

einer der Mitbegründer der Finnisch-Ugrischen Forschungen, die bald zu einem der führenden internationalen Foren der Finnougristik geworden sind. In eben dieser Tätigkeit als Wissenschaftsorganisator sieht Korhonen die größten Verdienste Setäläs (S. 142).

Jeweils eigene Kapitel widmet der Autor den mit finanzieller Unterstützung der Finnisch-Ugrischen Gesellschaft unternommenen Forschungsreisen, den Untersuchungen über die finnischen Dialekte und die ostseefinnischen Sprachen, den Forschungen im Bereich der alten finnischen Literatursprache, den Studien über die Beziehungen zwischen den ostseefinnischen und den indogermanischen Sprachen und den Bestrebungen auf dem Gebiet der deskriptiven Grammatik, der Sprachpflege, der Phonetik, der Lexikographie und der Namenkunde.

Der bibliographische Teil enthält ein Verzeichnis der wichtigsten Bücher und Handschriften, auf die sich der Autor bezieht (S. 190 - 220) und ein Personenregister (S. 221 - 225). Angaben zur derzeitigen Sprecherzahl der einzelnen uralischen Sprachen finden sich im Anhang (S. 226). Den Band beschließen zwei Karten, die die Verbreitung der finnischen Dialekte zu Beginn des Jahrhunderts und die heutigen Wohngebiete sowie die einstige weiteste Ausdehnung der Siedlungsgebiete der uralischen Völker zeigen.

Nur eine Randbemerkung bliebe im Zusammenhang mit dieser verdienstvollen Arbeit zu machen: Bei der Erläuterung des geschichtlichen Hintergrundes, bei der Darlegung der Anfänge der finnisch-ugrischen Forschung hätte man meines Erachtens auch auf József Pápay's Werk "A magyar nyelvhasználat története" (MNYTK I/3), Budapest 1922) Bezug nehmen können.

Sicher kann Mikko Korhonen's inhaltsreiches Werk all jenen als Wegweiser dienen, die die Geschichte der Finnougristik in Finnland in der fast ein Jahrhundert umfassenden, entscheidenden Zeit zwischen 1828 und 1918 kennenlernen wollen. Dieser wissenschaftsgeschichtliche Überblick gibt, wie ich in der Einleitung bereits sagte, nicht nur ein Bild über diese Zeit, sondern umreißt auch die davor liegende Epoche und gibt dem Leser einen kurzen Ausblick auf die folgende Zeit etwa bis zum Beginn der 50er Jahre dieses Jahrhunderts. Dieser Umstand zeigt deutlich, wie willkürlich die zeitlichen Grenzen der behandelten Epoche letztlich gewählt sind. Unser Dank gebührt dem Autor, der auch mit diesem Band äußerst sorgfältige Arbeit geleistet hat.

LÁSZLÓ HONTI

### A revival of Dagur studies

Until recently, very little information was available on the Dagur people and their language, the enigmatic northeastern form of Mongolic. The principal sources for decades used to be those published by Ivanovskiy (1894) and Poppe (1930 - 1935), later augmented by the materials and fresh theoretical insights of Martin (1961). The main problem was that the areas inhabited by the Dagur were long practically closed to foreigners. Very few Dagur speakers were accessible anywhere, and one could only make guesses about

how the Dagur were getting along during the long and dark years of the Cultural Revolution.

After the end of the Cultural Revolution, however, the Dagur areas once more became open to external contacts, and, surprisingly enough, the Dagur once more emerged as a living nationality. Interest towards the Dagur language arose immediately, and during a short time a wealth of new information has been published both by Chinese and foreign scholars.

We now know that the Dagur currently number appr. 94,000 individuals (1986), distributed in three main localities:

(1) in the basin of the river Hailaer (Hailar) and its tributaries in Hulunbeier (Hulunbuir) Province of the Inner Mongolian Autonomous Region; here the Dagur live mainly in the provincial capital Hailaer (Hailar) and the neighbouring rural areas, notably the Ewenke (Evenki) Autonomous Banner and the Chen-Baerhu (Old Bargut) Banner;

(2) in the basin of the river Nenjiang (Nonni) and its tributaries, administratively divided between Hulunbeier Province and Heilongjiang (Amur) Province; here the Dagur settlements begin around the city of Qiqihaer (Tsitsihar) and continue northwards, with a particularly significant Dagur population living in the Molidawa (Morindawa) Dagur Autonomous Banner of Hulunbeier Province;

(3) in the basin of the river Emin (Emel) and its northern tributaries, north of the town of Tacheng (Chuguchak) in the Yili (Ili) Kazakh Autonomous District of the Xinjiang (Sinkiang) Uigur Autonomous Region; here the Dagur, today reportedly organized into an autonomous rural area, live as a diaspora group since 1763.

