

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-

tions. For many purposes, however, free access to an unlimited selection of native informants would be necessary even for the study of Tundra Nenets. It is also regrettable that a large part of the material that is being published in and about Tundra Nenets in the Soviet Union remains almost unknown abroad and little exploited for linguistic work. The reason is that provincial publications as well as pedagogical literature are not distributed abroad through the normal book selling channels. An example is the last Nenets dictionary by Tereshchenko:

N. M. TERESHCHENKO, *Slovar' nenecko-russkiy, russko-neneckiy. Posobiye dlya uchashchixsya nachal'noy shkoly*. Leningrad: Prosveshcheniye, Leningradskoye otdeleniye, 1982. 303 pp.

Although intended for practical use at Nenets elementary schools, the new dictionary is useful for scholarly purposes also. The size of the vocabulary presented is, of course, much more restricted (appr. 4,000 items) than in Tereshchenko's earlier larger dictionaries (1955 and 1965), but it seems that the notational standards are now somewhat higher than before. So, for instance, the distinction between the reduced vowel (ä) and the full vowel (a) is rendered more consistently than earlier in the case of odd-numbered segments as well as at the end of verbal stems. An important thing is also that the new dictionary contains a Russian-Nenets part: this is actually the first Russian-Nenets glossary since the appearance of the dictionary of Pырerka (1948). In conclusion Tereshchenko lists a selection of Nenets expressions corresponding to Russian prepositions, conjunctions, particles, and prefixes. This brief list may well be a useful aid for future studies on contrastive syntax.

Tereshchenko's new dictionary belongs to a series published in connection with the 50th anniversary of the northern autonomous districts. The series also comprises dictionaries of Khanty (2 dialects), Mansi, Evenki, Nanay, Ulcha, Nivkh, Chukchi, and Koryak, and it is planned to cover still other languages. It is not certain whether other Samoyedic languages will be included, but in any case the series is a manifestation of the new wave of northern minority studies currently observable in the Soviet Union, apparently in accordance with general political developments in the country. The new policy is that the minority peoples should again be encouraged to use their own languages both in oral and in written form, the ultimate goal being perfect native-Russian bilingualism rather than Russian monolingualism. It is still too early to say, whether any real results can be attained in the present situation, which is already rather desperate for many northern minorities, but it is certainly interesting to follow how matters develop. From the point of view of Samoyedology, the most important recent achievement is the revival of the Northern Selkup literary language, as recorded in the new ABC-book by S. I. Irikov:

S. I. IRIKOV, *Azбуka dlya 1-go klassa sel'kupsnix shkol*. Leningrad: Prosveshcheniye, Leningradskoye otdeleniye, 1986. 127 pp.

Such a long time had elapsed since the publication of the previous Selkup ABC-book (1953) that it was generally thought that not only the Selkup literary language but the Selkup language as a whole was moribund. Now there is some hope again that the language might have a chance to

survive for couple of more generations among the Northern Selkup, who are the numerically strongest of the remaining Selkup speaking groups. However, on the evidence of the new ABC-book it is clear that the earlier literary tradition had, indeed, been broken, and a completely new start had to be made now. Thus, the orthography used by Irikov differs considerably from the earlier postwar Cyrillic orthography for Selkup. Without going into the details, we must say that, unfortunately, the new orthography is not necessarily better than the earlier one, but rather worse in many respects. Nevertheless, a bad orthography is better than none, and one hopes that the Selkup literary language will not perish in orthographical disputes.

The new ABC-book provides some fresh language material, which will certainly be of relevance to future studies on Selkup. It remains to be seen whether any other literary Selkup publications appear. Such publications cannot, however, alone compensate for the general lack of text material on Selkup. In a few years, we hope, two new sources of material will become available with the publication of the collections of Kai Donner, on the one hand, and of the Moscow team of linguists, on the other. But before that, we can mainly expect to get new information on Selkup through the philological analysis of the old sources already available. Indeed, it is interesting to note the extraordinary interest in philological studies by two noted specialists on Selkup, Eugene Helimski (Ye. A. Xelimskiy) and Hartmut Katz. Helimski, of course, has access to the collections of the Moscow team, representing largely the result of his own work, but he has nevertheless devoted a major monograph to the philological analysis of the early Southern Selkup literary language:

EUGENE HELIMSKI, *The language of the first Selkup books*. *Studia Uralo-Altaica* 22. Szeged 1983. 268 pp.

Helimski's book has been favourably reviewed both by Ago Künnap in *Sovetskoye finno-ugrovedeniye* (20:3,224 - 225) and by Janurik Tamás in *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* (87:1.261 - 262), so it sufficient here to emphasize once more the importance of this exceptionally carefully-made publication to all future studies on Selkup grammar and lexicon. As an authoritative treatment of the main corpus of the now-extinct Southern Selkup dialects, Helimski's monograph, with his diachronic and dialectological comments, will also be of relevance to general Samoyedic comparative studies.

