

sätze mitgeteilt. Der zweite Teil eines jeden Wortartikels enthält die schriftsprachlichen und/oder mundartlichen rumänischen Entsprechungen sowie eine kurze Bibliographie der wichtigsten Fachliteratur bezüglich der etymologischen Klärung der behandelten Lehnwörter. Auf den Seiten 166—173 befindet sich ein Quellenverzeichnis und eine Abkürzungsliste, auf den Seiten 173—177 ein Verzeichnis und eine Karte der 92 Sammelorte.

Die hohe Anzahl der Wortartikel spricht für sich. Márton — ein ausgezeichnete Kenner des Tschango-Dialektes und auch des Rumänischen — hat zweifelsohne Blei-

bendes geschaffen. Wenn man bedenkt, daß die die rumänischen Lehnwörter des Ungarischen behandelnde Synthese von G. Blédy (*Influența limbii române asupra limbii maghiare*, Sibiu 1951) ungefähr 900 Lehnwörter enthält, kann man die große Leistung von Márton sehen. Wir hoffen, daß die Erforschung des Tschango-Dialektes erfolgreich weiterschreiten kann und die Ergebnisse — wenn möglich, auch eine vollständige synchrone Beschreibung des Dialektes — irgendwann erscheinen werden.

JENŐ KISS (Budapest—Göttingen)

<https://doi.org/10.3176/lu.1974.2.11>

Erkki Itkonen, Terho Itkonen, Mikko Korhonen, Pekka Sammallahti, *Lapin murteiden fonologiaa*, Helsinki 1971 (Castrenianumin toimitteita 1). 110 pp.

This offset edition is the first issue of a new series whose purpose is the accelerated publication of linguistic papers. The edition contains five articles by four authors concerning the phonology, or rather the phonemic transcription, of five different Lappish dialects. All the articles are presentations of the most essential problems of phonologization for various dialects, originally meant to be discussed with a view to their subsequent unification at a symposium of Lappologists of the Northern Countries; the symposium did not take place, however.

The phonology of Lappish dialects, along with that of Livonian and Estonian, is doubtless one of the most complicated among the Finno-Ugric languages as well as the rest of the world's languages. Therefore it is no wonder that hardly any student of Lappish phonology has ever reached a satisfactory level. The first exception, and the only one before the appearance of the collection in hand, was G. Hasselbrink (1965) who formulated three possible phonologizations of group harmony and metaphonic series in Central South Lappish. This is why the collection under review is of extraordinary interest despite its seeming modesty.

1. In the paper "Ehdotus norjanlapin länsimurteiden fonemaattiseksi transkriptioksi" (pp. 7—22), Pekka Sammallahti

deals with the transcription for western dialects of Norwegian Lappish, devoting most of his attention to the vowel system.

Sammallahti holds that short vowels manifest weak vowel phonemes /u o a e i/. For long monophthongs and diphthongs Sammallahti points out three cases of complementary distribution in the following order: 1) between the long monophthongs *ū, ō, ē, ī* and the long diphthongs *uo, oa, eā, ie* (monophthongs occur for *e* or *o* in the 2nd syllable whereas long diphthongs occur for *i, ū, a, ā* in the 2nd syllable), therefore they are transcribed as /U O A E I/; 2) between long diphthongs and half-long diphthongs (such as *ūo*) (a long diphthong is followed by a weak consonant and is not followed by the symbol | designating a suprasegmental unit which entails the half-length of a diphthong whereas a half-long diphthong is followed by the symbol | and a weak consonant); 3) between long diphthongs and short diphthongs (such as *ūō*) (a short diphthong is followed by a strong consonant). Cf. /kUlka/ = *kuolgaht* 'hairs' : /vU'lkAn/ = *vūoigcān* 'I am going'; /vULkIh/ = *vūō-1^āciht* 'to go'. The phonologization of the different durations of *a* may be illustrated by the following example: *allū* = /aLlu/ 'let us not (dual)': *čalleht*

= [*calleh*] 'to write' (an allegro form) : *čälliht* = [*čA'LIih*] 'writers' : *čälliht* = [*čALIih*] 'to write'. Sammallahti leaves open the question how oppositions like *caġgàht* 'your support' : *caġġàht* 'your support (gen. & acc. sg.)' : *caġġàht* '[you] support' should be transcribed. Accepting the suprasegmental unit of duration, /-/, the last two words may be written as [*caĶĶAh*] and [*cakĶAh*]. It is not clear, however, whether it is better to transcribe the first word as [*cakĶAh*] or as [*caĶĶAh*] (or, rendering strong consonants by capital letters instead of the symbol ¹ which when applied after a consonant indicates that the preceding consonant is strong, as [*caĶĶAh*] or [*caĶĶAh*]).

