

PIRJO NUMMENAHO

OBSERVATIONS ON LJUNGO TUOMANPOIKA'S LANGUAGE

Ljungo Tuomaanpoika, one of the first law translators in Finland, was born at Liminka and worked as a vicar in Kalajoki, in Northern Ostrobothnia. At the beginning of the 17th century he completed the following law translations: *The law of the Swedish Kingdom or the peasants' law* (1601) and *The town law of the Swedish Kingdom* (1609). These translations remained as manuscripts for a long time, because the Swedish government did not favour publishing any laws in Finnish. Only in 1852 W. G. Lagus published these translations, which have great value for research on the Finnish language. This publication was criticized because of its mistakes of interpretation and because of its linguistic inaccuracies (see A. Penttilä 1926, 71-75). The corrected copy of the publication is conserved in the library of the Finnish Literary Society. Later on M. Ulkuniemi has made a new version of these translations, published in 1975, and it can be considered reliable in its interpretations (see R. Suhonen 1977, 338-339).

The language of Ljungo's translations is based on his own Northern Ostrobothnian dialect¹. Nevertheless, there are also characteristics not typical of Ljungo's native dialect and they can thus be considered as derived from the literary language which preceded him.

In this paper I will deal with some linguistic features typical of Ljungo comparing them to other users of old Finnish. The material derives from a systematic analysis of the law translations in question. As a linguistic point of comparison I have used the facsimile of Ericus Erci *Postilla* (I, II, 1621, 1625). We can see a lot of influence

¹ On Ljungo's language, see Malin 1866.

of Agricola on Ljungo's language, even though also differences can be noted. In his translations Ljungo himself proclaims to aspire after that Finnish language which is spoken around Turku and Eastern Ostrobothnia (see Malin 1866, 4).

APOCOPE

Apocope occurs in Ljungo's texts as in Agricola in spite of his northern dialectal background. This was very common in old literary Finnish, as it was largely based on the south-western dialects. These dialects were influenced also by Estonian, especially with respect to apocope. This phenomenon has been treated above all by O. Nikkilä 1988 (see also L. Hakulinen 1943). Apocope, however, was not at all so common in Ljungo as in Agricola. As Rapola (1965, 335) states, Ljungo's language might have had a much greater influence on the development of Finnish literary language (e.g. as regards apocope), if printing, which had been started in 1610, had not been interrupted. Apocope seemed to be diminishing among the writers of the early 17th century. So, e.g., in Sorolainen it is much less frequent compared to Agricola (see Rapola 1965, 335). Apocope, however, seemed to become more popular again in the Bible of 1642. Most members of the translating committee were in fact from South-Western Finland. This evolution continued for a long time, but apocope became less frequent among the writers of the 18th century. Vhael began to oppose apocopated forms in his "Grammatica Fennica", branding it a dialectal feature typical of Turku, or, anyhow, as some other limited dialectal form. Lizelius had already eliminated nearly all the forms with apocope in the version of the Bible edited by him in 1758, although he still preserved it in some cases, e.g., in conditional clauses, in the third person singular, and in the ending of the possessive suffix of the 2nd person singular (see Rapola 1965, 337). In modern spoken Finnish there is a tendency to use these kinds of contracted forms, e.g. particularly in the third person singular conditional: *tulis jo* 'wouldn't he come already', *hän haluais puhua teille* 'he would like to talk to you'. It is natural to think that this kind of "economy

in articulation" was common also in the 17th century colloquial speech and thus did not reflect solely dialectal forms. Ljungo's lesser use of apocopated forms was probably due to his own dialectal basis. Malin (1886) does not pay any particular attention to these apocopated forms in his writing dealing with Ljungo's language. He mentions only that the third person possessive suffix is mostly in a shorter form *-ns* (see p. 10). Furthermore, Malin states that some case endings are often in contracted shape (see p. 8), like e.g. the illative *kasvoin* 'to the face', the inessive *menosa* 'going', *kyrkos* 'in church', the elative *takauxest* 'on security'. The last two cases represent actually apocopated forms and not the contracted ones. As a matter of fact it is strange that Malin does not pay much attention to apocope considering that the forms without apocope were almost established already in the 19th century literary language.

O. Nikkilä (1988:94) deals with the apocopated cases in Agricola's language and has shown them to be much more regular as thought earlier. A certain regularity in apocopated forms can be noted also in Ljungo. As regards the different morphological structures it occurs most in connection with the inner local cases (cf. Agricola, see O. Nikkilä 1988:95). In Ljungo's text apocope occurs sometimes only in the determiner (more rarely to the contrary).

