

QUMRANICA MOGILANENSIA

Series started in 1990

ISSN 0867-8707

Editor: Dr. Z. J. Kapera, Published by The Enigma Press,
ul. Borsucza 3/58, 30-408 Kraków, Poland

QM-1: Hans BURGMANN, *Der "Sitz im Leben" in den Josuafluchtexten, in 4Q379 22 II und 4Q Testimonia*, Kraków 1990, pp. 61. Bound copy USD 12.00. Paper USD 8.00.

QM-2: MOGILANY 1989. *Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls in Memory of Jean Carmignac. Part I: General Research on the Dead Sea Scrolls, The Present State of Qumranology. Qumran and the New Testament*, Kraków 1993, pp. 296, Bound copy USD 35.00. Paper USD 28.00.

QM-3: MOGILANY 1989. *Part II: The Teacher of Righteousness. Literary Studies*. Kraków 1991, pp. 244. Bound copy USD 28.00. Paper USD 18.00.

QM-4: Z. J. KAPERA, *Third Battle of the Scrolls. The Philological Scandal of Century*, Kraków, about 200 pages, numerous plates (in preparation). Bound copy USD 28.00. Paper 18.00.

QM-5: Hans BURGMANN, *Die Geschichte der Essener von Qumran und Damaskus*, Kraków 1990, pp. 180, 4 tabl., 1 map. Bound copy USD 25.00. Paper USD 15.00.

QM-6: INTERTESTAMENTAL ESSAYS in Honour of Józef Tadeusz Milik, ed. by Z. J. Kapera, Kraków 1992, pp. 347, 7 plates. Bound copy USD 60.00. Paper USD 48.00.

QM-7: MOGILANY 1991. *Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of J. T. Milik*, ed. by Z. J. Kapera, Kraków, about 250 pages (in preparation). Bound copy USD 60.00. Paper USD 48.00.

QM-8: Z. J. KAPERA, *Bibliography of the Dead Sea Scrolls 1985-1991*, Kraków, about 200 pages (in preparation). Bound copy USD 28.00. Paper 18.00.

QM-9: Hans BURGMANN, *Weitere lösbar Qumranprobleme*, Kraków 1992, pp. 178. Bound copy USD 25.00. Paper USD 18.00.

QM-10: Piotr MUCHOWSKI, *Copper Scroll 3Q15. Implication of the Controversial Linguistic Problems*. Kraków, about 150 pages (in preparation). Bound copy USD 25.00. Paper USD 18.00.

QM-11: Bruno W. W. DOMBROWSKI, *Ideological and Socio-Structural Developments of the Qumran Association. Part I: Major texts mainly of Qumran Cave I, CD and 4QMMT*. Kraków 1994, 184 pages. Bound copy USD 28.00. Paper USD 18.00.

QM-12: Bruno W. W. DOMBROWSKI, *Ideological and Socio-Structural Developments of the Qumran Association. Part II*, Kraków, (in preparation).

QM-13: MOGILANY 1993. *Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls in Memory of Hans Burgmann*. Ed. by Z. J. Kapera, Kraków 1996, 229 pages. Bound copy USD 38.00. Paper USD 28.00.

QM-14: K. B. STARKOVA, *The Qumran Literary Monuments*, Kraków, about 250 pages (in preparation). Bound copy USD 35.00. Paper USD 25.00.

QM-15: MOGILANY 1995. *Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls in Memory of Aleksey Klawek*. Ed. by Z. J. Kapera, Kraków 1998, 256 pp. Bound copy USD 42.00.

FOLIA ORIENTALIA
VOL. 35 1999
PL ISSN 0015-5675

EDWARD SŁAWIŃSKI

THE NEWEST HANDBOOK ON URALIC LANGUAGES

(Review article)

The Uralic Languages, Edited by Daniel Abondolo, London: Routledge 1998, 8°, pp. XXIV, [4], 619. Bound. ISBN 0-415-08198-X

Juha Janhunen, a prominent Finnish uralist, reviewing the handbook 'The Uralic Languages' edited by Sinor in 1988 [1] wrote: 'Sinor may have produced the ultimate handbook of Uralic studies. With recent progress in data technology in mind, it is quite possible that nobody will ever undertake the editing of another similar work in book form. Instead the stage may well be an electronic data network, with constant input by those who are doing the active research' [2].