Geographically, at least, we can thus speak of three groups of the Dagur: the Hailaer (Hailar) Dagur, the Nenjiang (Nonni) Dagur, and the Xinjiang (Sinkiang) Dagur.

We also know that the Dagur language is fairly homogeneous so that communication between representatives of the different groups of the nationality faces no serious linguistic obstacles, although some dialectal variation does exist corresponding to the geographical dispersion. On the other hand, the difference between Dagur and the other Mongolic languages, including the standard variety of Mongolian as used in Inner Mongolia, is great enough to hamper mutual intelligibility. In practice, however, communication between the Dagur and other Mongols is facilitated by widespread Dagur-Mongolian bilingualism among the Dagur population, as well as by the general knowledge of Chinese among all the Mongolic minority nationalities. The Dagur living within the Inner Mongolian Autonomous Region, in particular, learn standard Mongolian as part of their regular school curriculum. Written Mongolian and Chinese are also the only literary languages used by the Dagur today. The Dagur language itself, in spite of past attempts at creating a written standard, remains so far without a normative and literary basis.

As a sign of revival of Dagur studies in China, scattered articles on the Dagur and their language began to appear soon after the end of the Cultural Revolution in periodicals such as *Minzu Yuwen*. Quite soon there followed the first overall treatment of the structure of the Dagur language to appear in China, written by Zhong Suchun:

ZHONG SUCHUN, *Dawoeryu jianzhi*. Zhongguo shaoshu minzu yuyan jianzhi congshu. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe, 1982. (4+) 105 pp.

As indicated in the preface to the book, the material was mainly collected in the Molidawa Dagur Autonomous Banner on an expedition carried out as early as 1963. The publication of the material was finally implemented in connection with the preparation of the official minority language series to which the book belongs and in which all the Mongolic languages of China have by now been described.

A close parallel to Zhong's book is formed by another recent work on Dagur, as published by B. X. Todayeva in the Soviet-Union:

B. X. TODAYEVA, *Dagurskiy yazyk*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Nauka, Glavnaya redakciya vostochnoy literatury, 1986. 189 pp.

Todayeva collected her material during a couple of joint Sino-Soviet expeditions in 1955 - 1956. Although her book is also focussed on a single dialect, termed the Butha dialect, she was actually able to visit all the major Dagur speaking localities. In fact, she collected extensive material from almost all the Mongolic speaking groups in China, and the work on Dagur completes her well-known series of grammatical outlines of various Mongolic idioms. Earlier she has published brief samples of her Dagur materials in her general survey of the Mongolic languages of China in the series *Yazyki zarubezhnogo Vostoka i Afriki* (1960).

In this connection, the concept of the Butha dialect needs attention, for its definition by Todayeva is far from clear. While traditionally a distinction has only been made between three dialectal varieties of Dagur, viz. those of Hailaer, Qiqihaer and Xinjiang, Todayeva, prefers to divide the Qiqihaer dialect into two separate entities, which she calls the Qiqihaer dialect (proper) and the Butha dialect. The latter term refers to the language of the Dagur living towards the northern part of the Nenjiang basin, thus most importantly covering the Molidawa group, the apparent source of Todayeva's material. It may be noted that the concept of the Butha (Buteha) dialect is also used by Chinese scholars since the 1950s. However, because of the many historical and geographical uses of the (Manchu) term *butha* in connection with various nationalities of northern China, this concept is inevitably ambiguous, and its linguistic basis remains to be clarified.

In any case, the material of both Zhong and Todayeva apparently derives from a dialectally more or less identical source, which makes the comparison of the two treatments of the Dagur language all the more interesting. Even dispositionally the treatments are very similar in that both begin with a presentation of phonology and morphology and end with a glossary. Zhong also adds a brief outline of syntax. The general scope of Todayeva's work is, however, larger, and it also contains diachronic remarks as well as a selection of texts with translations. As to the glossaries, Zhong gives appr. 800 items, while Todayeva gives more than 2 000. A problem with Zhong's glossary is that the items are not fully ordered according to any obvious phonological or semantic principle, while Todayeva lists her entries in a simple and consistent alphabetical order.