Examples:

<i>omas waldakunasa</i>	(p. 151)
'in the own realm'	
<i>samas laisa</i>	(p. 154)
'in the same law'	
<i>misä paikas</i>	(p. 158)
'in which place'	

The forms with apocope both in the head and its determiner are, however, much more common.

Examples:

<i>colmannes käräiäs</i>	(p. 70)
'in the third district court'	

<i>ensimmäises pitäiän cokouxis</i>	(p. 71)
‘in the first parish meeting’	
<i>oikeas satamas</i>	(p.118)
‘in the right harbour’	
<i>caxis maxois</i>	(p.158)
‘in two payments’	

Compare with Sorolainen:

<i>sinun rucouxisa</i>	(I:25)
‘in your prayers’	
<i>fangiudes</i>	(I:88)
‘in detention’	
<i>taiwalises majestetisa ia cunniasa</i>	(I:156)
‘in heavenly majesty and honour’	
<i>täsä vangeliumis</i>	(II:429)
‘in this Gospel’	

These examples, which I have picked out of Ljungo’s text, show that about 50% of the inessive forms occur with apocope. Variation in the inessive case ending is also common in Ljungo, as the abovementioned examples reveal. That kind of variation is typical of old literary Finnish: the single *s* in the inessive ending *sa*, *sä* appears together with the double *s* variant *ssa*, *ssä*, or with apocope (-*s*) (*kyrkosa* - *kyrkossa* - *kyrkos* ‘in church’). This single -*s* inessive is typical of Northern Ostrobothnian littoral dialects, as Lehikoinen and Kiuru (1990:127) affirm (see also Rapola 1990:129).

A certain hierarchy comes out in the apocope of the inner local cases as in Agricola (cf. Nikkilä 1988:96). Also in Ljungo apocope is most common in the inessive endings. This might depend on Southern Ostrobothnian dialectal influence, where the inessive is used with apocope (see Lehikoinen - Kiuru 1990:127 and Rapola 1990:126). The frequency of the apocopated forms in the elative case endings is around 30%.

Examples:

- oikeudest... kiriast* (p. 111)
 'from justice... from book'
- jos eläimen kaupast cannellan* (p. 131)
 'if one complains about the purchase
 of an animal'
- foudist, Bargmestarist ja radhimiehistä* (p. 141)
 'from bailiff, burgomaster and magistrates'

Compare that with Sorolainen:

- ..jotca odotit Messiaxen tulemist..* (I:223)
 'who waited for the coming of Crist'

The relative endings, too, appear with or without apocope in the same clauses as the inessive endings. As to the external local cases they appear nearly always without apocope in Ljungo as in Agricola (see Lehtikoinen - Kiuru 1990:111).

As regards the apocope of the possessive suffixes, the examples we find in Ljungo's text are limited almost exclusively to the third person pronoun, which naturally appears most of all in this kind of text, nearly regularly with apocope. This reflects thus the general tendency in old literary Finnish until the 18th century, when it gradually started to decrease (see Lehtikoinen - Kiuru 1990:137).

Examples:

- hänen irtaimesta calustans* (p. 24)
 'of his personal property'
- heidän mielesäns* (p. 66)
 'in their minds'
- mistatkan oikean kätens* (p.105)
 'may he lose his right hand'
- hänen cansans* (p.133)
 'his people'
- hän on rickonut hengens ja irtaimen calunsa*
 (p.146)
 'he has broken his mind and personal property'

Compare with Sorolainen:

<i>hänen seurakundan</i>	(I:14)
'his congregation'	
<i>heidän syndiäns</i>	(II:610)
'their sins'	

There is variation also in this morphological category as revealed by the examples. Thus forms with or without apocope may appear in the same clause.

As regards the verbs, the third person singular conditional appears often with apocope (see O. Nikkilä 1988:104).

