

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-

tionary, or perhaps better a collection of dictionaries on the Cheremis poetic language. The materials of the work consist for the greatest part of Cheremis songs, published as samples of the language, and of songs, written down by Beke, which had not been printed, at least not when the work was published. In part VII, a large amount of still other poems found in the literature have been taken into consideration.

Taken as a whole, the work represents quite a respectable realization. It is also especially remarkable for the fact that, in its editing, mechanical devices have been used for the first time in the history of Finno-Ugrian linguistics; the machine was an IBM 650 calculator.

The work is divided into nine parts. The introduction gives an account of how it was begun, of the dialects — its materials are divided into eight dialects — of the sources and of the transcription used. In addition, the most important of the Cheremis dictionaries published earlier are presented and the principles underlying the work now edited are explained; finally, the automatic compilation of the word-lists is also shortly described. The second part contains a list of the abbreviations, of the sources and of the symbols used.

The largest and most important part of the work, the concordance, forms its third subdivision. According to the declaration of the authors, it contains a list of all the words used in the materials studied. In addition, it contains references to the places where the words appear and the mentions on the total number of times each of them is represented in every song, dialect and the materials as a whole. The phonetic forms of each dialect are in general indicated, but the inflected forms are usually not given. The different derivatives have each their heading, so that e.g. verbs have all their substantival forms and the negative form given separately, whereas the heading under which the inflected forms are found is, as usual, the form of the first person singular. Some references have been provided to connect words belonging to the same group with each other.

It is quite obvious that the most important purpose in the work is not the study of the meanings of the words; in general, only one or two of the main meanings are given for each word. In a work like the one which is discussed here, this is no doubt quite an acceptable principle, but even so, the very considerable amount of false meanings which occur in it cannot be excused. I shall give hereunder samples of words provided with entirely false translations (I shall in general leave aside such cases in which the text from which the word is taken has already an erroneous translation).

- atal-em*¹ 'to tread?' should be 'to deceive'.
biz-əte, *biz-ət-ən* 'a collection of five', should be 'five by five'.
biz-at-te 'not fivefold', should be 'five by five'; in other words, the form is the same as the one above. The word looks certainly odd, but the context allows however easily to discover the meaning.
hopš, is given under the heading *bopš*; the meaning of both the words is given as 'at all'. It has not been possible to verify whether the meaning is right for the last-named word, which is taken from the manuscripts of Beke; it may quite well be exact for this word (which would then be a loan from Russian). The meaning of the word *hopš* is in any case quite different: 'beehive'.
čarka 'shot (of brandy)'; the main meaning of the word is however 'small cup' or 'tumbler'.
čāj 'surely', should be 'tea'. There is, no doubt, a homonymous particle in Cheremis, but in the songs of Karmazin, to which there is a reference in the concordance, the word is certainly the noun 'tea'.
er-la, *er-lä-š-* 'morning', should be 'to-morrow'.
jažga 'soft', should be 'sedge (*carex*)', Russ. *осока*. It is the same word as *jožga* in the Eastern dialects, which is, in fact, translated as 'a type of grass'.
jonđal 'felt boot', should be 'bark boots'.
**jəzl-em*, not translated, should be 'to sing'.
kaba 'a female deity, having to do with fate'. In all the places referred to, the meaning is 'heaven'. The mythological explanation has been taken from the Dictionary of Paasonen.
karməž 'a type of cloth, lit. »fly (insect)«, should be here also 'fly'. The context referred to has *karməž laj posto*, which has approximatively the meaning 'cloth for flies' (*laj* is a word put in for poetic effect).
**kel-əkt-em* 'to wade', should be 'to make wade'.
kiamat 'graveyard', should be 'the Abode of the Dead, Hell'.
kod-əkt-em 'to leave', should be 'to make leave'.
kosoj 'stealthy-eyed', should be 'squint-eyed'.
köra 'than', should be 'in accordance with'.
**kudaš-al-am* 'to dress', should be 'to undress'.
kurska 'elder sister', should be 'sister's husband'.
küdrät 'amazing', should be 'wonder, miracle'.
lač 'only', should be 'precisely'.

