Recent developments in Latvian dialectology: A review article

ANNA DAUGAVET
St Petersburg State University

TRUMPA, EDMUNDS. *Latviešu ģeolingvistikas etīdes* [Studies in Latvian Dialect Geography]. Rīga: Zinātne, 2012, 255p., 16 maps. ISBN 978–9984–879–34–5

SARKANIS, ALBERTS. *Latviešu valodas dialektu atlants. Fonētika. Apraksts, kartes un to komentāri* [Latvian Dialect Atlas. Phonetics. Description, Maps and Commentaries]. Rīga: LU Latviešu valodas institūts, 2013, 304p. ISBN 978–9984–742–68–7

1. Introduction

The last year saw the appearance of two significant contributions to the study of Latvian dialects. These are the phonology part of the Latvian Dialect Atlas prepared by Alberts Sarkanis (2013) and *Latviešu ģeolingvistikas etīdes* by Edmunds (Edmundas) Trumpa (2012a). The two are very different in their aims and methods, even though both deal with phonetic isoglosses of traditional rural dialects. In fact, traditional rural dialects are still considered as the only object of research by Latvian dialectologists in spite of the considerable changes to the field elsewhere, marked by the breakdown of the barriers between dialectology and sociolinguistics (see e.g. Chambers & Trudgill 2004 and Auer & Schmidt 2010). However, of the two reviewed books, Trumpa (2012a) seems to be closer to the modern understanding of research into language and space, and therefore his work can be seen as a promise of changes in Latvian dialectology, whereas Sarkanis (2013) almost entirely belongs to the traditional approach. Nevertheless, in the context of Trumpa's rather innovative book, Sarkanis' Phonological Atlas serves as a summary of achievements from the previous stage. For this reason, I prefer to start my review with Sarkanis (2013) and then proceed to Trumpa (2012a).

My discussion of each of the contributions is not going to be exactly parallel, because, in spite of being devoted to the same subject, they present different genres. While Sarkanis (2013) is a dialect atlas, Trumpa

(2012a) is a collection of three interrelated studies focusing on methodological issues. After reviewing each of the two authors, I will devote a separate section to the English summaries in both publications, followed by a brief conclusion.

2. The Phonological Atlas by Alberts Sarkanis

Sarkanis (2013) presents a long-awaited continuation of the Latvian Dialect Atlas, whose first volume, supervised by Benita Laumane, appeared in 1999 (Laumane 1999). As is often the case with dialect atlases, the preparatory work started many decades ago, involving several generations of Latvian dialectologists. Sarkanis (2013) finalizes the work done by his predecessors. Both Sarkanis (2013) and Laumane (1999) publish data collected in the second half of the 20th century using a specifically designed questionnaire (Šmite 1954). The latter contained 670 questions on various aspects of a language system, including 103 questions on phonetics, namely, 15 questions on prosody, 56 on vocalism, and 32 on consonantism. Apart from showing results from the Questionnaire, Sarkanis (2013) also accumulates dialect data from a vast range of both published and unpublished sources over the span of more than a hundred years. The outcome is an extensive collection making possible further research in various directions. But since Sarkanis (2013) is, in a sense, a culmination of traditional Latvian dialectology, it also inherits its weaknesses, which I will discuss further.

I will start with an extralinguistic issue pertaining to the general design of Sarkanis (2013), and then proceed to its structure and the contents and arrangement of maps in it. The following sections are given to the visual characteristics of maps, their type (display vs. interpretive), and the representation of regular and individual sound changes. The last section is about the information in the commentaries, followed by a short conclusion.

All examples from Sarkanis (2013) are given in the transcription used by Latvian dialectologists.

2.1. General design

Sarkanis (2013) is traditional in that it only exists in a paper version and

its maps, although not exactly hand-drawn, are not generated from a database as it is done in many modern atlases. About new possibilities that computerization presents to linguistic cartography, see Lameli, Kehren & Rabanus (2010). There are no sound recordings coming together with the book, either. But the current volume on phonology also differs from the previous one on lexicon (Laumane 1999) by having the maps bound together with the text. This results in smaller maps, but they are still large enough not to inconvenience the reader. Unfortunately, the fact that the maps are fastened together makes it rather cumbersome for the reader to examine more than two maps at a time, and even this is possible only if the relevant maps happen to be located on two pages that face each other. The same problem is encountered if one tries to examine a map and simultaneously consult the commentaries on that particular map, which may be a hundred pages away. Those readers who are less patient may be sorely tempted to destroy the binding in the process.

Forestalling the discussion, I shall say that this problem would have probably never arisen if the arrangement of the maps were not so mechanistic. There are other linguistic atlases with a fixed order of maps, for example, Labov, Ash & Boberg (2006), but their maps actually serve as illustrations for the text, which, in turn, has a more coherent structure than the sum of individual commentaries for each of the maps in Sarkanis (2013). Such a collection of unconnected maps and commentaries, as presented by the current work, would be of much better use for researchers if the data were digitalized and users were allowed to create their own maps with the help of a special programme, probably combining answers to more than one question on the same map. According to García Mouton, Heap & Perea (2012), an example of such atlas is going to be revealed in the computerized version of the *Atlas Lingüístico de la Península Ibérica*. But of course, this would be an entirely different work from what I'm going to review now.

2.2. Structure

Sarkanis (2013) contains 114 maps illustrating the geographical distribution of individual sounds or sound patterns, preceded by four introductory maps numbered in Roman numerals. Map ɪ displays the well-established classification of Latvian dialects; map ɪɪ gives the borders of the four his-

torical regions of Latvia, as well as the borders of civil parishes (*pagasti*) traditionally identified with subdialects (*izloksnes*); map III shows which subdialects are reflected in published sources. Map IV is more in line with the rest of the Atlas in that it deals with specific dialect data, representing the grouping of Latvian dialects according to their tone systems. Maps 1–9, also dealing with tones, can be seen as a logical continuation of map IV. Maps 10–82 provide information on vowels, and maps 83–114 on consonants.

2.2.1. Text part

Maps are preceded by a text part, containing what I will call the introduction as well as commentaries for each of the maps. Both the introduction and the commentaries have an abridged English version, which I will further refer to as 'summaries'. The introduction tells us about the history of the Latvian Dialect Atlas and describes its underlying principles covering the collection of data, the contents and design of maps. The information on the development of the Atlas is reduced in comparison with the Lexical Atlas (Laumane 1999), which is referred to as the main source. The text of the introduction often repeats formulations from the introduction to Laumane (1999), among other things the passage that actually sets the author free from the blame for many issues that I am going to discuss further—namely, that the Atlas data are incomplete and that some facts may have passed into the final version unchecked.

The introduction includes the information about transcription, the abbreviations, and the list of civil parishes with their corresponding numbers. Apart from the list of sources, it also contains a special section in which each of the subdialects is supplied with references to published materials. But at the same time, the author admits that the number and exact borders of subdialects are disputable, which is another traditional formulation transported from Laumane (1999). Since subdialects form the basis for both the collection and the representation of data (each map is drawn against the background of what is believed to be the borders of subdialects), this admission casts considerable doubt on the results presented in Sarkanis (2013). This problem is thoroughly discussed in Trumpa (2012a), and I will return to it later.

The introduction does not mention any theoretical issues with respect

to either the phonological processes concerned or their areal distribution, and the traditional repetition of the general claim that Latvian dialects are, to a certain extent, a continuation of languages spoken by earlier Baltic tribes cannot count as such. The definition of dialect (*dialekts*) as an aggregation of subdialects sharing common phonological, grammatical and lexical features seems unsatisfactory as it does not state the exact number and values of such features. I find the same flaw in the definition of 'transitional' subdialects, where the latter are claimed to be attributed to one of the bordering dialects on the basis of their 'dominant features', although there is no clue as to how 'dominant' features are set apart from 'non-dominant' ones.

