

vielen Punkten die notwendigen Grunduntersuchungen fehlen. Die Synthese aber, wenn sie so ausgezeichnet gelingt wie hier bei Raija Bartens, erfüllt eine doppelte Aufgabe: sie legt in komprimierter Form das derzeitige Wissen vor, regt aber gleichzeitig, indem sie auf die Lücken in unserem Wissen hindeutet, ergänzende und weiterführende Studien an.

ALHO ALHONIEMI

Progress in Samoyedology

Review of recent publications

The 1970s saw an unprecedented intensification in and expansion of Samoyed studies. In addition to the traditional samoyedological centers of Helsinki, Leningrad, and Budapest (Szeged), several new ones have been formed, such as Tomsk, Novosibirsk, Moscow, Tartu, Munich, and Vienna. Samoyedology has finally emerged as an independent discipline, and the new results achieved in the synchronic and diachronic analysis of the Samoyed languages make it possible, for the first time, to approach realistically the final goal of Uralistics, the reconstruction of the Uralic proto-language. At the same time, considerable progress has been made, especially by Soviet scholars, in research on the ethnic history, ethnology and sociology of the Samoyed peoples. The Samoyeds are now considered not only in the context of the Uralic linguistic family, but as part of the Circumpolar and Siberian cultural complexes.

Synchronic material on the Samoyed languages has recently been augmented by several significant publications. To start with the most important Samoyed language of the present day, Tundra Nenets, most recent work has, naturally, centered on the standard literary language. The most complete source of grammatical information on modern Standard Nenets is provided by a textbook actually intended for the use of pedagogical institutes:

З.Н. КУПРИЯНОВА & М.Я. БАРМИЧ & Л.В. ХОМИЧ, Ненецкий язык. Пособие для педагогических училищ. Издание 3-е, переработанное. Просвещение, Ленинградское отделение. Ленинград, 1977. 312 p.

This is the revised version of a work originally published by Z.N. Kuprijanova, L.V. Xomič and A.M. Ščerbakova in 1957 (second edition 1961). With M. Ja. Barmič, a native Tundra Nenets linguist and pedagogue, as a new contributor, the resulting book is now a most useful reference work with ample material on the morphology and syntax of Standard Tundra Nenets.

Another work of a similar type is the "practicum" of Nenets grammar by two of the same authors:

М.Я. Бармич & З.Н. Куприянова, Практикум по ненецкому языку. Пособие для педагогических училищ. Просвещение, Ленинградское отделение. Ленинград, 1979. 128 p.

The latter booklet contains a somewhat less systematic treatment of the grammar of standard literary Tundra Nenets. Primarily intended for native speaking students at the institute level, and probably very well fulfilling this pedagogical purpose, it is also useful as a general source of grammatical material. Interestingly, the text samples in the book offer illustrative extracts of modern Nenets poetry.

Works of the above type have, of course, no pretensions to be any scientifically exhaustive analyses of the language. It can only be regretted that at present there does not exist any modern scientific treatment of Tundra Nenets. The only true Tundra Nenets grammars ever published are those by M.A. Castrén (1854) and N.M. Tereščenko (1947), both of which are certainly useful but by now definitely obsolete. Although some attempts at the treatment of Nenets grammar from a more modern point of view can be found in various chrestomathies and dictionaries, they are of limited scope. It seems that one of the most urgent tasks in Samoyedology would now be the preparation of a comprehensive, theoretically advanced synchronic description of Tundra Nenets.

What makes the recently published Tundra Nenets grammatical works less suitable for scientific purposes is their basically normative attitude. Although normalization certainly serves the further development of the written use of the language, it often seems that the established norms of Standard Tundra Nenets are not based on any deep considerations. Actually, it appears that in many aspects, especially where morphology is concerned, Tundra Nenets is at present undergoing a phase of radical restructuring. Strict normalization in this situation would only have adverse effects on the spontaneous development and ultimately on the whole sociolinguistic status of the language.

One of the problems with the normative works on Tundra Nenets is the orthography. Although the Cyrillic writing system generally corresponds quite well to the basic features of Nenets phonology, there are also unfortunate cases of both over- and under-differentiation. Perhaps the most obvious shortcoming of the present standard orthography is the non-distinction between the reduced vowel /ə/ and the low full vowel /a/. E.g. triplets such as хада /xədə/ 'fingernail', хада /xadə/ 'grandmother', and хада /xada/ '(he) killed', are not distinguished at the orthographical level.

