

sondere Aufmerksamkeit der Phraseologie der Dialekte gewidmet (S. 174—180), die bei der Entwicklung der Phraseologie der Sprache eine wesentliche Rolle spielt. Erwähnenswert ist die Tatsache, daß der Umfang auch der klassischen geflügelten Worte, d. h. der geflügelten Worte antiker (griechischer, römischer) Herkunft, in den verschiedenen Sprachen — auch in den näher verwandten Sprachen — nicht zusammenfällt (S. 173).² Derartige Eigentümlichkeiten müssen natürlich berücksichtigt werden. Die Aufmerksamkeit erregen auch Probleme der phraseologischen Statistik, mit denen man sich bisher nur wenig befaßt hat (S. 181 ff.). Die Gesamtzahl der Phraseologismen in der Sprache hängt zweifelsohne auch davon ab, in

² Dasselbe gilt übrigens auch für andere Quellen weiterer Verbreitung, z. B. für die Wahl geflügelter Worte aus der Bibel in den verschiedenen Sprachen.

welchem Umfang man die Phraseologie behandelt. Von Interesse ist die Bestimmung der Häufigkeit des Vorkommens der Komponenten russischer Phraseologismen (S. 190—194), worunter — wie auch in den der finnisch-ugrischen Sprachen — die somatische Lexik eine bes. wichtige Rolle spielt.

Zusammenfassend sei gesagt, daß wir es hier mit einem interessanten polemischen Buche zu tun haben, das einen direkt zum Meinungsaustausch herausfordert und wohl keinen Phraseologen gleichgültig läßt. Diese Eigenschaft des besprochenen Werkes allein schon ist eine gute Empfehlung für das Buch.

Schließlich müssen wir in Trauer noch unseren Lesern mitteilen, daß unser Kollege Professor L. Rojzenzon inzwischen am 4. Januar 1977 in Samarkand verstorben ist.

FELIKS VAKK (Tallinn)

<https://doi.org/10.3176/lu.1977.2.12>

Valter Tauli, *Eesti grammatika I. Hääliku-, vormi- ja sõnaõpetus*, Upsala, Institutionen för finsk-ugriska språk. Soome-Ugri Keele Instituut, 1972. 167 pages.

Valter Tauli, *Standard Estonian Grammar. Part I. Phonology, morphology, word-formation*, Uppsala 1973 (*Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Uralica et Altaica Upsaliensia* 8). 237 pages.

Outlining the principles of his grammar V. Tauli declares that it differs from traditional grammars of the Estonian language in two respects. First, the manner and system of presentation of linguistic facts and partly also their interpretation are different, and second, the grammar represents the language norms considered right by the author even in case they do not coincide with those officially recognized (E 5).¹

The first-mentioned difference gives Tauli's grammar a special place among other Estonian grammars and thus deserves serious consideration. Earlier works have

¹ E = *Eesti grammatika*; SE = *Standard Estonian Grammar*.

² See M. Hint, *Eesti grammatikakirjanduse põhimõttelised ja konkreetseid probleemid*. — KK 1969, pp. 327—341, 399—412.

³ R. T. Harms, *Estonian Grammar*, Bloomington — The Hague 1962 (UAS 12).

all followed the petrified tradition of Estonian grammar-writing having neither a theoretical foundation nor a uniform methodological basis — the elements of diachronic as well as synchronic description of language, the methods of synthesis as well as analysis were used indiscriminately.² (The only exception is a descriptive grammar by R. T. Harms.³) Tauli's grammar is distinguished by the author's clear-cut conception defined in its most essential points in the Prefaces. (1) "The facts are presented in a purely synchronic manner" (E 5). (2) "The model of the present grammar resembles the method of item and process, for it describes by which processes the forms are derived from underlying forms, here labelled as *base forms*. It is also generative in the sense that it gives rules for generating all the inflectional forms (but not derivatives) of the whole underlying lexicon" (SE 5). Although the methodological basis is not the

same in all the chapters, the treatment of linguistic facts within one chapter is uniform and methodical.

