The soft /-r-/ and some words common to Lithuanian and Latvian
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Abstract

Some atlas pages are selected to illustrate phenomena common to the Lithuanian and Latvian atlases.

(1) For West Latvian dialects, data from Lettische Grammatik (1922) are used, combined with later information. The softened r-sound is now only spoken in part of Western Latvia, while precise information for Lithuanian is lacking.

(2) On the terms for ‘juniper’ in Latvia, data are taken from the author’s map for kadiķis, as well as for kadags (with variants).

(3) Krūpas alongside with krūpis (‘toad’) covers the northwest Lithuanian dialects, and adjoins a certain krūpis region in Latvia.

1. An Atlas of Latvian grammar and pronunciation is being prepared, although not yet published. In this contribution, I give a few examples of the geographical distribution of sounds and words, comparing my own results with that in the corresponding Lithuanian Atlas.

In most dialects of Latvian, the softened /χ/ has disappeared. However, it is still being used in the western Latvian dialects. Map I illustrates the Western part of Latvia with the present distribution of the softened /χ/ in Latvian. In Lettische Grammatik (1922) it is stated that the soft /χ/ was

1Rūķe (1947); Rūķe-Draviņa (1954).
used even in the areas West of Riga and in old times also around Jelgava (86. ȓ, ƅ̑, ȓj̑). The present distribution has been drawn according to the Atlas of Latvian and partly on my own observations. The Latvian Atlas, which is not yet published, is difficult to compare with the published Lithuanian Atlas work.

The soft /ȓ/ has been retained only in one part of western Latvia, and mere remnants can be found in the whole northern part. Previously, the eastern border line went approximately through Džūkste-Dobele, but the population structure in this area was largely destroyed during World War II. The disappearance of /ȓ/ has gone very rapidly.

In the northern part of this region in Kurland, the pronunciation has not been pattern uniform. The most rigid use of /ȓ/ can be found in the districts extending approximately from Stende to Nica. Nevertheless, in Nica the soft /ȓ/ is nowadays used only by the oldest and partly the middle aged population. In the dialects of Lestene (between Saldus and Dobele) even in the year 1944 there was no consistent softening rule.

For Lithuanian, there are no maps of -ȓ in Lietuvių kalbos atlasas and a question on /ȓ/ was not included in the Questionnaires used for preparing this atlas. The pronunciation of the hard consonant ȓ instead of the soft consonant in the Žemaitian dialects is recorded by V. Vitkauskas: “The line goes eastwards and to the north of Kurišniai, to the north of Raudenai, Tryškiai, Žarėnai, Silalė, Krašiai and approaches Tytuvėnai”, i.e. depalatalization of the soft r appeared in the northern part of Žemaitian. Even Z. Zinkevičius mentions the fact that the soft r does not occur only in the southern Aukštaitian dialects, there is a hard consonant even in the Varmai dialect of Žemaitian. V. Grinaveckis mentions some Žemaitian dialects where r has been hardened.

Thus, we do not know exactly in which regions the /ȓ/ is used; no maps exist.

Cf. map I for the distribution of the softened /ȓ/ in Latvian.

---

3Endzelis (1923), Endzelins (1951); Rūķe-Draviņa (1940, especially 75, 91-93).
4Birzniecena (1959:306, 324); Filologa biedrības raksti III, 103, VIII, 118; XII, 71; XVI, 97; XX, 42; XX, 91-93.
8Grinaveckis (1973:315).
2. The Latvian (Curonian) *kadiķis* 'juniper' (etc.), Lithuanian *kadagys* (etc.) and Prussian *kadegis* occupy a common western part of this Baltic area. In the whole eastern part of Lithuania, several variants of *ėglis* 'juniper' are used instead, which all together occupy a common *ēgliukas, aglis* etc.\(^9\)