Katz's latest contribution to Selkup philology is a rather curious booklet containing an analysis of the few pieces of lyrical poetry found among the Northern Selkup materials of Castrén:

HARTMUT KATZ, *Selcupica III. Castréns nordselkupische Lieder. Veröffentlichungen des Finnisch-Ugrischen Seminars an der Universität München. Serie C, Band 18. München 1986. 90 pp.*

Katz's own series of *Selcupica* has thus reached its third volume, and judging from the extreme meticulousness of the work we may look forward to many more volumes, even if no fresh material on Selkup were ever more published. As a matter of fact, Katz may have concentrated rather too much on Castrén's old materials, for he seems to be unaware of at least one relevant recent publication: Katz apparently believes that Castrén's

materials contain the only published samples of Northern Selkup lyrical poetry. However, several other brief samples, with both musical notation and a Cyrillic transcription of the Selkup texts, have been published by A. Ayzenshtadt (1982) in an article contained in the *sbornik Muzyka Sibiri i Dal'nego Vostoka* (1.175 - 204). Certainly it must be admitted that Ayzenshtadt's samples are less professionally made from the linguistic point of view than those of Castrén, and therefore quite difficult to decipher.

The poetic material is presented by Katz in three forms: as reproduced from Castrén's original manuscripts (kept at Helsinki University Library), as published by Lehtisalo (1940 and 1960), and as phonemized by Katz himself. All samples are accompanied by extensive philological, linguistic, and metrical comments, and the volume concludes with a glossary. The metrical comments, in particular, are of interest, since they are the first of their kind ever to be published about Selkup. Of course, because of the scarcity of material we do not know whether the features established by Katz have any general validity in Selkup poetry.

In addition to four original pieces of Selkup folklore, Katz pays a lot of attention to the two Selkup versions of the Finnish folksong "Jos mun tuttu-ni tulisi". Katz shows, on the basis of the original manuscripts, that it is really a question of two stages in a single process of elaboration, through which Castrén wished to obtain a maximally adequate and artistic Selkup translation of the Finnish text. However, it seems that Katz may have underestimated the personal role of Castrén himself in the matter: although native informants were certainly also involved, the poetical form and the choice of expressions must ultimately be Castrén's own work. Castrén's achievement can only be admired, but from the point of view of Selkup studies alone it was hardly necessary to submit his verses to such a careful poetical analysis as Katz has done.

Incidentally Robert Austerlitz has recently analyzed the Yakut translation of the above-mentioned Finnish folksong in the *Journal of Turkish Studies* (8.1 - 19). The point made in Austerlitz's analysis is that, although the Yakut translation, as published by Böhtlingk (1851), was made from Russian, it bears a considerable poetical similarity to the Finnish original. This similarity is, without doubt, mainly due to areal and typological factors. Now that we have Katz's analysis of the Selkup version of the text, as well as of other samples of Selkup poetry, we may note as a general impression that certain devices, such as alliteration, seem to be slightly less familiar in Selkup than in Finnish and Yakut. In any case, both Austerlitz and Katz have contributed to a largely unexplored field that may eventually grow into a more comprehensive understanding of the areal and typological aspects of comparative poetry.

Philological research is also a major tool in the study of Forest Nenets, a language that is rapidly deteriorating under the assimilatory pressure of Khanty, Tundra Nenets, and Russian. In view of the paucity of genuine information on Forest Nenets, Lehtisalo's publications still remain a goldmine. The problem is that Lehtisalo's materials are buried in his dictionary (1956) as well as in a few text samples (1947), and he never seems to have made any attempt at a systematic presentation of the data. The important task of systematization has been taken up by Pusztay János, who can without hesitation be considered as the leading specialist on Forest Nenets today. After a previous paper on the grammatical properties of the Kiselyovskaya dialect, published in *Annales Universitatis Scientiarum*

Budapestinensis (Sectio Linguistica 11.43 - 70), Pusztay has published a more detailed sketch of the Pur dialect:

JÁNOS PUSZTAY, *Die Pur-Mundart des Waldjurakischen. Grammatikalischer Abriss aufgrund der Materialien von T. V. Lehtisalo. Studia Uralo-Altai-ca 23. Szeged 1984. 161 pp.*

As Lehtisalo did not publish any texts from the Pur dialect, Pusztay has had to base his book completely on the scattered data found in Lehtisalo's dictionary. The corpus is not large: about 1,200 lexical items and 58 sentences, from three informants. Nevertheless, Pusztay has been able to compile a whole grammar, complete with phonology, morphology, and syntax, as well as dialectological and diachronic observations. Of course there are many lacunae due to the insufficiency of the material, and certain details have been interpreted erroneously by Pusztay. However, generally the achievement is remarkable, and the result is a most useful source of reference for Forest Nenets grammatical data. Of immediate value are, for instance, the detailed lists of examples illustrating consonant phonotaxis as well as the dialectological variation of stem types, not to mention the index of suffixes and suffix combinations.

