

Hauptprobleme der Finnougristik verallgemeinerndes Werk kommt ihm als Lern- und Unterrichtsmittel wie auch als notwendiges

Nachschlagewerk für die fernere Forschungstätigkeit ein bleibender Platz in der zuständigen Fachliteratur zu.

PAUL ALVRE (Tartu)

<https://doi.org/10.3176/lu.1975.3.10>

Mati Hint, Eesti keele sõnafonoloogia I. Rõhusüsteemi fonoloogia ja morfoloogia põhiprobleemid, Tallinn 1973 (Eesti NSV Teaduste Akadeemia Keele ja Kirjanduse Instituut). 253 pp.

The present volume is the first in a series dealing with the systematic presentation of problems of standard Estonian phonology and morphophonology. Here the problems of the stress system are discussed.

The volume consists of an introduction, four chapters (called *parts* in the introduction), an appendix, a detailed summary in English, and four indexes.

The introduction (24 pp.) gives first an idea of the role of stress in Estonian. Word stress in genuine Estonian words has delimitative functions. Besides that stress is said to have also a culminative function in a sentence "bringing forth a word or a morpheme with the strongest degree of the sentence stress" (p. 9). It is claimed that the book will deal with word stress (p. 9). The method adopted in the book is characterized as a "non-descriptive synthesizing item-and-process-method" (p. 17) and its advantages before the item-and-arrangement approach are discussed.

Chapter 1, "The Traditional Concept of the Estonian Stress System and Its Possible Phonological Interpretations with a Consideration of Morphophonological Problems" (20 pp.) must according to the author's intentions give a critique of the conceptions of the Estonian stress system formulated so far. Chapter 2, "Phonological Quantity Contrasts in Non-initial Syllables and Their Relations to the Phonology and Morphophonology of Secondary Stress" (30 pp.) is intended to give an integral treatment connecting all possible quantity contrasts in non-initial syllables and the stress system. However, the most essential part of the critique — that of Ilse Lehiste's model of Estonian quantity (cf. Lehiste 1965; 1966; 1970:157—159) — is in Chapter 2.

In Chapter 1 the following claims of the author (adapted keeping his ideas unfalsified) are of special interest.

(1) In the entire lexicon of Estonian the primary stress is distinctive (p. 30).

(2) The secondary stress is not always automatic but morphologically conditioned (p. 32); one must distinguish between two types of secondary stress: the morphologically bound secondary stress and the morphologically unbound secondary stress; the occurrence of the latter (as that of the weak stress) can be ruled phonetically/phonologically (p. 36).

(3) Final syllables having the secondary stress in compounds, unadapted borrowings or in words containing a gradational derivational suffix are structurally analogical to syllables having the primary stress; elsewhere final syllables having the secondary stress are structurally analogical to syllables having the weak stress (p. 37).

(4) The final syllables in *pankrot*, *kabinet* and *vankrit*, *redelit* are phonetically similar but morphophonologically different: the first are cases of gradational syllables in paradigms '*pank*'<sub>1</sub>*rot* : '*pank*'<sub>2</sub>*roti* : '*pank*'<sub>3</sub>*rotti* 'bankruptcy (nom. sg. : gen. sg. : part. sg.)', '*kabi*'<sub>1</sub>*net* : '*kabi*'<sub>2</sub>*neti* : '*kabi*'<sub>3</sub>*netti* 'cabinet (nom. sg. : gen. sg. : part. sg.)', the latter are cases of gradationless syllables in paradigms '*vank*'<sub>1</sub>*rit* : '*vank*'<sub>2</sub>*rite* 'carriage (part. sg. : gen. pl.)', '*rede*'<sub>1</sub>*lit* : '*rede*'<sub>2</sub>*lite* 'ladder (part. sg. : gen. pl.)' (p. 41).<sup>1</sup>

(5) The pronunciations '*rede*'<sub>2</sub>*litele* 'ladder (allative pl.)' and '*varase*'<sub>2</sub>*matele* 'earlier (allative pl.)' have alternative variants '*redeli*'<sub>2</sub>*tele*, '*vara*'<sub>2</sub>*sematele* (pp. 38, 42).