In Latvian there are three different main groups for 'juniper': *kadiķis* in Kurzeme and Auģizeme, *paeglis* (with many subgroups in Vidzeme and Latgale), and *ē(r)cis // ėrķis* in some northern parts of Kurzeme around Dundaga. The present map illustrates the western part of Latvia - for the first time since the *Lettische Grammatik* (1922) - and shows the forthcoming changes in respect to the position. The program has gone much more rapidly. The soft /ɛ/ has been retained only in one part of western Latvia and there are only remnants in the whole northern part. The western line about Dažkste is only the eastern line which shows the military war-line about ca 1946-1948; it was an unstable one. What needs to be stressed here is that the changes are relatively different. The most rigid forms are in the districts extending approximately from Stende to Nica, but even in the area where these forms occur we find many aged people giving forms without /ɛ/ sounds. On the northern side of the Daugava there has been a parallel use with *kadiķis* and *paeglis*, for example in Koknese and Iļģiķile. Thus, the whole western Baltic region, with the exception of one northern Latvian part, is dominated by *kadiķis, kadagys, kadegis*.

In Lithuanian, the whole western area is occupied by *kadagys // kadagis*, but more to the east and the south we find *kadugys // kaduģis*. In some places and in West Lithuania, and in a more concentrated way in the middle and eastern part of Lithuania, there is also *verbs*.

Cf. map II for the distribution of *kadiķis* and *ē(r)cis* and map III for the distribution of *kadagys* (and *verbs*).

\(^9\)Rūķe-Draviņa (1956).
The soft /t/ and some words common to Lithuanian and Latvian

3. In part of northwest Lithuania, the word krūpis ‘toad’ is used, sometimes along with krupe. In an adjacent region (Map 4) there is parallel use of kru- and krupe.-

When continuing into southwest Latvia, the same word occurs in Latvian dialects, which use the softened -t: krūpis (cf. in Asite and Nica).10

In Latvia, in the south-west region, together with the Lithuanian kru- and krupe- region there is a common region of krūpis.

Cf. map IV for the distribution of krūpis, kriūpe and krūpis, krupe ‘toad’.

---

References


Endzelins, J. (1922), Lettische Grammatik, Riga: A. Gulbis.


Grinaveckis, V. (1973), Žemaicių tarmių istorija, Vilnius.


Lietuvių kalbos atlasas II. Fonētika, Vilnius (1982).


Docentbacken 3  Velta Rūkė–Draviņa
S-10405 Stockholm

Linguistica Baltica 1 (1992), 63-69

Lithuanian in East Prussia
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Abstract

The paper gives a brief survey of the history of the Lithuanian language in Lithuania Minor, special attention being paid to the consequences of the incorporation of former East Prussia into the Soviet Union.

The territories inhabited by Lithuanians and later conquered by the Teutonic Order were eventually called Mažoji Lietuva (Lithuania Minor). The term must have been used for the first time by Simon Grunau (died about 1530) in the chronicle of the beginning of the 16th century (Kleinlitau). We also find it in the Prussian Chronicle by Luke David (1503–1583), and in the 18th century the term was used by A. Lucanus. In the newly formed state of Prussia the territory inhabited by Lithuanians was referred to as Lietuvos provincija, lietuviškoji sritis, lietuviški valsčiai, etc. It was also referred to simply as Lietuva (Germ. Litauen) or Prūsų Lietuva (Germ. Preußisch–Litauen).

Owing to forced Germanization carried out on a state scale from 1872 Lithuanian was declining rapidly at the end of the 19th century and in the 20th century. By order of the authorities its use was banned in schools, offices and, in general, in public life. An attempt was made to stop its use in the church as well. But the hardest blow was dealt to Lithuanian under Hitler. Nearly all Lithuanian settlements were given German names.

The least affected was Lithuanian in those areas of Lithuania Minor which in 1923 were incorporated into the Republic of Lithuania, i.e. in the region of Klaipėda (Germ. Memelgebiet). However, at the end of World War II a