On the whole, Sammallahti's phonologization may be considered correct. Moreover, such transcription may probably be used even for the description of morphology. And yet it is not the only possible phonologization (apart from those possibilities which, upon some reflection were abandoned by the author himself) and not even an entirely economical one.

To begin with, there is nothing to prevent us from taking into account the complementary distribution between short, half-long and long diphthongs in the first order and from accepting the diphthongs (i. e. sequences of vowel phonemes) /*uo oa ea ie*/; note that *ä* in *eä* = /*ea*/ can be explained by assimilation. In that case complementary distribution between long monophthongs and diphthongs will be out of the question, and in addition to sequences of two different vowels we shall have sequences of two similar vowels /*uu oo aa ee ii*/. The psychological reality of this solution can be proved by the existence of the so-called acculturized idiolects mentioned by Sammallahti (p. 14) where the allegro forms with half-long diphthongs are lacking, i. e. *in tiede, ij čäle* are used instead of *in tiede* 'I do not know', *ij čäle* 'he does not write'.

Having thus eliminated strong vowels, it is logical to try to get rid of strong consonants as well. For this purpose it is expedient to follow the mechanics applied in Estonian phonology: the strong grade

of a long syllable is treated as an effect of a syllable accent (Viitso 1962). This accent is called here the grave accent and transcribed as /' at the beginning of the syllable, although it is the final consonant of the syllable that is lengthened due to the syllabic accent (of course a stroke ¹ known already from Nielsen's orthography could also be used instead of the grave accent). The shortening of long monophthongs and diphthongs in allegro forms is then regarded as an effect of the acute accent /'/; the rest of the allegro phenomena are phoneme alternations. And this is enough to solve, in general outline, the problems of quantity in the 1st syllable. Nevertheless, the transcription of consonants still remains to be clarified. We shall come closest to Sammallahti's phonologization transcribing *kuolġġaht* = [*kuolkaht*] (if a phonemic orthography is attempted which would overlook some dialectal differences, one could write with Sammallahti /*h*/ instead of /*ht*/): *vüolġġàn* /'vuolkaan/, *aällü* = /'allu/, *čälleht* = /'čalleht/ : *čälliht* = /'čaalliht/; *caġgàht* = /'cakkaht/ : *caġġàht* = [*cakkaht*] : *caġġàht* = [*cakaht*] (cf. the same words in Sammallahti's transcription above). For this transcription -*g*- in words like *naġir* 'sleep' is to be regarded as the phoneme /*g*/ different from the phoneme /*k*/. On the other hand, the dialects examined by Sammallahti and the one examined in the next article stand comparatively close. Therefore it is worth checking whether Phonologization II presented in our Table I or some particular version of it could be used here. If so, we ought to have, e. g., *caġġàht* as [*caggaht*] or, as an extreme case, [*cagah*] whereas in the word *naġir* -*g*- = /*g*/; the above examples illustrate a solution inevitably slightly different from Phonologization III of the same Table.

The following papers differ from Sammallahti's synchronical description by frequent references to historical phonetics; the latter has often become even the starting-point of the description. They have also accepted the good tradition in Lappology of dividing consonants into *x*-, *xx*- and *xy*-series; i. e. into single consonants,

geminate consonants and clusters of different consonants. In the following, moreover, it is expedient to accept also the notations \mathfrak{z} as a general symbol for any vowel and $\omega\mathfrak{z}$ as a symbol for any diphthong.

2. Terho Itkonen's article "Itärujalapin foneemianalyysin pulmia Outakosken murteen valossa" (pp. 23—41) deals above all with the problems of the consonant system in the Outakoski subdialect of the Finnmark dialect of Norwegian Lappish, and is an ideally comprehensive survey. The dialect has aspirated stops along with unaspirated ones, and, as another peculiarity, also voiceless sonorants.