For the graphical presentation of Dagur both Zhong and Todayeva follow the established traditions of their countries, which means that Zhong employs the International Phonetic Alphabet, while Todayeva uses a slightly modified version of the Cyrillic alphabet. Neither of the choices is ideal, but one can hardly avoid the impression that Zhong's graphical approach is generally better suitable for Dagur. He has also better solutions to certain

details such as the notation of the long vowels, which he denotes by segment doubling, while Todayeva uses the inconvenient suprasegmental hyphen as the indicator of length.

We may here recall the history of the attempts aiming at creating a literary language for the Dagur. It is well known that only a few years before the Cultural Revolution there were Soviet-inspired plans of introducing the Cyrillic alphabet not only for the scholarly transcription but also for the practical orthographical notation of all the Mongolic languages of China, including Dagur. The rejection of these plans was apparently sealed by the subsequent political developments. The outcome was, without doubt, fortunate for most of the Chinese Mongols, who now continue to use the old Written Mongolian and Oirat literary languages. For the Dagur, however, the reorientation of Chinese politics meant the abandonment of a concrete opportunity of receiving a literary language.

The separation of the Soviet and Chinese traditions of Mongolistics is also evident from the fact that Todayeva does not seem to know Zhong's work, although it appeared four years prior to her own. Todayeva does, however, list among her sources all the other previous treatments on Dagur, including those by Poppe, whom she was still unable to mention by name in her earlier brief notes on Dagur. Zhong, on the other hand, does not specify any literary sources at all. This circumstance may be due to the requirements of the publication series in question, but it may also reflect the fact that Chinese Mongolistics, even after the end of the Cultural Revolution, still develops in relative isolation from both Western and Soviet scholarship.

Although a slight dialectal heterogeneity of the source corpora cannot be ruled out, the graphical differences between the descriptions of Zhong and Todayeva certainly also reflect differences in their phonological interpretations. Our understanding of Dagur phonology is still far from complete, so it is for the most part impossible to decide which one of the two authors has arrived at a more adequate interpretation of any given phonological detail. It must, however, be noted that the phonological interpretations of both Zhong and Todayeva are theoretically inferior to those of a third author, Tsumagari Toshirou, who has recently prepared an important paper on Dagur phonology, as published in Hoppou Bunka Kenkyuu (1985). Tsumagari's paper was partly stimulated by the appearance of Zhong's book, but partly also by the availability of a native informant.

We may here mention just two interconnected problems of Dagur phonology, viz. those of vowel reduction and consonant palatalization. Tsumagari, following Martin, suggests that all Dagur words end phonologically either in an archiphonemic nasal or in a vowel. Zhong and Todayeva, on the other hand, assume a complete reduction of all final vowels, so that a word may end in any consonant, including palatalized ones. The latter are occasionally transcribed as single segments by Todayeva, while Zhong consistently analyzes them as sequences of a consonant and the palatal glide. Thus, words of the (Common Mongolic) type \*mori(-n) 'horse' are rendered in three different ways by the three authors: \*[mori] by Tsumagari, [mory] by Zhong, and [moR] by Todayeva (here the various notational conventions are unified and simplified, with capitalization for palatalization and [y] for the palatal glide). In this particular case, all the three authors seem to have missed certain relevant details, as is perhaps evident from the following:

(1) It is well known that Dagur, like several other Mongolic idioms, is characterized by the phenomenon of palatal breaking (Brechung), e.g.

/miage/ 'meat' from \*mika(-n). Palatal breaking could, in principle, be analyzed in terms of sequences of a palatalized consonant and a vowel. This is the preferable analysis in a number of other Mongolic languages, including Buryat and Khalkha. Dagur, however, differs from the other Mongolic languages in that it also shows a phenomenon that can be termed labial breaking, e.g. /xuare/ 'rain' from \*kura. It is clear that the assumption of a complete set of labialized consonants would unnecessarily complicate the phonological paradigm. Much more economically it can be assumed that both labial and palatal breaking result in sequences with separate segments for palatality and labiality. The problem is, whether these separate segments are vowels or glides, and whether there are glide phonemes at all in Dagur. In difference from Martin, both Zhong and Tsumagari assume the presence of glides, i.e. [myag(e)] vs. [xwar(e)], while Todayeva, inconsistently enough, renders palatal breaking segmentally, i.e. [Mag(a)], but labial breaking sequentially, i.e. [xuar]. We adopt here the assumption that no separate glide phonemes exist in Dagur. This also means that we do not assume any vowel loss due to reduction, although some kind of qualitative reduction may well be recognized.

