

толкование перехода начального *ф* в *в* привело автора к объяснению этого гидронима на базе германских языков: сканд. *fisk*, нем. *Fisch*, англ. *fish* 'рыба' (*Вишера* < нем. *Fischer* 'рыболов'). На самом же деле гидроним *Вишера* происходит от коми *Висьёр*. Так именует свою реку само коми население до сего времени. Палатализованный сибилант *с*, произносимый коми своеобразно (с преобладанием шипящего элемента), русские усвоили как *ш* (вернее *ш'* — в то время русскими этот звук произносился мягко), акустически близким звуку родного языка, и получилось *Вишер*; затем по подобию многочисленных речных названий нерусского происхождения это слово было приспособлено к форме женского рода. Отсюда: *Висьёр* > *Вишер* > *Вишера*, ср.: *Кам* > *Кама*, *Мой* > *Моя* и т. д.

В статье К. Г. Бутыриной «Из наблюдений над топонимией междуречья Камы и Чусовой» (стр. 115—120) систематизируются сведения по топонимии Камско-Чусового междуречья. Автор выделяет особые топонимические форманты, характерные для указанной территории: *-к*, *-ата* (*-ята*) и др., отмечает топонимы нерусского происхождения.

Активный организатор топонимической работы среди студентов Пермского университета и член Пермского отдела Географического общества СССР Ю. Г. Вылежнев дает информацию о деятельности

секции топонимики и транскрипции Пермского отдела Географического общества СССР со дня ее организации (стр. 121—125). Ю. Г. Вылежнев выступает также с сообщением о работе топонимического кружка при географическом факультете Пермского университета (стр. 126—131).

С. Ф. Николаев помещает аннотированный указатель литературы по теме «Географические названия Пермской области» (стр. 132—146), в котором он дает анализ существующей литературы по топонимике Пермской области.

В конце сборника приложены четыре правительственных документа, касающиеся порядка наименования и переименования местных названий в нашей стране.

В заключение хочется сказать, что в опубликованном учеными-пермичами труде читатель найдет объяснения многим топонимам пермского края, например: *Оханск*, *Ухтым*, *Космос*, *Сюроль*, *Коколь*, *Кекур* и др., которые с точки зрения современного русского языка непонятны, но исторически доказываются их финно-угорское происхождение. Рецензируемый сборник — начало большой работы по сбору и расшифровке географических наименований Прикамья. Редакционной коллегией и ответственным редактором С. Ф. Николаевым проделана большая и полезная работа.

Т. И. ТЕПЛЯШИНА (Москва)

<https://doi.org/10.3176/lu.1970.1.11>

Henno Rajandi, Eesti impersonaali ja passiivi süntaks. Väitekeri filoloogiateaduste kandidaadi teadusliku kraadi taotlemiseks, Tallinn 1968.

On April 2, 1969, Henno Rajandi defended his candidate's dissertation "The syntax of the impersonal and the passive in Estonian" before the Social Sciences Council of the Academy of Sciences of the Estonian SSR. The supervisor of the dissertation was *Cand. phil.* V. Hallap, the opponents Professor A. Kask and *Cand. phil.* T.-R. Viitso. The work deserves particular attention not only because an attempt is made to solve one of the most complicated problems in Estonian syntax but also because the means of generative grammar (GG) were applied to describe this problem.

The dissertation consists of three chapters. The first is wholly devoted to presenting the theory of GG. This chapter is quite extensive and, with its wealth of details, occasionally approaches a popular presentation in its style. But taking into account that the present work is the first attempt to make use of the principles of GG in Estonian linguistics, such thoroughness is quite justified.

The work was completed when essential modifications began to take place in the theory of GG. The works of N. Chomsky, J. R. Ross, G. Lakoff, J. McCawley, C. Fillmore and others have substantially

changed our concepts about the construction of GG, in particular as regards the relationship between syntax and semantics.

To a certain extent these modifications are also expressed in the present work, but mainly it is based on the classical conception of GG.