The phonologization preferred by T. Itkonen is briefly as follows. Word-initially there occur unaspirated /p t k c č/ and aspirated /p^c t^c k^c/. On the boundary of the 1st and the 2nd syllables the quantity and quality of stops, affricates, sonorants and /s/ depends on the grade, strong or weak, and also on the environment: cf. our Table 1 where the position of consonants in a given environment is indicated by $_$.

Although T. Itkonen considers as many as four conceivable phonologizations and in addition a few minor possibilities, there are at least two phonologizations which are more appropriate than the one preferred by him (cf. Phonologization I in Table 1).

First, a compromise is practicable between Nielsen's orthography and the treatment of the strong grade as I presented it in connection with Sammallahti's paper. If the aspirated and unaspirated phonemes really are phonemes, in which case probably tense and lax phonemes, those phonemes must have a similar graphical representation both word-initially and word-internally. True enough, T. Itkonen also considered the possibility of designating them uniquely in all positions, yet he was scared off by the cluster *sk* whose interpretation as /sg/ would indeed be strange; but this proves unnecessary. As for assimilations of the type *kūāros kuyōis* 'in the empty hut' (*k^c → k̄*) counterbalancing cases where assimilation is impossible, cf. *kūāros k'irohk' u' s* 'in the empty church', it seems that the reason why the word boundary signalled by *k^c* is preserved is the single vowel following the latter. (By the way, if this be so it is an argument against the tradition of equalization of monophthongs and diphthongs in Lappology.) Thus the phonemes /b d g ʒ ʒ/ can be postulated on the one hand and /p t k c č/ on the other. Then word-internal consonants may be regarded as in Phonologization II of Table 1: the quantity of consonant clusters and geminates in the types 1a, 2a, 3a,

Table 1

Type	C. cluster		Vocalic environment	Phonologization					
				I		II		III	
	unasp-ed	asp-ed		unasp-ed	asp-ed	lax	tense		
1a	$\bar{g}G$	} $\bar{h}k'$	$\mathfrak{z} _ \bar{\mathfrak{z}}$	$g'g$	} $h'k$	} gg	} hk	} kk	} hk
b	$\bar{G}G$			$k'k$					
c	$\grave{G}G$	} $h'k'$	$\bar{\mathfrak{z}} _ \bar{\mathfrak{z}}$	$k\dot{k}$	} $h'k$	} gg	} hk	} kk	} hk
d	GG	} hk'	$_ \mathfrak{z}$	$k\dot{k}$					
2a	$\mathfrak{z}G$	$\mathfrak{z}hk'$	$_ \mathfrak{z}$	$l'k$	$l'hk$	} lg	} lk	} lk	} lhk
b	$\mathfrak{z}GG$	$L\dot{k}k$	$_ \bar{\mathfrak{z}}$	lkk	$lhkk \sim lkk$				
c	$\mathfrak{z}\grave{G}G$	$L\dot{k}$	$_ \mathfrak{z}$	lk	$lhk \sim lk$				
3a	$\bar{s}k$		$_ \bar{\mathfrak{z}}$	$s'k$		} sk	} sk		
b	$\grave{s}k$		$_ \bar{\mathfrak{z}}$	$\acute{s}k$					
c	sk		$_ \mathfrak{z}$	sk					

and with tense consonants also in the type 1b, is conditioned by the grave accent.

Secondly, the initial aspirated stops can be regarded as clusters */ph th kh/*. Then internal clusters and geminates can be treated as in Phonologization III of Table 1, with the grave accent having the same role as in Phonologization II. In order to find out whether Phonologization II or III is better suited for the given dialect, one must know the actual environments and morphologic context conditioned alternations for all consonants and all types of consonant clusters. At this moment it is also an open question whether Phonologization III allows us to avoid establishing in the Outakoski subdialect stops different from the phonemes */p t k/* — a need which arose in dialects considered by Sammallahti.

Besides, the conception of the grave syllable accent gives a clear-cut answer to T. Itkonen's question about how the sounds *i, u ~ u, i, u ~ u*, as the first components of syllable final consonant clusters, should be interpreted: since they occur at the end of a syllable marked with the grave accent, on the strength of the definition of the grave accent they are consonants, and hence they represent the phonemes */j/* and */v/*. Then there is no reason for establishing them as vowels in the weak grade and thus setting up an alternation of */j/* and */v/* with vowels.