<sup>1</sup> Here '1' stand for the primary and the secondary stress and quantity 3. Hint's typescript transcription cannot be adopted for typographical reasons.

(6) The penultimates in *'kadrina laste* 'inhabitant of Kadrina (gen. pl.)' and *'tööliste* 'worker (gen. pl.)' are neither in quantity 2 nor in quantity 3 (hereinafter Q2 and Q3) as because of non-occurrence of gradation in the given position an identification of quantity degrees is senseless (p. 45).

(7) It is to be defined that one must not identify quantity degrees and quantity contrasts in syllables with the morphologically bound secondary stress in gradationless suffixes (p. 45).

Probably nobody will dispute claims (1) and (2). For claim (5) it is not evident what is the nature of the alternative placement of the secondary stress. I suspect that here, for the minority of cases, certain dialectal, resp. idiolectal differences are present, whereas for the majority of cases Hint has failed to distinguish between the normal and neutral word stress patterning and the emphatic sentence stress patterning. However, the characteristic of sentence stress is just the displacement of stresses. Claims (3), (4) and (6) are axioms for Hint, claim (7) is a kind of superaxiom that (6) really is an axiom.

The critique both of the traditional conception of stress and quantity in Estonian (as in grammars) and of Lehiste's model of quantity contrasts in Chapter 2 is roughly based on claims (3)—(7). Actually, the traditional conception and that of Hint agree in most essential points: both emphasize that Q2 and Q3 are to be identified only in syllables having the primary stress and in gradational derivational suffixes, and then even in final syllables where Q3 is the case. Hint's criticism of the traditional conceptions concerns some minor inconsistencies.

Lehiste's model of quantity contrasts manages without using any stresses. According to Lehiste, the first syllable of a (genuine) polysyllabic word is in Q1, Q2 or Q3. If the first syllable is in Q1 or Q2, then in any following even-numbered syllables only two contrastive quantities occur (Q1 and an ambiguously long quantity which cannot be identified with either Q2 or Q3 on phonetic grounds) whereas in the following non-final odd-numbered syllables three contrastive quantities occur. If the first syllable is in Q3,

then in any non-final even-numbered syllables three contrastive quantities occur, whereas in odd-numbered syllables there occur only two contrastive quantities. Hint identifies the non-first syllables with three contrastive quantities in Lehiste's model with the secondarily stressed syllables in his own approach. His objections to Lehiste's model are in full concord with his claims formulated in Chapter 1, as can be seen below.

(8) Lehiste ascribes Q3 to an intervocalic geminate consonant even when that is gradationless and cannot contrast with Q2 (*'kindlasse*, *elamusse*, *'vastamata*, *'maksmata*) and Q2 in *'aastate*, *tundmatut*; she gives no concrete examples of three contrastive quantities (p. 51). Quantity identifications such as Q3 in *ss* of *kindlasse* and *elamusse*, in geminate *t* of *vastamata* and *maksmata*, and Q2 in geminate *t* in *aastate* and *tundmatut* (Lehiste 1966: 15, 32) are purely cases of agreement as here there occurs no contrast between Q2 and Q3 (p. 58).

(9) According to Lehiste's conception the contrast between Q2 and Q3 is neutralized in final syllables. One should expand her scheme of neutralization to monosyllables. According to the traditional conception monosyllables and final gradational stops are considered in Q3 on historical and morphophonological grounds and because of similarity of phonetic durations in monosyllables and bisyllabic words in Q3. Neither of the arguments can be ignored (p. 54).

Hint's objection (8) adds some data to those mentioned by him earlier, cf. also claims (5) and (6). The data reveal that this contradiction between Hint's and Lehiste's views is due to different linguistic competence.