¹ Failing an indication to the contrary, the words given here appear as headings in the concordance; the verbal forms marked *are, however, constructed by the authors, in general from nominal forms. As a rule, it has not been considered necessary to give here many phonetic variants.

- **laštər-g-em* 'to duck', should be 'to stoop' (Germ. *ducken*).
- lek-t-aš* : the fundamental meaning of this verb is oddly given as 'appear', whereas it should be 'go, come out'.
- lokama* 'water-lily', should be 'brier rose' (see also morphological remarks).
- luj* 'lynx', should be 'marten'.
- **lüm-d-em* 'to honour', should be 'to call (by a name), to give a name'.
- lābā-l* 'inside', should be 'under side'.
- mareṇəm* 'hunter?'. The word, however, is nothing but the genitive form of *mare* 'man', to which the accusative has still been added. This is quite common in the Western dialects. The texts in the dialect of Jaransk, which have been published, have even at least two such forms where also the ending of a local case has been added to the genitive.
- mu-narə* 'how', should be 'how much'.
- muzikan* 'hurdy-gurdy', should be 'accordion'.
- məgəl* 'crooked', should be 'gnarl, knot'.
- məzi-mör* 'raspberry', should be 'roebuck berry stone bramble'.
- ošk-er* 'willow', should be 'wood, copse of poplars'.
- oškə* 'willow', should be 'poplar'.
- padraš* 'ornamental coin', should be 'small bit'.
- puratka* '(good) custom'. This is, however, a loan-word from the Russian, where *порядок*, gen. *порядка*, has the fundamental meaning 'order'.
- puzar* 'type of cloth'; however, the word should probably be *Buzar*.
- semən* 'similar', should be 'in a certain way, or fashion'.
- sevə-kt-al-am* 'to write', should be 'to make write, to have written'.
- sev-al-t-am* 'to write', should be 'to be written'.
- surt-an* 'house', should be 'the master of the house'.
- šerengə* 'carp', should be 'roach'.
- šerəše* 'edge?', should be 'placed on the edge'.
- **širičə-ld-em* 'to sit', should be 'to sit down'; see also morphological remarks.
- šəgər* 'thicket', should be 'narrow, cramped'; see also morphological remarks.
- taj-n-al-am* 'to dip', should be 'to sway'.
- talınğa* 'teacup', should be 'saucer'.
- taŋgal* 'face to face'; the word appears only in the expression *taŋgal lijəm* 'I met'.
- tuzə* 'strong', should be 'sound, healthy'.
- tuzat* 'indeed', should be '(with negation) not at all'.
- tüle* 'world', should be 'nature' (in the concrete meaning).

tam-əl-ge 'quiet', should be 'wet'.

una-lək 'like a visit', should be 'fit to be a guest, who can be a guest'.

uj-al-am 'to curl', should be 'to grow abundantly, thrive'.

usta 'knife', should be 'master (skilled in something)'.

üjängə 'bow (part of harness)', should be 'willow'.

üma-l 'top', should be 'under, bottom, beneath' (is given under the heading *ümba-l*).

Many of these thoroughly faulty translations already extend their influence also on other parts of the work, where they produce still more errors, but the many morphological errors of the concordance are still more fatal in this respect. Some of the various types among these errors are given hereunder.

It has already been mentioned that, in the work, the different phonetic variants of the several dialects have been given together. However, if there is a semantic difference bound with the phonetic one, the different variants of the word have often — not always — been given at different places. Either for this reason, or just because of neglect or faulty translations, e.g. the following phonetic variants have been separated from each other:

čün 'rank, status' and *čən* 'true, genuine';

čok 'tassel', also second component in *soja-čok* 'a necklace component' and *čoko* 'tassel';

jäj 'soul' and *jəj* 'person';

kül-am 'to be necessary' (the verb will hardly ever appear in the first person) and *kül-eš* 'liked person' (translation not exact);

lo- 'between' and *lu-* in *lu-gə-cen* 'among';

olm- in *olm-ajga* 'bench', *olm-*, **olmə* 'place', *olam* in *olam-bal* 'bench' and *om* in *om-bal* 'bench'; these words belong certainly all to the same group. In addition, it would be time to drop the habit of uniting the word meaning a bench with the word *om* 'dream', for at least Vasiljev and Beke have demonstrated already that this etymology is erroneous;

orba 'cart' and *orba* 'wheel';

porš- in *porš-kem* 'felt boot' and *portəš* 'felt';