Some problems concerning the vowel system are also considered in the article. The presentation of this material is not fully satisfactory, however. Thus it remains obscure to what extent those first components of compounds with an apocopated vowel where, according to T. Itkonen, the *a* and *ä* of the 1st syllable seem to be different phonemes are not directly derivable in the speaker's mind from the normal forms with no apocope. It also remains obscure what are the "extensible" (*venyvät*) and "unextensible" (*venymättömät*) vowels, what differentiates the diphthong *ii* from the "extensible" phoneme */i/*, and what actually is the fundamental difference between the same diphthong *ii* and the diphthong *ui* or *ui'* (p. 33). The treatment of allegro phenomena, too, is perhaps comprehensible only to a reader well

acquainted with the subdialect of Outakoski. For others the Table given on p. 38 appears insuperable. (It is clear enough that *eä, qa, ua* must be *ëä, q̃ä, üä*; but what are *iæ ~ ĩæ, uv, ie, uo ~ uõ* supposed to be?)

3. Erkki Itkonen, in the first of his papers, "Ehdotus inarinlapin fonemaattiseksi transkriptioksi" (pp. 43—67), examines the Inari dialect of East Lappish the quantity system of which is very complicated even for Lappish dialects.

E. Itkonen accepts as phonemes two kinds of monophthongs and diphthongs, viz. short and long, cf. */i/ : /ĩ/ : /ie/*; throughout, only those that are long phonetically have been considered as long. Phonological quality distinctions are postulated between *e : ẽ* and *ä : a* both for the short and the long vowels in monosyllables; elsewhere the members of either pair are allophones of the same phoneme, provided they have equal length (*ẽ* in monosyllables is transcribed phonemically as either */æ/* or */æ̃/*). A conspicuous vowel of the non-first syllable is */ä/* because it never occurs in the first syllable and lacks a long counterpart. In the *x*- and *xx*-series of consonants three degrees of quantity are distinguished, */x/ : /x̃/ : /xx/*, whereas in the *xy* series there are two, */xy/ : /x̃y/*; we are left in the dark as to what are */ʃ/* and */ʃ̃/*. In order to explain the difference between the patterns *̄x̄x̄x̄* and *̄x̄x̄x̄*, cf. *pānēh* 'you' probably *spin'* : *pānēh* 'teeth', the concept of secondary stress is used (transcribed by E. Itkonen as *·*), thus */pānēh·/ : /pānēh/*. It is also the secondary stress that causes such types as exemplified by the words *v̄iv̄v̄stis = /v̄iv̄v̄sti-s/* 'from his son-in-law', *k̄ä l̄ustis = /k̄äl̄usti-s/* 'in his skull', cf. *v̄iv̄v̄st = /v̄iv̄v̄st/* 'from the son-in-law'; *k̄ällust = /k̄äl̄u-st/* 'in the skull'. The secondary stress of the 2nd syllable is the only differentiator in pairs like */kieläs/ (= kielv̄s)* 'keel' : */kieläs·/* 'his tongue (gen. & part. sg.)'.

In general, E. Itkonen's approach is wholly satisfactory. Moreover, the reader's attention is drawn to many subtle points

of different subdialects, and the history of the vowel system is presented. However, the historical view has hindered the author from establishing a still better phonologization, and all the more so because the historical reconstructions are far from phonological. Thus E. Itkonen discards the possibility of interpreting the half-long and underlong vowels as long ones, e. g. $\bar{p}\bar{a}n\bar{e}h = [p\bar{a}n\bar{e}h]$, $k\bar{a}l\bar{u}stis = [k\bar{a}l\bar{u}sti-s]$ (pp. 61—62), since this would destroy the habitual idea of the three quantity degrees for single consonants and two quantity degrees for consonant clusters developed from Proto-Lappish. True, E. Itkonen considered this possibility only in connection with the possibility of eliminating the symbol /l/ from the strong (or the long as he calls it) grade of the *xy*-series, instead of trying to find a uniform solution for the *xx*- and *xy*-series and even for the *x*-series.

