den Sprachen mit normaler Phonemzahl. Es bleibt etwas
unklar, mit welchen Gründen für das phonemreiche Wepsisch
gerade die Zahl 45 angegeben wird.

Die speziell im Bereich von Europa begegnenden sprachli-
chen Systemganzheiten heissen bei Haarmann Europeme.
Auch wenn die genetische und die typologische Klassifikation
verschiedene Arten der Systematisierung von Sprachen darstel-
len, setzt ein engeres Verwandtschaftsverhältnis dennoch auch
eine grössere Strukturähnlichkeit voraus.

Der Verfasser behandelt die Sprachen Europas nach Areal-
typen, indem der balkanische, baltische, britische, der sog.
SAE-, der eurasische und der eurafrikanische Sprachbund
untersucht werden.

Innerhalb dieser Sprachbünde und mitunter auch zwischen
ihnen lassen sich interessante Übereinstimmungen feststellen.
Einige westliche ostseefinnische Sprachen gehören zum balti-
schen und einige andere finnisch-ugrische Sprachen zum eura-
sischen Arealtyp. Für die westlichen osfi. Sprachen gelten
zumindest die folgenden Sprachbund-Merkmale: stark differen-
ziertes Vokalsystem, Opposition der Phoneme /e/ und /ä/,
Quantitätskorrelation der Vokale, Reichtum an Diphthongen,
schwach entwickelte Palatalisationskorrelation, unbeweglicher
Wortakzent, polytoner Tonverlauf, synthetische Nominalfle-
xion, Vorhandensein nominaler Flexionsklassen und Auftreten
von indirekter Erlebnisform als selbständigem Modus. Charak-
teristisch für die östlicheren osfi. Sprachen wiederum ist ent-
sprechend dem eurasischen Arealtyp die Monotonität und die
ausgedehnte Palatalisationskorrelation.

Abschliessend werden einige supra-areale Aspekte der Areal-
typologie erörtert.

SEPPO SUHONEN

The morphology of Lappish nominal verb forms

MIKKO KORHONEN, Die Konjugation im Lappischen. Morpho-
logisch-historische Untersuchung. II. Die nominalen Form-
kategorien. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 155.
Helsinki 1974. 227 p.

The book under review is the second volume of Mikko
Korhonen's study on Lappish verb morphology. The first
volume, on finite verb forms — now already considered a classic
— was published in 1967 (MSFOu 143) as a doctoral disserta-

tion, with the volume number I as a promise of a sequel in the future. After seven years and an intervening monograph on Lapp morphological means (Korhonen 1969), we now have the second and final volume at our disposal.

Korhonen begins from the crux of the problem by asking "what is a nominal verb form?" He distinguishes five criteria on the basis of which the question can be answered, out of which no single one is sufficient: the morphological, the functional, the syntactic, the semantic, and the productivity criterion. Morphologically, a verb can be considered nominal, if an obviously verbal morpheme (e.g. with time reference) adheres to a nonfinite stem. The functional criterion is the use of a form as a constituent of a compound finite form. Syntactically, the nominality of a form depends on its concord, whether it can take an object and a subject or various kinds of adverbial. Semantically, a nonfinite form can be considered nominal if its meaning relation to its stem remains constant from case to case. Finally, productivity is required: any inflectional form should be formable from any non-suppletive stem in the word class under scrutiny.