There are two major types of pronunciation of nonfirst syllables in Estonian (excluding North-East Estonian dialects which, characteristically, have only two contrastive quantities). First, there exists a type that distinguishes between three contrastive quantities in all stressed syllables. In non-gradational cases Q3 of secondarily stressed syllables can vary as Q2, but not vice versa. This type is, as a rule, characteristic of North Estonian dialects and some neighbouring subdialects of South Estonian. There exists also a subtype with but

Q1 and Q3 in gradationless non-final second syllables when preceded by an initial syllable in Q3, cf. cases with Q3 as e.g. 'aas'tasse, 'aas'tate 'year (ill. sg., gen. pl.)' vs. gradational cases as 'mets'nikku : 'mets'niku 'forester (part. sg. : gen. sg.)'. This subtype occurs mainly in the contact area of Central North Estonian and South Estonian dialects. Second, there is a type with Q3 occurring only in a restricted number of derivational suffixes that unexceptionally undergo gradation. Hint's pronunciation of standard Estonian seems to have preserved just the last, South Estonian type. Otherwise his objection (9) would be entirely incomprehensible: it is hardly minimal pairs that Hint insists on having as "concrete examples". Lehiste's quantity identifications, on the other hand, represent the most wide-spread North Estonian type. (Note, however, that not all North Estonians pronounce Q3 in the suffix *-mata*, e.g. in *vastamata* and *maksmata*.) As standard Estonian is a set of dialects with a standardized, predominantly North Estonian morphological system and with a variety of North Estonian or North Estonianized pronunciations it represents also the most normal standard Estonian quantity identifications; cf. also Tauli's discussion of Hint's position (Tauli 1973: 396).

Further, it is questionable whether it is possible to regard all Lehiste's non-first syllables with three contrastive quantities as syllables with secondary stress. First of all, this holds for syllables in Q1 and Q2 when preceded by a syllable in Q3. For most North Estonians a secondary stress in this position is quite unnatural, except in words consisting of at least four syllables. Thus the normal pronunciation of forms such as *metsniku* : *metsnikule* 'forester (gen. sg. : all. sg.)' are [¹metsniku], [¹metsnik.kulè] ~ [¹metsnik.kule] but not \*[¹mets'nikkù], \*[¹mets'nikkùle], cf., on the other hand, the pronunciation of compound forms *metsviisa* : *metsviisale* 'Lysimachia (gen. sg. : all. sg.)' whose second syllables are stressed [¹mets.viisà], [¹mets.viisàle]. There is probably no such question in the case of Hint's dialect.

Hint's objection (9) besides its repetitive character, cf. claims (3) and (4), contains

a proposal that can be refuted on phonetic grounds: durations in monosyllables are similar to those in bisyllabic words in Q3, thus monosyllables lack Q2 and do not neutralize the contrast between Q2 and Q3. On the other hand, the proposal provokes a counter-proposal: one should expand Hint's conception of morphologically bound and unbound secondary stresses to the primary stress. In a Central North Estonian dialect spoken in north-western Virumaa there occur besides monosyllabic nom. sg. forms of usual gradational stems also some nonstandard monosyllabic nom. sg. forms of gradationless *e*-stems, cf. *lõim* 'warp' (nom. sg. 'lõim, gen. sg. 'lõime, part. sg. 'lõime), *sõim* 'manger', *uim* 'fin', *taim* 'plant', *toim* 'grain, texture', *räim* 'dwarf herring' (this is a late borrowing from standard Estonian), *rüpp* 'lap', *tupp* 'sheath', *pilv* 'cloud', *talv* 'winter' (*pilv* and *talv* are inflected in the same way in most Central North Estonian dialects and show a tendency of spreading elsewhere). The difference between e. g. *pilv* (nom. sg. 'pilv, gen. sg. 'pilve, part. sg. 'pilve) and *põlv* 'knee' (nom. sg. 'põlv, gen. sg. 'põlve, part. sg. 'põlve) can be captured by setting up (a) the morphologically bound primary stress for gradational words (such as *põlv*) and (b) the morphologically unbound primary stress for gradationless words (such as *pilv*). Let us presume now that Q2 and Q3 can contrast only in gradational syllables. Then in all dialects both standard and nonstandard, which have three contrastive quantities for bisyllabic words at least two morphologically unbound primary stresses occur: one in syllables similar to (or rather: identical with) gradational syllables in Q2, another in syllables similar to gradational syllables in Q3. One may also ask why this approach should not be expanded to words in Q1 and a third morphologically unbound primary stress be set up for words not undergoing gradation (consonant mutation) in contrast to words that undergo it (cf. *jada* 'sequence (nom., gen. & part. sg.)' vs. *rada* : *raja* 'path (nom. & part. sg. : gen. sg.)'). Needless to say, these expansions demonstrate the almost absurd abstractness both of themselves and of the expandum as far as the syllables with morphologically bound and unbound stresses are phonetically similar (cf. also Hint's