The reader cannot help doubting the phonemic status of /e/ and /æ/ as well as /ē/ and /ǣ/ as there are no examples to show their occurrence before the same consonant. This is likewise true of [ā] and [ā̄] in all their durations. The most weighty argument for postulating their phonemic status seems to be the occurrence in East Inari of cases like $t\bar{a}iD$ 'into them', $t\bar{a}in$ 'with this' vs. $t\bar{a}iD$ 'them (part. pl.)', $t\bar{a}in$ 'in them, from them'. Yet even here it is not the position of $\bar{a} : \bar{a}$ (or $\bar{a} : \bar{a}$) which is the same, but that of $\bar{a}i$ and $\bar{a}i$, which allows us to state that in the first case we have / $\bar{a}\bar{a}$ /, whereas in the other case we have / \bar{a} /, apparently before /j/. And if the phonetically long, half-long and underlong monophthongs, except \bar{e} in the combination $\bar{e}x\bar{e}$, and all diphthongs are considered as combinations of two vowel phonemes, E. Itkonen's / $\bar{u}e$ / has to be written as / ue /, since / \bar{u} / is not present in the list of single vowels and there is a vacant place for / ue / in the list of diphthongs.

Of special interest is the status of the phoneme / \bar{a} / which depending on its environment has the allophones $A \sim v \sim a \sim a$. Moreover, note that E. Itkonen

hesitates whether one should write / \bar{a} / or / a / before /h/ in $k\bar{u}z\bar{a}h \sim k\bar{u}z\bar{a}h$ 'cows' (p. 51). The already mentioned uniqueness of / \bar{a} / makes one think that this is not a case of the neutralization of / \bar{a} / and / a / before /h/: / \bar{a} / and / a / are rather the same phoneme. The possibility of integrating / \bar{a} / and / a / is suggested by such stem alternations — most probably with no phonological vowel alternation in the 2nd syllable — as $\bar{a}r\bar{G}\bar{A} : \bar{a}r\bar{G}\bar{A}$ 'week-day (nom. sg. : gen. sg.)' (according to E. Itkonen, / $\bar{a}r\bar{g}\bar{a} : \bar{a}r\bar{g}\bar{a}$ /), cf. also $k\bar{u}\bar{a}l\bar{s}i : k\bar{u}\bar{a}l\bar{s}i$ 'merganser (nom. sg. : gen. & acc. sg.)' (/ $k\bar{o}\bar{a}l\bar{s}i : k\bar{o}\bar{a}l\bar{s}i$ /), $t\bar{s}\bar{u}\bar{i}n\bar{e} : t\bar{s}\bar{u}\bar{i}n\bar{e}$ 'behind, bum (nom. sg. : gen. & acc. sg.)' etc. For / a /, on the other hand, there seem to be no alternations like that for /e/ in $kolle : kol\bar{e}$ 'gold (nom. sg. : gen. & acc. sg.)' (/ $kolle : kol\bar{e}$ / in E. Itkonen's phonologization). Thus / a / is a kind of unique case, which again is an argument against the phonemic status of / \bar{a} / and / a /). The only argument really adduced in E. Itkonen's paper for / \bar{a} / : / a / is the pair $pall\bar{v}\bar{d}$ 'to tolerate cold' : $palla\bar{d}$ 'to escape'. In the absence of more convincing arguments, / \bar{a} / and / a / can indeed be integrated, giving the secondary stress as an explanation for the 2nd syllable \bar{a} in cases like $palla\bar{d}$. Considering the grave accent to be connected with the *xx*- and $\bar{x}\bar{y}$ -series of Inari Lappish and designating the secondary stress by the symbol /,/ at the beginning of the corresponding syllable, the pair in question could be treated as / $palla\bar{d}$ / : / $pal,la\bar{d}$ /). But on the whole, the joinability of / \bar{a} / and / a / as well as the best phonologization of Inari Lappish in general can only be ascertained after a scrutiny of occurrences of different allophones in all the structural types, or rather quantity patterns, established by E. Itkonen (1946).