(2) Sequences of a consonant and a segment conveying palatality may also occur word-internally. The most important group of examples is formed by the cases in which a long illabial middle vowel is present phonetically, e.g. /uniee/ 'cow' from \*üniye(-n). Tsumagari analyzes such cases in terms of diphthongoids, i.e. [unyei] (the simplified notation [e] is here used for the middle vowel in question), while Zhong postulates a special palatal middle vowel phoneme, i.e. [unEE] (the notation [E] is here used for the special vowel). Zhong's idea of a special palatal middle vowel phoneme is interesting in that it reminds us of the similar segment in the vowel paradigm of the neighbouring Evenki (Solon) dialects. Indeed, it cannot be ruled out that a restructuring of the Dagur vowel system on Evenki lines is under way in some dialects. It may be relevant to note that sporadic developments have already introduced the short variety of the phonetic segment in question, as in /biede/ 'we', i.e. Zhong's [bEd], for earlier (\*)/biade/ from \*bida. However, morphophonological evidence proves that no such special vowel phoneme needs to be postulated for ordinary Dagur. This is clearly demonstrated by the morphological paradigm of stems ending in a consonant plus a segment of palatality, e.g. /geri/ 'house': abl. /geri-eese/, cf. /mori/ 'horse': instr. /mori-oore/. The morphophonological disadvantages of the analyses suggested by Zhong and Tsumagari are obvious: the former has to render the items as [gery] : [ger-EEs] vs. [mory] : [mory-oor], while the latter would obviously render them as [geri] : \*[gery-eise] vs. \*[mori] : \*[mory-oore].

(3) The phonological and morphophonological problems connected with stems ending in a palatal segment are most crucially revealed by the preservation of stem-final palatality before suffixes comprising the palatal high vowel /i/. In such cases a phonetic and phonological distinction seems to exist with regard to stems with no stem-final palatality, cf. e.g. /geri/ 'house' vs. /tere/ 'that' : acc.sg. /geri-i(i)/ vs. /tere-i(i)/. The distinction is clearly detectable in the transcription of Todayeva, although she renders it as [geR] : [geR-ii] vs. [ter] : [ter-ii]. Since a similar phenomenon is also well known from both Buryat and Khalkha, its absence in Zhong's material is probably only due to insufficient auditive discrimination. Tsumagari does not comment on the problem.

The interpretation preferred above, with no paradigmatically distinctive glide phonemes and no syntagmatically relevant vowel reduction, appears to yield a maximally simple description of Dagur morphophonology. However, it is not at all clear, whether all varieties of Dagur are so simple, after all. In particular, there are indications that the reduction of stem-final vowels can in certain cases have morphophonological consequences. This is shown by, for instance, consonant assimilations at morpheme boundaries, as cited by both Zhong and Todayeva, e.g. [bol(e)-] 'to become' vs. [tat(e)-] 'to pull': part,prf. [bol-len] vs. [tat-ten] from earlier (\*)bol(e)-sen vs. (\*)tate-sen.

As far as morphology is concerned, both Zhong and Todayeva move on fairly similar traditional lines. Neither of the two authors shows any great insights into morphological theory, for they present their material with minimal systematization, with very few complete paradigms and almost no notes on morphophonology. However, both authors illustrate the morphological presentation with valuable sentence samples, which, in the case of Todayeva, also have occasional folkloristic value.

Even more valuable as specimens of both the language and the folklore of the Dagur are Todayeva's text samples, comprising tales, puns, proverbs, and riddles. This is an important addition to the available corpus of Dagur texts, and had this material been published a little sooner after the original field work, it would certainly have formed an important stimulus to Dagur studies on an wide international level. However, the relative value of Todayeva's texts is now slightly diminished by the fact that more and more text material is beginning to be published in China. The largest publication of Dagur texts so far has been prepared by a work team of the Mongolian Language Department of the Inner Mongolian University. The publication was edited by the Inner Mongolian scholar Enhebatu (Engkebatu) and others as a volume in a series specially devoted to the description of the Mongolic languages of China:

ENHEBATU deng bian [ENGKEBATU-nar nayraghulba], Dawoeryu huayu cailiao [Daghur kelen-ü üge kelelge-yin materiyal]. Menggu yuzu yuyan fangyan yanjiu congshu [Monghol törül-ün kele ayalghun-u sudulul-un cuburil] 006. Huhehaote: Nei Menggu Renmin Chubanshe [Öbür Monghol-un arad-un keblel-ün qoriy-a], 1985. (2+)414 pp.