Examples:

<i>mies olis tainnut</i>	(p. 71)
'the man might have'	
<i>kuka heistä sen tekis</i>	(p. 160)
'which of them would do it'	
<i>iocu mw mies tahdois tappaian wariella</i>	(p. 112)
'someone else would like to protect the killer'	
<i>ebkä Isändä olis andanut</i>	(p. 160)
'the master might have given'	

Compare this with Sorolainen:

<i>ettei me epäelis</i>	(I:238)
'that we would not doubt'	
<i>meitä caickia pyhällä hengelläns ballitsis</i>	(I:60)
'would govern us all with his Holy Spirit'	

The examples which I have compiled from the Dialect Archives in Helsinki show that apocope may appear sporadically also in the dialects of Kainuu. Apocope occurs generally after the *s* in the numerals (*yks*, *kaks*) and with some verbs in the third person singular of the past tense.

Examples:

<i>üks päevä</i>
'one day'

vähäh huokas se isäntäh
 'that master sighed a little'

These examples have hardly any connection with Ljungo's apocope, which was evidently based on the model of old literary Finnish, except for the inessive form, which has clearly been influenced by the Southern Ostrobothnian dialect as noted before (see p.4).

THE NEGATIVE FORM

In Ljungo's texts there is the same negative form that was typical of old literary Finnish, but different from the modern standard Finnish.

I. Savijärvi (1969, 1977) has treated this matter thoroughly. He gives examples of negation in the 16th and 17th centuries and states that its paradigm was still fairly unestablished at the beginning of the 17th century. Most writers have both congruent and incongruent forms (see I. Savijärvi 1969:256, G. Karlsson 1965:15).

I have noticed through a detailed analysis of Ljungo's texts that the incongruent negative form occurs above all in the third person plural, which is natural considering the fact that the 3rd person is dominating in this kind of text as noted before (see p.5). Thus the 3rd person plural takes nearly regularly the 3rd person singular negative form *ei*.

Examples:

- | | |
|--|----------|
| <i>..jos ei he siben sovi</i> | (p. 69) |
| 'if they are not adapt to it..' | |
| <i>ja ei mahda he nijn raketa</i> | (p. 74) |
| 'and they cannot build that way' | |
| <i>jos ei ne täytä</i> | (p. 147) |
| 'if they won't fill' | |
| <i>Ettei he mahda aviokesky kieltä</i> | (p. 157) |
| 'So that they cannot deny the marriage acts' | |
| <i>Ei he saa enämbiä</i> | (p. 164) |
| 'They won't have any more' | |

Compare this with Sorolainen:

<i>Eij he kysyneet</i>	(I:50)
'They did not ask'	
<i>..iota ettei te tunne</i>	(I:128)
'whom you do not know'	
<i>..iota sinä ei ole saanut</i>	(I:132)
'that you have not had'	
<i>Ettei he sitä sano</i>	(II:195)
'That they do not say it'	

Notice that in Sorolainen the 3rd person singular negative form was commonly used in all the persons according to the rules of old literary Finnish.

As Ljungo's examples show the negation is often placed at the beginning of the clause. Savijärvi (1969, 124) states that in Northern Ostrobothnian dialects the incongruent negation often precedes the personal pronoun: *ei minä tule* 'I do not come', etc. For comparison I have picked up some dialectal examples from the Dialect Archives.

Pudasjärvi:

<i>ei minä os sitä nähnü kuinka</i>	
<i>tehdään eräs kuviokudonta</i>	
'I have not seen how one fancy weave is done'	
<i>ei kaim me naura</i>	
'we won't laugh, will we'	
<i>ei ne ossaa ne nüküajan ihmiset</i>	
'the modern people are not able'	

Ljungo's incongruent negative form reflects thus his own dialectal basis and generally agrees with the old literary Finnish usage.²

²Malin states about Ljungo's negation (p. 13): Ljungo T. uses the negation somewhat carefreely, thus he says e.g.: *ei attako enembä* 'may they not take more'.

The expansion of the incongruent 3rd person negative form into all the persons may depend on its markedness status. As Fred Karlsson states (1977, 379) the 3rd person singular is the basic person. Let us not forget that also in modern spoken Finnish use of incongruent negation is common: *ei me tulla* 'we do not come', *ei ne ole uusia* 'they are not new' etc., so why not in the 17th century already.

SOME DIALECTAL FEATURES IN LJUNGO'S TEXT

Ljungo uses very frequently intervocalic *b*, which was typical also of other old writers. This characteristic prevailed for quite a long time together with the forms without *b*. In old literary Finnish this depended largely on the model given by the writers who were from Häme and northern dialect areas. The preservation of the *b* after a short vowel without main stress in these dialects dates back to Proto-Finnic (see Lehtikoinen-Kiuru 1990, 108, 109).