2.2.2. Maps

Map I on the classification and the borders of Latvian dialects and map IV on the areal distribution of tones are very similar to maps I and II in Laumane (1999)—if one ignores the fact that the maps in Sarkanis (2013) are richer in colours. Although the dialect borders on map I in both atlases are claimed to follow the map in Rudzīte (1993), they both deviate from it in many minor details, although the map in Sarkanis (2013) has more deviations from Rudzīte's original map than the one in Laumane (1999). Even though no explanation of the deviations is offered, one can notice that both atlases tend to 'amend' the dialect areas so that there would be a fewer number of *pagasti* with a territory crossed by a dialect border. The classification itself, traditional as it is, receives no attention in either the commentaries or the introduction, which is not surprising in the context of other works on Latvian dialects. If the reader is diligent enough to compare the dialect areas on map I with the geographical distribution of variables on maps 1–114, they will discover that none of the isoglosses conforms with the dialect borders. As Andronovs (2006) points out, grouping of subdialects into a dialect in Latvian linguistics is normally based on several features, which suggests that a dialect border must be defined by different isoglosses at different points. A similar problem arises if the reader tries to compare map IV showing the areal distribution of different tonal systems[1] with maps 1–9 reflecting the variation of tones in particular lexical items.

---

[1] It is a pity that map IV does not reflect comments and suggestions by Andronov (1996).

Map II gives the borders of the four historical regions of Latvia, which partly falls in line with the traditional allusion to the influence of Baltic and Finnic tribes on Latvian dialects. It would have been even better to complement it with maps of actual territories occupied by these tribes according to archaeological findings and medieval sources; cf. maps I–IV in the Russian Dialect atlas (Avanesov 1986). Map III provides valuable information about which subdialects are reflected in published sources.

Further, I will only speak about maps 1–114, dedicated to various phonological variables. The ratio of maps for vowels to those for consonants (73 vs. 30) is reminiscent of the one in the Lithuanian Dialect atlas (79 vs. 25) (Grinaveckienė 1982), which may lead to the thought that Girdenis and Zinkevičius' (2000 [1966], 46) view on Lithuanian dialectal variation as determined by vowels rather than consonants also holds for Latvian.[2]

2.3. Contents of the maps

The contents and arrangement of maps for the most part reflect the peculiarities of the Questionnaire (the number of the corresponding question is given under the title of each map), although Sarkanis (2013) also uses the data that originally come from the morphological part of the Questionnaire. The result is, however, still far from what one would expect from a phonological atlas, which is supposed to reflect the most important phonetic processes. It is not difficult to notice that Sarkanis (2013) favours some of the possible variables and disregards others without offering any justification for these choices.

The section on vowels concentrates around the development of stressed root syllables (maps 10–65) whereas unstressed suffixes and endings (maps 66–82) are only presented with a few maps. The infinitive suffixes (maps 79–82) are affiliated with inflectional endings under the pretext of both being 'final syllables'. This goes against a well-established fact of the Baltic languages that derivational suffixes, even if they occur in the final position in a word, group together with word-medial syllables with respect to many phonological processes and do not undergo the changes found in inflectional elements; cf. Rudzīte (1964) who only treats endings

---

[2] One could compare both Baltic atlases with the Russian one (Avanesov 1986) where the numbers of maps on vowels and consonants are roughly equal (43 vs. 49).

as 'final syllables'. Prefixes are simply ignored in Sarkanis (2013), as well as unstressed root syllables—the only exception is maps 39–40 displaying both stressed and unstressed vocalism of the negation *ne-*.

The section on consonants gives a very detailed account on processes which are in one or other way associated with *j* and other palatal consonants (maps 83–101), the rest of the maps (102–114) being concerned with various instances of assimilation, dissimilation, metathesis, as well as consonant insertion and deletion. Some of these changes are irregular and only pertain to certain lexical items, such as *bedre > brede* 'pit' and *caurums > caumurs* 'hole' (map 106), *burvis > buris* 'wizard' and *cirvis > ciris* 'axe' (map 107), *kaste > skaste* 'box' and *krasts > skrasts* 'shore' (map 109), *maiss > maikss* 'sack' and *īss > īkss* 'short' (map 111).

Some of the most important phonetic processes either do not make their way into Sarkanis (2013) or appear only fractionally. With the exception of map 39 for *ne·viens* 'nobody', there is no information about non-initial stress, even though it is known to be more widespread in dialects in comparison with Standard Latvian; see Rudzīte (1964, 155–165, 262–263). The regular lengthening of voiceless consonants is never mentioned, either in the intervocalic position after stressed short vowels,[3] as in *lapa* 'leaf' (actually *lappa*), or as a result of compensatory lengthening after apocope, as in *lapa > lap̄*;[4] see Rudzīte (1964, 84, 150). (Map 114 labelled as 'long consonants' actually deals with syllabic sonorants.) Secondary tones, e.g. *kâtus > kâ:ts* 'shaft' (ACC.PL), which can sometimes develop before voiceless consonants in apocopated words according to Šmite (1928), as well as Grauds-Graudevics (1927) and Ēvalde (1940), are posited by Sarkanis (2013) as non-existent. Apocope (reduction and subsequent loss of short vowels in endings) is only illustrated on the basis of feminine nominative singular forms like *daba* 'nature', *kaza* 'goat', *ruoka* 'hand; arm' and *lapa* 'leaf' on maps 70–71, which tells us nothing about the other short vowels and in other endings, for example *zeme* 'earth; land', *zemes* (GEN.SG), *zemi* (ACC.SG), *brālis* 'brother', and so on. Syncope, that is the dropping of vowels in the middle of the word, as in *kumeļam > kūmļam* 'colt' (Rudzīte 1964, 175), is entirely absent from

---

[3] For some reason, this important process is traditionally ignored even in transcription.

[4] This is the traditional interpretation, probably influenced by the inconsistent transcription of words like *lapa*. It seems more likely, however, that the lengthened consonant is inherited from the disyllabic form, i.e. *lappa > lap̄*.

Sarkanis (2013), and so are any data on palatalization of consonants before front vowels, as in **vesti* > *v́eśt́* 'lead' (INF); see Rudzīte (1964, 186–187, 302–303).

In some instances, information is too scarce to be used in research. Even if the diphthongization of *ī*, as in *vīrs* > *veirs* 'husband' (map 48), can be traced in both stressed and unstressed position due to the presence of map 67 for *barība* > *bareiba* 'nourishment', showing an unstressed suffix with *ī*, there is no map for unstressed *ū*—cf. the stressed syllable in *cūka* > *ceuka, cyuka, couka* 'pig' (map 49). Particularly puzzling is the absence of any map for the infinitive suffix -*īt* (Should the *ī* in *barība* compensate for it?), since the other infinitive suffixes are displayed in two sets of maps, the first one showing their tones (maps 7–9), and the second one the development of the vowels (maps 79–82).

2.4. Arrangement of the maps

The grouping of maps is not entirely consistent, as in some cases it is based on the phonetic similarity of sounds, and in other cases on the nature of the process itself. The first approach seems unsatisfactory because it leads to placing the numerous maps on the variation between open *ę, ę̄* and closed *e, ē* (maps 23–45) so that they interrupt the sequence of maps depicting the results of the High Latvian vowel shift. It would be more logical to put the variation between open *ę, ę̄* and closed *e, ē* (as well as the change *i > y*) in the same section with maps which reflect the results of the palatal modification (*palatālā pārskaņa*, maps 55–57), since both processes involve assimilation of vowels under the influence of the next syllable. For instance, the vowel *e* is open in *zęmu* 'low' (ACC.SG) before *u* and closed in *zemi* 'earth' (ACC.SG) before *i*, and the same conditions are found in the development of *i* into the central unrounded *y* in *mizu* > *myzu* 'bark' (ACC.SG) as compared to *vilki* 'wolves'. Similarly, the palatal modification of *acis* > *äcis* or *aᵉcis* 'eyes' and *upe* > *uⁱpe* 'river' takes place before a front vowel. A close examination of the area on map 36 where the root vowel in *vęci tę̄vi* 'old fathers' assimilates to the vowel in the ending (*veci tēvi* with the closed *e, ē*), shows that this territory coincides with the area where the palatal modification is found. On the other hand, the placement of the variation between open *ę, ę̄* and closed *e, ē* together with the maps on the vowel shift is not without reason, since some of the processes that makes up the vowel shift is also determined by assimilation to

the next syllable, especially the change of the short *a* into *o*, as in *mazu* >
mozu 'small' (ACC.SG). However, what I perceive as a shortcoming of Sar-
kanis (2013) is that it neither discusses the possible connections between
different processes nor explains the order of the maps. Another example
of maps that should be arranged otherwise includes maps 53 and 54 on
ie > *ī* and *uo* > *ū*, which constitute a part of the vowel shift, although in
Sarkanis (2013) they are united with maps depicting the more indepen-
dent changes in diphthongs.