Cases like this have led to unnecessary confusion about many phonological phenomena among literate native speakers.

The language of the Forest Nenets was until recently known only from the material collected by Castrén and Lehtisalo. In the 1970s, however, the task of studying this language was taken up by several scholars. The first and most dedicated contemporary student of Forest Nenets was Jadviga N. Popova. It is a great pity that the results of her work are now only posthumously available. Popova primarily concentrated on phonology and lexicology, and her main scientific achievement is the phonological description of the Eastern (Pur) dialect of Forest Nenets:

Я.Н. ПОПОВА, Фонетические особенности лесного наречия ненецкого языка. Наука. Москва, 1978. 172 p.

Popova's work is a sincere attempt at a thorough and complex analysis of the phonetics, phonemics, morphophonemics, diachronical phonology, and even areal phonology of Forest Nenets. The greatest merit of the work probably lies in the information on phoneme frequency and phonotaxis, illustrated also by statistical data. Unfortunately, Popova's methods also make necessary some critical comments, which are valid for traditional Soviet phonological research in general.

First, the transcription system used by Popova is adopted from the "universal phonetic transcription" created by V.M. Nadeljaev in 1960. This is a system combining extreme visual and manual unpracticalness with serious theoretical confusions and quasi-exactitude, matched in these respects only by the Dulzonian transcription system used by the Tomskian school. Indeed, in phonetic notation, there seems to be no reason to deviate radically from the Finno-Ugrian Transcription System, the use of which was firmly established in Samoyedological fieldwork by the two pioneers Donner and Lehtisalo. On the other hand, in strictly phonological notation various simplifications and graphemic transformations may well be in place.

Second, although apparently aware of the nature of the principal concepts involved, Popova, like many of her colleagues, seems still to have been unable to distinguish in practice between phonetics and phonemics, phonology and morphophonology, diachronical regularity and irregularity, and so on. Thus, for instance, the material given by Popova to illustrate the phonological correspondences between Forest Nenets and Tundra Nenets is rendered rather meaningless by these theoretical confusions.

Third, the auditive reliability of the field data is sometimes doubtful. The unnecessary overdifferentiation in the phonetic

transcription actually seems to conceal a state of uncertainty with regard to the phonetic reality. For instance, on the basis of notations such as *ησ*: 'остров', *ησ* 'краска', *тσ* 'озеро', *тϕ* 'крыло', Popova suggests establishing three distinctive quantities within each vowel quality. It is, however, considerably more likely that only two quantities are present. The phonetic field material is simply overdifferentiated (and overinterpreted), possibly due to the influence of an excessively helpful informant.

Popova also prepared a lexicological work on Forest Nenets:

Я.Н. ПОПОВА, Ненецко-русский словарь. Лесное наречие. *Studia Uralo-Altaica* 12. Szeged, 1978. 152 p.

This small dictionary contains about 3,000 word items from the Eastern (Pur) dialect. As the first systematic lexicological treatment of Forest Nenets the work certainly fills a distinct need. As is known, the Forest Nenets lexical materials of Castrén and Lehtisalo are rather incomplete and inconvenient to use. However, as compared with Lehtisalo's material, Popova's presentation of the lexical items is very concise, being in most cases confined to simple glossing. This unfortunate shortcoming, probably due to the posthumous character of the work, seriously restricts the usability of Popova's material for any more advanced semantic and comparative purposes.

Popova gives the lexical material in both phonetic and phonemic transcriptions. Here, again, notational problems are apparent. For instance, the preaspiration (phonemically glottal stop) occurring before obstruent consonants does not in Popova's notation follow the established rules of occurrence. Cases of inetymological preaspiration, as in Popova's *ηu^httv* pro **ηuttv* /*ηuta*/ 'рука', must be confusions either by the transcriber or by the informant. Actually, it may well be that many Forest Nenets idiolects of the present day represent a rather rudimentary language command, with various phonological confusions as the result. To some extent this is true of all Forest Nenets field material collected in recent years (Popova, Sammallahti, Pusztay). For the purposes of comparative analysis, therefore, the materials of Castrén and Lehtisalo are more reliable.

The Enets are today the Samoyed people closest to linguistic extinction. From a conservative point of view it would seem that quick efforts should be made to gather all possible lexical and grammatical material as well as a representative collection of texts from the last living informants with a reasonable command of the language. Fortunately, some important field work has actually been carried out (by I. Sorokina, E.A. Xelimskij, and others), but the results are so far unpublished.