Pusztay has organized the material according to a well-planned system, close to conventional grammar and therefore simple enough to be handled even by a non-Samoyedologist. The underlying idea is that the disposition should serve as a possible model for similar descriptions of other Uralic languages in the future. Anticipating such descriptions, Pusztay has already propagated his grammatical model, with emphasis on morphology, in the symposium *Dialectologia Uralica* and the associated volume of *Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altai-ca* (20.49 - 56). The idea is sound, and one can only wish success to such unified grammatical studies, which will certainly contribute to the understanding of not only Uralic dialectology, but of general language typology as well. However, it might be fruitful to emphasize the fact that Uralic genetic unity is not the only factor that has played a role in the typological development of the individual Uralic languages. Of probably much greater importance is the areal factor. Indeed, it seems that, instead of new programmes and symposia centered around Uralic unity, international team work on the areal problems of certain crucial geographical regions should be favoured by specialists on the Uralic languages. From the point of view of Samoyedology, such crucial regions are, in the first place, Western and Southern Siberia.

As far as general linguistic relevance is concerned, the most interesting Samoyedological publication of recent years is perhaps Michael Katzschmann's treatise about what he calls nominal and *esse*-sentences in Samoyedic:

MICHAEL KATZSCHMANN, *Nominal- und Esse-Satz in den samojedischen Sprachen. Dargestellt anhand ausgewählten Belegmaterials. Fenno-Ugrica, Band 9. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag, 1986. 188 pp.*

In Katzschmann's terminology, *esse*-sentences are, to define them briefly, equivalents of Indo-European sentences containing morphemes corresponding to Latin *esse*. Nominal sentences can be understood as *esse*-sen-

tences without a material manifestation of *esse*. The terminology reflects the fact that Indo-European is the main point of reference for Katzschmann in his attempt at approaching the problem of Samoyedic nominal and *esse*-sentences.

The problem is extensive and difficult, and Katzschmann's treatise can by no means be considered an exhaustive analysis of it, but it is certainly a good start. Katzschmann's most important achievement is the collection and systematization of a huge amount of sentence material, some 3,500 units, a selection of which is presented in the book. The material covers all the five Samoyedic languages from which syntactic material is available. Of course, the amount of material available from each language varies greatly and is probably sufficient only for Nenets, but a satisfactory preliminary picture of the problem can be sketched even for the most poorly recorded languages.

Katzschmann's principal means of analysis is statistics. The book abounds in statistical tables, presenting the distribution of various stem morphemes and morphological categories in different sentence types, as well as in the different Samoyedic languages. This is, without doubt, correct, but for an unprepared reader most of the tables and the complicated digital codes they contain are rather difficult to digest. One wonders, whether all of these tables are really relevant to the problem, and whether they really contribute to the clarity of presentation.

The main parameter in Katzschmann's presentation is sentence type. He distinguishes, apparently quite correctly, two primary sentence types on a formal basis: nominative (Nx) sentences, in which the predicate consists of an uninflected noun, and oblique (Cx) sentences, in which an inflected noun or the equivalent of such a noun is present. The best choice would have probably been to build the whole presentation upon this simple and easily definable dichotomy. However, Katzschmann prefers to take semantic factors also into consideration, and classifies the relevant sentences ultimately into five different types, which he calls identifying, attributive, existential, local, and possessive sentences. This is the taxonomy which he applies to his sentence material, and this is also reflected in a considerable part of his statistical tables. The unfortunate thing is that, as Katzschmann himself admits, the five types are not at all easy to distinguish from one another, and, in any case, they have no direct relevance to the formal and material structure of the Samoyedic languages. They can only be considered as an aprioristic apparatus that is forced upon the description of Samoyedic.

Another important parameter of Katzschmann is the variation in the stem morpheme. Katzschmann has tried to identify all the different Samoyedic morphemes corresponding to the definition of *esse*, and lists five of them for statistical purposes, with the zero of nominal sentences as the sixth. Katzschmann's main concern seems to have been the comparative analysis of the material, for he clearly wishes to establish the functional similarities and differences between etymologically identical morphemes, as used in the different Samoyedic languages. Moreover, although most modern Samoyedic languages have several morphemes corresponding to *esse*, Katzschmann seems to favour the idea that only one morpheme, apart from the zero of nominal sentences, was originally present.

In his analysis Katzschmann also includes the morphemes expressing negation, listing three for statistical purposes. In view of functional and syntactic factors it is, indeed, justified to consider certain aspects of negation in the context of the problem of *esse*. However, in principle,

negation and *esse* are two completely different things, and they should not be confused. In particular, invariant negative particles, such as those attested in Selkup and Kamas, seem to have no synchronic relevance to the analysis of *esse*-morpheme and *esse*-sentences.