claim (4)). Moreover, even in the most modest case the morphologically bound stresses are less stresses than addresses of the word in a grammar.

Further, it is rather doubtful whether there exist in North Estonian final nonemphatically stressed monosyllabic suffixes, gradational or gradationless. A clear proof of the stress would be the occurrence of the suffixes in Q3. However, there is a strong tendency to pronounce even the most wordlike and, hence, the least suffix-like borrowed gradational suffix *-elm(a)* with an unidentifiable quantity, cf. [*kujutelm*] 'fancy, image (nom. sg.)' although it is stressed and in Q3 in part. sg., cf. [*kujut<sub>1</sub>elma*]. Moreover, monosyllabic suffixes ending in stops are different from similar component words of compounds that are clearly in Q3 and according to Hint also carry the secondary stress, cf. [*pimèd<sub>1</sub>k*], 'nightfall' vs. compounds [*ime<sub>1</sub>Bi<sub>1</sub>k*] 'wonder how long', [*tule<sub>1</sub>Di<sub>1</sub>k*] 'safety match'. Historical arguments do not help as the gradational suffixes have lost their former stress on the second syllable of their weak grade forms, cf. the pronunciation of the forms *metsniku* and *metsnikule* above. There is even a known (although substandard) tendency to replace quadrysyllabic and longer historical strong stressed forms such as [*mets<sub>1</sub>ni<sub>1</sub>kkude*] 'forester (gen. pl.)' by unstressed forms of unidentifiable grade, cf. [*mets<sub>1</sub>ni<sub>1</sub>ku<sub>1</sub>tè*]. Therefore it is not sure that the final monosyllabic suffixes are treated as in the strong grade. Even more, although the gradational monosyllabic suffixes when followed by a closing affix *-ki* 'even', have in quadrysyllabic words an automatic secondary stress and are in Q3, cf. [*pimè<sub>1</sub>Di<sub>1</sub>kki*] 'even the nightfall', they are unstressed and not in Q3 in trisyllabic words, cf. [*mets<sub>1</sub>ni<sub>1</sub>kki*] 'even the forester' instead of the "expectable" \**[mets<sub>1</sub>ni<sub>1</sub>ki]*. I hold this for a sufficient argument for the unstressed nature of final monosyllabic suffixes. Hence I can but find myself in sympathy with Lehiste's approach. There exists also a third approach. Vihman (1974 : 418 ff.) holds all final syllables of trisyllabic words whose second

syllable is unstressed to be secondarily stressed. It is not quite sure what is actually meant here. First of all, such automatic stress can hardly be proved. But Vihman might also have in view the point that this syllable can receive the emphatic stress, being thus potentially stressed.

Besides the critique Chapter 2 contains a systematized body of illustrations to Hint's model of contrastive quantities together with interesting comparative data from South Estonian dialects.