The reasons for that opinion included the process of editing and publishing Sinor's book, which took about fifteen years, and the antiquated conceptions contained in some papers. Janhunen's prediction, however, has not proved correct. In 1993 in the series *Języki mira*, the encyclopaedic guide-book *Ural'skie języki* [3] was published, and in 1988 the collective work 'The Uralic languages', edited by Daniel Abondolo, lecturer in Hungarian language and literature at the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University of London. The latter book appeared in the Routledge series of language family descriptions. To date, the following books have been published in this series: *The Celtic Languages* (1993), *The Slavonic Languages* (1993), *The Germanic Languages* (1994), *The Dravidian Languages* (1997), *The Indo-European Languages* (1998). The *Turkic languages* is forthcoming. The contributors to the work reviewed here, 'The Uralic Languages', edited by D. Abondolo, are prominent, internationally recognized scholars from both Hungary, Finland and Estonia and other, mainly West European, countries. Of these, the following are among those particularly worthy of mention: the editor and author of four chapters Daniel Abondolo, Eugene Helimski, Laszlo Honti, Juha Janhunen and Pekka Sammallahti.

This voluminous book, numbering over 600 pages, provides a unique up-to-date survey of the main individual Uralic languages and the genetic and areal groups into which these languages fall. The description of the individual languages is primarily synchronic, but 'there is also considerable treatment of the (pre)history of elements of each language and genetic subdivision' (p. XVI).

The book contains 7 maps, 26 figures, 147 tables and thoroughly selected bibliographies after each chapter with the newest items and the most important older ones. The volume is also comprehensively indexed. The index is arranged according to linguistics terms and according to the names of the languages, e. g.

Conjugation, objective

Hungarian 447

Khanty 371 etc.

cf..

Hungarian

Objective conjugation 447 etc.

The index contains also references to other names of a language e. g.

Lapp see Saamic

The work consists of 19 chapters: an introduction, chapters devoted to language groups such as Saamic, Fennic (Baltic-Finnish), Permian, ObUgrian, Samoyedic, and chapters describing the individual languages: Estonian, Finnish, Mari, Udmurt, Komi, Khanty, Mansi, Hungarian, Nganasan, Nenets, Selkup and Kamassian. The chapters are ordered geographically and proceed roughly from west to east; this enables the reader to compare individual languages from an areal angle. The chapters are written according to the same general pattern although they vary somewhat in both style and content.

Each chapter on an individual language incorporates in principle the following elements:

- An introductory section describing the language's social context and, where appropriate, the development of the standard language and a discussion of dialects.
- A discussion of the phonology of the language including a phonemic inventory and morphophonemic alternations from both the synchronic and diachronic perspectives.
- A presentation of the synchronic morphology of the language with notes on the major historical developments.
- A brief discussion of the syntactic properties of the language.

- A discussion of lexicon including borrowings.
- A sample text

The sample text usually consists of: 1) text in orthography or text in phonological transcription, segmented by a hyphen (-) preceding inflexional suffixes, an 'equals' sign (=) preceding derivational suffixes, a plus sign (+) indicating the boundary between the members of a compound, an ampersand (&) signalling reduplication, and a double hyphen preceding enclitics (- -); 2) morpheme-by-morpheme glosses; 3) word-by-word English translation; 4) a freer English translation.

Phonemic transcription and segmentation is also used at different points of the book for examples from particular languages. Even Hungarian, Finnish and Estonian words are phonemic-transcribed despite the fact that these languages have long-established orthographies.

Orthographies and phonetic transcription given in square brackets have only an ancillary role. For Nenets and Saami special writing systems are used. Finnish and Hungarian language data is presented on a more abstract plane by use of the morphophonemic code.

- References and further reading.