As far as the material interpretations and explanations of Katzschmann are concerned, he should perhaps have penetrated somewhat more profoundly into the details, for the etymological comments presented by him remain partly inexact and insufficient. To take the analysis slightly further, we list below the five principal Samoyedic morphemes for *esse* together with some essential etymological information:*

1. **i-*: this seems to have been the Proto-Samoyedic shape of the primary and most important *esse*-morpheme, used in both nominative and oblique sentences. In the modern Samoyedic languages this item is probably preserved in Kamas /i(:)-/ as well as Selkup /i(:)-/ : /ippə-/. As new data, it may also be relevant to mention in this context Nenets /yib⁹/ 'although', which can be analyzed as the fossilized subordinative of **i-*, i.e. **i-pət* 'if (it) is'. Most importantly, **i-* is the shape that explains the origin of the periphrastic preterite, which developed from the suffixation of **i-sä* '(it) was', as well as of the modal gerund or infinitive and the related *essive-translative* constructions, which developed correspondingly from the suffixation of **i-kä* 'being'. As to the further connections of **i-*, it is hardly possible to assume any relationship with the homonymous general negative verb **i-*, as Katzschmann suggests. On the other hand, the homonymy of the *esse*-morpheme with **i-* 'to take', as attested in Selkup and Kamas, may not be accidental and should have been analyzed more carefully by Katzschmann. Indeed, the Indo-European parallels cited by Katzschmann concerning the functional relationship between *esse* and *habere* make it look even more likely that Samoyedic originally possessed a single root **i-* which later differentiated into the two functions of *esse* and 'to take' in accordance with the material distinction between the absolute and objective verbal conjugations.

2. **a-*: this is another general *esse*-morpheme, also used both in nominative and oblique sentences. The phonological reconstruction of this morpheme is quite problematic, but it seems that it mainly appears in two enlarged shapes: **aə-* and **ay-*. The former shape is reliably attested in, at least, the Nganasan imperative form /huëq/, i.e. **aə-t*³, while the latter is the origin of Nenets /he-/ and Enets /e-/. The normal Selkup *esse*-morpheme /e:-/ has an irregular relationship to both **a-/aə-/ay-* and **i-*, so it is impossible for the moment to decide which morpheme is originally in question. A similar problem is connected with modern Nganasan /i-/ , which, in view of its earlier shape /ey-/, might derive from **ay-* rather than **i-*. As new data, we should note the Nenets infinitive perfect /hoqma/ 'circumstances of past being', which stands in an irregular relationship to the stem /he-/ and more probably represents the original shape **aə-*, i.e. **aə-y-t*³-ma. This is just one more example showing that the two enlarged shapes

*The language material is cited here in a moderately simplified phonological transcription with /h/ for the velar nasal, /q/ for the glottal stop, /y/ for the palatal glide, capitalization for palatalization, and umlaut for vowel oppositions on the palato-velar axis.

*aə- and *ay- are morphologically in complementary distribution in Nganasan, Enets, and Nenets.

3. *më-: this root, in the function of an unambiguous *esse*-morpheme, seems to be attested only in Nenets, with closely related functions known also from Kamas. According to the traditional formulation this is the Nenets *esse*-morpheme used for animate subjects, but Katzschmann suggests that the use of this item is actually confined to oblique sentences, whereas the category of animateness may be irrelevant here. Importantly, just like *i-, the morpheme *më- also occurs transitively in the function of 'to take', which means that Samoyedic has apparently had a general tendency to view the functions of *esse* and 'to take' as the intransitive vs. transitive aspects of one and the same thing. A further important feature of the morpheme *më- is that it is also homonymous with the pronominal root *më 'something', and there is a possibility of an etymological connection in this case, as well. The pronominal and verbal functions are linked with each other through, at least, the derivative *më-(y-)t-, Nenets /meq-/ : /mes-/ 'to keep', sometimes functioning almost as *habere*. As a matter of fact, Katzschmann presents the hypothesis that all Samoyedic *esse*-morphemes are of pronominal origin. Though plausible, this hypothesis remains to be proven in detail, and it also contains the well-known risk of mixing glotto-*gonic* speculations with diachronic linguistics.