Chapter 3, "Morphophonological, Phonological and Phonetic Component Words and Their Interrelations in Word Phonology" (32 pp.) contains first a somewhat tiresome discussion of the meanings of the term *phonological word* as used by different authorities. Besides that the terms *morphophonological word*, *morphophonological component word*, *phonological component word* and *phonetic component word* are defined, yet not well defined. Actually, Hint's morphophonological word is a sequence between two word boundaries, i. e. a simple word or a compound in the common sense. (Hint himself prefers to treat the morphophonological word as a unit primarily beginning with a syllable that carries a morphologically bound stress and ending before another syllable with a morphologically bound stress and only exceptionally as what it unexceptionally is.) If a morphophonological word contains several morphologically bound stresses then the domain of each stress is called a morphophonological component word. An initial unstressed syllable is treated as belonging to the domain of the stress whose focus is the second syllable. A phonological component word is a sequence with one morphologically bound stress and ending before a syllable with a morphologically bound or unbound secondary stress or ending before a word boundary. A phonetic component word begins in a syllable with the morphologically unbound secondary stress and ends before the word boundary. Hence, no "component word" is, in principle, a word. However, one more "component word" covering the proclitic initial syllables in morphophonological (and phonological) component words would be expedient. Then the placement of the morphologically unbound secondary stress, for a dialect, could be considered as auto-

matic and instead of six types of phonological component words with the primary stress listed in Chapter 3, only three would be the case.

Chapter 4, "The Accentual Structure of the Vocabulary of Literary Estonian and Orthological Problems of Morphologically Bound Stresses" (64 pp.) deals with four major problems: (a) stress(es) in borrowings, (b) morphologically bound stress in derivational suffixes, (c) unbound secondary stress and (d) the way stresses are to be handled in grammar.

Hint's treatment of stresses in borrowings, no doubt, is very valuable for the practical standardization of borrowings in Estonian as he proposes simple and effective ways of unifying several contradictory norms. For me, however, a number of pronunciations of borrowings accepted and discussed by Hint are hypercorrect. Therefore I prefer not to comment on Hint's discussion in more than one point. Namely I cannot adhere to the "powerful opposition" (i. e. Hint, Erelt & Kull) who advocate writing borrowings such as *pankrot* 'bankruptcy', *piiskop* 'bishop', etc. with two final stop letters (p. 118) as e. g. in a true compound *rändrott* 'grey rat', cf. the discussion of statements (4) and (9) hereinbefore. In addition to the only possible kind of consistency, as Hint characterizes writing two stop letters in words of the type, and to "the practical alternative" of allowing here depending on one's wishes the parallel use of one and two stop letters, I should like to propose a third alternative: to write final stops in all polysyllabic words with one letter except (1) in compounds with a monosyllabic final component word and (2) in bisyllabic words with a proclitic first syllable in Q1 or Q2. For me and most North Estonians this is the only consistent way of treating the type of borrowings although it is very different from Hint's idea of the only kind of consistency.

When examining morphologically bound stresses in derivational suffixes, Hint finds a number of interesting examples about unstable or parallel use of the morphologically bound and unbound stress. It still remains problematic to what extent this instability depends on one's dialect and the sentence stress.

For the morphologically unbound nonemphatic secondary stress Hint formulates a set of stress rules that as far as I see yield 13 stress patterns for words consisting at the utmost of six syllables. Let P, A and U stand for syllables having, correspondingly, the primary stress, the morphologically unbound secondary stress, and no stress. Then the patterns, ordered according to the number of syllables (1--6) are as follows:

- (1) P, e. g. *ma*
- (2a) PA, e. g. *vankrit*
- (2b) PU, e. g. *laulu*
- (3a) PAU, e. g. *vankrile*
- (3b) PUA, e. g. *osavat*
- (3c) PUU, e. g. *nooriku*
- (4a) PAUU, e. g. *tõestusele*
- (4b) PUAU, e. g. *tõestusele*
- (5a) PUUAU, e. g. *õpetajateks*
- (5b) PUAUA, e. g. *õpetajateks*
- (5c) PUAAU, e. g. *õpetajateks*
- (6a) PUUAUU, e. g. *erinevatesse*
- (6b) PUAUAU, e. g. *erinevatesse*

Yet I suspect that the feature treated as the unbound secondary stress on final syllables in patterns (2a), (3b), and (5b) is actually an inherent characteristic of long closed syllables although it is ordinarily the final syllable that bears the sentence stress for words of the type. Moreover, although Hint seems to be correct in stating alternative pattern usage of quinesyllabic and longer words, it seems also that either some patterns are still emphatic or represent different styles. For a hypothesis I claim that the formal and, for the most part, even normal nonemphatic North-Estonian stress patterns for noncompound words are as follows (M stands for syllables with the morphologically bound secondary stress, Q3 is indicated when necessary).