A further difference from traditional grammars is Tauli's very comprehensive treatment (exhaustive in the case of morphology), all the presumptions and rules originate directly from the material, without ignoring the "nuisance" facts.

The present review does not contain a closer consideration of the orthographical aspect of the grammar as that question should be tackled together with the analysis of V. Tauli's theory of language planning.⁴ Nevertheless, we could mention a couple of his more conspicuous innovative proposals and some peculiarities of the author's use of the language⁵: (1) in words belonging to the field of material civilization and in international words in everyday use *g*, *b*, *d* might be replaced by *k*, *p*, *t*, e.g. *parett*, *peeibi*, *tiivan*, *kripp* (E 19); (2) initial *h* might be dropped in writing except in international words and homonyms (E 21); (3) in the partitive plural, *-sid* might be replaced by *-si*, e.g. *tulesi*, *piigasi*, *mägesi* (E 38); (4) in the present indicative passive forms similar to other passive forms might be used such as *loodakse*, *ʔuldakse*, *mindakse*, *nähtakse* (E 81); (5) in certain words, the affix *-ne* might be used alongside with the affix *-line*, e.g. *kunstiuhvine* 'interested in the fine arts', *mustanahane* 'black-skinned', *sellesisune* 'having that content', *sügavamõttene* 'profound' (E 100); (6) instead of *-nud*, the author uses *-nd*, e.g. *ilmund* instead of *ilmunud* (E 6).

Tauli's grammar has been published in English and Estonian as two separate books which differ in the stress they lay on certain aspects and in their degree of comprehensiveness. The edition in Estonian is normative and meant for native speakers, thus containing a large number of notes, comments and recommendations for the correct use of that or the other form; similarly, more orthographic and orthoepic

guidance material has been included in the Appendix. In the English variant the orthoepic aspect is more in the background, the aim of the grammar is "to give an adequate and explicit description of the phonological, morphological and derivational structure of the Estonian standard language" (SE 5). The Estonian variant is more condensed, being often limited to a couple of examples where the English variant gives an exhaustive description. Since the underlying principles and the interpretation of the material are the same in both books, the present review proceeds mainly from the English variant (as the more thorough of the two); in case of need, reference is made to the Estonian version as well.

The body of the grammar consists of three chapters devoted to phonology, morphology and word-formation. These are followed by an Appendix of only one and a half pages in the English book, covering the spelling and pronunciation of foreign names and the use of small or capital initial letters. The Estonian variant deals with the transliteration of the Russian and Greek alphabets and it also includes brief reviews of the history of Estonian, its regional dialects and language planning. The grammar ends with a list of the literature used and an Index that provides the words discussed with the numbers of the corresponding paragraphs.

The chapter on phonology is relatively short and heterogeneous, containing, in addition to the author's original conception of the quantity system (the most disputed issue among Estonian phonologists), a discussion of a limited number of secondary matters (orthography, palatalization, stress in international words).

The subdivision "Phoneme and Syllable" gives a brief review of the inventory of Estonian phonemes alongside with a characterization of some of them; on the basis of binary quantity opposition, the phonemes are classified into long and short. Then the author passes on to the syllable and gives directions for defining syllable boundaries; on analogy with phonemes, syllables are divided into short and long on a quantitative basis: "A syllable which contains a short single vowel that is not followed by a long consonant or cluster, is *short*; all other syllables are *long*" (SE 16). This defini-

⁴ V. Tauli, Introduction to a Theory of Language Planning, Uppsala 1968; V. Tauli, Keelekorralduse alused, Stockholm 1968 (Eesti Teadusliku Seltsi Rootsis Väljaanne 4).