The volume contains material collected from a number of Molidawa Dagur individuals in the early 1980s. The Dagur language material is presented using the International Phonetic Alphabet, but the transcription differs slightly from that used by Zhong. Vowel length, for instance, is expressed by the colon (:), while consonantal palatalization and labialization are expressed in terms of diacritical modifications of the basic signs for consonants. The collection comprises a selection of basic sentences, stories, tales, song texts, proverbs, and riddles, as well as an appendix comprising three shamanistic incantations. All samples are parallelly presented in Dagur, Chinese and Written Mongolian, with the exception of the incantations, which, curiously enough, are presented without a Chinese translation. It goes without saying that the whole volume is extremely important as a source of both linguistic and folkloric material, and it will take time before all of this new material becomes fully incorporated into the general corpus of Mongolistics.

In this connection it must be mentioned that another representative collection of Dagur folklore has recently become available in both Written Mongolian and English. The collection was originally published in a Chinese translation by the Dagur national enthusiast Meng Zhidong (Meng Zhi Dǔng) of the Inner Mongolian Academy of Social Sciences (1979). The Mongolian version is based on the Chinese edition, but with obvious consideration of the Dagur original:

MENG ZHI DǔNG *nayiraghulba*, *Daghur arad-un aman üliger* [Kökeqota:] *Öbür Monghol-un arad-un keblel-ün qoriy-a*, 1983. (2+)468 pp.

The English version is an abridged translation of the Chinese edition. The translation was prepared by Mark Bender in collaboration with the native Dagur Su Huana:

*Daur folktales. Selected myths of the Daur nationality.* Translated by MARK BENDER and SU HUANA. Beijing: New World Press, 1984. 191 pp.

Since this is the first collection of Dagur folklore ever to appear in a Western language, it will be of some relevance to folklorists with no knowledge of Chinese or the Mongolic languages. Indeed, although the translation aims at a certain literary effect, the material is reliable enough for a rough folkloristic analysis. Most of the samples in the selection are heroic tales, but there are also a few minor stories and fables. The use of the collection by the general reader is made easier by the introductory notes of the translator on the Dagur nationality and their culture. The notes are written in a clear and fascinating way, but it is easy to notice that the translator himself is no specialist on the Dagur. A big problem is that the Dagur names and terms occurring in the samples are rendered in a completely misleading and inconsistent transcription, often confused by the distortive influence of Chinese.

Recent publications of Dagur material in China also comprise two lexicological works, which to some extent make the glossaries of both Zhong and Todayeva superfluous. The largest Dagur dictionary so far has appeared in the very same series of the Mongolian Department of the Inner Mongolian University as the text collection mentioned previously, and the chief editor is again Enhebatu:

ENHEBATU *deng bian* [ENGKEBATU-nar *nayiraghulba*], *Dawoeryu cihui* [Daghur *kelen-ü üges*]. *Menggu yuzu yuyan fangyan yanjiu congshu* [Monghol *törül-ün kele ayalghun-u sudulul-un cuburil*] 005. Huhehaote: Nei Menggu Renmin Chubanshe [Öbür Monghol-un arad-un keblel-ün qoriy-a], 1984. (2+)337 pp.

The lexical material was collected at the same time and from the same informants as the texts, and the transcription is also the same. By a rough estimation, the material comprises more than 5,000 lexical items as well as a considerable number of compound expressions and phrases. The items are glossed in both Chinese and Written Mongolian. Alphabetically organized, the dictionary is easy to use and will certainly long remain the main lexicological work on Dagur. Again, it will take some time to incorporate this

fresh information into various levels of descriptive and comparative Mongolistics.

The other lexicological work is a slightly smaller Dagur dictionary with a more practical orientation. Once more the compiler is Enhebatu:

ENHEBATU, *Da-Han xiao cidian* [Daor Niakan bulku biteg]. Huhehaote: Nei Menggu Renmin Chubanshe, 1983. (2+)248 pp.