The focus on the process itself is seen in the grouping of maps 59–
65, all reflecting the lengthening of vowels before the tautosyllabic *r*,
e. g. **varna* > *vārna* 'crow'. This approach is also revealed in that this
section is immediately preceded by map 58 on anaptyxis, as in **varna*
> *varana*, which is another version of the same change. The grouping of
maps devoted to consonants is implicitly based on the similarity of the
processes rather than the phonetic affinity of sounds, which I explain by
the fact that consonant changes in Latvian are more contextually deter-
mined, and their classification has to refer to conditions that make up
the pattern of the change. But it must be noted that the application of
this principle is not always successful, either. For example, the affiliation
within the same section, labelled 'assimilation', of such diverse processes
as *pilns* > *pills* 'full' (map 102) and *runga* > *ruŋga* 'club, stout stick' (map
103) appears far-fetched. As for the heading of the groupings, it is not
clear to me why maps 90–101, plotting the variation *kaķis* ~ *kakis* ~ *kačs*
'cats', *dančі* ~ *daņči* 'dances', *ceļs* ~ *ceļš* 'road', *vējs* ~ *vējš* 'wind' are given
the title 'palatalization' (*mīkstināšana*), whereas maps 83–89 on such
forms as *skapjuos* ~ *skapuos* 'wardrobe' (LOC.PL), *lāca* ~ *lāča* 'bear' (GEN.
SG) are simply called 'sequences of consonants and *j*'. It would be more
convenient, perhaps, to regroup the maps in both sections according to
the position in the middle or in the end of the word, that is, *lāca* ~ *lāča*
vs. *vējs* ~ *vējš*.

2.5. Visual characteristics of the maps

Following Laumane (1999) Sarkanis (2013) uses only four colours: yel-
low, red, green, and black. The author claims to use yellow for colour-
ing areas where the value of a variable is the most common and usually
coincides with the standard language. Less common and/or non-standard
variants are shown with various types of hatch and dot pattern in red and,

less frequently, green colour. My impression as a reader shows, however, that it is not easy for the eye to discern the different hatch and dot patterns in the same colour. There is also too much red in some of the maps, which makes me doubt if the yellow area really displays the most common variant. For instance, on map 76 *brālītis* 'small brother' and *latvietis* 'Latvian person', which are the standard forms, are selected for marking with yellow colour, although most dialects clearly favour the shortened forms *brālīts*, *latviets*. The use of the red dot pattern for *vēš* on map 95 is not very judicious because it is almost indistinguishable from the red hatching designating *vē(j)s*. Since the map seems to be specifically designed to show the final consonant in *vē(j)š* vs. *vē(j)s* 'wind', the deletion of *j* in one of the competing forms must be of secondary importance. The contrast between red and black dot pattern on maps 62–65 is so weak that the area with anaptyxis after a tautosyllabic *r* is easily confused with one of the areas where the preceding vowel is lengthened instead.

Another issue that I would like to mention is that it is common for many maps in Sarkanis (2013) to have the same locations marked in more than one way, which means that in such locations more than one variant is found. For example, on map 19 for *tēvs* > *tāvs* or *tāvs* 'father' there are areas that have both the yellow colouring associated with *tēvs* and the hatching assigned to *tāvs*. Other areas combine the hatching for *tāvs* with the dot pattern for *tāvs* or, alternatively, the dot pattern for *tāvs* is laid above the yellow colour for *tēvs*. The most complicated are areas where all the three types of marking are used simultaneously to represent the co-existence of the three variants. (Here I ignore three additional variants on map 19 marked with geometrical symbols.)

One would expect areas with the overlapping marking to be found on the borders of major homogeneous areas, and this is indeed so with map 19, but not all cases are clear-cut. The reasons for marking the same areas in more than one way are diverse. Firstly, the marking is based on information coming from many sources over the span of one hundred years, and certain contradictions between different sources are unavoidable. To some extent, the use of different sources for one map is reflected in the commentaries. Secondly, assigning more than one value to a variable for the same location may be due to not recognizing variation within the traditional subdialects, territorially associated with parishes—an issue discussed in great detail by Trumpa (2012a, 56–62).

2.6. Interpretive vs. display maps

As formulated in Chambers and Trudgill (2004, 25), "[d]isplay maps simply transfer the tabulated responses for a particular item onto a map, putting the tabulation into a geographical perspective. Interpretive maps attempt to make a more general statement, by showing the distribution of predominant variants from region to region." Most of the maps in Sarkanis (2013) are interpretive in that they reflect only one aspect of the pronunciation of items in the heading. For example, map 51 only shows the variation in the diphthong in *saule* 'sun', *braukt* 'go (by vehicle)' while it ignores the differences in the realization of consonants and the unstressed vowel. But Sarkanis (2013) does not differentiate between different vocalic processes in the root, which makes some maps more similar to display maps. Various patterns of distribution of open *ẹ, ẹ̄* and closed *e, ē* on maps 23–45 are conflated with results of a regular shift. In order to correctly read the maps, one has to bear in mind that closed *e, ē* correspond to either open *ẹ, ẹ̄* or closed *e, ie* in High Latvian and open *ẹ, ẹ̄* are turned into *a, ā*. In other words, these maps do not reflect the fact that High Latvian *sẹt* and *siet* 'sow' (INF) on map 24 correspond to Low Latvian *sēt* rather than Low Latvian *sẹt*, which in turn corresponds to High Latvian *sāt*. The three main patterns on map 36, that is, *vẹci tẹ̄vi, veci tēvi* and *vaci tāvi* 'old fathers', are easily reduced to two, since *vẹci tẹ̄vi* and *vaci tāvi* historically represent the same pattern.

The same is true for maps 13–15 and map 66 showing the variation between open *ẹ, ẹ̄* and *a, ā*, as in *sari* vs. *sẹri* 'short stiff hair', *nagla* vs. *nẹgla* 'nail' and *vẹ̄dẹrs* vs. *vēdars* 'abdomen'. High Latvian *vādars* corresponds to Low Latvian *vẹ̄dẹrs*, whereas Low Latvian *vẹ̄dars* is a counterpart of *vādors* in High Latvian. Although the necessary information about the sound correspondences is sometimes provided in the commentaries, it does not make the maps more informative or easier to read. Only on map 17 are both the Low Latvian *āmurs* 'hammer' and its High Latvian correspondences *oamurs, uomurs* marked with the same colour.

One more example of a display map is map 82 where the unstressed suffix of the infinitive in *mẹļuot* 'lie (present false information)' is shown as *-uot* for both Low Latvian and the eastern part of the High Latvian area. Since it is known (and mentioned in the commentaries for the map) that in the eastern area this *-uot* corresponds to the Low Latvian suffix *-āt*,

which replaces the original *-uot* > *-ūt*, the best solution would have been to leave the eastern area blank.

2.7. Regular changes vs. individual history

With few exceptions, each map in Sarkanis (2013) represents results of some phonetic process with the help of one or several words. For example, the labialization of *a* > *o* on map 10 is illustrated by *lapa* 'leaf', *daba* 'nature', *galva* 'head', and the deletion of *j* in *pj* by *skapjuos* 'wardrobe' (LOC.SG) on map 83 and *rupja* 'rough' (GEN.SG.M / NOM.SG.F) on map 84. This is a different solution from what is offered, for example, in the Lithuanian atlas (Grinaveckienė 1982), or especially the Russian atlas (Avanesov 1986), where changes peculiar to certain words are differentiated from across-the-board processes; see Avanesov (1986, 77–78).