The author begins with an analysis of the differences between GG and taxonomic linguistics. He adduces cogent reasons why descriptive linguistics was doomed to fail in its attempts to find a universal method which, when applied to the concrete material of a given language, could lead to the discovery of its grammar. After that the main task of GG is formulated: 1) to find the rules for generating all and only the grammatically normal sentences of the described language, 2) to formulate the rules in such a way that the grammar would automatically provide each generated sentence with its structural description, not contradictory to the intuitive evidence of native speakers. This is followed by a short illustrative grammar, on the basis of which it is shown what is actually meant by these requirements.

The version of GG used by the author in his work is quite remarkable. The commonly accepted condition is that the transformations must not affect the meaning of the sentences. In other words, all information relevant to the semantic interpretation of sentences must be introduced by the phrase structure rules. This is precisely the reason why the concept of kernel sentences was replaced by the concept of deep structure. The version of H. Rajandi is original in that an attempt is made to combine these two alternatives. Phrase structure rules generate here not only the structures underlying the kernel sentences, i. e. kernel structures, but optionally also the "possibilities of transformations" related to the special category of "transformational mood".

The first phrase structure rule is then as follows:

$$S \rightarrow \# S' \# \text{ (transformational mood)}$$

where S' is the symbol of kernel structure.

For example, the first of the sentences *Meie oleme ülesande lahendanud* 'We have

solved the task' and *Ülesanne on meie poolt lahendatud* 'The task has been solved by us' is derived without using the transformational mood, but the latter sentence can be generated only in the case when there is the category symbol PASSIVE in the position of transformational mood.

Taking into account that it has not yet become immediately apparent how to fix the possibilities of transformations in GG, the solution given by H. Rajandi is remarkable. It is a fully appropriate way to describe the matters presented. Nevertheless, the general nature of the transformational mood is not very clear. The inclusion of transformational mood into the grammar is motivated by the author exclusively on the grounds that it is possible to subcategorize the verbs not only with respect to the variants of simple phrase structure (transitivity, presence or absence of various adverbials), but also with respect to the possible transformations. This, however, is obviously an insufficient motivation. In any case, all the symbols included in the transformational mood must be repeated in the lexical entries of respective verbs (as contextual features). But for the subcategorization it would be sufficient to include these symbols only in the lexical entries of verbs (in that case as inherent features) and to formulate the transformations so that their application depends on the presence of the respective symbols in the lexical entry of verbs. What has been said does not mean that such a use of transformational mood has absolutely no value. The principal value of transformational mood depends first of all on whether this way of presenting the possibilities of transformations is better or worse than others. It is namely here that some additional motivations would be necessary.

Let us proceed now to the concrete analysis contained in the work under review. The main problems discussed in this work are the relations between active and passive sentences in Estonian, including the relationship between impersonality and passivity. These are the problems to which the second (and central) chapter of the work is devoted. This chapter is divided into the following sections: 1) impersonal, 2) *tud-*, *nud-*, *mata-*adjectivi-

zation, 3) *tav-*, *v-*, *mata*-adjectivization, 4) nominalized predication. (The term "predication" is used by the author for the sake of brevity instead of the term "predicativization". Indeed, this does not lead to any confusion in the present work. But with respect to a larger context it is a rather thoughtless substitution. The notion of "predication" differs greatly from that of "predicativization". Moreover, the notion "predication" itself seems indispensable when the problems discussed here are to be considered from the viewpoint of semantics.)

At the end of this chapter the results of the analysis are formulated as a part of the grammar. In the third (and last) chapter the possibilities of the further expansion of the system of predication are considered.

The author has been able to make so many valuable observations that any attempt to summarize them here would be impossible. Therefore, we shall consider only the main topics dealt with in the work, i. e. on the one hand the impersonal and on the other hand the passive, with the related problems of adjectivization.

What are impersonal constructions? In the case of the "simple tenses" (present, preterite), the identification of the impersonal presents no problem because there a nonambiguous morphological marker is associated with the impersonal verbs (*töötatakse*, *töötati* '(somebody) works, worked').