4. Mikko Korhonen in his article "Ehdotus koltanlapin Suonikylän (nyk. Sevettijärven) murteen fonemaattiseksi transkriptioksi" (pp. 69—86) examines the Suonikylä subdialect of Skolt Lappish. Metaphony, contraction and some other developments have caused a great number of morphological alternations in this vernacular. As Korhonen has said elsewhere

(1969:274), they are probably more numerous here than in any Lappish sub-dialect.

Like the other authors of the collection reviewed, Korhonen regards both monophthongs and diphthongs as phonemes. In the first syllable both monophthongs and diphthongs may be phonemically short or long, thus making up four series of phonemes: /ɜ/, |ɜ̄|, |ǝ̃| and |ωɜ|. In non-first syllables three (!) degrees of quantity must be taken into account, viz. the ǝ-, ɜ- and ɜ̄- ~ ǝ̃-series; cf. *sä*l̄BBE 'door

bolt': *sä*l̄BBē '[they] stick the needle into the cloth': *sä*l̄BBē̄ 'to lock, to close'. The overshoot vowel is reported to be always unstressed whereas the short and the long ones — always stressed. From this the problem is derived whether the presented triplet should be rendered 1) by indicating the stressed short vowel of the non-first syllable: |sā'lbe : sā'lbe : sā'lbē|, 2) by indicating the unstressed vowel of the non-first syllable: |sā'lbe° : sā'lbe : sā'lbē| or 3) by indicating the overshoot unstressed vowel: |sā'lbē : sā'lbe : sā'lbē|. Korhonen thinks the first possibility is the most correct, but he uses the third one. As for consonants, Korhonen finds that a quantity correlation exists between the *x*- and the *xx*-series. Although it is not clear whether a certain |*xx*| is a separate phoneme or a combination of phonemes, the transcription for consonants is quite elegant: the *xx*-, *xx̄*- and *xx̃*-series are derived from |*xx*|, the *x̄*- and *x*-series from |*x*|, and the *x̄y*-, *x̄yy*-, *x̄yȳ*- and *xy*-series from |*xy*|. But this transcription is an automatic consequence of the far from elegant conception of the four vowel series.

The outlines of Korhonen's phonologization will have been rendered completely when we add that suprasegmental palatalization operates in the given subdialect. It is designated by /'/ after the vowel of the stressed syllable, and it shifts the vowel forward and/or upward. The following dental or velar consonant may also become coronalized. Such palatalization is caused by the front vowel of the following unstressed syllable, which has

generally retained its frontness, but which may sometimes have disappeared. Due to *D*-contraction a palatalized stressed syllable may nowadays be followed even by a syllable containing a back vowel. So owing to vowel elision palatalization is independent of the quality of the vowel of the following syllable, and Korhonen's conception of palatalization is on the whole justified.

While the general principles of Korhonen's phonologization are fully correct despite a certain lack of elegance, the same cannot be said about the details.

The diagram representing the monophthong system for the 1st syllable (where, curiously enough, the postulated division of monophthongs into short and long ones is ignored) shows immediately that no attempt whatever has been made to classify the vowels:

<i>i</i>		<i>u</i>
		<i>ɔ</i>
<i>e</i>	<i>ɛ</i>	<i>o</i>
	<i>ä</i>	<i>å</i>
	<i>ä</i>	<i>a</i>

Here the vowels /*ä å ä a*/ have nothing in common with the rest of the vowels. Yet when it is considered that the vowel alternation |*i*| ~ |*e*| can be understood as an alternation of a high front vowel with a mid front vowel, and the alternation |*u*| ~ |*ɔ*| ~ |*o*| (*ɔ* does not occur in the speech of the younger generation) as one of a high, a higher mid and a lower mid labial back vowel, then the character of the alternations |*e*| ~ |*ä*| and |*o*| ~ |*å*| will remain incomprehensible. It seems that the vowel system of Suonikylä can be presented as follows:

<i>i</i>	<i>u</i>		<i>i</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>u</i>	
		<i>ɔ</i>			<i>ɔ</i>	
<i>e</i>	<i>ɛ</i>	<i>o</i>	or rather	<i>e</i>	<i>ɛ</i>	<i>o</i>
	<i>ä</i>	<i>å</i>		<i>ä</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>å</i>
	<i>ä</i>					

As for the diphthongs of Suonikylä, listed by Korhonen as |*iɛ ie ie ee eä oa ue uä uo uɔ*| (*iɛ* and *uɔ* do not occur in the speech of some young people), their identification as vowel combinations is impossible on the basis of the data presented by Korhonen. What is presented is