The placing of lexical items in the heading of almost every map could lead to a discussion on lexical diffusion and on the extent to which the area in which *lapa* > *låpa* or *lopa* is representative of the area where every stressed *a* is labialized. But one can surmise from the commentaries that the words in the heading are not always the only variables used in mapping the area, and that in different locations the same process is traced with the help of different words. The resulting geographical pattern in many cases emerges as a sum of the areal distribution of some ten to twenty items. This is not true for maps 83 and 84, but in addition to *lapa*, *daba*, *galva* the commentary for map 10 mentions the following forms: *påts* 'himself', *åka* 'water well', *må(z)s* 'small', *bålta* 'white' (F), *våkarâ* 'evening' (LOC.SG), *kåtram* 'every' (DAT.SG), *åvuoc* 'water well', *pošas* 'themselves' (F), *korsc* 'hot', *pošu* 'him/herself' (ACC.SG), *kolts* 'hammered' (PTCP), *rogs* 'horn', *so:kᵃs* 'horse collar', *so:kumⁱ* 'beginning' (PL), *izvodot* 'see out' (2PL.PRS), *troku* 'mad' (ACC.SG), *pokalu* 'behind' (ACC.SG), *voska* 'wax' (ACC.SG) and some others. Apart from speculation that each of these items may have its own history, they are not uniform and present slightly different positions with respect to the labialisation of the stressed vowel (e.g. in *izvodot* 'see out' (2PL.PRS) the vowel is not even stressed).

However, even those items that are put into the heading may show variation in dialects. Map 113 depicts the insertion of *t* in *gans* > *ganc* 'shepherd' and *viņš* > *viņč* 'he' as covering the same area, although an attentive reader will find in the commentary an indication to locations

where the change is only found after one of the consonants. The presentation of the two areas as identical on map 113 seems even more strange when one looks at map 114, where the parallel (even if less common) insertion of *t* in *gals* 'end', *mīļš* 'dear' is plotted as having separate geographical patterns for each of the two consonantal environments. One can also add that the choice of the personal pronoun 'he' is not good, since this word is very likely to have its individual history. In fact, this is confirmed by the absence of *viņš* in Latgale where *jis* is used instead. It is clear from the commentary that in Latgale the change is mapped on the basis of such forms as *vilceńč* 'wolf cub', although the position after unstressed suffix in *vilceńč* is not equivalent to that after the stressed stem in *viņš*. (The distribution of *-iņš* vs. *-iņč* is also depicted on map 93, which is especially concerned with the variation in this particular suffix.) The different phonetic context might be a factor influencing the geographical distribution of the change. Although the commentaries for map 113 show that Sarkanis is aware of the possible influence of the tone on the insertion of *t* in *dêls* 'son' vs. *veļš* 'devil (< *veļns*)' and *gaļš* 'end' vs. *vesàlc* 'healthy', these examples do not seem convincing either, because they represent contexts that are different in more than one respect.

What may be the failure to distinguish between a regular change and the history of an individual lexical item, is revealed after comparing the area in which the contrast between the falling and the broken tone is lost on map IV with the area in which the words *kùoks* 'tree' and *meîta* 'daughter' have the same tone on map 2. The small areas in the east, corresponding to the subdialects of Trikāta[275], Ranka[396], Mālupe[468], and Liepna[469], are marked with the same red hatching as the large territory in the western part of Latvia, although it is possible that the eastern 'islands' only show the variation in the tone of the word *kuoks* rather than the general loss of the contrast.[5]

2.8. Information in the commentaries

The commentaries supply a lot of interesting dialectal data in addition to what is shown on the maps. The most welcome is the precise information about the variation of tones in affixes in different subdialects, for exam-

---

[5] Cf. the commentaries in Sarkanis (2013, 33).

ple, *sẽjeîs* 'sower' in Īvande$_{13}$ corresponds to *sẽjeĩs* in Bērze$_{138}$ (map 99); cf. the more archaic standard form *sējējs* with a long vowel in the final syllable. Information about tonal characteristics of affixes is lacking for many subdialects, so that it is only in special cases like those of the infinitive suffixes that the data are enough to make up a separate map, see maps 7–9. Another illustration of the way in which the commentaries complement the maps is the indication of the development of *slapja > slapņa* 'wet' in certain subdialects which is absent from map 84 on *rupja > rupa* 'rough'. But it is not always clear on what ground the same or similar data are placed or not placed on the map itself. In the case of *pj > p*, it comes as a pleasant surprise for the reader that the change of *grābju* 'grab' (1 sg. prs) into *gruobņu* and *gruobļu* is not only mentioned in the commentaries but also marked on map 85, which actually shows the change in the passive participle form *glābjams* 'save'. In a curious way, both map 83 for *skapjuos > skapuos* 'wardrobe' (loc.pl) and its commentaries say nothing about the possibility of a similar development of *pj* in nouns, and it is left to the reader to contemplate if it is not found or simply omitted from Sarkanis (2013).

I cannot always agree with what information is placed on the map and what goes to the commentaries, although I admit that for some maps it would change their main contents as well as the affiliation of a map with those on vowels or consonants. For example, maps 97–99 are concerned with the quality of the final consonant in *arājs* 'plougher', *skuoluotājs* 'teacher' and *sēdējs* 'sitter, one that sits', *vedējs* 'carrier, usher'. Even though they convey the different quality of the preceding vowels, they put together short and long vowels (as in *arājs* and *arais*). It is to the credit of Sarkanis (2013) that the information on vowel length is found in the commentaries for these maps, but I am disappointed not to have it displayed on the map itself. The same must be said about map 100, which only shows the drop of final syllables in *skrējis* 'run' (pst.ptcp), *gājis* 'go' (pst.ptcp) without reflecting the shortening of the root vowels (*skrē(j)s* vs. *skreis*, *gā(j)s* vs. *gais*), although the latter is mentioned in the commentaries.

It must be said that, nevertheless, the whole series of maps from 97 to 101 makes a very good impression in that they are all concerned with the same change of the final *-js* into *-jš* while differentiating between different conditions for the process. The positions in *arājs* (map 97) are not quite the same as in *sēdējs* or *vedējs* (map 99), and they are both different from

the polysyllabic *skuoluotājs* (map 98) whereas all these items differ from *skrējis*, *gājis* (map 100) and *gudrais* (map 101) by being substantives rather than participles or adjectives. But although Sarkanis (2013) is worth praising for giving each position a separate map, it would be even better if this were done more regularly.

Sometimes the commentaries are the only source of information (scarce as it is) on some very important processes. For example, it is in the commentaries for map 75 that one can find a list of subdialects where the intervocalic *ķ* is lengthened in *zaķis* 'hare', even though map 75 is designed to reflect the reduction of the ending and the variation between *ķ* and other consonants. The quality of *l*, which is normally 'dark' in Latvian, but in dialects can vary from the 'light' European sound to the non-syllabic *u*, is only fully covered in the commentaries for map 46 on *miza > myza* 'tree bark', *vilks > vyłks* 'wolf'. The reason is that the area where the velarization of *l* is especially strong roughly coincides with the one where *i* turns into the central unrounded vowel *y*.

One more remark about the commentaries is that very often locations, traditionally identified with subdialects, are only referred to by their conventional numbers. With few exceptions, their names are missing. It would be more convenient for readers if both the name and the number of any location mentioned in the commentaries were supplied in a manner employed in Rudzīte (2005) or Trumpa (2012a)—for example, Aduliena$_{(408)}$ or Aduliena$_{408}$. But this is possibly not done out of considerations of space.

What is not justified by space considerations is the way that the commentaries give references to other publications, for instance, *Latv.dial* means *Latviešu dialektoloģija* by Rudzīte (1964) and *LaDial* is the Russian summary of Rudzīte's dissertation (1969). Numerous papers on subdialects published by various authors in *Filologu Biedrības raksti* between the two world wars are made reference to by the abbreviation FBR combined with volume and page number, for example, *FBR xx 37* for Ēvalde (1940, 37). Not only does it strike me as old-fashioned, but also it confuses the reader as it prevents them from immediately recognising a familiar source from the author's name and the year. Sarkanis (2013) itself is abbreviated as *LvdaF*, and it takes time for the reader to perceive that the abbreviation refers to the book they are currently reading.

2.9. Conclusion on Sarkanis (2013)

The Phonological Atlas has been long awaited, and its appearance introduces new possibilities for researchers of Latvian dialects as it provides us with a large amount of valuable data. But it is not very convenient to use because of its design and visual characteristics. Also it must be used with caution, since the organization of these data cannot fail to be found wanting in many respects. These include the lack of a general theoretical foundation together with the lack of clear criteria for either mapping dialect areas or selecting the data to be presented on a particular map. However, it is true that here we are confronted with an inherent weakness of the Latvian dialectological studies rather than a drawback of the Atlas itself.