- (1) P
- (2) PU
- (3a) P\*MU
- (3b) PUU
- (4a) P\*MUU
- (4b) PUAU
- (5a) P\*MUAU
- (5b) PUUMU
- (5c) PUAUU
- (6a) P\*MUAAU
- (6b) PUUMUU

- (6c) PUAU  
 (7a) PUUMU  
 (7b) PUAUMU  
 (7c) PUAUU  
 (8a) PUUMU  
 (8b) PUAUMU  
 (8c) PUAUU  
 (9a) PUUMU  
 (9b) PUAUMU  
 (9c) PUAUU  
 (10a) PUUMU  
 (10b) PUAUMU  
 (10c) PUAUU  
 (11a) PUUMU  
 (11b) PUAUMU  
 (11c) PUAUU  
 (12) PUAUU

Examples: (1) 'maa, (2) 'vankrit, (3a) 'mets|nikku, 'tap|mata, (3b) 'mets|niku, (4a) 'mets|nikkude, 'tap|miseni, (4b) 'eri|neva, (5a) 'mets|nikku|dele, 'tap|mi|se|nigi, (5b) 'mõnu|mine, (5c) 'mõnu|lesime, (6a) 'mets|nikku|delegi, 'kart|matu|selegi, (6b) 'mõnu|mise|legi, (6c) 'mõnu|lesi|megi, (7a) 'mõnu|lese|legi, (7b) 'vastas|tikusta|mine, (7c) 'vastas|tikus|tata|vate, (8a) 'halas|ta|matu|telegi, (8b) 'vastas|tikusta|mise|legi, (8c) 'vastas|tikus|tata|vate, (9a) 'karjalas|tata|matu|sele, (9b) 'vastas|tikusta|mise|legi, (9c) 'vastas|tikus|tata|vatele, (10a) 'karjalas|tata|matu|selegi, (10b) 'vastas|tikusta|matu|selegi, (10c) 'vastas|tikus|tata|vate|legi, (11a) 'karjalas|tata|matu|mate|legi, (11b) 'vastas|tikusta|matu|mate|legi, (11c) 'vastas|tikus|tata|matu|mate|legi, (12) 'vastas|tikus|tata|matu|mate|legi. Note, first, that here the position of the morphologically bound stress does not coincide with that of the automatic secondary stress; thus the morphologically bound stress is treated as a marking device and not as a principle. Second, patterns (4a), (5a) and (6a) are in nongradational cases normally replaced by patterns (4b), (5c) and (6c), i. e. for patterns with automatic, morphologically unbound secondary stresses. Third, it is noteworthy that stress groups (i. e. "component words" having a stressed initial syllable) P, PUU, MUU and AUU are never followed by a syllable carrying the automatic secondary stress whereas stress groups PU, MU and AU are never followed by a syllable carrying the morphologically bound secondary stress.

According to Hint, the stress rules can

be most efficiently integrated into grammar by operating with hierarchically ordered junctures. Junctures are considered initial phonemes of morphemes or morphophonological component words. Junctures determine rules establishing stresses, the possibility of the contrast of Q2 and Q3, and even the possibility of pattern replacement. Thus nine junctures are postulated, among them, interesting enough, a juncture of weak-stressed (i. e. unstressed) syllables. It is questionable whether junctures really must determine the possibilities (and ways) of pattern replacement. What concerns the possibility of the contrast of Q2 and Q3 then, in Hint's dialect, this really must be handled by means of junctures.

