определению, члены падежной системы праязыка представлены в современных финно-угорских языках не в равной мере. Если какой-то язык имеет более одного члена, то другие пользуются только одним-единственным. В формировании современных венгерских суффиксов решающую роль играли первичные суффиксы (4.31.6). После рассмотрения происхождения и спорных проблем окончаний, обозначающих число существительных, время, наклонение и лицо глаголов в заключительной части главы дается несколько интересных замечаний о запасе слов. На основе строгого этимологического рассуждения число основных слов финно-угорского происхождения — 700—800, но при учете производных слов и группы слов внутреннего сложения это количество сильно возрастает. На основе статистики частоты употребления слов и некоторых текстологических исследований количество старинных слов в текстах и в речи достигает 80% (4.4).

Для подробного реферирования богатого материала книги надо очень много места. Цель данной рецензии — осветить вопросы, которые интересуют большинство финно-угроведов, поэтому четвертой главе уделено меньше внимания. Книга профессора П. Хайду представляет большой интерес для международной лингвистики, и очень важно, чтобы она как можно скорее была переведена на ведущие языки мира.

*ПЕТЕР ДОМОКОШ* (Ленинград)

https://doi.org/10.3176/lu.1967.4.11

**Ilse Lehiste, Consonant Quantity and Phonological Units in Estonian (= Indiana University Publications. Uralic and Altaic Series, Vol. 65), Bloomington, The Hague 1966. V + 73 pp.**

The phonology of quantity in standard Estonian has for decades been in the focus of attention of Estonian phonetics and phonology. Nevertheless, the perceptual and objective physical aspects of phonological quantity in Estonian are still not entirely clear and in the case of several problems connected with quantity, phonological theory is compelled to speculate without up-to-date experimental material. In such a situation every experimental investigation carried out with more exacting methods is extremely welcome.

The present review deals with the phonological side of Ilse Lehiste's investigation although the book merits particular appreciation on the part of phoneticians.

Ilse Lehiste's investigation is authoritative proof that there is extensive overlapping of the objective physical durations of consonants in quantities 1 and 2 (and especially in quantities 2 and 3) when they occur after a stressed vowel. In interpreting the concrete realizations of different phonological degrees of quantity it is therefore necessary to take into account extensively the phonological environment (including stress). But phonological theory can proceed beyond the empiricism of concrete individual cases. In the opinion of the present reviewer this is a situation where phonological theory requires that a distinction should be made between language (*langue*) and speech (*parole*). At the language level, the phonological degrees of quantity are clearly distinguished; at the speech level, the realization of quantity distinctions depends in each concrete case on the conditions of the segmental and suprasegmental environment. The combined influence of these conditions may often result in the objective physical (durational) overlapping of different phonological degrees of quantity.

One of the essential problems of phonology which I. Lehiste endeavours to answer is whether the beginning of a word and the beginning of the second member of a compound word in Estonian are phonetically marked by a different quantity of the word-initial segment. The answer is that the beginning of a word and the beginning of the second member of a compound word m a y b e phonetically marked by the special duration (intermediate between quantities 1 and 2) of the word-initial plosive consonant or

sibilant. This conclusion is of paramount importance for phonology. In the light of the theoretical precondition mentioned in the preceding section of this review one may paraphrase the result of Lehiste's research as follows: in language (in case of Estonian) there is a possibility of marking the beginning of a word and the beginning of the second member of a compound word by means of the special duration of a word-initial plosive or sibilant; in speech this possibility may or may not be used and various environmental conditions (unstressed position, the sequence nasal + plosive at a word boundary) may eliminate the possibility of the durational marking of the beginning of a word. The utilization in speech of the possibilities inherent in language belongs to the domain of probability and statistics. Unfortunately we have thus far few concrete data on the frequency ratio of the durational marking and non-marking of the beginning of a word and the second member in compound words.

I. Lehiste has also earlier dealt with the problem of exceptional word-initial quantity. In the book under review she does not reiterate her earlier view that if morphological prerequisites are not introduced into phonological description, then the exceptional word-initial quantity of the second member of a compound word should be regarded as an independent contrastive degree of phonological quantity and one should distinguish four phonologically contrastive degrees of quantity in standard Estonian.[1] As a matter of fact such a revision of Estonian phonology is not necessary. The case under discussion is one involving what is almost a classical juncture situation: an exceptional quantity occurs only before stressed vowels (primary, secondary stress). Moreover such stressed vowels are often preceded by phoneme sequences that permit us to postulate a structural juncture. Thus, there is also a phonetic possibility for the manifestation of word juncture (phonetic juncture).

[1] I. Lehiste, Compounding as a Phonological Process. — Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Linguistics, Cambridge, Mass. 1962, s-Gravenhage 1964, pp. 331—337.