3. *Latviešu ģeolingvistikas etīdes* by Edmunds Trumpa

Trumpa (2012a) is an unprecedented occurrence in Latvian dialectology because it provides a critical examination of some fundamental notions in this field. The book seeks to clarify traditional implicit assumptions and shows them as a product of a particular time and circumstance, created by individual researchers and therefore susceptible to reevaluation by other researchers, rather than eternal principles that must be taken for granted. As an alternative Trumpa (2012a) proposes new working methods that are inspired by the approach to dialect studies, employed by linguists working with other languages.

    I will start the discussion of the book with its structure and then turn to maps in the appendix, comparing them with maps in Sarkanis (2013). After that, I will proceed to the three main parts of the book, each of which will be given a separate section. These will be followed by concluding remarks that also draw a parallel between Trumpa's approach and results and the situation in dialect studies of other languages.

3.1. Structure

Trumpa (2012a) is a collection of three interrelated studies. Although there is a clear connection between each of the three parts, these links are not coherent enough to create a uniform text. But their author escapes the blame for this lack of consistency by placing the word *etīdes* 'sketches' in the title.

The book is essentially about dialect borders. It explores how established dialect borders reflect isoglosses, on the one hand, and administrative borders, on the other hand. The first part of the book offers a glimpse into how the first contours of the traditional dialect borders emerged at the earliest stage of the Latvian dialect studies. The second part discusses what cultural and historical factors may lie behind borders between subdialects. The third part investigates the precise course of the border between two major groupings of subdialects inside the High Latvian dialect, based on one specific isogloss.

The first and the second parts of the book are based on Trumpa's previous work (2010, 2012); the third one (which is more than twice as long as the first and second part together) is completely new. The main text is preceded by an introduction and followed by references and an English summary (translated by Laimute Balode).

3.2. Maps

There are sixteen maps coming with the book. They are given on separate sheets attached to the book between the main body and the back cover. The sheets are folded in order to fit the size of the book. This solution seems as inconvenient for the reader as the one employed in Sarkanis (2013), as in both cases it is difficult to examine a map related to a text that may be many pages away.

Although the actual number of maps is sixteen, some of them are titled as variants of one map with different indices so that the last map has the number xıb. The first three maps are reproductions of much older maps from Bielenstein (1892), Döring (1881) and Rūķe (1939). Maps ıv–xı are produced by Trumpa himself. They relate to issues discussed in the second and third part of the book, including overlapping administrative and ecclesiastical borders from different times, the localization of informants, and the establishment of isoglosses.

All maps are beautifully done using a wide range of colours. Although conveying a large amount of information, they are quite easy to read. The only thing that the reader could complain of is the difference in the colour of the frames around small black squares on map vıı, which is not easy to detect. The squares are used to mark informants, and the difference in the colour of the frame shows if an informant is local or not. Maps ıx–xı

apparently use the same system, but it is almost impossible to discern the colour of the frame there due to the additional colouring of the squares themselves. There is no doubt that such details would be of better use on much larger maps. Nevertheless, all maps produce a much more favourable impression than those in Sarkanis (2013). Since Trumpa is one of the many people who once worked on the preparation of the Phonological Atlas,[6] one cannot but wonder what Sarkanis (2013) would look like if Trumpa had also been responsible for the final versions of its maps.

3.3. The first part: history

The first part discusses the oldest map depicting Latvian dialects. Although published in Döring (1881), it was created by August Bielenstein some thirty years earlier than the famous map in Bielenstein (1892)—the one that gave the world the term 'isogloss'. The earlier map had been unknown to dialectologists before Trumpa (2010). As distinct from the map in Bielenstein (1892), it shows dialect areas rather than individual isoglosses. Döring (1881) also contains a short description of dialects, which Trumpa claims to be entirely based on either published or unpublished information from Bielenstein.[7] The map and the text in Döring (1881) uphold the now-traditional division of the Latvian area into three main dialects, which was originally introduced by Bielenstein (1863). But what is now known as the Livonianized dialect (*lībiskais dialekts*) is not clearly differentiated from the Curonian grouping of subdialects inside Central Latvian, and the borders of the dialects in Döring (1881) are only roughly similar to the ones on the modern maps.

Trumpa (2012a) carefully registers every detail that deviates from other works by Bielenstein and our current knowledge, as reflecting the developing understanding of dialect distinctions and their geographical distribution. For instance, it must have been in the beginning of the 1880s that Bielenstein realized that the territory around Nīca forms an enclave within the rest of Kurzeme, even though the precise limits of the area were gradually discovered later by Bielenstein himself and other linguists (Trumpa 2012a, 31–32). Not every border on the map in Döring can be

---

[6] See Sarkanis (2013, 8).

[7] Trumpa did not work with Bielenstein's archive; see the footnote in Trumpa (2012a, 36).

clearly identified with the areas currently known to Latvian dialectologists. For instance, it remains a mystery on what ground the High Latvian dialect is depicted as split up into seven parts (Trumpa 2012a, 36). Nevertheless, Trumpa (2012a) associates another mysterious area, the one situated in the north of present-day Vidzeme and labelled 'the purest Latvian' (*reinstes Lettisch*) on the map, with the geographical distribution of the three-way tonal contrast (Trumpa 2012a, 37–40).

The most fascinating, perhaps, are Trumpa's attempts to determine which isoglosses in Bielenstein (1892) can be possibly reflected in the dialect boundaries in Döring (1881). Trumpa (2012a, 40–45) identifies the border between High Latvian and Central Latvian as determined by the labialization of *a*, *ā* (isogloss 25 by Bielenstein), and equates the border between the 'proper' Tamian dialect (*Eigentliches Tamisch*) and what is now the Curonian grouping, with Bielenstein's isogloss 1 depicting the reduction of final syllables.[8] But for the most part, one borderline corresponds to different isoglosses at different geographical points. In fact, a similar picture emerges if one tries to establish the connection between the dialect borders and the areal distribution of various phonological processes in Sarkanis (2013).

3.4. The second part: grid of (sub)dialects

The second part contains a thorough examination of one of the most fundamental concepts in Latvian dialectology, namely, that of *izloksne*, which is usually lamely translated in English as 'subdialect', though in fact it would be more convenient to refer to *izloksne* simply as 'dialect' in English. *Izloksne* is the smallest unit of dialect division, even though *izloksnes* are too numerous (the exact number is 512) to be included in the classification, which at its lowest level instead deals with whole groupings of subdialects. The main problem with subdialects is that their borders are derived from the administrative division of Latvia into *pagasti* 'civil parishes', Russian *volost'* (an ecclesiastical parish is called *draudze* in Latvian). Although it is traditional to think of *pagasti* as having each its own subdialect, this can be easily called into question, and this is what

---

[8] It is notable that the latter boundary runs further to the north-west than we are accustomed to. Trumpa (2012a) is inclined to explain this fact by the lack of information about dialects in the time when Bielenstein created the two maps rather than by linguistic changes.

Trumpa (2012a) indeed does. On the one hand, there is often further linguistic differentiation inside the boundaries of a subdialect. On the other hand, the areal distribution of many phenomena does not align with the borders between subdialects.

According to Trumpa (2012a, 53–55), the tradition of identifying subdialects with civil parishes goes back to as early as Bielenstein (1892) and Rūķe (1939, 1940), but in the beginning a clear distinction was made between administrative and linguistic borders. Both Bielenstein and Rūķe differentiate between isoglosses that run along the administrative border and those that cross it. However, in the second part of the 20th century administrative borders between civil parishes completely supplanted classical isoglosses on the maps of Latvian dialects. All linguistic borders, whether they are marked by the different colouring of adjoining areas or by lines, are now shown as directly following the contours of administrative borders. Exceptions comprise several subdialects that are split into two parts by a linguistic boundary. The claim that the Latvian language, with respect to the dialectal dimension, exists in the form of 512 subdialects, is so central to the field that every dialect map is drawn following the contours of their (administrative) borders. These contours, which precede the creation of any dialect map, are called *izlokšņu tīklojums*, where *tīklojums* is usually translated as 'network', but I will further call it 'grid', since it is actually used as reference for locating dialectal facts.