4. *tə(+) and *tə-nä(+): interestingly, these items happen to provide some more evidence in favour of the pronominal hypothesis, for they are identical with the nominative and locative forms of the pronominal root *tə 'that'. Like *më, the root *tə has yielded *esse*-morphemes for the oblique type of sentences only, a fact that might at least make necessary some restrictions of the pronominal hypothesis. Generally the development from pronoun into *esse*-morpheme is much more obvious and transparent in the case of *tə than in the case of *më. Thus in Nganasan the *esse*-related expressions based on *tə(+) and *tə-nä(+) are synchronically bi- or tri-morphemic constructions in which the pronominal element is followed by a slightly reduced shape of the general *esse*-lexeme /ey-/ or /i-/, cf. Nganasan /tëy-/ and /tëniy-/, i.e. *tə(e)y- and *tə-nä(e)y- 'there is'. Enets shows a basically similar solution, but applied to the pronominal locative only, cf. Enets /tonea-/, i.e. *to-nä+(h)a(ə)-, while Nenets seems to have simply verbalized the pronominal locative, cf. Nenets /təNa-/. No data of immediate relevance in this context are known from the rest of the Samoyedic languages.

5. *yähka(+): this is the negation of existence, as used in oblique sentences in all the Samoyedic languages. Katzschmann is a bit uncertain about the etymological status of Kamas /na:ga/, but it is actually more than likely that the latter also belongs to the context of *yähka(+) in spite of phonological problems. The most important thing about *yähka(+), and this is something to which Katzschmann has not paid sufficient attention, is that this morpheme has apparently originally been a full noun, meaning roughly 'absent'. Sentences with *yähka were thus originally nominal sentences, as clearly shown by archaic Nganasan data such as sg.3 /yahku/ : Sg.1. /yahgum/, i.e. *yähka-m. In most Samoyedic languages, and also in modern Nganasan, *yähka(+) has undergone verbalization by means of suffixation. In Nganasan this development is still synchronically transparent, for the verbalizing suffix seems to be identical with the general *esse*-morpheme, just as in the case of *tə(+)/*tə-nä(+), cf. Nganasan /yahguy-/, i.e. *yähka+(e)y-.

Something similar probably underlies Nenets /yəhgo-/ and Enets /jago-/, possibly also Selkup /Tähkə-/.

The tendency to verbalize the Samoyedic *esse*-morphemes of nominal and pronominal origin is important in that it reflects the universal fact that *esse*-morphemes tend to be verbs from the morphological point of view. Katzschmann avoids explicit reference to this verbal character of *esse*-morphemes, but it is, of course, evident from the morphological data presented by him, for all of the Samoyedic *esse*-morphemes can be conjugated just like any other verbs. It should indeed be noted that, although a nominal or pronominal origin can be either established or assumed for three *esse*-morphemes in Samoyedic, i.e. *mä-, *tə(+)/*tə-nä(+), and *yähka(+), the two other *esse*-morphemes, and the only two that can occur in both nominative and oblique sentences, i.e. *i- and *a-, must have been true verbs even in Proto-Samoyedic and probably much earlier. Certainly they may have been homonymous with pronominal or other deictic elements, but we have really no way to prove that the homonymy derives from original identity.

The nominal sentence in Samoyedic can also be viewed as an instance of a kind of verbalization. However, a nominal predicate is quite defective in its conjugation, comprising basically only the paradigm of personal forms. In some of the modern Samoyedic languages, as in Nenets, the paradigm of the nominal conjugation also comprises special past tense forms, but these are diachronically of periphrastic origin, containing the conjugated *esse*-morpheme *i-, i.e. *i-sä, as already implied above. All modal, nominal and gerundal forms as well as the connegative are even synchronically absent in the Samoyedic nominal conjugation and must be replaced by syntactic constructions based on the use of an *esse*-morpheme. As to the personal endings of the nominal conjugational paradigm, they are normally, as Katzschmann emphasizes on several occasions, those of the absolute verbal conjugation and thus maximally different from the possessive suffixes. However, Katzschmann seems to ignore the fact that the possessive suffixes are also occasionally used in functions similar to the nominal conjugation, e.g. Nenets (Tereshchenko) /yuqmə^q/ : /yuqlə^q/ : /yuToⁿ/ 'there are ten of us/you/them'. Examples of this type are even contained in Katzschmann's own data. The whole phenomenon remains to be analyzed and explained in the future.

Generally, as is perhaps evident from the above brief remarks, Katzschmann has succeeded in writing a book which will certainly long stimulate the little cultivated field of Samoyedic syntactic studies. It can also be hoped that this field will in the future be further stimulated by a freer access to native informants, for continuous consultation with native speakers is a must in syntactic studies. After all, many phenomena of Samoyedic syntax, including such trivial ones as the distribution of the absolute and objective verbal conjugations, are still largely obscure. Fresh field material should be urgently gathered especially among the Tundra Nenets, who still know their language.