The realization of the phonological degrees of quantity in Estonian cannot be viewed apart from the phenomena of stress. I. Lehiste shares this view.

But stress in Estonian is a much more complicated matter than hitherto believed. The realization and neutralization of phonological contrasts of quantity in non-initial syllables cannot be satisfactorily accounted for if one does not distinguish "connected" and "free" secondary stress.

Connected secondary stress occurs in the initial syllables of the second members of compound words, in foreign words, and, under certain conditions (after disyllabic and longer stems), in some derivational suffixes, including all suffixes with quantity or consonant quality gradation (after monosyllabic stems these suffixes can occur also with free secondary stress, cf. [*saks|laštele*] and [*'saksla|žele*], [*'arst-|likkule*] and [*'arstlik|kule*] where primary stress is indicated by ' and secondary stress by | before the stressed syllable). Connected secondary stress does not shift away from the syllable in any inflexional form of the word concerned. The phonologicity of connected secondary stress is beyond doubt. In non-initial syllables the phonological contrast of quantities 2 and 3 is possible only in syllables with connected secondary stress: in the initial syllables of the second members of compound words, in foreign words, and in derivational suffixes with quantity or consonant quality gradation. Thus, the contrasting of three phonological quantity degrees is possible in non-initial syllables only if words with connected secondary stress participate in contrasting, i. e. compound words, foreign words or words containing suffixes with quantity or consonant quality gradation (or also words with suffixes derived from the strong grade forms of such suffixes), e. g. *avalaga*, *avaliku* and *avalikku* or *avalikkus*.

The placement of free secondary stress depends on the quantity of the initial syllable of a word, on the number of syllables in a word and on their structure. Free secondary stress can shift from one syllable to another in the different inflexional forms of a word, cf. [*'kiɲɒ|lat*] but [*'kiɲɒla|mat*] or [*'ilù|žalè*] but [*'iluža-*

[*ˌmaťte*]. There is individual variation in the use of free secondary stress. As in the case of weak stress, there is no phonological contrast of quantities 2 and 3 in non-initial syllables with free secondary stress (or in a position following the vowel of such a syllable). Here consonants and consonant clusters that are phonologically contrasted with consonants in quantity 1 occur in an ambiguous quantity intermediate between quantity 2 and quantity 3. This is also the case after vowels in weakly stressed (unstressed) syllables.

At the present time it is still not quite clear how many purely phonological criteria uninfluenced by morphophonology (e. g. phonetic and structural juncture in connection with secondary stress, the different placement of connected and free secondary stress in words with the same number of syllables and the same syllabic structure) could be established in order to distinguish connected and free secondary stress and whether it is at all possible to set up phonological criteria capable of providing a solution for each concrete case (a hierarchical description of language does not even require criteria uninfluenced by morphophonology). Nevertheless, I. Lehiste's differentiation of consonants of ambiguous duration intermediate between quantities 2 and 3 into consonants of ambiguous quantity following weakly stressed vowels and into consonants in quantity 3 following vowels with (free) secondary stress, would appear superfluous to a phonologist. Thus, e. g. Lehiste regards *ss* as being of indeterminate quantity in such words as *talusse*, but assigns it to quantity 3 in such words as *kindlasse* or *elamusse* (6. 1. 4., p. 32). Other *ad hoc* decisions seem to be the assignment of intervocalic *t* to quantity 2 in such words as *aastate* or *tundmatut* and to quantity 3 in such words as *vastamata* or *maksmata* (4. 1. 2., 4. 1. 3, pp. 14—16); it is not possible to construct a phonological contrast of quantities 2 and 3 here, just as it is not possible to do so in the case of a so-called indeterminate quantity following a weakly stressed vowel (*kipitab*, *huvitav*, etc., 4. 1. 4, p. 17). It should be noted that when dealing with *k* such a differentiation is justified because connected secondary stress does occur in words like *puusliku* and *luustiku*, *puuslikku* and *luustikku*, and there is a genuine contrast here of quantities 2 and 3 (5. 1. 2. — 5. 1. 4, pp. 24—26).