Here all geminates and clusters of different consonants with a long or a half-long first component (thus including xy but excluding xy and $x\bar{y}$) are regarded as being in the strong grade in E. Itkonen's phonologization; the strong grade is indicated by the symbol of half-length above the consonant. Geminates and clusters with a short first component are in the weak grade. The weak grade is not specially indicated. It is noteworthy that in the Songuj subdialect the strong and the weak grade are distinguished even in monosyllables, although weak and strong forms have equal duration. Thus according to E. Itkonen the weak-grade $\dot{s}i\text{-}e\bar{s}$ 'bird-snare (gen. sg.)' differs from strong-grade $\dot{s}ie\bar{s}$ 'bird-snare (nom. sg.)' by the focussing of the syllable stress on the first component of the diphthong. E. Itkonen's informant claimed that he could discriminate between the strong and the weak grade even in words containing a short vowel such as $kq\hat{l}$ 'gold (nom. and gen. sg.)', which E. Itkonen was unable to prove (30 years ago). E. Itkonen considers a probability of different intensity patterns here.

Extending the above treatment of diphthongs and long monophthongs as sequences of two vowels to this subdialect, we meet the problem whether to interpret the xy - and $x\bar{y}$ -series as pairs $/xy/$ in the weak grade or, unlike E. Itkonen, as triplets $/xyy/$ in the strong grade. However, because of morphological considerations, E. Itkonen's interpretation is the correct one. Now, in order to distinguish the weak and the strong grade, the strong grade is treated as an effect of the grave accent even here and also in cases like $\dot{s}ie\bar{s}$.

Although E. Itkonen's approach to the vowel system can be considered entirely correct, a few interesting possibilities of re-phonologization should still be mentioned.

The first of them concerns only the status of E. Itkonen's $/\dot{e}/ = \text{a}$. As has been stated, with this vowel the palatalization of the preceding syllable is unpredictable. In addition, E. Itkonen's (1946: 220, 231—234, 238—239, 251) material shows that a

occurs in the 2nd syllable before xy or word-finally only when preceded by ax or $\bar{\text{ax}}$ with x being either a sonorant or v , δ , γ . But even here there are aberrant cases: cf. $m\bar{e}n\text{a}$ 'go!' and $\bar{a}n$ 'ask!'. The only words where ax or $\bar{\text{ax}}$ are never followed by a word-finally (although x is a sonorant) are personal and demonstrative pronouns, i. e. very strictly limited class of words. Hence a phonologization is possible which would regard a as an aphonemic epenthetic vowel. But if one prefers to remain within the framework of so-called classical phonology, a is to be regarded as a phoneme, designated as $/\dot{e}/$, as is done by E. Itkonen, or, e. g., as $/\partial/$.

The other possibility is closely related to a gap in E. Itkonen's paper. Namely, one might have expected to see some proof that, first, the front allophone of $/i/$ i_{f} (or \dot{e}), occurs in the same environment as $/\dot{e}/$, and second, that the back allophone of $/i/$, i_{b} , occurs in the same environment as $/i/$. The point is that the uniqueness of $/i/$ on the one hand, and the system of long monophthongs and diphthongs as well as the vowels of the 2nd syllable on the other, suggest that the following vowel phonemes and phoneme sequences occur in the 1st syllable.

i	u	ii	uu	ie	ue
e	o	ee	oo	ea	oa
ε	ɔ	$\varepsilon\varepsilon$	ɔɔ		
a	\hat{a}	aa	$\hat{a}\hat{a}$		

Besides $/i/$, this system differs from E. Itkonen's in that $/\varepsilon/ = \hat{a}$, g (g occurs in the single case of $/\varepsilon\varepsilon/ = \bar{g}$) and $/a/ = a$; the phonemes $/e\ \varepsilon\ \hat{a}\ \text{ɔ}/$ correspond to E. Itkonen's $/e\ a\ a\ \hat{a}/$. If E. Itkonen's $/i/$ and $/\dot{e}/$ cannot be integrated, the system just presented obviously belongs to the recent past.