For Enets and Nganasan, the need for fresh field material is perhaps already too obvious, too serious, and too chronic to be stated again. In spite of scattered samples in publications of the Tomskian school and elsewhere, our total corpus of Enets and Nganasan texts amounts to just a few pages. As for the lexicon, the glossaries of Castrén still remain the principal primary source. Under these circumstances, a Samoyedologist can hardly wish for anything more than the publication of new material from the two

languages. Incidentally we know that in the Soviet Union there already exist large collections of material from both Enets and Nganasan, notably those of Helimski. The problem is that it may take years, or even decades, before these collections will finally reach the international Samoyedological community. Therefore a feeling of pleasant surprise was the first natural reaction when the news came of the appearance of something that seemed to be a new dictionary, or at least a comprehensive glossary, of the Nganasan language:

I. R. KORTT & YU. B. SIMCHENKO, Wörterverzeichnis der Nganasanischen Sprache. Teil 1: Nganasan-Deutsch-Russisches Glossar. Systemata mundi: Institut zur Erforschung fremder Denksysteme und Organisationsformen. Materialien, Band 1. Berlin 1985, 422 p.

It was actually widely known that Yu. B. Simchenko, the Moscow-based specialist on the culture of the Samoyedic and other northern peoples, had made lexical field notes and text recordings during his many expeditions to the North. All Samoyedologists have probably enjoyed reading his wonderful travel descriptions, presenting, in a belletristic form, extremely valuable information about the otherwise inaccessible daily life of the modern Samoyeds, particularly of the Nganasan. But it was certainly rather startling to have his lexical collections so quickly and unexpectedly published, moreover in an unknown series, in an unconventional place, and with the assistance of an almost unknown collaborator.

Unfortunately, the pleasant surprise was soon over, and there remained only bitter disappointment. The more one examines it, the more one thinks that, even in view of the general insufficiency of material on Nganasan, this book should never have been published: it is so incredibly unprofessionally made, so full of mistakes, and so poorly organized that it could never have fulfilled the qualitative requirements of any established scholarly series. The only correct way to use this material would have been to include it, in a critically revised form and together with other data, in a professionally prepared Nganasan dictionary, possibly the one expected to be published by Helimski.

A major problem is the transcription. One can assume that of the two compilers Kortt has, without any previous knowledge of the Nganasan language, romanized the original Cyrillic material of Simchenko. The distorted appearance of the Nganasan words thus achieved is hardly paralleled even in the most primitive 17th and 18th century sources. Of course, the original Cyrillic material of Simchenko was also full of inconsistencies and errors, which are reflected without corrections in the romanization. It becomes evident that in spite of his long field experience Simchenko has never really learnt Nganasan, nor probably any other language of the North. Thus his lexical notes have mainly a value comparable to those of any occasional traveller. Probably most occasional travellers have a better innate linguistic sense than Simchenko.

It is unnecessary to present any details here, since the contents of the dictionary of Simchenko and Kortt have already been analyzed by Helimski in *Sovetskoye finno-ugrovedeniye* (22:4.312 - 315). Like a true gentleman, Helimski actually tries to find something positive to say about the book, so he emphasizes the fact that the new corpus does contain certain additions to our previous knowledge of the Nganasan lexicon and even some new data

relevant to Common Samoyedic and Common Uralic comparisons. Nevertheless, we could certainly have waited a decade or two for these additions rather than get them now in a distorted and unreliable form.

In this connection the fact inevitably comes to mind that so-called professional anthropologists and ethnologists very often do not know the languages of the populations which they are supposed to study. It is indeed curious that there are still scholars who think that they can get a reliable picture of the cultural heritage of a population without bothering to learn the language through which the whole cultural heritage is transmitted. Moreover, it is often these very scholars who use linguistic material for making conclusions about cultural history. It goes without saying that the less linguistic training a scholar of culture has, the more fantastic his conclusions based on linguistic material tend to be. Fortunately among the Soviet specialists on northern cultures there have traditionally been isolated figures with linguistic competence, as well, and in spite of the generally rigorous distinction between linguistics and ethnography in the Soviet Union, the number of such figures may be slowly growing. After all it is these people alone who can guide us towards a comprehensive understanding of native cultures, including those of the Samoyeds. Simchenko, as if recognizing this situation, has perhaps wanted to make an attempt at such comprehensiveness, but he should have relied on the help of some professional linguist before publishing his materials. Now we can do nothing but wait, more than ever, for a true Nganasan dictionary to be published.

Certainly we should also blame many professional linguists who get so deeply involved in their narrow special discipline that they completely ignore the cultural context of the population whose language they are studying. This is why we still need ethnologists, in spite of their linguistic handicap. To take just one example from the very field of Nganasan studies, we have an interesting piece of ethnological research in a monograph on Nganasan religion and traditional world view by G. N. Gracheva:

G. N. GRACHEVA, *Tradicionnoye mirovozzreniye oxotnikov Taymyra (na materialax nganasan XIX - nachala XX v.)*. Leningrad: Nauka, Leningradskoye otdeleniye, 1983. 173 pp.