Examples:

<i>lyömähän</i>	(p. 105)
'into beating' (illative)	
<i>huonehen</i>	(p. 105)
'of the room' (genitive)	
<i>samahan kiblakundan</i>	(p. 108)
'to the same rural district' (illative)	
<i>cothobon</i>	(p. 135)
'home' (illative)	

Ljungo has also forms where the vowel before *b* has disappeared: e.g. *täythen* 'full' illative (p. 167). This is a common Ostrobothnian dialect feature (see Rapola 1990, 126).

A matter which has not drawn much attention before in old literary Finnish is the preservation of a long vowel in Ljungo in some cases. Thus the diphthongizing of long vowels had not been carried out fully at his time. We can find this kind of orthography also in Agricola (see Lehtikoinen-Kiuru 1990, 77), which may have influenced Ljungo's language, but it is justified to think that in his

native dialect the long vowels had been partly preserved. This is obvious considering the archaistic character of the Northern Ostrobothnian dialects.

Examples:

<i>coole</i>	(pp. 163, 164, 167)
'to die'	
<i>öötä</i>	(pp. 165, 170, 177)
'night' (partitive)	

Ljungo represents thus the old standpoint of Finnish language. These *uo*, *yö* -diphthongs are namely not very old, but they may have developed first in the Middle Ages of the earlier *oo* and *öö*, as Rapola states (1990, 60)

In a few cases Ljungo's texts display also a svarabhakti vowel, which is a common feature in the Central and Northern Ostrobothnian dialects (see Rapola 1990, 129, 130).

Examples:

<i>talavi</i>	(p. 103)
'winter'	
<i>sykysyn</i>	(p. 103)
'in the autumn'	
<i>perebens</i>	(pp. 103, 104)
'his family'	
<i>perebestä</i>	(p. 104)
'from the family'	

In other texts of old literary Finnish this kind of forms cannot be found. Neither does Ljungo use this anaptyctic vowel so commonly as one might expect considering his dialectal provenience.

As stated above Ljungo's language is based also on the tradition of older literary Finnish. This is hardly surprising. His idiom is just another example of the typical case in which the author is drawn between his dialect and the standard of his day.

REFERENCES

- HAKULINEN, LAURI
1943 *Suomen ja viron eroista ja yhtäläisyyksistä*. Helsinki.
- KARLSSON, FRED
1977 *Syntaktisten kongruenssijärjestelmien luonteesta ja funktiosta*, in "Virittäjä", 359-389.
- KARLSSON, GÖRAN
1965 *Piirteitä suomen yleiskielen kehityksestä 1900-luvulla*, in "Virittäjä", 9-17.
- LEHIKONEN, LAILA - KIURU, SILVA
1989 *Kirjasuomen kehitys*. Helsinki.
- MALIN
1886 *Kielellinen ja sanastollinen tutkimus Ljungo Tuomaanpojan lainkäännöksistä*. Helsinki.
- NIKKILÄ, OSMO
1985 *Apocope und altes Schriftfinnisch. Zur Geschichte der i-Apocope des Finnischen*. Groningen.
1988 *Agricolan kieli ja teokset loppubeiton valossa*, in "Mikael Agricolan kieli". Juva.
- PENTTILÄ, AARNI
1926 *W.G. Laguksen julkaisema Ljungo Tuomaanpojan lainkäännös*, in "Virittäjä", 71-75.
- RAPOLA, MARTTI
1965 *Suomen kirjakielen historia I*. SKS:n Toimituksia 197. Tampere.
1990 *Jobdatus suomen murteistin*. Vaasa.
- SAVIJÄRVI, ILKKA
1969 *Kieltoverbin yleismoduksen paradigma suomen kielessä*. Helsinki.
1977 *Itämerensuomalaisten kielten kieltoverbi*. Helsinki.
- SUHONEN, RIITTA
1977 *Ljungo Tuomaanpojan lainsuomennokset*, in "Virittäjä", 338-339.
- SOROLAINEN, EERIK
1988 *Kaksiosainen postilla 1621, 1625*. Facsimile Helsinki.
- ULKUNIEMI, MARTTI
1975 *Ljungo Tuomaanpojan lainsuomennokset. I. Maanlain ja kaupunkilain teksti*. SKS:n Toimituksia 319. Vaasa.
- VHAEL, BARTHOLDUS
1968 *Grammatica Fennica*, Turku 1733. Facsimile Helsinki.