After introducing the basic analytical procedures, the author briefly surveys the nominal forms given in various Lappish grammars, both antiquated and modern (one misses only Ganander's *Jaackehteppe* 'credendus'; cf. Henricus Ganander: Grammatica Lapponica, p. 127, Holmiae 1743). An inconsistent picture emerges, mainly because of failure to observe some or all of the criteria mentioned above (with some splendid exceptions, of course). The proposed nominal forms are then examined more closely vis-a-vis how they fulfil the given criteria. Korhonen considers the following forms nominal: the infinitive (lpN -*t*), the first gerund (lpN -[*d*]*ēddiin*), the second gerund (lpN -*me* [*n*], -*mě* [*n*]), the abessive (lpN -*kæt'ta*), the action (with hesitation; lpN -*m*, -*bme*), the present participle (as a boundary case; lpN -*e*, -*o*, -*g'gje*), the perfect participle (lpN -*m*), the supinum (lpNTo -*ʒit*, -*ʒ'ʒât*), the verbal adverb in some dialects (lpN verb stem in the weak grade, no ending), and the negative forms (lpN no ending). At the end of the chapter Korhonen explains that he considers deverbal nouns ending in -*muš* and deverbal adjectives ending in -*l*, -*lâs* etc. nonverbal, as they do not take the object as systematically as e.g. the elative of the action. As for the deverbal adjectives at least, one might take a different view, since they can take other complements in addition to the object, e.g. when passivized: *diet bænâ læ hui snel'kulâs boc'cuid* 'that dog is very apt to snap at the reindeer (object)' vs. *boc'cuk læk hui snēlkutâllâlâsâk diem bædnâgii* 'the reindeer let that dog snap at themselves' (*snēlkutâllâlâsâk*

'apt to have oneself snapped at (nominative plural)', *bǣdnâgii* 'by the dog (illative singular)'.

The chapters discussing the history of the nominal forms begin on page 50. In each chapter the material is given first, and then the historical background, i.e. the origin of the morphemes and their development into the modern forms in the Lapp languages and their dialects.

The first chapter deals with the negative forms, firstly those ending in **k*. After comparison with other Uralic languages the author draws the conclusion that the negative conjugation in the Uralic protolanguage already featured an inflected negative verb with a simple form of the main verb, possibly ending in **k*, as witnessed by the Finno-Permian and Samoyed languages. The chapter concludes with a review of some analogical cases in which the negative is a personal form.

The next chapter examines the perfect participle. It takes two suffixes, *-mĕ* being identical with the first component of the Finnish fourth infinitive suffix *-mi(se-)* (< **me* + *ńśe), and the first component of the second suffix *-mâ* + *ńDźĕ* with the action form suffix **-mâ*, which corresponds to the Finnish third infinitive suffix *-ma*. Korhonen points to the cognates of **-ma* in the Uralic languages and the uniformity of its use. With hesitation he derives the suffix **-me* (> lp **-mĕ*) from **-ma*. He supports this with the duality of the vocalism in some functionally close suffixes such as the essive **-na* and the comitative **-j* + *ne*, and the dual and plural personal suffixes, du. 1. **-me* + *n*, 2. **-te* + *n*, pl. 1. **-ma* + *k*, 2. **-ta* + *k*. Even the duality **-ma* ~ **m(e)* has counterparts in the Volgaic languages, but there can hardly be any question of a single process, since the relationship **-(m)a(k)* ~ **-(m)e(n)* in the personal suffixes goes back to the Uralic protolanguage. Wisely enough, the question is left open. In agreement with Erkki Itkonen (1950), Korhonen reconstructs **-mĕ* for even-syllable stems and **-mańDźĕ* for odd-syllable stems. The latter comes close in structure to the Baltic Finnish suffix with the same function, *-nut* (e.g. *pala/nut* 'burned') which was originally an *ut*-diminutive of a deverbal *na*-noun (e.g. *koli/na* 'rattling').

The third chapter is devoted to the action suffix, which goes back to the Uralic **-ma*. Here, one could add a rare function of the action form, coming close to the perfect participle, namely the two meanings of such expressions as lpN *vaӡ'ӡem-olmuš:* 'a person who walks, or has to walk due to conditions, or voluntarily or habitually walks' and 'a person who has walked'. The latter meaning is equivalent to *vaӡ'ӡam olmuš*, but is used in ways which for lack of space cannot be dealt with in this review.

The next suffix, the second gerund (lpN *-me(n)*, *-mĕ(n))*, is

actually the essive of the action, and goes back to Uralic *-ma +
*-na, the latter an old locative suffix (cf. Finnish ulko/na
'outside', lpN ol'go/n id.). Much space is given to the present
dialectal forms of the suffix. The development from proto-Lapp
*-me + ne has been affected by such factors as stem stress
(German Stammbetonung) and the fact that the original mor-
phological nature of the suffix became obscure very early.