Trumpa (2012a, 56–62) discusses the advantages and shortcomings of the subdialect grid. On the one hand, it makes easier both collection and analysis of dialectal data. Since the grid is based on the administrative division as it was in 1939, it is also perceived as a tool that ensures succession between the research done before and after the Second World War, which must have been of special importance to Latvian linguists during the Soviet time. On the other hand, the grid obscures the real distribution of dialect features. For example, the subdialect of Līvāni[436] is shown on the map in Rudzīte (2005[1969]) as having four different reflexes of *ū*, as in Standard Latvian *lūpa* 'lip': *əu, eu, ou*, and *yu*. The map says nothing about the conditions under which each of the variants is preferred. But it becomes clear from the position of the corresponding isoglosses in Rūķe (1939) that *ou* is found in the northern, and *eu* in the southern part of the *pagasts*, whereas *yu* is typical for the territory adjacent to the neighbouring *pagasti* with *yu*. Trumpa (2012a, 62–65) claims that the subdialect grid poorly reflects linguistic reality because the administrative division

of 1939 was a poor choice to base a dialect map upon. Borders between *pagasti* changed many times before 1939, as well as in the 19th century when *pagasti* coexisted with other territorial units. Trumpa (2012a) believes the choice was purely accidental—Elfrīda Šmite, who was responsible for creation of the (sub)dialect grid, appears to have taken the contours of *pagasti* from a road map *Latvijas ceļu karte* (1940[1991]). Trumpa (2012a, 64) also observes that it is often difficult to apply the *pagasti* borders from 1939 to what the territory looks like nowadays. Especially problematic are small villages and farms, which are difficult to locate with respect to the old administrative borders. Surprising as it may be, dialectologists usually do not know where the precise borders of a subdialect lie, and choose to ignore this problem. It is Trumpa (2012a) who brings it forward and tries to solve it.

It must be said that, in general, Trumpa (2012a) does not deny the influence of administrative and other non-linguistic borders on the geographic distribution of dialect features. But rather than relying on the results of the administrative reform of 1939, he searches for earlier versions of territorial division, into *pagasti* as well as other territorial units, among them manors and church parishes. This is a hard interdisciplinary task, thoroughly described in Trumpa (2012a, 75–95). The results of this work are also seen on the attached maps (IV–VII) where administrative, ecclesiastical and other borders from various times are juxtaposed with the division into *pagasti* both in 1939 and at present. Trumpa (2012a) compares the revealed historical and cultural borders of the past with isoglosses that he has established during the fieldwork in 2010–2012, confirming that the distribution of dialect features even now mostly follows the borders between church parishes, as they existed before the First World War, rather than the administrative division of 1939. The work is only done for a part of the Latvian territory, roughly corresponding to the linguistic border between the Selonian and Latgalian groupings of High Latvian subdialects (which is the main subject of the third part of the book). One can only hope to see the day when such maps are completed for the rest of the Latvian territory, but it goes without saying that this can hardly be achieved by one person.

3.5. The third part: Latgalian-Selonian isogloss

The third part of Trumpa (2012a) returns to the problem of dialect division, dealing with establishing of the precise border between the two parts of High Latvian, known as Selonian and Latgalian (non-Selonian). This border is identified with an isogloss that divides the Latgalian broken tone (in such words as *lûks* 'window', Standard Latvian *logs* [luôks]) and the Selonian rising tone (*lúks*). The isogloss is especially important as it largely coincides with the historic border between the Catholic Latgale and the Protestant Vidzeme. In order to verify earlier controversial claims about the location of the isogloss, Trumpa has investigated a wide stripe of territory in the form of a crescent between Līvāni, Lubāna and Lizums. The full list of the *pagasti* visited and their modern administrative affiliation is given in the table in Trumpa (2012a, 115–117). Trumpa tries to find out how the isogloss corresponds to changing administrative and ecclesiastical borders from different times, also paying considerable attention to natural barriers such as forests and wetlands.

Since many places in the area were described during the 20th century, a possibility is provided to compare the data from different periods. Trumpa observes the disappearance of many High Latvian features, including the labialization of *a*, and especially the disappearance of the traditional agricultural vocabulary. Still, tonal features are more likely to survive as they are less subject to conscious efforts by speakers who try to avoid the dialect, and even the standard language retains much variation in this respect. According to Trumpa (2012a, 201), traditional dialect is better preserved among Catholics concentrated in the Latgalian area (to be more precise, in the territory corresponding to the historical Latgale). In this part of Latvia, Catholics have a long tradition of translating religious texts into their dialect, which gives them the opportunity to claim that they speak "as in the Bible". The preservation of the dialect seems to be due to the prestige connected with religion. In the mostly-Protestant Selonian area the Bible is in the standard language, and, as a consequence, many dialect features are now lost to the degree that Trumpa (2012a, 200–201) considers the possibility to treat the Selonian area as belonging to Low Latvian instead of High Latvian. In this case, the isogloss in question may become the border between Low Latvian and High Latvian rather than between the two parts of High Latvian.

No little space is devoted to methodological issues, many of the solu-

tions in Trumpa (2012a, 108–144) being new to Latvian dialectology. Traditionally, dialectologists have been contented with a network of informants as dense as the subdialect grid. Although one *pagasts* may have been represented with several people, the latter were not differentiated with respect to their different living places inside the *pagasts*. Trumpa (2012a, 65) criticizes the Lexical Atlas (Laumane 1999) for this very reason. As opposed to this practice, Trumpa (2012a) seeks to visit as many communities as possible in each of the chosen *pagasti*. He has also tried to interview representatives of different generations from one family, but this has turned out to be achievable only in some places in Latgale. As for Vidzeme, where the influence of the standard language is much heavier, it has been decided at one point to interview even those speakers who retain only some of dialect features. The information about informants' age in each of the *pagasti* is also given in a diagram in Trumpa (2012a, 133).

3.5.1. Rising vs. broken tone

The whole number of informants is 264; each of them is shown on maps viiia and viiib according to the place of the interview (which is most often the place where they currently live), as well as the place of birth. If an informant's current place of living is different from their place of birth, the two locations are connected with an arrow. This allows including informants who are genuine dialect speakers but are not local. At the same time, the arrows shed some light on the migration of dialect speakers inside and outside the region. The number of informants from each of the *pagasti* together with the proportion of local and non-local informants is supplied in the form of a table and a diagram in Trumpa (2012a, 127–128). On the maps, each of the informants is given a number reflecting the order in which they have been approached.

In order to investigate the tones, Trumpa has recorded sentences from 139 informants, containing minimal pairs between the broken/rising and the falling tone, for example, *salyûza zyr̂ga lùks* 'a/the shaft bow (part of horse harness) broke' and *acav'èrẹ ustobys lûks* 'a/the window opened in the room'. Informants have been also asked to pronounce minimal pairs out of context and comment on how they perceive them. Additionally, the salience of the contrast is subjectively evaluated by Trumpa himself on a scale of 0 to 3. He also instrumentally measures the relative duration of vowels under each of the tones. The results for each minimal

pair provided by each of the informants are presented in two multi-page tables in Trumpa (2012a, 150–175, 223–231), as well as visualized on the attached maps (ix–xi). Apart from analysing minimal pairs, Trumpa (2012a) studies the distribution of the tones across the lexicon with the help of a questionnaire which is an expanded version of the respective part of the Atlas questionnaire (Šmite 1954). He also employs impressionistic observation of tones in informants' narratives (*dzīvesstāsti*).

Trumpa (2012a) finds the contrast between the broken and the falling tone in the Latgalian area to be more salient (that is, more often given the maximum points) than the one between the rising and the falling in the Selonian area. For this reason, it is the broken tone whose presence is qualified as the main criterion for establishing the dialect border. For the most part, the isogloss is clear-cut, with the exception of the transition areas in Līvāni$_{436}$ and Atašiene$_{432}$ where the broken tone coexists with the rising one. Trumpa (2012a) proposes to classify an informant as belonging to the Latgalian or Selonian grouping on the basis of several phonological positions forming a hierarchy; see the table in Trumpa (2012a, 193).

The broken tone is most common in final syllables belonging to endings and suffixes—it is assumed that, sporadically, it can be found in this position even in the Selonian area. The second most typical position for the broken tone is in final root syllables ending in voiceless consonants. Other positions include non-final root syllables, also ending in voiceless consonants.[9] Consequently, the rising tone is more likely to be found before voiced consonants. With the exception of a sporadic broken tone in endings and suffixes, any informant regularly showing the broken tone at least in the first two positions is treated as Latgalian, which means that the transition areas are also considered Latgalian.