In the end I. Lehiste comes to the conclusion that "Within a word-level unit, consonants in the quantity up to now called ambiguous are thus equivalent to what up to now have been considered certain positionally conditioned allophones of consonants in quantity 3" (p. 40). This conclusion derives from the neutralization of the contrast between plosives in quantities 2 and 3 of the word types *saata* and *niit* or *huvitav* and *alet* (pp. 40 ff., p. 44) and from the physically identical durations of intervocalic plosives in both groups of words. One is not justified, however, in drawing a parallel between the quantity of *t* in the words *saata* and *niit* and *huvitav* and *alet*. In *saata* and *niit* the *t* occurs after a long stressed vowel, in *huvitav* and *alet* it stands after a short weakly stressed vowel; the physical similarity of their quantity is not sufficient ground for separating overlength from stress. The neutralization of quantities 2 and 3 in such words as *saata* or *niit* which is due to a vowel in quantity 3 (or the neutralization of vowels in quantities 2 and 3 due to a consonant in quantity 3) is not comparable with the neutralization of quantities 2 and 3 in non-initial syllables which is associated with the phonology and morphophonology of the stress system (moreover, the contrast of voiceless obstruents in quantities 2 and 3 is not neutralized completely after a long vowel or diphthong in words of the *saata* type; to a limited extent this contrast is preserved: cf. such words in quantity 2 as *Meeta*, *Aita*, *liipa-laapa*, *teeta* (*ϑ*), *beeta* (*β*), *täika*, *koiku*, etc., where the plosive is contrasted with a plosive occurring after a long vowel or diphthong in words of quantity 3). And the neutralization of quantities 2 and 3 (of consonants) occurs not only in a weakly stressed (unstressed) syllable (and after the vowel of a weakly stressed syllable) as pointed out by I. Lehiste (p. 42), but also in syllables carrying a free secondary stress (and

after the vowel of a syllable with free secondary stress; and also after vowels with a connected secondary stress in suffixes without quantity or consonant quality gradation such as *-line*, *-lane*, *-kene*, etc.; such suffixes without gradation reveal a certain tendency to acquire a free secondary stress in colloquial pronunciation).

Quantity 3 (or overlength) is indeed very closely associated with stress (cf. I. Lehiste, p. 42: "overlength is somehow associated with stress"), and, namely, with primary stress and connected secondary stress.

The detailed problems of quantitative phonology in Estonian, including the neutralization of phonological quantity in non-initial syllables, cannot be solved satisfactorily for intuition unless one links these problems with the phonology and also with the morphophonology of the stress system. It is regrettable that so little attention has been paid to the system of stress in Estonian up to now.

The reviewer is entirely in sympathy with I. Lehiste's standpoint that quantity 3 in Estonian is associated with either overlong vowels and diphthongs or with overlong consonants (p. 1), and not with a consonant cluster as a whole.[2] Such a point of view derives from the peculiarities of the phonological system, not from the assignment of a phonological status to physical duration. Consequently a phonologist fails to be convinced by I. Lehiste's attempt to justify an earlier inconsistency of hers, viz. her assignment to quantity 2 of the initial component *t* of the consonant cluster in *katki*, a word of quantity 3 (p. 45 ff).[3]

The present review contains some observations about the role of quantity within the phonological system of Estonian which are directly connected with the subject-matter of I. Lehiste's investigation and with her phonological interpretation of phonetic data.

I. Lehiste's book is an extremely welcome contribution to the investigation of the phonetics and phonology of quantity in Estonian. It is all the more welcome because the materials analyzed by I. Lehiste make it possible for analogous data to be submitted for vowels and voiced consonants. Hence there is reason to hope that before very long we shall see some additions to the investigation discussed in this review.

*MATI HINT* (Tallinn)

[2] Cf. M. Hint, On the Phonological Transcription of Overlength in Standard Estonian. — СФУ II 1966, pp. 23—36.

[3] Cf. I. Lehiste, Segmental and Syllabic Quantity in Estonian. — American Studies in Uralic Linguistics (= Indiana University Publications. Uralic and Altaic Series, Vol. 1), Bloomington 1960, p. 55.

**Г. И. Лаврентьев, Волжский говор марийского языка. Диссертация на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук, Тарту 1967.**

20 апреля 1967 г. на заседании Ученого совета Историко-филологического факультета Тартуского государственного университета состоялась защита диссертации преподавателем Цибикнурской средней школы Марийской АССР Г. И. Лаврентьевым. Официальными оппонентами выступили академик Академии наук ЭССР П. Аристэ и кандидат филологических наук И. Г. Иванов. Над своей диссертацией Г. И. Лаврентьев работал на кафедре марийского языка Марийского педагогического института под руководством профессора Н. Т. Пенгитова.

По своей композиции и методу анализа работа Г. И. Лаврентьева отличается от предыдущих диссертаций, посвященных характеристике говоров. В последнее время в марийском языкознании появился целый ряд исследований по отдельным говорам. Диссертация Г. И. Лаврентьева представляет собой одну из таких работ. Она посвящена своеобразному, но до сих пор малоизученному волжскому говору марийского языка. Эта диалектная разновидность занимает довольно значительную территорию по левому берегу Волги и составляет почти одну десятую часть всего