The fifth chapter deals with the infinitive suffix (lpN -t < pre-
Finnic *-ta + k). Together with the second gerund and the
locative of the action this formed a system in which the infinitive
took over the lative functions from the former illative of the
nominal *-ma-form, preserved in Baltic Finnish. (In spite of the
collapse of the former elative and inessive to the present
locative in lpN, there are different forms for the elative and
inessive functions in these nominals, i.e. the second gerund is
inessive and the locative of the action is elative, e.g. lpN oi'dnim
boattemen 'I saw (somebody) coming' and hēitii gul'lumist 'it
stopped being heard'. Nowadays, the second gerund is gaining
ground, and expressions like hēitii gul'lumen are becoming more
and more common.)

The infinitive suffix consists of the deverbal noun suffix *-ta
and the lative suffix *-k. As cognates of the Finno-Ugric *-ta, at
least some of the Samoyed suffixes given are out of the
question, e.g. in such participles as Nenets ŋāmdŏda 'one who
is sitting' from the verb ŋāmdŏś 'to sit', for ŋāmdŏda goes back
to a proto-Samoyed *åmtɔjɔj + ntå. The nasal *n is regularly
dropped between two consonants giving *åmtɔjɔj + tå. After
vocalic stems, the suffix appears in the form -na in present-day
Nenets. (In Baltic Finnish, the passive second participle suffix
-tu (< *-ta + v, e.g. in juo/tu 'which has been drunk') is
probably of the same origin as the Lappish infinitive suffix, cf.
mdE panza/do 'which has been opened, open'.)

The first gerund suffix (lpN -[d]ēddiin) goes back to the Pre-
Finnic deverbal noun suffix -nta, the plural character *j and the
locative (-essive) suffix *-na, or the locative suffix *-sta in Skolt
Lappish or the instrumental suffix *-lla in East Lappish dialects,
the latter being of Carelian origin. When dealing with the
question of whether the final -in is to be regarded as the
comitative singular suffix or the locative plural, Korhonen
states that in West Lappish one can reconstruct *-jne for both
suffixes, although some dialects of Lule Lappish have such
oppositions as com.sg. båluin vs. loc.pl. boaloin 'button'. This
criterion is, of course, inapplicable to the first gerund suffix, but
it is a clear sign that the West Lappish protolanguage also had
different suffixes for com.sg. (*-jně) and iness. pl. (*-j + ne).

The present participle, dealt with in the next chapter, goes

uniformly back to the Pre-Finnic nomen actoris suffix *-ja*. One
could add to the dialectal forms listed at the beginning of the
chapter such lpN cases as *oappâtœi (~ oappâtei ~ oappâtii)*
'teacher', *mui'tâlœi* 'story-teller', *čuojâtœi* 'musician, player',
guodötœi 'herdsman' from *oappâtit* 'to teach', *mui'tâlit* 'to tell,
to relate', *čuojâtit* 'to play, to ring (tr.)', *guodötit* 'to graze (tr.)',
respectively. These forms occur mostly in compound words,
e.g. names *(Oappâtii-Nil'la* 'the teacher's son Nils'), but are
used as independent words as well, especially by old people
(though *oappâtii* 'teacher' seems to be used by all age-groups).
In these forms, a no doubt relatively late apocope has dropped
the final vowel, as witnessed by the vowel *œ ~ e* (instead of *i*) in
the 3rd syllable. Originally, such forms as *oappâtei* represent
the same kind of pleonasm as the more common four-syllable
forms, e.g. *oappâtœg'gje (< *ʌppĕtɛ-jà-jà)*. For the South
Lappish participles, the author proposes the possibility of a
nǯ-contraction (p. 168). There are not even any relicts of this
contraction (such as lpN *gukka* 'a long time, long' < *kŭkkàn-
ǯĕn)* south of Lule Lappish, however, so that the explanation
using the hypothetical nominative *-jjies* is more plausible.