On the whole, when Trumpa evaluates the contrast between an informant's tones as weak (0 or 1 point), it is usually in cases when informants themselves fail to notice the difference between the words in question. When Trumpa gives the contrast 2 or 3 points, informants are more likely to be conscious of it, although they very often explain the difference as the one in the quality of vowels or following consonants. But when the contrast is perceived as suprasegmental, informants often men-

---

[9] In Tirza$_{399}$ non-final syllables are, on the contrary, found to be more common for the broken tone, which makes Trumpa suggest that phonetic correlates of the broken tone there may turn out to be different from those in Līvāni$_{436}$ and Atašiene$_{432}$.

tion duration. Trumpa, too, choses duration as an objective criterion for differentiating between the Latgalian and the Selonian tones.

The duration of a vowel for each of the two contrasting tones is measured relative to the duration of the following consonant closure so that the latter interval also includes the glottalization that occurs in syllables under the broken tone. Examples of spectrograms and oscillograms are provided in Trumpa (2012a, 220–221). The ratio found for the broken resp. rising tone is further divided by the similarly determined value for the falling tone, that is $t_{rr} = t_r(\hat{\ })/t_r(\backslash)$ in Latgalian and $t_{rr} = t_r(/)/t_r(\backslash)$ in Selonian. In Latgalian, the final ratio is < 1, and in Selonian > 1. It is interesting that the ratio remains the same even for those informants for whom the contrast between the two tones is judged as weak by Trumpa.

3.6. Concluding remarks on Trumpa (2012a)

Although Trumpa (2012a) is quite traditional in his attempt to establish a connection between isoglosses and such external factors as natural communicative barriers and political or administrative borders, he is the first in the field of Latvian dialect studies who wants this connection to be based on well-documented facts. One of the main findings by Trumpa (2012a), which is at risk of passing unnoticed because Trumpa himself prefers not to attract attention to it, is that the areal distribution of the 'Latgalian' broken and the 'Selonian' rising tone rather reflects the relatively modern border between Vidzeme and Latgale than the archaic boundary between the Baltic tribes of Selonians and Latgalians.[10]

In comparison to Sarkanis (and other Latvian linguists), Trumpa (2012a) is more open to what one might call 'foreign' influences and therefore more inclined to take into consideration what is done in dialect studies of languages other than Latvian. The book contains several references to various contributions to German and general dialectology, not to mention the obvious influence from the Lithuanian school of dialectology which is most clearly seen in Trumpa's determination to base the border between two dialects on a single feature; see Andronovs (2006). But Trumpa (2012a) would only benefit if the references to dialect studies of other languages were more explicit.

---

[10] As the example of Sarkanis (2013) shows, the idea that main dialect groups coincide with the prehistoric tribes is still prominent among Latvian researchers, even though it has been critically evaluated elsewhere, see the literature in Auer and Schmidt (2010, 97).

I especially regret the absence of any reference to Estonian dialectologists, because they make use of a particular methodological tool that is so typical of their Latvian colleagues, namely the '(sub)dialect grid'; see e.g. the map in Pajusalu et al. (2002, 58–59). In Estonian dialectology, *murrak* is analogous to the Latvian *izloksne* with the exception that each *murrak* corresponds to an ecclesiastical parish (Estonian *kihelkond*, Latvian *draudze*) rather than a civil parish (Estonian *vald*, Latvian *pagasts*), as in Latvia. However, Estonian dialectologists show much more caution regarding the connection between dialectal variation and the above-mentioned grid. They specifically warn against the straightforward identification of subdialects with parishes, claiming that the geographic distribution of dialect features may follow different cultural and administrative borders in different cases—which is essentially the idea that Trumpa arrives at in the conclusion of his book on Latvian dialectology.

4. Problems of English summaries

Both Sarkanis (2013) and Trumpa (2012a) have English summaries. In the Atlas the English text is produced by Alberts Sarkanis himself, while in Trumpa (2012a) the summary is translated by Laimute Balode.

What I call summary in Sarkanis (2013) actually serves as a slightly shortened English version of the text and commentaries. In some respect, the English part is even more informative than the Latvian text because it includes a short overview of the history of dialectal studies of Latvian. This overview is absent from the original Latvian introduction, which is instead supplied with a reference to the corresponding sections in Laumane (1999). (This reference is also retained in the English summary where it seems unnecessary.)

It is true that writing an English version of a text on Latvian dialectology (or any other traditional branch of Latvian linguistics) is a difficult task. Apart from the lack of words for many frequent terms, the work is also hindered by the fact that established means of expression in Latvian lose their convincing power in translation into a language where they are not supported by the repeated use in authoritative texts on the subject in question. Consequently, English summaries are very often clumsy, or may unnecessarily simplify the matter, and this is indeed so with Sarkanis (2013) and Trumpa (2012a).

The summary in Sarkanis (2013) is also heavily influenced by Latvian. The author might have benefited from either showing the text to a native

speaker or at least consulting English sources on a similar subject, from any general texts on dialectology and historical phonology to works especially dedicated to Latvian, such as the translation of Endzelīns' comparative phonology and morphology of the Baltic languages by Schmalstieg and Jēgers (1971). This would have prevented some of the translation blunders, for example, the frequent use of 'locality' in the meaning of 'area' and 'separation' instead of 'differentiation' in the discussion of the tonal contrast. Examples of less than adequate translation of terms more specific to Baltic and Latvian linguistics are the numerous occasions of 'consonant bond with *j*' meaning 'sequences of consonants with *j*' and 'diphthongoidal *r*' instead of 'tautosyllabic *r*'. Perhaps the least successful is the translation of *diftongiskie savienojumi*, which is rendered as 'semi-diphthongs' on p. 139 and 'diphthongoidal bond' on p. 163.[11] I also would not recommend the translation of *vidus dialekts* 'Central Latvian' as 'Middle Latvian' because of the associations with historical periodization (cf. Middle English) rather than variation in space.

It is true, however, that many important terms of Baltic, and Latvian, linguistics have more than one translation into English by different authors, and some have none. Even if I prefer 'diphthongal sequences' (see Young 1991), other may call them 'semi-diphthongs' (Ambrazas 1997), or 'diphthongal combinations' (Endzelīns 1971), or even 'diphthongoid sequences' (Balode and Holvoet 2001). While there is no controversy on either 'falling' or 'broken' tone, the tone that I label as 'level' (see also Kariņš 1996) may be also known as 'drawn' (Balode and Holvoet 2001) or 'sustained' (Endzelīns 1971). One of the worst terms is probably 'tone' itself, also known as 'accent' or 'intonation'. Curiously enough, in Trumpa (2012a) Laimute Balode uses the word 'syllable intonation' while in Balode and Holvoet (2001) the preferred term is 'syllabic tone' or 'syllabic accents'.

There is no established translation of terms serving as names for various groupings of Latvian dialects. Although the most common way of translating *lībiskais dialekts* is Livonian (Balode and Holvoet (2001) offer 'Tamian'), this causes confusion with the Livonian language (*lībiešu valoda*) and so, for the sake of clarity, I prefer to follow the suggestion by Strelēvica-Ošiņa (2009) to refer to the dialect as 'Livonianized' even if it does sound clumsy in English. Another issue concerns the translation of terms *dziļās un nedziļās izloksnes* in both High Latvian and the Livo-

---

[11] The translation of *metatonija* as 'metonymy', that is, 'a figure of speech' instead of 'metatony', which is a tonal process, must be written off as an accident.

nianized dialect. *Dziļās izloksnes* are often given as 'deep', but it is not without reason that Balode and Holvoet either simply refer to them as to dialects which 'display the Tamian features in the most pronounced way' or produce the more established German equivalents *strengtahmisch* and *tiefhochlettisch* (Balode and Holvoet 2001, 26, 38); see also Gāters (1977, 13). One must also mention the unfortunate practice of translating *izloksne* as 'subdialect' whereas in Latvian the word is not derived from *dialekts* and serves to represent a concept that may be seen as more basic than the one connected with *dialekts*.

I would like to conclude that writing an English summary for a text on Latvian dialectology also presents a good opportunity to work out the most suitable English equivalents for some of more frequent terms in the field. It is a pity that neither of the two reviewed books used this opportunity fully.