šöst-em 'to cover' and *šojə-št-em* 'to cover';

šigər 'narrow' and *šəgər* 'thicket' (wrong meaning);

šinčə-ld-em 'to sit' (wrong translation) and **šinč-ald-em* 'to set, to sit down'; it is probably not necessary, either, to separate

šinčə-ld-al and *šinč-ald-al*;

šor-t-am 'to cry' and *šor-akt-am* 'to cry';

šükšü 'unfortunate!' and *šükšə* 'old (on the other hand, the meanings 'dross, sweepings' given for the last word pertain

to an entirely different one; see the list of words erroneously put together);

ta in *ta-ma-ok* 'somebody special', *ta* in *ta-geške-bek* 'wherever' and *ta* in *ta-ženam* 'sometime'.

Again, the following forms, among others, have been erroneously put together:

ber and *bere* 'place'; the last one is, however, an adverb derived from the first, meaning 'in places';

lokama 'water-lily', (should be 'brier rose'), under this heading, we find also *lokön*, which is a different word, meaning 'water-lily';

läbe 'butterfly'; the longer form *lepenä* is also placed under this heading;

šükšä 'old'; a word *šük*, which has the possessive ending of the third person singular, has also been placed under this heading. It is only this last word which has the meaning 'dross, sweepings';

tene-se 'this year' and *tene-žē* are of course quite different forms;

už-mä 'to see'; the imperative from *už*, provided with the remark (sic) has also been placed under this heading;

ümba-l, *üba-l* 'top'; *üma-l* has also been placed under this heading, although its meaning is opposite: 'under, beneath';

üstel, *üštel*, *üštü-*, *üšta-* 'table'. To the words having this stem, the stems *üstem-* and *üštem-* have also been added (the later one is again provided with the remark *sic*); the *m* of these latter forms comes, however, from the form *ümbal*, and does accordingly not belong at all here.

No attention has been paid, either, to the various foreign origins of the loan-words in Cheremis. Turkish, Chuvash and Russian loan-words have been freely put together, when they have the same meaning and are more or less similar. For example, the loan from Chuvash *oza* 'master' has been put together with *xozäjin*, which, from the point of view of Cheremis, is of Russian origin, *tamaka* 'tobacco', of Turkish origin, has been put together with the loan from Russian *tabak*, etc.

Variants of the same stem are often inexplicably separated from each other. Such are e.g. *ba-* 'top' and *ba-l* 'top', *ümba-* 'top' and *ümba-l* 'top', *šenge-* 'behind' and *šenge-l* 'behind' (from the historical point of view, the *l* has disappeared from the first forms in certain dialects before the *k* of the lative case and the *tš* of the separative case). Other cases are e.g. the separating of the forms *te*, *de-* 'with, by' from the ones having the stem *ter-* 'home' (the later type of stem appears also often in the meaning 'by').

The leading principle seems not to have been to indicate the forms of the cases, but, nevertheless, some of them appear in the work; e.g. the forms *er-lü-š* 'morning' (the meaning should be: 'to-morrow') and *pæckemeš* are no doubt lative cases. Similarly, there are some forms with the possessive suffix added, e.g. under the heading *parak* 'cunus' there is the form *parakš*, under the heading *tene-se* 'this year' the form *tene-žē*, etc.

Some of the words have been divided into morphemes, not quite appropriately, for e.g. *šüj-ŋr* 'necklace' ought, of course, to be divided *šü-jār* (the meaning is, literally, 'the circle of the neck'). There are many cases in which a word, clearly to be divided into morphemes, is presented undivided, e.g. *julgen* 'cold' is composed of three morphemes, thus: *jul-g-an*; the word *kogəñ* 'both' has not been divided, although there is a reference, under that heading, to the word *kok* 'two', etc.