In comparison with Simchenko, who seems to be aiming at a broad circumpolar perspective, Gracheva has devoted all of her scholarly activity to the study of the Nganasan, and she can now be considered as the main living expert in this field. The Nganasan, apparently because of their extraordinary habitat in the extreme north of the Eurasian continent, have until recent times preserved elements of their traditional culture better than probably any other northern people in the world. On several field expeditions, Gracheva has had the opportunity to follow the transition from traditional to modern culture, and she has been able to record the last traces of many vanishing cultural phenomena.

Focussing on the spiritual heritage of the Nganasan, Gracheva's book reflects the recent boom in studies on shamanism in the Soviet Union. She gives the most detailed picture so far of the whole realm of shamanistic and related beliefs and practices of the Nganasan. In addition to the technical aspects of shamanism in a narrow sense, we get a comprehensive introduction into the Nganasan way of understanding such central oppositions as life and death, body and soul, human and god, etc. In general Gracheva seems to

emphasize the cognitive, rather than the experiential role of religion. Thus she views Nganasan shamanism basically as a system creating an organized network out of the otherwise chaotic external world, as perceived by the Nganasan. Today as alternative and, possibly, superior conceptual and ideological systems are available to the Nganasan, the old beliefs naturally fall into oblivion. Not surprisingly, as in so many other cultures, the last relics of the traditional world view are encountered in funeral practices. Since this is an area about which abundant eyewitness information can still be collected, the section on funeral practices is perhaps the most interesting in the whole book.

While Gracheva's contribution to the ethnological study of the Nganasan must definitely be recognized as a major achievement of lasting value, it is impossible here to leave unmentioned the fact that she, too, has considered it necessary to operate with linguistic material, as well. This is certainly all right, as far as only the synchronic presentation of the Nganasan terms corresponding to the phenomena analyzed is concerned, although the transcriptional standards of Gracheva are not exactly satisfactory. However, Gracheva also makes extensive diachronic excursions with comparative material drawn from the other Samoyedic idioms as well as from various unrelated Siberian languages. The normal procedure is that she first establishes homonymy, or quasi-homonymy, between the Nganasan term to be explained and some other word attested in either Nganasan or some other language. On the basis of the assumed homonymy she then goes on to make conclusions about the historical background of the concept underlying the Nganasan term. Unfortunately, as the homonymic identifications are without exception wrong, the historical conclusions based on them must also be so. It would be fruitless to provide any examples here, but a word of advice is really in place to all ethnologists with no linguistic training: be more careful in handling language material, and avoid making etymological conclusions altogether.

Immediately after the publication of her own work, Gracheva also made available the monograph of A. A. Popov relating to the social structure and religious beliefs of the Nganasan:

A. A. POPOV, *Nganasany. Social'noye ustroystvo i verovaniya*. Leningrad: Nauka, Leningradskoye otdeleniye, 1984. 150 pp.

The book represents a partly abridged edition of the second part of Popov's great work on the Nganasan, the first part of which, devoted to material culture, appeared several decades ago (1948). For various reasons, Popov had to leave the manuscript unpublished during his own lifetime, so it is only thanks to Gracheva's effort that we now finally have access to the complete work. In fact Gracheva's own work can be seen as a direct continuation to that of Popov, for the two authors treat essentially the same phenomena with the difference that Popov's field experience preceded that of Gracheva by almost two generations. Thus Popov, during his stay on Taymyr in 1930 - 1931 and 1936 - 1938, was still able to perceive the whole richness of the local native culture, with a fully preserved traditional society, ancient annual festivals, and practising shamans. Popov was also an exemplary ethnologist in that he completely adopted the local mode of life during his field work, becoming a Nganasan among Nganasan. This approach was made easier by the fact that he was since childhood fluent in Yakut

and, consequently, Dolgan, the lingua franca of Taymyr. He also seems to have soon acquired a completely satisfactory working knowledge of the Nganasan language. For these reasons, Popov's work remains an unsurpassed unique source on all aspects of traditional Nganasan culture.

As the introduction of modern Soviet civilization to the Nganasan took place so recently, there are still people alive who remember how it all happened. A rare perspective into the world of the "krasnyy chum" is offered by the diaries of Amaliya Xazanovich from the years 1936 - 1937, which only recently became available to a broad circle of readers:

AMALIYA XAZANOVICH, *Druz'ya moi nganasany. Iz taymyrskix dnevnikov.* Moskva: Sovetskaya Rossiya, 1986. 172 pp., 19 photo ills. (Earlier edition: Krasnoyarsk: Krasnoyarskoye knizhnoye izdatel'stvo, 1973. 295 pp.)

This book, although intended for the general reader, must definitely be recommended for the professional Samoyedologist, as well. In view of its popular orientation it might even be worth translating into some other major languages. This is not to say that all readers will necessarily share the views and values reflected by the book, but, in any case, we get a stimulating perspective that may help us to deepen and widen our own ideas about the difficult problem of ethnic and national identity.