The author of the first Chapter (*Introduction*, pp. 1-42) is the editor D. Abondolo. It constitutes a brief general introduction to the Uralic languages with a description of the general features of the modern languages and historical comments. This description is preceded by a presentation of the controversial problem of internal subdivisions. Traditionally the Uralic languages have been classified into Samoyedic and Fenno-Ugrian (Finno-Ugric); the Fenno-Ugrian into Ugrian and Fenno-Permian; the Fenno-Permian into Permian and Fenno-Volgaic; the Fenno-Volgaic into Volgaic and Fenno-Saamic; the Fenno-Saamic into Fennic and Saamic. According to this tradition, the splitting of both proto-Uralic and proto-Fenno-Ugrian has begun from east to west.

In recent years, the Estonian scholar T.-R. Viitso, studying the developments of the consonants in the Fenno-Ugrian languages, proposed a new hypothesis, favoured by D. Abondolo, according to which the splitting of Fenno-Ugrian began in the west, with first Fenno-Saamic, then Mordva, then Mari, and finally Permian leaving the core. 'The 'core' is the linguistic cauldron from which 'Ugric' was to emerge' (p.3) claims D. Abondolo. Viitso writes that 'it is possible that Ugric was just the Finno-Ugric component of a greater Sprachbund, and not a result of a dialect split' [4]. From that it follows that it is difficult to talk about a genetic group named 'Ugrian' and the reconstruction of proto-Ugrian. Similarly 'the idea, once widely-held that

there was a common Mordva-Mari protolanguage (so-called 'proto-Volgaic') is now out of favour' (p.4).

Other controversial problems are the genetic connections of the Uralic languages. When comparing Uralic with Indo-European two kinds of difficulty arise, according to Abondolo: 1) the gross divergences between proto-Uralic and proto-Indo-European morphological typology, and 2) the character of the phonology of proto-Uralic and proto-Indo-European, which makes comparison easy but as a result yields false results in reconstruction. In the case of the comparison of Uralic with Altaic another kind of difficulty arises. Altaic is not a language family, but a phylum containing the Turkic, Mongolic and Tungusic language families and possibly also Korean and Japanese. Therefore it is senseless to compare Uralic with 'Altaic'.

A typological comparison of the languages and language families which stretch across central and northern Eurasia would be fruitful.

D. Abondolo is of the opinion that Yukagir, an isolate language in north-east Siberia is 'the only truly credible candidate for productive comparison with Uralic' (p.8), but here superficial similarities cannot be sufficient, and a deeper analysis can result in more darling hypotheses and thereby incur greater risks.

With reference to the affinity of Uralic with the Dravidian languages and other families, alongside the above mentioned, the author of this chapter does not express his opinion at all.

Elsewhere i. e. in 'The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics' D. Abondolo claims: 'There have been numerous attempts to relate the Uralic family to most of the other language families of Eurasia, but none of these has supplied a systematic set of sound laws for core shared vocabulary or contributed to a deeper understanding of the internal relationships of Uralic' (5, p.4856)

With regard to the vocabulary of the Uralic languages, the author presents distributional patterns concerning word for 'name, hand, fish, water, tree, fire, white, black' and states that 'survival of both lexeme and sememe across the entire range of the family is rare' (p. 34).

Only the word for 'name' proved to have clear reflexes in all the Uralic languages. The word for 'hand' has common reflexes for Fenno-Ugrian languages but different reflexes for all the Samoyedic languages. This 'has traditionally been seen as one of the better pieces of evidence in support of the idea that Samoyedic broke away from the rest of Uralic early, it not first' (p. 35).

The distributional patterns for the remaining words point to less and less

common reflexes and more and more innovations in particular Uralic languages.

The author of the second Chapter (*Saamic*, pp. 43-95) is Pekka Sammallahti from the University of Oulu, Finland. This is the most voluminous chapter in the entire book and is devoted to the 10 Saami languages: South Saami, Ume Saami, Pite Saami, Lule Saami, North Saami, Inari Saami, Skolt Saami, Akkala Saami, Kildin Saami and Ter Saami. In literature, these languages have been treated as dialects. The author of this chapter, however, treats them as languages and claims that these differ from one other at least to the same degree as the various Germanic languages. Six Saami languages (South, Lule, North, Inari, Skolt, and Kildin Saami) have independently standardized written forms. The differences between the particular Saami languages are mostly phonological with largely the same basic vocabularies.