The matter is clear also in the case of the perfect tenses of the intransitive verbs and in the case of verbs that take a participial object (*on*, *oli ujutud*, *teda on*, *oli meelitatud* '(somebody) has, had swum, he has been, had been flattered'). On the other hand, there is no difficulty in including such constructions as *Me oleme*, *olime sunnitud vaikima* 'We have, had to be silent' in the personal paradigm because the auxiliary verb has a clearly personal marker and it would be absurd to regard them as impersonal constructions.

But problems arise in the case of such sentences as *Tunnistaja on*, *oli sunnitud vaikima* 'The witness is, was forced to be silent' or 'The witness has, had to be silent' because in this case it is impossible to say whether the main condition of an

impersonal construction — the absence of a personal form — is fulfilled or not. It is not immediately clear from the form of the verb whether it agrees in person with the word *tunnistaja* 'witness' or not. The verb *sundima* 'to force, to make (somebody) do something' takes the nominative object and, therefore, the noun *tunnistaja* may be considered both as a subject and an object. Thus, there are, on the one hand, the clearly impersonal constructions and, on the other hand, the clearly personal *tud*-constructions. In addition to these, there are sentences about which it is impossible to say whether we have to do with personal or impersonal sentences.

Estonian linguists have thus far not been able to decide how to analyze the above constructions. H. Rajandi points out that there are two possible ways of interpreting these sentences: first, to regard them as impersonal sentences (somebody has forced the witness to be silent), which means that one sees here a reference to an animate actor, and secondly, an interpretation neutral with respect to such a reference. In the latter case the noun in the nominative *tunnistaja* is the subject of the sentence. The sentence *Tunnistaja on sunnitud vaikima* 'The witness has been forced to be silent' interpreted in the former way enters the paradigm *tunnistaja sunnitakse*, *sunniti*, *on sunnitud*, *oli sunnitud vaikima* 'The witness is (being) forced, was (being) forced, has been forced, had been forced to be silent', but interpreted in the latter way the paradigm *Tunnistaja on sunnitud*, *oli sunnitud*, *on olnud sunnitud*, *oli olnud sunnitud vaikima* 'The witness has, had, has had, had had to be silent'.

Thus, the author arrives at the conclusion that the impersonal in Estonian has an independent paradigm and the impersonal constructions, which include the verb in the perfect tenses, must be kept apart from the personal constructions formed by the *tud*-participle and an auxiliary verb. The demarcation line runs also through the syntactically ambiguous cases presented above, which could be considered either as impersonal sentences or as personal sentences but surely not as both simultaneously.

In terms of GG the impersonal is

considered as a transformational mood. The impersonal structures have been derived from the personal kernel structures by the impersonal transformation. The kernel structures to which the transformation applies have a subject-noun characterized by the feature "animate". The transformation either deletes the subject or converts it into the agent-adverbial. For the transformation to be applied, there must be the category symbol IMPERSONAL in the position of the transformational mood. The final form of the impersonal transformation is as follows (cf. pp. 114):

$$\begin{matrix} NP_1 \text{ SUBT} \\ \text{AUX V} \end{matrix} \left[\begin{matrix} NP_2 \text{ OBT IMPRST AGENDIT} \\ NP_2 \text{ OBT IMPRST} \\ \text{IMPRST} \end{matrix} \right] \rightarrow$$

$$\rightarrow \left[\begin{matrix} NP_2 \text{ OBT} \\ NP_2 \text{ OBT} \end{matrix} \right] \text{AUX IMPRST V INP}_1 \text{ AGENDIT}$$

where SUBT, OBT, IMPRST and AGENDIT are the markers of the subject, object, impersonal and agent-adverbial respectively.