The following forms, among others, have been placed under a wrong conjugation: **caraklam*, should be *-em*, 'to brace', *püčk-em*, should be *-am*, 'to cut', **šeŋ-am*, should be *-em*, 'to sink in'. Probably, *ejer-am* should also be *ejer-em* 'to fish'.

Often, stems have been constructed in cases where the word appears always in one definite case only. In my opinion, it is to be considered erroneous that, when the whole form in which the word appears has not been indicated, the stem has been given a meaning which belongs only to the whole word. Some instances of this: *baštar-* 'encounter'; it is only the lative case *baštar-eš* which has this meaning; *mart-* 'till', should be *mart-n* 'till'; *per-* 'because', notwithstanding the fact that, in this form, the word would have quite a different meaning and that it is only the form of the separative case *pertš* which has the sense indicated in the work.

It is rather often the concordance gives the idea that the form given should appear (or, at least, could appear) as such in the text, even if this is not really the case. E. g. *kogəñ* 'both' could not possibly ever appear under this form only (and does not appear even in the cases referred to), *tor* 'across', should be: *tor-* in *tor-eš* 'across', etc.

I have availed myself of the complete concordances to Paasonen's and Wichmann's texts to take some samples in order to see whether the texts used as materials have been carefully collected. I have not found very many omissions, only some words here and there. I have e.g. not been able to find in the concordance the word *aibat*, *ajbat*, which appears in Paasonen's songs 198, 206 and 212. Then, it is also possible, sometimes, that one finds a song in which the words of a line or two have been totally omitted. So Karmazin's song No. 193; the words

at the beginning seem to have been taken into account, but from the two last lines not a single word has been included in the concordance. Maybe this is somehow due to the mechanical devices which have been used; anyhow, one notices that, exceptionally, this song has six lines among other songs which, as a rule, have four lines.

It is rather annoying that, very often, the references are wrong or totally lacking. I have not examined systematically the references at any place, but, nevertheless, I have found several scores of instances where the indication is wrong or not given at all. A few examples may suffice here: the *äväm* appearing under the heading *aram* has the reference Karm. 7, 20, 22, whereas it appears in Karm. 3₂, 94; *ik-är* has the reference Karm. 73, which should be Karm. 9, *laštär-gə* ref. Wich. 269, should be Wich. 105; *šič-ald-em* ref. Paas. 35, should be Karm. 35, etc.

The indication of the source is totally lacking in e.g. the following instances: *jär-šə*, which is Wich. 51; *pastär-aš*, which is Karm. 161₂; *šarbaḡ*, which is Paas. 11, etc.

The concordance is followed by the fourth part of the work, a list of the words grouped according to form-classes and dialects. Here also, eight dialects are distinguished. The morphological grouping starts with a division in three parts: the main groups consist of substantives, verbals and, forming a whole, of particles, enclitics as well as expressive forms and unclassified forms. Then, the substantives are divided into the following sub-groups: nouns, signs for the plural, locational nouns, personal pronouns, relative pronouns, numerals and other substantives. As for the verbals, they are divided into verbs, verbal substantives and verbal particles. The third main group is not further subdivided according to the various forms.

The reasons for this very surprising way of grouping are not given in the work. The leading principle seems however to be that e.g. the derivatives of nouns which, traditionally, have been considered as adverbs, are put in the same group with the nouns from which they are derived. Accordingly, it is in the group of nouns that we find the forms, ending in (ə)n, which are generally used as adverbs, e.g. *čeber-ən* 'beautifully', *saj-ən* 'nicely', *peškə-də-n* 'soft' (here, as in many other cases, the translation of the (ə)n-form is not correct; it should be 'softly'). Among others, the following forms have also been put among the nouns: *er-la* 'morning' (should be 'to-morrow'), *berə* 'place' (should be *ber-e* 'in places').

Similarly, the following derivatives are also found in the group of numerals: *kok-tə-n* 'two' (should be 'two together') and *kok-la* 'middle', which, according to the authors, belongs to the family of the word *kok* 'two', etc.

Almost all the stems to which the old endings having a local meaning, such as the lative *k* and *an*, the locative *ne* and the ending of the separative case *lš(ən)*, may be added, seem to have been placed in the group of locational nouns. In addition to these stems, only two or three other forms are to be found in this group: *əŋgaj*, which is translated 'along', *lo- lu-* (see the faulty translations in the concordance).