The most important recent publication on the Enets language is a compilative dictionary by Michael Katschmann and János Pusztaý:

MICHAEL KATSCHMANN & JÁNOS PUSZTAY, *Jenissej-Samojedisches (Enzisches) Wörterverzeichnis. Fenno-Ugrica, Band 5.* Hamburg, 1978. 283 p.

This work contains, for the first time, a collection of all the lexical information presently available on the Enets language. Altogether 1,642 word items are present, gathered both from earlier vocabularies and from publications of non-lexicological character. The dictionary will, no doubt, remain the standard lexicological reference work on Enets for a long time to come.

The material presented by Katschmann and Pusztaý illustrates the total lack of uniformity that prevails traditionally in the graphic notation of Enets. It would have considerably added to the value of the dictionary if the compilers had given the head words of the items in a unified phonemic transcription. It would not have been too difficult to create an essentially phonemic notation for the two main dialects of Enets.

As for the Nganasan language, there seems to be no danger of any rapid deterioration of language command among the native speakers. Nevertheless, more information on Nganasan is urgently needed since the language has long been known only fragmentarily. A most welcome contribution to Nganasan studies is the new grammar by N. M. Tereščenko. From the point of view of "juvenile" material supply this work is probably the single most important publication in recent descriptive Samoyedology:

Н.М. ТЕРЕЩЕНКО. Нганасанский язык. Наука, Ленинградское отделение. Ленинград, 1979. 322 p.

Once more, it seems that phonology has caused the theoretical and practical problems most difficult to overcome. Although Tereščenko has established a paradigmatic set of surface phonemes probably close to the truth, she has not always been able to follow the phonological methods in practice. Some very basic features of Nganasan phonology have escaped Tereščenko's attention (as, for instance, the structural division of words into phonologically independent two-syllable sequences, and the double-vowel sequential nature of the "long" vowels). One source of confusion is, no doubt, Tereščenko's transcription, which is Cyrillic-based and apparently far from optimal for Nganasan. Still, Tereščenko's phonological presentation does contain a lot of valuable information and new observations. For instance, it now seems justified to include the front vowels /ä/ and /ö/ in the Nganasan vowel paradigm.

Morphology forms the main part of Tereščenko's work. The shortcomings in the phonological analysis have made the presentation of the complicated Nghanasan morphophonology quite difficult, but in other respects Tereščenko has been able to give a rather insightful and comprehensive survey of the morphological categories of modern Nghanasan. The sample material is throughout extremely valuable, not only grammatically but also lexicologically. Abundant and precise information has also been collected on derivation in Nghanasan, a field practically unknown earlier.

As was known already from Tibor Mikola's publication of Nghanasan language material (1970), modern Nghanasan has undergone considerable changes since Castrén's times. This is particularly apparent in morphology. New morphological affixes such as the second dative in /-ža/ have arisen, and some old ones have disappeared or been restructured. Especially important is the phonologically conditioned disappearance of the old suffixes for gen.sg. (-ŋ) and acc.sg. (-m). As the typical Nghanasan consonantal gradation as well as other fairly complicated morphophonological alternations have still been largely preserved, it can be said that the morphology of the language, as a whole, has evolved towards increased flectivity: cf. e.g. nom.sg. /ʒeŋhä/ 'garment': gen.acc. /ʒembä/, nom.sg. /baŋ/ 'dog': gen.acc. /baŋä/.

Although basically descriptive in character, Tereščenko's work also contains a number of diachronic remarks, quite often both original and correct. To give just one example: Tereščenko establishes the parallelism between the Selkup translative case in /-tqo/ and the Northern Samoyed "translative" constructions involving a gerundial verbal noun of an auxiliary verb (e.g. noun + /iša/ in Nghanasan). Indeed, the Selkup element /-qo/ (preceded in the translative case by the gen.sg. marker *-n) can be derived from a Common Samoyed verbal noun of a periphrastically used auxiliary verb (probably reconstructable as *i-kä, which is also the source of the verbal "infinitive" forms in the Samoyed languages).

In the study of the Selkup language, the dividedness of the world has been felt more concretely than elsewhere in Samoyedology. Soviet scholars in Tomsk (É.G. Bekker, A.I. Kužmina, Ju.A. Morev, and others) have been publishing short samples of their obviously much more extensive field materials, while other students of Selkup outside the Soviet Union (Tamás Janurik and Hartmut Katz, in the first place) have been busy trying to subject the available material to a deeper and more detailed theoretical analysis. Non-Soviet scholars have often found the situation rather frustrating, as practically no possibility exists for them to check the available linguistic data.