The abessive shows a wide variety of suffixes in different
Lapp languages, and Korhonen lists no less than six types. Of
these, *-kœt'ta* is historically basic. Originally it was the abessive
of a deverbal noun, derived with the suffix *-kka,* which has
cognates in Baltic Finnish. The abessive suffix derives from an
earlier *-pta,* and Korhonen agrees with Knut Bergsland in
explaining that the form *-kœt'ta* is probably an old genitive
singular form of a derived adjective ending in *-kœttĕs,* now used
as the attributive form of the verbal abessive. If the variant
-kœttĕs is to be regarded as the old nominative, then it is more
plausible to explain the form *-kœt'tai* as a genitive plural *(<
-kettàsĕj) than an illative singular (Korhonen reconstructs
-ketàjĕn, probably a misprint for *-kɛtàjĕn),* which presup-
poses instead the nominative *-kœt'te.* The abessive in *-k*
extending from Lule to South Lappish is explained as analogi-
cal. The suffixes *-tâgâ* and *-htahka* have been taken over from
the declension (they go back to *-pta* + lative *k+ĕ* and, for
-tâgâ, lative *n* or *k).* The suffix *-kœnna(i)* has an interesting
history. It was originally an enclitic negative particle equivalent
to the Finnish *-kaan,* but as a result of a contamination process
it acquired the function of an abessive suffix.

Korhonen accepts K. B. Wiklund's old explanation that the
verbal adverb (e.g. lpN *čuoigâ* 'skiing': *dât bōdii čuoigâ* 'he
came skiing' is the genitive form of the verb stem. The suffix *-n*
has been preserved in South and Ume Lappish and, exception-
ally, in Inari Lappish, too.

The supinum is dealt with in two parts, one of which is devoted to the supinum with the ending *-žit* and the other to that of the negative verb (suffix *-mǎ-)*. In both cases the supinum has a final meaning, i.e. it functions as an adverbial expressing the goal of the action indicated by the main verb and its complements (e.g. *De vulki bar'ne ætnes viežžacet* 'then the boy took off in order to fetch his mother'). In agreement with Björn Collinder and Erkki Itkonen, Korhonen explains the *-žit ~ -žžât* supinum as the infinitive (lpL-N *-t)* of the potential (lpN *-ž- ~ -žžâ-)* substem of the verb. Historically, it goes back to the Lappish protolanguage, but is subsequently lost in East and South Lappish.

The supinum of the negative verb has an almost identical distribution, from Ume to Inari Lappish, probably being borrowed in the East from Norwegian Lappish. The suffix *-mǎ-* (> lpN *â-mâ-* + possessive suffix) is morphologically identical with the perfect participle suffix, but its sole function was to nominalize the negative verb. Semantically the perfect participle and the supinum have very little in common, unless one tries to see some kind of a future-orientated general meaning in the perfect participle when used in compound tenses, e.g. *læm boattam* 'I've come (= my past arrival is still relevant at the moment of speaking)'.

The book concludes with an appendix containing the results of a questionnaire survey on the different complements of the nominal forms in Norwegian Lappish.

With Korhonen's study we finally have a reliable and detailed historical account of Lappish nominal verb forms, together with a critical survey of the various hypotheses launched. In addition to the historical contribution, Korhonen's book has synchronic relevance as well, in its emphasis upon the often neglected criteria for the nominal forms. Future contributions to our knowledge on Lappish nominal forms in the different Lappish languages and dialects cannot overlook Korhonen's methods and results. Much remains to be done, however, and the synchronic aspects of the use of the nominal forms in the scattered Lappish idioms require thorough study.

PEKKA SAMMALLAHTI

Die Entwicklung der mordwinischen Schriftsprachen

Sowohl das Erza- als auch das Mokša-Mordwinische sind auf monodialektaler Basis entstandene Schriftsprachen. Die Stan-

17