud apellatiivne, tuletusliiteid, topoformante vms.

Atilükse koguduse õpetaja Otto Friedrich Paul von Prühl oli 1815. a paiku koostanud loendi Kalnamuiža talude, kus elavad eestlased (34 talu). Heikki Ojansuu teatel, kes 1911. a uurimisreisil käis ka Kalnamuižas, oskasid veel vaid vähesed mingil määral eesti keelse. Ometi on Kalnamuiža eestlased jätud nimetamisväärse jälje kohalikku läti murdekeeldes, kui proovide otseseltkki ana-
lūsida hiljaegu ilmunud Sarmīte Balode ja Ilga Jansone koostatud sōna-
raamatut „Kalnienas izloksnes vārdnīca“. Valdav osa ainestikust on kogutud
aastatel 1977–2013. Sōnaraamatus on pearõhk spetsiifilisel lokaalsel sōnavaral.
Läänemeresoome, sh lōunaeesti mōju võib täheldada kōgil keeletasandeil.
Sōnavara körval tuleb substraatnähtustest nimetada abstraktnoomeneid, mis
eeesti keele eeskujul esinevad murrakus ootuspäraste mitmussõnade asemel
ainsussõnadena, nt bāda ‘mure, vaev, häda’, läti kk bēdas pl jt. Siinsele idalāti
murdekeelele on omased lānnemeresosome keeltele iseloomulikud pōhiverbi
ja adverbi ühendid (ühendverb) ja prefiksverb, mida saadavad sama-
tähenduslikud adverbid. Jne. Kōnealuse murdesōnaraamatu materjali edasist
võrdlevat analüsi tuleb jätkata, mis tōnāoliselt toob esile uut huvipakkuvat
substraatset lōunaeesti keeleainest.

Kohanimed on tōend võimalikust eesti asustusest Vidzeme kagunurga
Madona piirkonna seeli murdeala lōunaoas, praealue haldusjaotuse järgi
Mārciena ja Bērzaune vallas, samuti Lazdonas. Kohanimede eesti resp.
lānnemeresosome pāritolu näib toetavat siinsele murdekeelele iseloomulik
häaldust hōlbustav siirdevokaal sōnaalgulistes, harvem ka sōnasistes
konsonantühendides. Praegu pole selge, kas tegemist on tōesti pōlise lōunaeesti
resp. lānnemeresosome asustusega või sisserändega. Piirkonna murdekeele ja
kohanimistu edasine süstemaattiline uurimine aitaks välja selgitada uusi eesti
(lānnemeresosome) pāritolu kohanimesid ja võimaldaks luua selgema ette-
kujutuse sealse piirkonna võimaliku eesti (lānnemeresosome) asustuse ulatusest
ja keelelisest iseloomust.

Mārksōnad: kohanimed, etümolooogia, läti murded, lōunaeesti murded, keele-
saared