

abweichenden Auffassungen recht ausführlich referiert hat, gibt Verf. begründeterweise einer solchen Rede, die neben den Eigenschaften der indirekten Rede auch solche der direkten Rede enthält, den Namen *sekaesitys*, *vermischte Rede*, *oratio mixta*. Er ist der Ansicht, der schriftsprachliche Gebrauch dieser Darstellungsart, die als Untergattung der *oratio obliqua* zu gelten hat, beruhe auf der Sprache des Volkes, wo die *oratio mixta* wegen ihrer Direktheit und ihrer Anschaulichkeit weit- aus allgemeiner ist als die reine *oratio obliqua*.

Eine solche in der Belletristik auftretende Art des Referats, wo der Schriftsteller die Gedanken einer von ihm geschilderten Gestalt gleichsam von deren Standpunkt aus, indem er sich intensiv in deren Rolle versetzt, darstellt, nennt Ikola die erlebte Rede. Z.B. *Hiltu ei voinut olla pirtissä; hän katseli sinertävää metsänrantaa, jonka taakse haalea, kuuma taivas painautui. Jotain itkun tapaista jutkahti hänen kurkussaan. Siellä jossain etäällä kaljupäinen isä kuljeskeli. Kalle oli lähtenyt kotoa jo kauan sitten ja Ville oli äsken kuollut pirtissä.* 'Hiltu hielt es nicht mehr in der Stube aus; sie blickte nach dem bläulichen Waldrand hin, wo der verblichene, heisse Himmel verschwand. Etwas wie ein Schluchzen blieb ihr im Halse stecken. Dort irgendwo, weit weg, trieb sich ihr kahlköpfiger Vater herum. Kalle hatte sich schon längst auf und davon gemacht und Ville war soeben in der Stube gestorben.' Seines Erachtens ist die erlebte Rede grammatisch gesehen keine besondere Form des Referats, sondern ein rein stilistischer Begriff. Formal handelt es sich immer um die *oratio obliqua* oder *oratio mixta*.

Ikolas Untersuchung ist ausser in rein sprachwissenschaftlicher Hinsicht auch vom Standpunkt des praktischen Sprachgebrauchs wertvoll. Manche Einzelheiten des Sprachgebrauchs, die früher vielleicht für selbstverständlich galten, kommen dadurch in ein neues Licht.

MIKKO KORHONEN

OSMO IKOLA, *Lauseopillisia havaintoja Georg Müllerin virolaisten saarnojen (1600—1606) kielestä*. Turku University Publications B 82. Turku 1962.

Mr. OSMO IKOLA has made quite remarkable work in studying various problems in the field of Finnish syntax, including syntactical relations in old literary Finnish. In his latest work, he turns his attention to the only other branch of Balto-Finnic which has some recorded historical evidence to show, that is,

Estonian. The collected sermons of Georg Müller is the richest monument of old literary Estonian. In quality, they are not equal to Agricola's comparatively finished and outstudied achievements, but they were not either composed with publication in mind. The unevenness of the language is only an advantage, from the scholar's point of view, as it may well be supposed to reflect the varieties of spoken Estonian.

The author has followed a selective and descriptive method and has concentrated on points in which Müller's language differs from present-day standard Estonian. The deviations are probably due to four different factors: 1. The archaic character of the language. 2. The dialect of Tallinn. 3. Müller's native language, viz. German. 4. His defective knowledge of Estonian. As mentioned by the author in the Preface, Müller could consult handwritten Estonian texts, which represent a dialectically very varied background. If he relied on the speech of a native informant, this person probably spoke the Tallinn dialect, the influence of which is strongest on Müller's language. The Estonian text is scattered with quotations in German or Latin, inserted rather skilfully in the general structure of the sentences. Towards the end, the quotations increase in number. This is supposed to be due to Müller's improved knowledge of Estonian: he did not find it necessary to have his sermons completely translated, as he was able to refresh his memory with the help of German notes.

Mr. Ikola gives a detailed and careful analysis of Müller's language, considering both the grammatical rules given in old Estonian grammars and the corresponding phenomena in present-day Estonian dialects. This contemporary background is a special merit of Mr. Ikola's method. As in most treatises concerning syntactical phenomena, congruency is the central problem, whether it appears in the adjective attribute and its main word, in the subject and the predicate, in the negative verb and the primary verb, in the transitive verb and its object. The adjective attribute follows its main word in nominative, genitive, partitive, elative, allative, adessive and translative, i.e. in the grammatical cases which occur most frequently in the text. In other cases, the attribute probably represents either the genitive form or the weak-grade stem; from a descriptive point of view, either interpretation could be justified.

— As to the relations of subject and predicate, when a singular nominative subject, contrary to present usage, occurs with a predicate in plural form, the word is usually a collective substantive or a numeral, and conceived as referring to many.

— In Müller's sermons, the passive voice is a direct translation

from German, as indicated in old Estonian grammars: »Minna sahn armastut. Ich werde geliebt.» As, in Balto-Finnic, the passive is not personal in the Indo-European sense, but an indefinite voice, it is not an equivalent of German passive expressions. The author remarks that, in Müller's texts, the perfect and pluperfect passive »are expressed as in present-day Estonian by combining the verb *olema* in the present or past tense with the past participle of the verb in question.» As it is, the construction is not necessarily a passive, but a case of copula and nominal predicate. — In the chapter dealing with the negative verb, the author expresses the opinion that, in Müller's language, the word *ey* is not a negation, but a confirmatory interjection, since it occurs also in purely positive sentences (p. 59). Could it possibly be interpreted to be a negative interjection in sentences as »ey se eb siirry mitte ilma lumala tädtmatta» (cf. nein — nicht)?

From a strictly descriptive point of view, one might remark that the author uses the term »accusative» in two senses, according to common use: syntactically, to indicate the total object, and morphologically, as the name of a (nonexistent) case. Synchronically speaking, »accusative» in Balto-Finnic languages is a syntactical notion, not taking into account the restricted Finnish accusative in *t*. This same remark was made already by F. Wiedemann (*Grammatik der esthnischen Sprache*, p. 253).

In Mr. Ikola's analysis, no comparison is made between the old Estonian and the old Finnish literary languages, for which, naturally, Müller's collection would not provide a basis wide enough. Nevertheless, his work opens interesting perspectives for the study of syntactical relations in the Balto-Finnic languages.

EVA KANGASMAA-MINN

THOMAS A. SEBEOK and VALDIS J. ZEPS, *Concordance and Thesaurus of Cheremis Poetic Language*. Mouton & Co. 's-Gravenhage 1961. 259 p.

Among the Finno-Ugrian languages, Cheremis seems to have become a kind of favourite in modern American linguistics. Many papers and monographs on the Cheremis language and popular civilization have been published from 1950 on by the Finno-ugrists beyond the Ocean. The concordance and thesaurus presented here are closely connected with this research work. The authors of the work have undertaken to compile a dic-