The pronouns, as said, are divided only into two groups. In the group of the personal pronouns, we find the forms for the first and second persons and, in addition, the word *əške* 'self'; the other pronouns have been placed in the group of relative pronouns (on the other hand, the concordance has, in addition, the terms reflexive, indefinite, interrogative and demonstrative pronoun).

The group Other Substantives is not very important; in fact, it has only a few words. Such a group, which is obviously nothing but a kind of dump, seems quite odd already as such, and, further more, it would hardly have been necessary at all. As far as I can see, the word *jədu* 'each' could e.g. quite well have been placed among the pronouns, the word *möngö* 'back' among the locational nouns, as, according to the idea prevailing at the present time, it contains an old lative in *k*. It does not seem normal, either, to find the negation *uke*, which usually has the function of a verb, in this group and only in this, just as the affirmative form *ulo*, which is perhaps even more verbal. Further, as *koktən* has been put among the numerals and *sajən* among the nouns, it would certainly have been logical to put *əskətən*, placed among the other substantives, in the same group as *əške*, etc.

In conformity with the general principle laid out above, all the infinitive forms of the verbs have been put among the verbal substantives, and, in addition to them, some derivatives in *əš*, e.g. *koč-əš* 'food' (which, it is true, is given as a verbal particle in the concordance). On the other hand, the nominal forms ending in *ən* and *(ə)n* have been put among the verbal particles, as well as the negative forms similar to the stems of verbs, whereas the imperative forms, which have quite the same form, have been placed among the verbs. Among the verbal particles, we find also the negation *ag-ep*.

The fifth part is the Tergum, where the words have been grouped according to the final sounds of the derivative morphemes. This gives a clear idea of how the morphemes are joined to each other. A form like *joškargalən* is e.g. divided in the *r* column as follows: *joškar-galən*, in the *g* column *joškarg-alən*, in the *l* column *joškargal-ən*, and, finally, the undivided word is to be found in the *n* column. When such a section is being

compiled, the main difficulty is no doubt how to draw the limits of the morphemes. It is, in fact, by no means rare that e.g. the final sound of the first morpheme has been amalgamated with the first one in the next morpheme. Of course, one can always refer to morphophonemics and say that the study of the phonetic forms of the morphemes belongs first to that level. This argument will however hardly suffice to meet all the illogical facts one finds in the Tergum. Some examples may suffice. Why has e.g. *bojža-lden* a 'vocalic stem', but *bojž-aldem* a 'consonantic stem'? Why has *tarbanem* been divided both *tarba-nem* and *tarb-anem*? Is *a*, then, a morpheme of its own? But why is it not then a derivative particle also e.g. in the word *tarba-nen*, which is divided only in this way in the Tergum?

In addition, one would also expect that the compiler of such a section treating of derivative particles would have met the difficulty of deciding which morphemes in the language from which a feature has been borrowed shall also be considered as morphemes in the language which took the loan. However, in the Tergum, not only Turkish but also late Russian loans have been divided without any hesitation, thus e.g. *petro-bič*, *kazan-skaj*, *basili-č*.

The sixth part consists of a list in which the words have been grouped in the alphabetical order of their first vowels. This part clearly shows which consonants may come before the first vowel appearing in a word and which sounds may come after it. According to the authors, this would be of help e.g. when the vowel system of Chermis is studied historically.

The seventh part is an index according to the first word of each song — in this part, the materials are much more abundant than in the others —, the eighth, a thesaurus, i.e. the English translations of the words, grouped according to subject matters, and the ninth, an English alphabetical index.

Taken as a whole, my opinion on the work is that it is an interesting example of how materials may be treated mechanically so as to serve the purpose a scholar may set to himself each time. Taken as a complete dictionary however, the work does not seem to be quite mature. It may be that part of the remarks I have made can be taken just as an expression of wonder from the part of an observer with a historical turn of mind, but, in any case, summing it up, the work has quite a lot of errors and loose generalities. Maybe the result would have been better if, instead of the songs, the authors had chosen an easier material, e.g. tales?