

ad (4): Dass /č/ des M- und S-Selk. im Norden /t/ entspricht, gilt erst sei PROKOFJEV (bei CASTRÉN steht meist noch č, bei DONNER t).<sup>1</sup>

ad (5) und (6), die etwas unpräzise formuliert sind, handle ich an anderer Stelle ausführlich.

ad (7): »č« ist im Norden als /t/ zu werten und eignet sich nicht als Dialektunterscheidung.<sup>1</sup>

ad (10): Nord *l* S, M *j* gilt nicht nur für das Suffix *-l*, sondern ganz allgemein für einfaches *l*, vgl. z.B.

Sam.Spr.mat. 44: Tas Kar *kolja*, N MO K Tsch *koja* »Kreis«.

Weiter wäre erwähnenswert gewesen, dass inlautendes nicht-geminiertes *ŋ* des Nordens (ausser Jel.) in gleicher Weise in den übrigen Dialekten *j* entspricht, vgl. z.B. (Sam.Spr.mat. 48):

N . . . *kaje*, K *käi*, NP *kaije*, Tsch *kai* . . . , Kar B Tas *kénje*, Jel. *kei* »Fischsuppe«.

ad (12): Dieser Punkt gehört zusammen mit (8). Es ist aber zu betonen, dass die angegebenen Formen postvokalisch sind, postkonsonantisch sind Formen mit *m* belegt, vgl. Sam. Spr.mat. (Px1P1)

S. 156 K *lokkáut*, aber 158 *maanmet*

152 N *loqaút*, aber 154 *mānmut*

Alle Dialektunterschiede konnten natürlich nicht erwähnt werden. Wichtig scheint mir wegen der schwierigen Frage der Vokalquantität die Diphthongierung in Tsch, Tschl, 00 zu sein, vgl. Sam.Spr.mat. 11

N *aamak*, K *aammang*, NP *aammuang*, Tsch Tschl *oamang*, 00 *éammang* »ich gähne«

weiter, dass Nord (ausser Tu) und Mitte *ś*, *s* im Süden (incl. MO) nur *s* gegenübersteht.

Im Ganzen gesehen kann sich die Uralistik zu diesem abgewogenen, hochwertigen und längst unentbehrlichen Handbuch beglückwünschen.

HARTMUT KATZ

### From the Depths of the Taiga

PEKKA SAMMALLAHTI, Material from Forest Nenets. Castrenianum toimitteita 2. Helsinki 1974. 140 p.

In recent years the scanty information available concerning the minor Northern Samoyed idioms has been augmented by

<sup>1</sup> Vgl. meine Dissertation (o.Fn. 3 S. 256).

T. Mikola's publications of Enets and Nganasan material (NyK 66, 72, ALH 17). P. Sammallahti now offers a similar contribution to our very limited stock of knowledge of the Forest Nenets dialect. The material was collected by Sammallahti at the Herzen Institute in Leningrad from a single informant, a cultivated representative of the (eastern) Pur sub-dialect. In view of the extreme brevity of the field work period, an almost incredibly rich picture of the idiolect has emerged.

In the main part of the work the author presents a grammatical sketch comprising a phonological survey and morphology with comments on syntax. After Castrén's notes (in MSFOu 122) and Verbov's unpublished manuscript this is the third systematic treatment of Forest Nenets and at the same time the first more comprehensive application of a modern complex view of language in descriptive Samoyedology.

Sammallahti accepts both the functional and the dynamic aspect of phonology, thus being able to account for most of the morphophonemic alternations in process form without losing the principle of distinctivity. A few inconsistencies have remained in the postulated deep representations, e.g. (pp. 98, 104) /jt/ pro /js/ in the instrumental verbs (in verbs /ʔ/ ~ /s/). The surface phonemes are further classified in terms of the Ladefogedean phoneticist features which unfortunately give the impression of arbitrary inexactitude. In two points the surface paradigm deliberately, yet, as it seems, unnecessarily violates strict functionalism: (1) the syllable initial /d/ and the syllable final /j/ are separated (p. 21), the /d/ being now a unique phoneme in the system; (2) the preaspirated obstruents are interpreted as independent units (p. 24) and not as clusters (as proposed also by Mikola, NN 15—16: 46). Particularly problematic are the counterparts of Tundra Nenets /ä/ (now largely merged with /e/). In Lehtisalo's Forest material the representation seems to be a phonemically uniform (phonetic) diphthong of very much the same quality as in Tundra dialects, e.g. P *χǎëm* 'Auge', *kǎëβčǎšǎa* 'Seitenholz', Lj. *ηǎëιββηǎ* 'Kopf', *tǎëιββηǎ* 'Schwanz'. Sammallahti, however, gives three phonemizations, cf. /haɛm/ (*χǎëm*), /kaev/ (*kǎëv*) 'edge', /ηaeva/ (*ηǎëvva*), /tajva/ (*tǎjvva*). As no minimal pairs were obtained (p. 14), the distinction between the diphthongs /aɛ/ — /æ/ can be questioned, but the representation /aj/ (also of other origin, e.g. /tajna/ 'then' = lit. тайна) seems to be a phonemic reality that will have to be given an explanation in the future.

Of particular interest are the author's scattered remarks on historical phonology. On the basis of Lehtisalo's material a classification is given of the Forest dialects, the criterion being (as by Verbov, cf. Tereščenko 1956: 195) the system of

liquidae. The author repeats his view (JSFOu 72: 421), unfortunately contradicted even by the synchronic data, of the originality of the word final obstruent (actually a recent paradigmatic generalization) found in some dialects instead of the more common glottal stop. Erroneously Sammallahti reconstructs both \*ki and \*k̥j in Proto-Nenets on the basis of the Tundra relation /xiba/ 'who' — /xid'a/ 'cup' (here also a recent sporadic change, the Northern Samoyed \*ki being represented in Nenets as /ši/, e.g. /šide-/ 'to wake' < \*kitä-).

The exposition of the morphology is generally close to that found in traditional grammars of Tundra Nenets. Here, and especially in the syntactical notes, the limits of the material make themselves more clearly felt. A useful contribution to the grammatical treatment of Nenets are e.g. the simple criteria for distinguishing between mood markers and derivational suffixes (p. 83); so e.g. the habitative morpheme /šetu/ is considered a mood marker (cf. Tereščenko 1965: 904).

The grammatical sketch is followed by two texts with ample comments (other texts in Forest Nenets being only those of Lehtisalo, now also the brief Verbov materials by Labádi, NN 17—18). The book concludes with a vocabulary of nearly 400 items, particularly useful for studies in historical phonology.

It is warmly to be hoped that the growing technological-scientific cooperation between Finland and the Soviet Union will continue in the future to enable Finnish scholars to carry out more extensive field work among the Northern peoples, not only the Uralic, but the Altaic and Paleo-Siberian as well.

JUHA JANHUNEN

### **Eine Festschrift für Béla Gunda**

Anzuzeigen ist eine stattliche Festschrift, erschienen aus Anlass des 60. Geburtstages des namhaften ungarischen Ethnologen Béla Gunda (Debrecen). In deutscher, englischer, französischer und italienischer Sprache (Reihenfolge nach der Häufigkeit) schreiben 48 Wissenschaftler aus verschiedenen Ländern von England bis Japan (Finnland ist nicht vertreten) über ein recht breites Spektrum an Themen in den

Studia Ethnographica Et Folkloristica In Honorem Béla Gunda. Redigerunt J. Szabadfalvi — Z. Ujváry. Debrecen 1971. 756 S. Műveltség és Hagomány XIII —XIV.