Here we have one more transcription system for Dagur, for in this small booklet Enhebatu has not employed the International Phonetic Alphabet but a modified version of the Chinese Pinyin system. The aim has been to provide a bilingual dictionary primarily for use between speakers of Dagur and Chinese, and in a certain sense the work is a step towards a normative standard for the Dagur language, as is also evident from the presence of a Dagur subtitle in the volume. The material is basically the same as in the other dictionary by Enhebatu, but the items are glossed in Chinese only. A skeleton grammar of Dagur completes the volume. It remains to be seen, whether this dictionary is finally the first herald of a functioning Dagur literary language. In any case, the adoption of the Pinyin system for the Dagur practical orthography is certainly a realistic choice in today's China.

Speaking of fresh Dagur language material the comparative work by Namusilai (Namcharai) and Hasieerdun (Qasardani) must also be mentioned:

NAMCHARAI & QASARDANI *jokiyaba, Daghur kele monghol kelen-ü qaricaghulul* [English subtitle: Comparison between the Daurian language and the Mongolian language]. [Kökeqota:] Öbür Monghol-un arad-un keblel-ün qoriya, 1983. (2+)655 pp.

This massive work is basically an attempt at a systematic presentation of the structural similarities and differences between Dagur and standard Written Mongolian, but the comparative aspect is perhaps of less interest here. Instead, the information presented by the authors can well be used as an additional source of data on the phonology and morphology of the Dagur language. Even more importantly, the work also contains a glossary of nearly 4,000 Dagur words and expressions, as well as folklore samples with translations, comprising children's verses, riddles, tales, chain verses, and song texts. The material may prove to be of some dialectological interest, since it derives from several different localities, including the Molidawa and Ewenke Autonomous Banners and the suburbs of Qiqihaer. The transcription is based on the International Phonetic Alphabet, but has some idiosyncracies as compared with the transcriptions of both Zhong and Enhebatu.

Finally, as background information on the Dagur, their history, culture, administrative situation and physical environment, three Chinese publications may be briefly listed. One of them is a short history of the Dagur nationality:

Dawoerzu jianshi. "Dawoerzu jianshi" bianxiezu. *Zhongguo shaoshu minzu jianshi congshu*. Huhehaote: Nei Menggu Renmin Chubanshe, 1986. (2+)173(+8) pp.

Another is a special treatment of the social and cultural history of the Dagur:



Dawoerzu shehui lishi diaocha. Nei Menggu zizhiqiu bianjizu. Zhongguo shaoshu minzu shehui lishi diaocha ziliao congkan. Huhehaote: Nei Menggu Renmin Chubanshe, 1985. (4+296(+2+18+3) pp.

The third publication, perhaps the most interesting one, is a general description of the Molidawa Dagur Autonomous Banner:

Molidawa Dawoerzu Zizhiqi gaikuang. "Molidawa Dawoerzu Zizhiqi gaikuang" bianxiezu. Zhongguo shaoshu minzu zizhi difang gaikuang congshu. Huhehaote: Nei Menggu Renmin Chubanshe, 1986. (4+16+3+1)153 pp.

All of the mentioned three publications contain an immense amount of previously unknown statistical material and factual information, maps, as well as rare illustrations. The books belong to a large program, devoted to the systematic description of the various minority nationalities of China and their autonomous areas. Actually, Zhong's work on Dagur grammar also ultimately belongs to this large context.

The fresh material on the Dagur and their language has in the course of just a few years multiplied our knowledge of this small Mongolic nationality. Perhaps we can now soon expect a real boom of Dagur studies in centers of Mongolistics all over the world. May we on this occasion also wish success to the Dagur nationality and its consistent effort at preserving its unique language and remarkable national heritage.

JUHA JANHUNEN

#### Samoyedological news Review of recent publications

Although the number of active scholars in the field is not large, Samoyedology continues to develop today on a broader basis and more rapidly than ever. Moreover, there have been some external developments that may affect the future of the field in a positive way. Without doubt, among Western Samoyedologists, as well as other specialists on the Siberian peoples and languages, there is currently considerable excitement about how the on-going political changes in the Soviet Union will finally affect the Russian policy of territorial seclusion. There is, indeed, some hope that in a few years' time the regions inhabited by the Samoyedic speaking peoples may be opened to visits by foreign scholars. In any case, the general international cooperation between Western and Soviet specialists on Samoyedology already seems to be increasing, and the flow of material and other scientific information is easier than before.

Nevertheless, the old dichotomy between Soviet scholars as the suppliers of material and their Western colleagues as the interpreters of it still, on the whole, holds true in Samoyedology. So the most important thing expected from Soviet Samoyedologists is, as before, new field material. Of the Samoyedic languages only Tundra Nenets is so well recorded in published sources that linguistic analysis can be carried out without serious restric-