⁵ For a more comprehensive review see S. Suhonen, Eine estnische Grammatik. V. Tauli, Eesti grammatika I. Hääliku-, vormi- ja sõnaõpetus, Uppsala 1972. 167 S. — FUF XLI 1975, pp. 196—199.

tion, however, introduces a discrepancy: in the word *tedred*, according to Tauli, the first syllable *ted* is long, the second syllable *red* is short. Such a contradiction could be avoided by taking into account the closed or open nature of syllables.⁶

In the subdivision "Stress" V. Tauli gives an interpretation of the Estonian quantity system that differs from traditional views. He proceeds from the following conception. Estonian quantity phenomena should be phonologically interpreted not as the realization of ternary quantity opposition, but as two distinct binary oppositions: (1) phonemic quantity opposition — a short phoneme vs. a long phoneme (hence also a short syllable vs. a long syllable), (2) syllabic opposition of the stress (or accent) — a heavy-stressed syllable vs. a lightstressed syllable.⁷

A short syllable is opposed to a long one (quantity opposition), it is always light (the neutralization of stress opposition) and in the first quantity degree (*[kalu]* vs. *[kaalu]* and *[kaalu]*; *[vaka]* vs. *[vakka]* and *[vakka]*). The opposition of the second and third quantity degrees is revealed in the long syllable by stress opposition, the phonemic structure of the syllables being identical (*[kaalu]* vs. *[kaalu]*; *[vakka]* vs. *[vakka]*). Consequently, different quantity degrees always characterize a (stressed) syllable only and not a single phoneme or phonemic compound.

Valuable information is offered by the set of examples on light and heavy syllables where the material is grouped according to the structural pattern of the syllables (or, more correctly, the internal phonemes of a word). Sequences which are always heavy are brought out separately.

According to Tauli, quantity opposition is usually neutralized in diphthongs and consonant clusters; he points out three types of consonant clusters where the opposition is still distinctive (SE 21). A problem arises in connection with the second of them, namely, the quantity is distinctive in case of *[p t k]* following a

short vowel and preceding a voiced consonant in a light syllable, e.g. *[atra]* — *[mittra]*. In heavy syllables with that same structure the quantity opposition is neutralized and all the phonemes are transcribed singly — thus the words *[atra]* and *[rütmi]* are analogous with *[virna]*, *[paksu]* and *[maski]* (SE 18). However, in the chapter on gradation Tauli appears to hold another view when he states that prosodic gradation before *[l r v j]* occurs as *[pp]* ~ *[p]*, *[tt]* ~ *[t]*, *[kk]* ~ *[k]* and *[ss]* ~ *[s]* (SE 38). Consequently *[sõppra]* ~ *[sõpra]*, *[vakkla]* ~ *[vakla]* and *[attra]* ~ *[aira]*. Another contradictory issue is the word *rütm* with its heavy-stressed partitive form, transcribed as *[rütmi]* (SE 18), the light-stressed genitive form, on the other hand, as *[rüttmi]* (SE 19). This type of gradation is not mentioned elsewhere.

Morphology is the most interesting and problematic part of Tauli's grammar. To begin with, the chapter is divided in a somewhat unusual manner. The grouping of the material is based principally on the type of word inflection, as is also shown by the subheadings "Declension", "Comparison", "Conjugation". When discussing morphology, such a division is certainly more to the point than grouping by parts of speech as in the latter case, theoretically speaking, the same morphological process should be discussed repeatedly in several chapters (although in practice the inflection of several parts of speech is dealt with jointly under one part of speech, e.g. the chapter on substantives includes the declination of adjectives and partly also of numerals and pronouns). Unfortunately, Tauli fails to be fully consistent here. There are separate chapters for the pronoun, numeral and particle. Their inflection could have been similarly included in the chapter on declension (as is the case with adjectives and some numerals) despite the fact that exceptional features are more numerous here. On the other hand, the essentials of the pronouns, numerals and particles as well as their subdivision could be presented under the parts of speech. Naturally, it is a separate question whether the parts of speech should be discussed in the chapter on morphology at all inasmuch as morphological features are the least important among the criteria that serve to distinguish the parts of speech. However, this is a question that concerns all Estonian grammars.

⁶ Cf. J. Valgma, N. Rimmel, *Eesti keele grammatika. Käsiiraamat*, Tallinn 1968, p. 33.