It must be pointed out that such a formulation of the impersonal transformation has a comparatively bad consequence. In the formulation of H. Rajandi this transformation (as also all other transformations) will be applied after the concrete lexical items are introduced into the kernel structure; in particular, in the kernel structure there is always a concrete lexical subject, and the impersonal transformation can delete it. But taking into account that semantic interpretation is given to sentences always before the transformations are applied to them, so it appears now that according to H. Rajandi there is a concrete lexical subject in the semantic representation of impersonal sentences. So, for instance, such sentences as *Töötatakse* '(Somebody) is working', *Ujutakse jäises vees* '(Somebody) is swimming in icy water' receive a semantic interpretation where a wholly concrete actor (worker, swimmer) is presented: Jüri, Jaan, a boy, a man, etc. From the point of view of the semantics of the impersonal this is, of course, absurd. Thus the requirement is needed that the impersonal transformation which deletes the subject does not apply in the case of concrete lexical subjects but can take place only in the case of specific "empty" subjects (which, nevertheless,

must contain the feature "animate"). It is not easy to decide how exactly to formulate this requirement. But it may be noted that the need for such a requirement can turn out to be a very strong argument in favour of those who treat the Estonian impersonal as a so-called "fourth person".

What is the grammatical status of personal complex *tud*-constructions? According to the author, it is here and only here that we have passive constructions, since the object of the kernel structure has become the subject of the transformed structure. This puts an end to the view that the Estonian impersonal is only a special case of the passive. The impersonal and passive constructions may overlap formally, but this does not mean the sameness of these categories, as is shown by the existence of two different interpretations of such overlap-cases.

One of the most conspicuous features of complex *tud*-constructions is that the participle has the clear characteristics of an adjective. Another feature is that the verb *olema* 'to be' occurs here more as a copula than as an auxiliary verb. In other words, these constructions are very similar to predicative constructions. Since such adjectivity is characteristic not only of *tud*-participles (in personal *tud*-constructions), the author has sufficient grounds to speak of a specific grammatical category "adjectivization". So, for instance, the adjectivity of the *nud*-participle reveals itself clearly in the sentences of the following (b)-paradigm, as contrasted with those of the (a)-paradigm:

- a) *Ta üllatub* 'He feels surprised'
Ta üllatus 'He felt surprised'
Ta on üllatunud 'He has felt surprised'
Ta oli üllatunud 'He had felt surprised'
- b) *Ta on üllatunud* 'He is surprised'
Ta oli üllatunud 'He was surprised'
Ta on olnud üllatunud 'He has been surprised'
Ta oli olnud üllatunud 'He had been surprised'

The description of the types of adjectivization is very thorough and wholly new in Estonian linguistics. In addition to the *nud*- and *tud*-adjectivi-

zations the author has also thoroughly analyzed the *tav-* and *v-*adjectivizations. The *tud-*adjectivization along with the *tav-*adjectivization (*Me mõistame seda* 'We understand it' → *See on meile mõistetav* 'It is understandable to us') constitutes the so-called passive adjectivization; and it is contrasted with the active adjectivization, i. e. with *nud-* and *v-*adjectivizations.

The forming of constructions with personal participles constitutes, in fact, the predicativization of kernel structures where the adjectivized verb assumes the function of the predicative. In the transformational mood the symbol PREDTVN is now added to the symbol IMPRSNL, and the first rule of grammar takes the following form:

$S \rightarrow S'$ (IMPRSNL) (PREDTVN)

where S = sentence, S' = kernel structure, IMPRSNL = impersonal, and PREDTVN = predicativization. The symbol PREDTVN will in turn be rewritten as follows:

PREDTVN → (AGENDIT) (PASS)

(EITUS) (ADJVN)

where AGENDIT = agent marker, PASS = passive, EITUS = negation, ADJVN = adjectivization.

In connection with the notion of adjectivization as employed in the dissertation, it is necessary to add some remarks on the problem of distinguishing word classes. The author emphasizes that "adjectivization" does not mean that the participles in the constructions under discussion are in fact adjectives. They belong, it is said, nevertheless to the domain of verb syntax. The treatment of participles as adjectives would add a considerable amount of redundancy to the grammar. This is because many syntactic properties of verbs (e. g. government) are preserved by the participles, and this entails giving the same rules in many places in the grammar.