A factory girl from Moscow, Xazanovich became an arctic enthusiast after the huge propaganda effort started by the Soviet authorities in connection with the tragedy of the Icebreaker *Chelyushkin* (1934). She applied for a job in the North and was sent to Taymyr with the task of civilizing the aborigines. She arrived there full of confidence and with a feeling of cultural superiority, and started to introduce things such as socialism, the constitution, the gramophone, and personal hygiene to the local population. Today we know the results: settled, healthy and civilized, but also severely acculturized aborigines with perhaps no ethnic future.

It is indeed regrettable that no person of the calibre of, say, G. N. Prokof'yev or V. I. Cincius was sent to Taymyr, for the conditions would have been ideal for creating a strong and resilient native identity among the linguistically and culturally homogeneous Nganasan population. Certainly Popov was there, and Xazanovich even met him several times, but he was probably too much of a professional ethnologist to become an active cultural protectionist. Also, at the time of Xazanovich's arrival on Taymyr, the period of a liberal policy towards minorities that had followed the October Revolution was already a thing of the past, and the period of Stalinist russification had begun.

In any case, the stay on Taymyr was useful to the personal development of Xazanovich herself. Lacking any ethnological or linguistic training as she was, she nevertheless learnt to appreciate the high degree of adaptability of the local material culture, and she even acquired a few words of the Nganasan language, though she was clearly more enthusiastic about teaching Russian to the Nganasan. Of the social and spiritual aspects of the native culture she understood nothing, so she kept on insisting on the absolute superiority of the Russian socialist ideology, which she thought represented the highest possible level of democracy and emancipation.

Apart from the Nganasan, Xazanovich also came into contact with the Dolgan, with whom she spent her first winter in the North. However, she

clearly took the Nganasan as a greater challenge and chose to join a group of the latter for the summer on their annual route up to the central parts of Taymyr following the migration of the wild reindeer. This summer, spent completely outside the bounds of Russian civilization in a monolingual Nganasan environment, was the main arctic experience of Xazanovich. The description of this experience is also the most fascinating part of her book, full of ethnologically interesting details. Of course we should keep in mind that Xazanovich was no professional observer, so her account can only serve as primary material, which must be cleared of her own misunderstandings and personal prejudice.

Reading Xazanovich's account, one cannot help feeling that, in spite of her missionary-like attitude, she has an aura of sincerity and humanity. In fact, the reader cannot but envy her for her unique experience. What she did, cannot be done again, for the uncivilized Nganasan exist no more. Xazanovich civilized them.

JUHA JANHUNEN

Ein neues etymologisches Lexikon für die Uralistik

KÁROLY RÉDEI, Uralisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch. Lieferung 1 - 3. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1986 - 1987. XLVIII + 340 S.

Vom Budapester Akademie-Verlag wurden 1986 innerhalb von vier Monaten die ersten beiden Lieferungen des neu erarbeiteten Wörterbuches uralischer Etymologien vorgelegt, im Januar 1987 erschien bereits die dritte Lieferung. Wenn dieses Tempo für das Erscheinen beibehalten werden kann, wird den Finnougristen/Uralisten und darüber hinaus den an etymologischer Forschung Beteiligten und Interessierten bald ein bedeutendes Grundlagenwerk zugänglich sein.

Das Uralische Etymologische Wörterbuch (UEW) wurde unter Mitarbeit von M. Bakró-Nagy, S. Csúcs, I. Erdélyi (†), L. Honti, É. Korenchy (†), É. K. Sal und E. Vértes von Károly Rédei erarbeitet. Einige der Autoren (Erdélyi, Rédei, Sal, Vértes) hatten bereits am etymologischen Wörterbuch "A magyar szókészlet finnugor elemei" (Hg. von G. Lakó, Budapest 1967 - 1968) mitgearbeitet und konnten ihre dort gesammelten Erfahrungen in das neue Unternehmen einbringen.

Um eine Vorstellung von den Schwierigkeiten der Erarbeitung uralischer Etymologien zu bekommen, muß man sich Klarheit darüber verschaffen, in welchem Areal die Wohngebiete der zu dieser Sprachfamilie zählenden Völker liegen. Auch haben die mit Ausnahme der Ungarn in den nördlichen Regionen Eurasiens lebenden Völker kein geschlossenes Siedlungsgebiet, wie etwa die slawischen, germanischen oder romanischen Völker. Ihr ursprüngliches Wohngebiet wurde vielmehr in einem sehr frühen Stadium der gesellschaftlichen und sprachlichen Entwicklung durch andere Völker gesprengt, sie wurden z. T. weit abgedrängt. Im Ergebnis dessen ist mit Sicherheit anzunehmen, daß ein beträchtlicher Teil gemeinsamen uralischen Sprachguts verlorengegangen.