⁷ Theoretical arguments can be found in V. Tauli, *Quantity and Accent in Estonian*. — *Commentationes fenno-ugricae in honorem Erkki Itkonen*, Helsinki 1973 (SUST 150), pp. 390—403.

As to gradation, it has been pointed out several times that gradation in contemporary Estonian is neither a phonetical nor a phonological phenomenon as it has been historically, and that in a grammar, it is morphology and not phonology that is the proper place for its synchronic description.⁸ So far Tauli is the first scholar to deal with gradation under morphology. The treatment itself is fairly traditional: gradation is defined as a kind of stem alternation, namely, the alternation of strong and weak grades of the stem (SE 36). Phonemic and prosodic gradations are differentiated and their subtypes listed; however, no difference is made between strengthening and weakening types of gradation. Also, the relationship between grades and quantity degrees, which is referred to only a couple of times (SE 38), might have been brought out separately. Finally, Tauli gives the rules for the derivation of a strong stem from a weak stem, listing those few sound combinations which present such a possibility, e.g. *tarve* : *tarbe*, *kõnnin* : *kõndima*, *viske* : *viske*, *hüljes* : *hülge* (SE 39). This kind of information is of great interest and it can be found in no other Estonian grammar.

The treatment of verb forms also differs in certain aspects from the accepted practice. The *des*-form, instead of its traditional role of a case of the *da*-infinitive, has obtained the status of gerund. The *v*- and *tav*-participles are looked upon as verbal nouns (i.e. nouns generated from verbs) and not as infinite forms. Intuition suggests that such a viewpoint is justified although Tauli's definition of infinite forms ("infinite forms occur as modifiers of other words, or form together with the

verb *olema* compound tenses" (SE 91)) provides no sufficient ground for it.

Tauli's conception of morphology is extremely interesting and original. The basic notion is *grammeme* (*vormitunnus*)⁹: "... grammeme is the way or rule of generation of a grammatical form" (SE 35). A grammeme expresses the structural or grammatical meaning, e.g. "the inessive case", "the plural", etc. and it may be of three kinds: (1) suffix, (2) stem change (replacement, addition or deletion), (3) \emptyset -grammeme. However, in addition to the phonemic shape of a grammeme the description of form and grammeme also includes the base form, i.e. a form which itself or whose stem serves as the base in generating another form. (There are several base forms: a noun has five and a verb six.) Thus a grammeme can occur in four forms: (1) base and suffix, (2) base and stem change, (3) base, stem change and suffix, (4) (in the case of a \emptyset -grammeme) only the base. Examples:

- (1) Sg All: Gen + *le* (*lapse* : *lapsele*),
- (2) Sg Part: Nom -*i* → -*e* (*nimi* : *nime*),
- (3) Pl Gen: Gen -*V*¹⁰ → \emptyset + *te* (*kaane* : *kaante*),
- (4) Sg Gen: Nom + \emptyset (*isa* : *isa*).

Judging from the introduction to the chapter on morphology, the relationship between the base and a grammeme remains unclear. In some places Tauli does not mention the base when discussing a grammeme (SE 36, 41), at other times he declares that the base belongs to its description (SE 35). In practice, however, Tauli appears to regard the base as a component of the grammeme, e.g. Nom + *te* (*okste*, *õpetajate*) and Gen + *te* (*ausate*, *liikmete*) under Pl Gen, or Da + *nud* (*korranud*, *laulunud*) and Ma + *nud* (*jooksnud*) under the *nud*-participle have been presented as separate grammemes. We have separate grammemes of a grammatical category every time there occur differences in the bases (Nom + *te* and Gen + *te*), in suffixes (Gen + *te* and Gen + *de*) or in stem alternation rules (Nom -*i* → -*e*, Nom -*s* → -*nda*, Nom S → W, etc.).