It is clear, of course, that the redundancy of grammar should be avoided. But the solution offered by H. Rajandi, where the verb is in every respect the primary category, is hardly the most appropriate. In the case of participles there would appear to be no troublesome consequences. Such troubles appear immediately, however, when we consider the other possible adjectivizations. Thus, the author tries to

convince us (on pp. 249 ff.) that, for instance, the words *ettenägelik* 'far-sighted', *tänulik* 'grateful', *leplik* 'tolerant', *asjatundlik* 'competent' are not adjectives but grammatical forms of verbs, since in Estonian there are the corresponding verbs and there are, moreover, the negative adjectivizations *ettenägematu* 'lacking foresight', *tänamatu* 'ungrateful', *leppimatu* 'irreconcilable', *asjatundmatu* 'incompetent'. But it cannot be said that such a treatment would significantly clarify the problem of word classes. We might ask now, for instance, why not to treat even such a word as *vihane* 'angry' as a verb form. We can easily find the needed verb (*vihastuma* 'to get angry' or *vihkama* 'to hate'), and so we could formulate also the corresponding transformation. It is clear that if we follow this principle strictly we will either reach a deadlock or, at least, appear to stand very far from linguistic tradition. It would appear that the only reasonable way to avoid redundancy in this part of grammar and, at the same time, to exclude such facts as contradict our linguistic intuition, is to cease treating the difference between morphological word classes (at least between verbs and adjectives) as relevant in deep (= kernel) structure, and instead to introduce a category which would cover the common syntactic and semantic properties of adjectives and verbs*. These latter categories will appear as formal variants of this basic category at some point in surface structure. The question of at which point exactly (and therefore, also, of what is the exact relationship between participles and adjectives) must inevitably remain open at the present time.

In the dissertation the formal syntactic mechanisms have been brought out by which the impersonal, passive, adjectivized, etc. sentences are formed (can be formed). These are the mechanisms whose description is indispensable in any grammar which deals with these constructions, and however contentoriented the treatment. But at the same time, it is just in the case of such a description that it becomes

* Cf., for instance, G. Lakoff, On the Nature of Syntactic Irregularity. — Report No. NSF-16, 1965. Harvard Computation Laboratory.

evident to what an extent such categories as the impersonal and the passive are in fact semantic categories. If we want to explain (and not merely to describe) the differences between impersonality—personality, passivity—activity, etc., it would not suffice to present only the respective formal facts, but we have to descend into semantics and show what differences underlie the formal contrasts described. Only in this way we are able to offer some more convincing essential motivations for the selected syntactic treatment of impersonal and passive constructions, than are the phrases “connected with the useful notion “subject”” and “connected with the useful notion “object”” which are given in the dissertation (p. 138). This does not mean, of course, that we should have expected to find such semantic motivations already in the dissertation. The corresponding semantic problems in themselves constitute a field of study which apparently is far more extensive than are the problems treated in the given dissertation. But we would like to emphasize that it must not be thought that the problems connected with the categories of the impersonal and the passive (even only in Estonian) are now completely resolved. (It must be noted that the same is stressed in the dissertation.) We should also like to point out that the problems treated in this dissertation appear to be of the very kind which at the present time are becoming more and more topical in the theory of GG and, in particular, in

the theory of semantics. Many of the problems which are (or are becoming) central in semantics, such as, for instance, the difference between a sentence (as a predicative structure) and a noun phrase (as a nonpredicative, or attributive structure) from the point of view of semantics, and the semantic role of the subject (or, more generally, of “topic”) and of the predicate (or “comment”) in a sentence — are problems the practical solution of which is possible to a great extent just through the semantic analysis of impersonal, passive, adjectivized, nominalized, etc. constructions. For this reason, it is extremely desirable that the treatment of these constructions in Estonian should not be limited to the analysis offered in the dissertation, but would move (in future) into semantics where in fact the answers to the majority of problems connected with them must be sought.

Finally, we should like to say that the reader must not be misled by the critical tone of this review. It is common knowledge that works of great practical and theoretical value generally evoke more criticism than mediocre and insignificant works since the latter do not contain anything of particular interest for the reviewer. The authors of the present review have no reason to doubt that H. Rajandi's dissertation belongs to the former class of linguistic studies.

MATI EREL, HALDUR OIM (Tartu)