E. Itkonen's consonant system also seems capable of some simplification. Taking into account that 1) $/b\ d\ z\ \check{z}\ g/$ never occur at the beginning of a word, 2) $/bb\ dd\ \check{z}\check{z}\ gg/ = Bp\ Dt\ Dts\ \acute{d}\acute{t}\acute{s}\ Gk$, 3) $/pp\ tt\ cc\ \check{c}\check{c}\ kk/ = \text{'pp}\ \text{'tt}\ \text{'tts}\ \text{'tt}\acute{s}\ \text{'kk}$ and 4) the consonants $/v\ l\ r/$ have voiceless counter-

parts /V L R/, it seems that /b d ʒ ʒ g/ can be integrated with the phonemes /p t c č k/; so E. Itkonen's /bb dd ʒʒ gg/ and /pp tt cc čč kk/ will be written as /pp tt cc čč kk/ and /hp ht hc hč hk/, respectively, and /V L R/ as /hv hl hr/ unless they follow a voiceless consonant where they are /v l r/. In addition, /ʎ/ and /χ/ can apparently be integrated into the phoneme /h/, and /z ž/ can be integrated with the phonemes /s š/. The status of /ž/ and /χ/ requires further checking.

*

Summing up, it may be said that this slim collection of papers is and will remain

an outstanding achievement of Finno-Ugric studies in the 1970s. The presentation of the first phonologizations of five Lappish dialects or subdialects, along with the precise formulation of basic problems, is a success even if these phonologizations, although quite acceptable in principle, will never be applied in practice. For no matter how much forthcoming interpretations might differ from them, the bulk of the work has been performed by the authors of the present collection. The interpretations given above and any proposed in the future can be but more or less successful attempts to skim off the cream from the milk.

LITERATURE

Hasselbrink, G. 1965. Alternative Analyses of the Phonemic System in Central South-Lappish, Bloomington—The Hague (UAS 49).

Itkonen, E. 1939. Der ostlappische Vokalismus vom qualitativen Standpunkt aus mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Inari- und Skottlappischen. Lautgeschichtliche Untersuchung, Helsinki (MSFOu LXXIX).

— 1946. Struktur und Entwicklung der ostlappischen Quantitätssysteme, Helsinki (MSFOu LXXXVIII).

Itkonen, T. 1956. Outakosken lapinmurteen vokaalisti. — JSFOu 58.

Itkonen, T. I. 1958. Koltan- ja kuolanlapin sanakirja I—II, Helsinki (LSFU XV).

Korhonen, M. 1969. Die Entwicklung der morphologischen Methode im Lappischen. — FUF XXXVII 2—3, 203—362.

Viitso, T.-R. 1962. Tüvelisest astmevaheldusest (eriti eesti keeles). — ESA VIII, 44—62.

TIIT-REIN VIITSO (Tartu)

Raimo Anttila, *An Introduction to Historical and Comparative Linguistics*, New York: The Macmillan Company 1972, XII + 438 стр.

Эта книга Раймо Анттилы, видного финского специалиста в области индоевропейистики и общей лингвистики, работавшего до 1973 г. в США, заслуживает особого внимания в нескольких отношениях. Во-первых, здесь объективно представлены и систематизированы все оправдавшие себя принципы и методы исторической и сравнительной лингвистики, разработанные разными школами и течениями вплоть до настоящего времени, а также все языковые явления, известные в исторической и сравнительной лингвистике. Во-вторых, хотя в фокусе книги — индоевропейские языки, прежде всего английский, здесь на редкость много внимания уделено языкам других семей Европы, Азии, Африки и Америки, особенно финно-угорским. Так,

кроме представления в уральском языковом дереве (стр. 301) — единственном примере разветвления языковых семей, данные из всех финно-угорских языков, кроме мансийского, использованы в примерах, причем финский язык более 50 раз, саамский около 25, эстонский около 15 раз.

Наилучшее представление о содержании книги дает ее оглавление: (в скобках указывается количество страниц): Часть I: Фон: Генетическая лингвистика в отношении к общей лингвистике и родственным дисциплинам: 1. Язык и лингвистика (28). 2. Письмо и язык (16). 3. Лингвистическая вариантность (8). Часть II: Историческая лингвистика: Как язык изменяется?: 4. Звуковое изменение (31). 5. Граммати-