Although Tauli's manner of treatment bears a resemblance to the item and process (IP) method (all the forms are generated from an underlying form by means of certain operations) as well as to

⁸ See also M. Hint, *Eesti grammatikakirjanduse põhimõttelised ja konkreetseid probleemid*. — KK 1969, pp. 329–330; T.-R. Viitso, *Eesti muutkondade süsteemist*. — KK 1976, p. 150.

⁹ In general, Tauli does not use the traditional notion of morphology, the *morpheme*. It occurs only in the beginning of the chapter "Morphology" as a synonym for a part of a word form (SE 34) and, obviously by mistake, also in the heading "Conjugation morphemes" (SE 7, 95). To a certain extent, a grammeme can be compared to an allomorph.

¹⁰ Here and further on: V = vowel, C = consonant, S = strong grade of phonemic gradation, W = weak grade of phonemic gradation.

Estonian traditional grammar (main forms occur as the basis for all other forms), it is neither the former nor the latter, but rather a peculiar blend of the two which, in the last analysis, fails to yield better results than either.

The idea of several base forms obviously goes back to traditional morphology where it has been used fairly successfully, to provide a relatively good survey of our highly-inflected morphology. However, the main forms in Estonian morphology have a function different from that of the base in the sense of IP. They are not the forms from which by means of replacement, addition or deletion rules other forms are generated, rather they are forms on whose model it is possible with the help of analogy rules to choose correct stem variants for other forms, e.g. from the stem of the *ma*-infinitive one can get the stems of other cases of the *ma*-infinitive, of indirect speech and the *v*-participle; from the stem of the present indicative one obtains the stems of conditional forms, etc. In Estonian morphology the primary function of the main forms is to indicate such permanent mutual relationships between inflectional forms as are valid for all the words (perhaps with a few exceptions). At the same time, the sole reason for the existence of several main forms is that they themselves have no such analogy-based relations, being relatively independent of one another. In Tauli's treatment, however, this particular function of the main forms has largely escaped the author's attention, or at least it is not brought out with sufficient distinctness. Instead of analogy relations Tauli considers the generative relations of the forms, thus approaching IP-morphology.

However, in IP-morphology only one underlying form is generally postulated and this serves as the basis for the generation of all other forms (several underlying forms occur only by way of exception, e.g. in case of suppletivity). The underlying form may be represented by one of the inflectional forms or by a constructed form without morphological specification, yet it is never included in the grammatical description of the form being generated. For example, using the IP-method the generation of the inflectional forms of the word *nuga* could be described

as follows: underlying form [*nuga*] (Sg Nom)

Sg Gen: S → W

Sg Part: + ∅

Sg Ill: S → W + *sse*

Sg In: S → W + *s*

Sg El: S → W + *st*, etc.

Thus, in the singular we have two processes (stem alternation and the addition of a suffix), stem alternation being common for all the cases beginning with the illative. The use of several base forms enables one to avoid such reiteration, according to Tauli's method the rules for the generation of the same forms would be as follows:

Sg Gen: Nom S → W

Sg Part: Nom + ∅

Sg Ill: Gen + *sse*

Sg In: Gen + *s*

Sg El: Gen + *st*, etc.

Although Tauli's method appears more economical at first sight, matters are rendered complicated by the fact that in most cases the base form is itself a product of generation and, hence, in order to get the necessary form one has first to produce the base form, then the base form of the former and so on. For example, the base form of Pl Part may be represented by Sg Nom, Sg Gen and Sg Part. Consequently there exist four possibilities for the generation of Pl Part, namely:

(1) Sg Nom → Pl Part (*pere, aasta, suur*)

(2) Sg Nom → Sg Gen → Pl Part (*tuli, tore, haruldane*)

(3) Sg Nom → Sg Part → Pl Part (*mägi, luik*)

(4) Sg Nom → Sg Gen → Sg Part → Pl Part (*ahi, sõber*)

In this way we have obtained base form chains which can all be traced back to one point which is Sg Nom in case of nouns and the *ma*-infinitive in case of verbs. Thus it follows that in actual fact Tauli still proceeds from one and the same form which he labels as the basic form — the one which cannot be generated by another form (SE 35). The only difference is that other forms are not generated directly from the basic form as in IP-morphology but via a base form chain which can at times include quite a few links. For example, in order to produce Pl All of the word *sõber* one has to generate four different forms in succession:

Sg Gen: Sg Nom -VC → -Ca (*sõber* : *sõbra*)

Sg Part: Sg Gen II → III (*sõbra* : *õsõpra*)

Pl Gen: Sg Part + *de* (*õsõpra* : *õsõprade*)

Pl All: Pl Gen + *le* (*õsõprade* : *sõpradele*)

Thus in the given case four different rules are needed instead of only one in the case of IP-morphology (Pl All: -VC → -Ca III + *de* + *le*).

One faces a problem also in connection with the interpretation of the meaning of grammatical forms. If the description of a grammeme includes the base form (resp. a chain of base forms), the grammatical meaning expressed by the grammeme could be expected to include the grammatical meanings of all the base forms.¹¹

Tauli gives a thoroughgoing description of the intricate mechanism of form-generation. In the case of each form he lists all the grammemes. The number of the latter may be large, e.g. 68 for Sg Gen, 19 for Pl Part, 17 for Sg Part, 14 for Sg III and the *da*-infinitive, fewer for other forms. To describe the conditions in which it occurs, each grammeme is provided with rules having numerous exceptions and lists. According to Tauli, the complexity of the grammar is due to the complexity of the language itself, a circumstance which cannot be evaded without violating the facts if an exhaustive description is aimed at (E 5). However, it seems that the problem lies not so much in the intricacy of the language as in the method of its description.

One reason for the existence of so many grammemes has been discussed already — in case the description of a grammeme includes the base form, such different grammemes of Pl Part are possible as Sg Nom + *id* (*aasta* : *aastaid*) and Sg Gen + *id* (*aus* : *ausa* : *ausaid*).

The other and much more significant reason is the fact that Tauli has chosen Sg Nom for the basic form of the noun. The shortcomings of such a choice are especially evident in the description of Sg Gen where different grammemes are represented,

simply enough, by different rules of stem alternation (the base form is common to all, suffixes are absent). There are two main reasons why Sg Nom is unsuitable as the basic form:

First, if a nominative form with its ending reduced is chosen for the base form of the genitive case, one has to produce a separate rule for each stem vowel. E.g. different rules apply for alternations such as *king* : *kinga* (24. -a II) (the number and description of the rule is given in brackets), *hing* : *hinge* (25. -e II), *ring* : *ringi* (27. -i II) and *ving* : *vingu* (28. -u II). The opposite procedure, namely the deletion of a stem vowel could be formulated in one rule (V → Ø) and, besides, it would be in agreement with the data of the history of the language. Naturally, the synchronic description of a language must not necessarily contain diachronic data, nevertheless, a grammar which contradicts the development tendencies of the language cannot be correct as a matter of principle, since the state of a system always contains its entire history, being the result of its development.

Second, Sg Nom can occur in the strong as well as weak grade, often placing one and the same gradation process under several rules. A weak form is generated from a strong one, and vice versa. Cf. *tupp* : *tupe* (25. -e II) and *hape* : *happe* (37. II → III), *nälg* : *nälja* (29. -a W) and *hüljes* : *hülge* (49. -s → Ø S). In the case of Estonian, the generation of the weak grade on the basis of the strong one can be considered a regular process which can be described largely by means of mutually exclusive automatic gradation rules (see SE 36—39). On the other hand, the prediction of a strong grade on the basis of a weak one is not always feasible. This circumstance leads to several different rules in cases such as *pinge* : *pinge* (37. II → III) and *tõlge* : *tõlke* (38. -C → -CC- III) or *tarve* : *tarbe* (39. W → S), *hüüe* : *hüüde* (40. -e → -de ~ te /le/ III), and *muie* : *muige* (41. -e → -ge ~ ke /ke/ III). If the alternations had the opposite direction, the first two rules could be united under the alternation III → II (cf. *sang* : *sanga* and *pank* : *panga* — both 24. -a II) and the last three under S → W (cf. *orb* : *orvu*, *hüüd* : *hüüu*, *peig* : *peiu* — all 33. -u W).