5. Conclusion

Sarkanis (2013) and Trumpa (2012a) are both ground-breaking contributions to the field of Latvian dialect studies, the former by virtue of presenting a large amount of important data in a geographical format and the latter by virtue of a thorough analysis of methodological issues concerning the presentation of data in a geographical format. Although the two works are different in genre, they clearly match each other. The drawbacks of Sarkanis (2013), including the uncritical assumption of traditional concepts and methods, as well the lack of clear criteria for organizing dialect data, are the general weaknesses of Latvian dialectology, and it is these particular issues that are addressed by Trumpa (2012a). Since Trumpa (2012a) not only uncovers the problem but also develops solutions, we might be looking now at a turning point in the course of Latvian dialect studies. But this, of course, depends on how Trumpa's ideas are going to be met by other researchers in the field.

Anna Daugavet
St Petersburg State University
Philological Faculty
Chair of General Linguistics
Universitetskaja nab. 11, RU-199034 St Petersburg
anna.daugavet@gmail.com

Abbreviations

ACC — accusative, DAT — dative, F — feminine, GEN — genitive, INF — infinitive, NOM — nominative, LOC — locative, M — masculine, PL — plural, PRS — present, PST — past, PTCP — participle, SG — singular

References

AMBRAZAS, VYTAUTAS, ed., 1997. *Lithuanian Grammar*. Vilnius: Baltos lankos.

ANDRONOV, ALEKSEJ. 1996. Nekotorye zamečanija o prosodičeskix javlenijax v dialektax latyšskogo jazyka i ix predstavlenii na karte. *Baltistica* 31.2, 201–212.

ANDRONOVS, ALEKSEJS. 2006. Par latviešu valodas izlokšņu klasifikāciju un dialektu kartēm. In: *Letonikas pirmais kongress. Valodniecības raksti.* Rīga: Latvijas Zinātņu akadēmija, 18–31.

AUER, PETER & JÜRGEN ERICH SCHMIDT, eds. 2010. *Language and Space: An International Handbook of Linguistic Variation, Volume 1. Theories and Methods.* Walter de Gruyter.

AVANESOV, RUBEN IVANOVIČ, ed., 1986. *Dialektologičeskij atlas russko-go jazyka. Centr evropejskoj časti SSSR v trex vypuskax. Vypusk 1. Vstupitel'nye stat'i. Spravočnye materialy. Fonetika.* Moskva: Nauka.

BALODE, LAIMUTE & AXEL HOLVOET. 2001. The Latvian language and its dialects. In: Östen Dahl and Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm, eds., *Circum-Baltic Languages: Volume 1: Past and Present.* John Benjamins Publishing, 3–40.

BIELENSTEIN, AUGUST. 1863. *Die Lettische Sprache nach ihren Lauten und Formen. Erster Theil. Die Laute. Die Wortbildung.* Berlin: Ferd. Dümmler's Verlagsbuchhandlung.

BIELENSTEIN, AUGUST. 1892. *Die Grenzen des lettischen Volkstammes und der lettischen Sprache in der Gegenwart und im 13. Jahrhundert. Ein Beitrag zur ethnologischen Geographie und Geschichte Russlands.* St. Petersburg: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften.

CHAMBERS, JACK K. & PETER TRUDGILL. 2004. *Dialectology*. Second Edition. Cambridge University Press.

DÖRING, FRIEDRICH JULIUS. 1881. Über die Herkunft der kurländi-schen Letten. In: *Sitzung-Berichte der kurländischen Gesellschaft für*

Literatur und Kunst nebst Veröffentlichungen des kurländischen Provin-zial-Museums aus dem Jahre 1880. Mitau: J. F. Steffenhagen u. Sohn, 47–118.

Endzelīns, Jānis. 1971. *Jānis Endzelīns' Comparative Phonology and Mor-phology of the Baltic Languages.* Translated by William R. Schmal-stieg and Benjamiņš Jēgers. The Hague: Mouton.

Ēvalde, Līvija. 1940. Piltenes un Ziru pagasta izloksne. *Filologu biedrības raksti* 20, 36–58.

García Mouton, Pilar, David Heap & Maria-Pilar Perea. 2012. The present and the future of the *Atlas Lingüístico de la Península Ibérica (ALPI)*. *Dialectologia*. Special Issue, 3, 1–6.

Gāters, Alfreds. 1977. *Die lettische Sprache und ihre Dialekte.* The Hague — Paris — New York: Mouton.

Girdenis, Aleksas & Zigmas Zinkevičius. 2000 [1966]. Dėl lietuvių kal-bos tarmių klasifikacijos. In: A. Girdenis. *Kalbotyros darbai. I tomas: 1962–1974.* Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas, 44–55.

Grauds-Graudevics, Žanis. 1927. Ugāles izloksne. *Filologu biedrības raksti* 7, 12–30.

Grinaveckienė, Elena, ed., 1982. *Lietuvių kalbos atlasas II: Fonetika.* Vilnius: Mokslas.

Kariņš, Krišjānis. 1996. *The Prosodic Structure of Latvian: A Dissertation.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Labov, William, Sherry Ash & Charles Boberg. 2006. *Atlas of North American English: Phonetics, Phonology, and Sound Change.* New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Lameli, Alfred, Roland Kehren & Stefan Rabanus. 2010. *Language and Space: An International Handbook of Linguistic Variation, Volume 2. Language Mapping.* Walter de Gruyter.

Laumane, Benita, ed., 1999. *Latviešu valodas dialektu atlants. Leksika.* Rīga: Zinātne.

Pajusalu, Karl, Tiit Hennoste, Elen Niit, Peeter Päll & Jüri Viikberg. 2002. *Eesti murded ja kohanimed.* Tallinn: Eesti Keele Sihtasutus.

Rudzīte, Marta. 1964. *Latviešu dialektoloģija.* Rīga: Latvijas Valsts izdev-niecība.

Rudzīte, Marta. 1969. *Latyšskaja dialektologija. Fonetika i morfologija: Avtoreferat dissertacii na soiskanie učenoj stepeni doktora filologičeskix*

nauk po knige «Latyšskaja dialektologija», Riga: Latgosizdat, 1964 (na latyškom jazyke). AN LatvSSR.

RUDZĪTE, MARTA. 1993. *Latviešu valodas vēsturiskā fonētika*. Rīga: Zvaigzne.

RUDZĪTE, MARTA. 2005 [1969]. *Latviešu dialektoloģija (fonētika un morfoloģija). Doktora disertācijas autoreferāts*. In: Rudzīte 2005, 39–172.

RUDZĪTE, MARTA. 2005. *Darbi latviešu dialektoloģijā*. Rīga: Latvijas Universitāte.

RŪĶE, VELTA. 1939. Latgales izlokšņu grupējums. *Filologu biedrības raksti* 19, 133–188.

RŪĶE, VELTA. 1940. Kurzemes un Vidzemes lībiskais apgabals. *Filologu biedrības raksti* 20, 75–128.

SARKANIS, ALBERTS. 2013. *Latviešu valodas dialektu atlants. Fonētika.* Rīga: LU Latviešu valodas institūts.

STRELĒVICA-OŠIŅA, DACE. 2009. Latviešu valodas lībiskais dialekts un tā lietotāju identitāte: pārdomas pēc pētījuma. *Latvijas Universitātes raksti* 746. *Valodniecība. Latvistika un somugristika*, 94–112.

ŠMITE, TEKLA. 1928. Sarkanmuižas pagasta izloksne. *Filologu biedrības raksti* 8, 108–134.

ŠMITE, ELFRĪDA. 1954. *Latviešu valodas dialektoloģijas atlanta materiālu vākšanas programma.* Rīga: Latvijas PSR Zinātņu akadēmijas izdevniecība.

TRUMPA, EDMUNDS. 2010. *Karte des lettischen Sprachgebiets* (1881): Pirmā latviešu valodas dialektu karte. *Baltu filoloģija* 19.1–2, 79–102.

TRUMPA, EDMUNDS. 2012. Pārdomas par izlokšņu, administratīvi teritoriālo vienību un draudžu robežām Rietumlatgalē. In: Agnese Cimdiņa and Ieva Raubiško. *Dzīve, attīstība, labbūtība Latvijas laukos*. Rīga: Zinātne.

TRUMPA, EDMUNDS. 2012a. *Latviešu ģeolingvistikas etīdes*. Rīga: Zinātne.

YOUNG, STEVEN R. 1991. *The Prosodic Structure of Lithuanian*. Lanham — New York — London: University Press of America.