Nevertheless, Western "Selkupistics" has come out with significant results. The most recent contribution is a book by Hartmut Katz that might be called a dialectal anthology of Selkup:

HARTMUT KATZ, *Selkupische Quellen. Ein Lesebuch. Studia Uralica, Band 2.* Wien, 1979. 231 p. + 1 map.

Katz's book is without doubt a success. He has collected representative samples of all available Selkup text sources from a period ranging over more than 300 years, from Witsen to the Tomskian school. All samples are reprinted, transcribed, translated into German, and critically commented. The selection comprises 54 texts representing all known Selkup dialects. Each source is also briefly characterized from the source-critical point of view.

On one minor point, incidentally, Katz has been fooled by old Mathias Alexander. The "Song of the good man's wife", which Katz cites as the "only Selkup love song" known to him, is, of course, nothing else but the translation into Tas Selkup of the well-known Finnish folksong "Jos mun tuttuni tulisi". Lehtisalo certainly knew this, too, although he did not mention it in his publication of Castrén's materials. Translating this Finnish song into various languages of the world was a hobby in some academic circles in the early 19th century.¹

In the Soviet Union, the Tomskian school of Selkupologists have recently been challenged by a research team based at the University of Moscow. This Moscow team, composed of E.V. Gruškina, A.I. Kuznecova, and E.A. Xelimskij, have now published an extensive description of the Tas dialect of Northern Selkup:

А.И. КУЗНЕЦОВА & Е.А. ХЕЛИМСКИЙ & Е.В. ГРУШКИНА, *Очерки по селькупскому языку. Тазовский диалект. Том I. Публикации отделения структурной и прикладной лингвистики, серия монографий, выпуск 8, материалы полевых исследований. Издательство Московского университета. Москва, 1980. 411 p.*

The work is superb and in many respects qualitatively surpasses anything published so far in the field of descriptive Samoyedology. It is not only a comprehensive description of an important Selkup dialect but it is also the first treatise of any Samoyed language based both on modern theoretical expertise and on abundant field

¹ Castrén had this song translated into Tundra Nenets also, as published by Schiefner in Castrén's *Wörterverzeichnis*, p. 339. See also Tarkiainen, "Jos mun tuttuni tulisi", *Suomalaisen kansanrunousseminaarin julkaisuja III, Suomi IV: 11* (1912), p. 5.

material. All relevant aspects of Selkup grammar are described, and, for the first time, topics such as accentology, phonostatics, morphophonology, derivation, semantics, syntax, and even ethnolinguistics, toponymics, and onomatopoeia (a chapter written by O.A. Kazakevič) have been treated in detail.

For a non-Selkup reader there is, of course, no possibility to check whether the interpretations suggested by Kuznecova, Xelimskij and Gruškina are always justified. For instance, in the phonological analysis, the identification of the reduced vowel of non-initial syllables as a representation of the phoneme /y/ is questionable; from the point of view of the overall system of the vowels in non-initial syllables, the postulation of an independent reduced vowel phoneme would seem more justified. Another problematic point in phonology is the status of the "lax" vowel phonemes /i̥/ and /ε̥/; actually, no complete minimal triplets contrasting /i—i̥—y/ or /ε—ε̥—ä/ are given.

The book contains many valuable additions and corrections to the previous treatments of Selkup grammar. For instance, the description of the categories of nominal case declension and verbal aspect (actually divided into two categories: вид and совершаемость) has undergone significant elaboration. A very useful innovation in Samoyedology is the introduction of the category of "representation", covering the cases where a word form has the functions of two different parts of speech at the same time (e.g., verbal nouns and gerunds, nominal predicative conjugation).

The new and precise material contained in the book will be of particular value to the diachronic analysis of Samoyed morphology. Of similar importance to Samoyed etymological studies will be, no doubt, the second volume of the monograph, which will contain a dictionary and a collection of texts. The two volumes together will form a truly excellent handbook of Northern Selkup, to be recommended for use by any Samoyedologist, Uralist, Siberiologist, or just general linguist.

JUHA JANHUNEN

Bärensprache in Sibirien

MARIANNE SZ. BAKRÓ-NAGY, Die Sprache des Bärenkultes im Obugrischen. (Bibliotheca Uralica, 4.) Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1979. 141 S.

Das Bärenfest ist einer der ältesten und am weitesten verbreiteten Riten im zirkumpolaren Kulturkreis. Eine besonders wichtige