From the foregoing it follows that the

¹¹ E. Vihman, A Grammatical Description of Estonian: A Review Article. — *Journal of Baltic Studies* 6 1975, p. 59 has also drawn attention to that fact.

set of rules covering the generation of the genitive (or stem alternation) is considerably more simple and comprehensive in case the basic form of a noun is always in the strong grade and contains a stem vowel. As the noun paradigm has no such form, then one has to choose between the possibilities: either to take different basic forms for different word groups as is suggested by M. Hint¹², or to construct a basic form having no morphological specification, from which all the inflectional forms can be generated.

The fact that Tauli's 68 rules for the formation of the genitive have insufficient motivation and a small power of generalization is proved, among other things, by his failure to characterize the words falling under this or the other rule with an adequate degree of generality. Often it is necessary to employ only lists (in 43 cases out of 68), or, in the case of more general characterizations, long lists must be added as a supplement (e.g. 24, 28, etc.), or correction by means of numerous exceptions is necessary (e.g. 1, 4, 27, etc.).

The number of verb grammemes is markedly smaller (maximally 14, in the case of the *da*-infinitive). On the one hand, the inflection of verbs is a more regular process in itself, on the other, the *ma*-infinitive is a suitable basic form, being almost always in the strong grade and containing a stem vowel in most cases (with the exception of the words of the *saatma*-, *tundma*-types).

In the chapters "Declension" and "Conjugation" the description of grammemes is followed by the morphological classification of words. Tauli's work is unlike traditional grammars in that it does not group inflectional types into declensions and conjugations. Also the classification features are different, arising directly from Tauli's conception of morphology. The words which acquire mostly the same grammemes in the main forms fall into one general type. The general types are supplemented with subtypes in which some grammeme differs from the general types and/or which include only a limited number of words (SE 71). The number of subtypes is different in the Estonian and English variants since the latter does not take genitive grammemes into account while differ-

¹² M. Hint, *Eesti keele morfoloogia kirjeldamise meetodika probleeme*. — KK 1972, pp. 611—612.

entiating the subtypes whereas the Estonian variant does so.

Types and subtypes are treated in the customary manner, presenting the main forms of the word after which the type is named: Sg Nom, Sg Gen, Sg Part, the short Sg Ill, Pl Gen and Pl Part in the case of nouns, the *ma*-infinitive, *da*-infinitive, 1st person singular present indicative, 1st person singular imperfect, 3rd person singular imperative, *nud*-participle, *kse*-presence and *tud*-participle in the case of verbs. Of a subtype only such forms are given whose generation procedure differs from the general type. Then the words belonging to a type are characterized according to the number of syllables, syllabic length or degree, the word-final phonemes and gradation. Directions are given for determining the general type on the basis of a word's characteristic features which are expected to occur in Sg Nom and/or Sg Gen in case of nouns and in the *ma*-infinitive and/or present stem in case of verbs.

*

More than a third of the total volume of the grammar is occupied by the chapter "Word-formation", the bulk of which is devoted to the problems of derivation. The survey of compounding takes up considerably less space (3:1).

Although it is noted in the Preface that the treatment of word-formation cannot be considered exhaustive, it is precisely that part which makes the largest contribution to Estonian linguistic science. Up to the present time relatively little research work has been done on the problems of derivation and this circumstance is naturally reflected in the grammars. The questions of derivation are usually squeezed into 9—10 pages where each suffix is provided with a rather general definition of its meaning, superficial references to formal aspects and a few examples. In comparison with this, Tauli's treatment is very detailed and thorough.

Derivation is discussed on 59 pages followed by 18 pages on compounding and 6 pages dealing with solid and separate writing. Tauli uses the descriptive method of treatment which in the case of derivation certainly is (at least considering the present standards) a more reliable tool than the IP-method.