As standard Estonian is, above all, Estonian with a standardized morphology, then for the majority of speakers of standard or almost standard Estonian, the most interesting properties of the stress system described in Hint's book can be characterized as traces of the lost youth of the standard morphological system. In North Estonian the standard morphological system has received a rather complicated morphophonological reinterpretation because of a considerable simplification of the stress system. The South Estonian variety of the standard (North) Estonian is thus more consistent than the North Estonian varieties in preserving the original stress and quantity in gradational suffixes. On the other hand, the stress system exhibited in the book has given, in its dialect, rise to a sharp decrease in possibilities of the contrastive occurrence of Q2 and Q3. It is a great merit of Hint that he has let us know about the reality of such an Estonian stress system although or, rather, because he did not describe the most wide-spread variety of standard Estonian. So far even all generations of investigators of Estonian local dialects have paid no attention whatsoever to secondary stresses and nongradational quantity contrasts in nonfirst syllables. One could also suspect that the traditional conception of stress and quantity in Estonian was purely a didactic oversimplification of facts. Still it is a reality for a fifth part of the Estonian population.

There is much more that is valuable in the book. The present reviewer has the weakness of constantly raising objections

instead of merely enumerating the contents and merits of a piece of research. The

reader will discover all the numerous merits when reading the book.

## REFERENCES

- Lehiste, I. 1965, The Function of Quantity in Finnish and Estonian. — Language 41, pp. 447—456.  
 — — 1966, Consonant Quantity and Phonological Units in Estonian, Bloomington—The Hague (UAS 65).  
 — — 1970, Suprasegmentals, Cambridge, Massachusetts—London, England.
- Tauli, V. 1973, Quantity and Accent in Estonian. — Commentationes fenno-ugricae in honorem Erkki Itkonen, Helsinki (MSFOu 150), pp. 390—403.
- Vihman, E. 1974, Estonian Quantity Re-viewed. — Foundations of Language 11, pp. 415—432. (Review of Lehiste 1966.)

TIIT-REIN VIITSO (Tartu)

**Фразеологический словарь мордовских языков. Составитель Р. С. Ширманкина, под редакцией Д. В. Цыганкина. Мордовское книжное издательство, Саранск 1973. 222 стр.**

Специального словаря фразеологизмов мордовских языков до сих пор не было. Фразеологизмы приводились лишь в словарных статьях существующих мордовских словарей. Фразеологический словарь, составленный Р. Ширманкиной, представляет собой довольно удачную попытку восполнить этот пробел в мордовской лексикографии.

Естественно, создание словаря потребовало и теоретической разработки вопросов мордовской фразеологии, что сделано автором в ранее написанной работе «Фразеология мордовских языков» (1970, канд. дисс.).

Для более полного раскрытия природы фразеологизма в монографии дается определение фразеологической единицы, ее сопоставление со словом как единицей языка, а также со словосочетанием, с парными словами, которых очень много в мордовских языках, пословицами и поговорками.

Некоторые теоретические положения о фразеологизмах нашли место во вступительной статье. Автором четко определены критерии выделения мордовских фразеологизмов, установлены границы фразеологических единиц, их типы.

С точки зрения образования Р. С. Ширманкина выделяет следующие типы фразеологических единиц: 1) устойчивые ме-

тафорические сочетания, представляющие собой составные названия, переносимые на основе сходства признаков с одного предмета или явления на другой предмет или явление; 2) фразеологические единицы с изобразительными словами; 3) устойчивые сравнения (эрз. *прок толдо пелемс* 'сильно бояться', эрз. *кода ой ланга*, мокш. *кода вай ланга* 'как по маслу' и др.); 4) эллиптические устойчивые сочетания, имеющие разнообразную грамматическую структуру (эрз. *а кулозь а жив*, мокш. *аф жив аф кула* 'ни жив ни мертв', эрз. *а тей а тов*, мокш. *аф сей, аф тов* 'ни туда ни сюда' и др.); 5) эмоционально-экспрессивные выражения междометного характера, количество которых в мордовских языках значительно.

Во вступительной статье дается характеристика структуры словаря.

Для обеспечения наиболее удобного пользования словарем фразеологизмы в нем расположены в алфавитно-гнездовом порядке. И варианты и некоторые производные формы размещены внутри словарной статьи. Толкование значения фразеологических единиц дается на русском языке. После заголовка статьи идет помета, указывающая, какому языку принадлежит фразеологизм (эрзянскому или мокшанскому). Тщательно продумана система ссылок.