Derivational suffixes are grouped according to the parts of speech (substantive, adjective, verb and adverb suffixes). Within a part of speech the affixes are arranged in alphabetical order, in the Estonian variant according to decreasing productivity. The treatment of affixes is extremely uniform, proceeding from the following scheme: (1) the specification of the derivational base from the viewpoint of the parts of speech, (2) the semantical aspect of the affix, (3) the formal aspect of derivation. Each point is illustrated with numerous examples. In some instances also the meaning of the derivational base together with its influence on the meaning of the derivative are touched upon (for example, the discussion of the meaning of onomatopoeic *ise*-verbs is quite intriguing). No grammar of the Estonian language has hitherto given so deep an analysis of the questions of derivation.

Completely new is the concept of *direct derivation*, or derivation by means of the Ø-suffix: from the base belonging to one part of speech a word belonging to another part of speech is derived in such a manner that the stem of the base becomes the inflectional stem of the derivative without any affix being added (E 104—105), e.g. *hukkuma* 'perish' → *hukk* 'ruin, perdition', *kaduma* 'disappear, vanish' → *kadu* 'disappearance', or *tahm* 'soot' → *tahmama* 'to soot', *puur* 'bore, drill' → *puurima* 'to bore', etc. Such a way of derivation is fairly productive in Estonian, but up to now the grammarians have ignored it for no obvious reason. New terminology is introduced also elsewhere. In the introduction to the chapter the author specifies the principal notions such as *derivation*, *derivative*, (*derivational*) *base* and (*derivational*) *stem*. Of these the notion of derivational base is not new in Estonian linguistics, yet it occurs for the first time in our grammars. Likewise, the notion of *regular semantic relation*, occurring in connection with the *kond*-affix (SE 119), has not been used before.

As to the exhaustiveness of the chapter on derivation, the material it includes is beyond any reproach. Its value is reduced, however, by the fact that not all the affixes are considered. Among those omitted the largest portion is formed by noun suffixes such as *-(i)k*, *-m*, *-mu*, *-ndik*, *-ndus*, *-rd*, *-stu*, *-ts*, etc. which, although not parti-

cularly productive, are widely used in the present-day literary language. Of adjectival suffixes, e.g. *-s*, *-ik*, *-lane*, *-ldane*, *-mine* are absent, of verbal suffixes *-skle*, of adverbial suffixes *-tsi*, *-ldi*, etc., numeral suffixes are not touched upon at all.

Minor disputable points may arise with regard to the meaning of some examples, e.g. *kõide* 'volume, binding' and *hinne* 'mark' as the result of an action, or *kaubitsema* 'to trade, carry on business' with a pejorative connotation. In a few cases the specified direction of the derivation process is dubious, e.g. *nõres* 'dripping' → *nõretama* 'to drip' (SE 162). At times the author's striving to link the derivative with a fixed base is somewhat exaggerated. This applies in particular to *ne*-words with an international stem as it is more likely that those words are derivational loans and not words derived from a loan-word base, cf. *tsenter* 'center' — *tsentraalne* 'central', *unioersum* 'the universe' — *universaalne* 'universal', etc. (SE 137 ff.).

Regardless of such minor issues Tauli has been successful in producing the most comprehensive description of the derivation system of the Estonian literary language. Its scope and depth can be compared only with the corresponding part of Wiedemann's grammar which, however, was published a full century ago.

*

In summary it can be said that Tauli's work has two great merits which make it prominent among all other Estonian grammars. First, it is more profound and precise than the rest. Instead of a predetermined scheme which has to "take in" the facts, Tauli proceeds from the language material itself. Second, Tauli's grammar has helped to overcome the stagnation in Estonian grammar-writing. His grammar is marked by its novelty and originality. The author has kept to a definite point of view. Although it does not provide final solutions to all problems, it stimulates discussion as well as the search for alternative ways. And this is a great step forward.

ULLE VIKS, SILVI VARE *
(Tallinn)

* Reviewer of the chapter "Word-formation".