P. Sammallahti and many other scholars maintain that the Saami languages developed from the proto-Saamic, and that the proto-Saamic had emerged after the break-up of the Fenno-Saamic protolanguage, which dates from about 2500 BCE. Here it should be mentioned that Carl O. Nordling from Lidingö (Sweden) expresses a different opinion regarding that problem. He claims that 'Saami was probably a language of its own already in the period of time when the Permian, the Volga-Fennic and the Fennic languages has not yet separated from each other' [6].

Sammallahti presents a detailed classification of the Saami languages, dialects and subdialects, outlining the main isoglosses which distinguish these languages (and their dialects) from one other. The extremely complex phonological system (gradation and other kinds of alternation) including the development of the proto-Fenno-Saamic stressed vowels is illustrated by the example of eastern Enontekiö, a subdialect of the Finnmark dialect of North Saami. The phonology of other dialects is even more complex. The oppositions between unvoiced and voiced consonants including nasals, liquids, and fricative are typical of North Saami dialects, also of Eastern Enontekiö e. g. M:m, N:n, L:l, R:r, J:j (M, N, L, R, J denote unvoiced consonants). The western dialects have a phonological opposition between long and short geminates, while the eastern ones have transferred the difference onto the vowels. The position within a word plays an important part in the distribution of consonants.

The discussion of morphology is accompanied by numerous sample paradigms.

Morphology and derivation are treated synchronically and also diachronically. Examples go as far back as proto-Saami, proto-Fenno-Saamic, and where appropriate, proto-Fenno-Volgaic and proto-Uralic. A discussion

of syntax, lexicon including borrowings, a brief North Saami text and references end the second chapter.

The next two chapters i.e. Chapter 3 (*Fennic*, pp.98-114) and Chapter 4 (*Estonian*, pp.115-148) are written by Tiit-Rein Viitso from the University of Tartu, Estonia. The former chapter is treated mostly diachronically, and the latter synchronically. Chapter 3 begins with brief information on seven Fennic (Balto- Finnic) i. e. Livonian characterized among other things by two distinctive lexical languages tones: the level tone and the glottalized laryngalized tone (or stød); Estonian, Votic, Ingrian, Finnish, Karelian and Veps. The native names of the above mentioned languages are also given.

T.-R. Viitso criticizes the Soviet language policy with regard to Livonians: 'The Livonian literary language was annihilated with Soviet occupation of Latvia. Most Livonians were forced to leave their homeland... Not until 1989 were a few booklets published once again in Livonian and efforts begun to revive the language' (p. 96). Then T.-R. Viitso deals with the historical grouping of Fennic dialects (not languages), which was different to the grouping of modern Fennic dialects and languages and was a result of the complex interrelations between them.

The phonology (including quantity and tone), morphology, syntax and vocabulary of Fennic dialects are also discussed, mostly diachronically.

The fourth Chapter is a clear and concise introduction to modern standard Estonian. After a brief discussion of dialects and the Estonian literary languages – the North Estonian literary language and the South Estonian literary language (the latter was used in Southeast Estonia from the first half of the seventeenth up until the second half of the nineteenth century), Tiit-Rein Viitso deals with complex Estonian phonology. Standard Estonian has nine short monophthongs, nine long monophthongs and 36 diphthongs in the first syllable, whereas in the non- first syllables there are only four short monophthongs and three diphthongs. (In Estonian dialects which have vowel harmony are also diphthongs ending in ü, viz. öü, äü, eü). Typical of Estonian is a tripartite correlation of distinctive syllabic quantities, usually referred to as quantity 1, quantity 2 and quantity 3. A syllable of quantity 3 has an overlong monophthong, a long diphthong or a long consonant or long consonant cluster. In the section entitled Phonology stress and tone are also discussed briefly and in more detail the very complicated morphophonological alternations including gradation, vowel apocope and syncope etc.

In the discussion on syntax, the author presents, inter alia, 12 word order patterns with an example containing an Estonian clause with segmentation, English translation and glosses.

The fifth Chapter (*Finnish*, pp.149-183) is written by Daniel Abondolo. Unlike the preceding chapters in this chapter, a morphophonemic code devised by Robert Austerlitz is introduced (D. Abondolo is a follower of R. Austerlitz). The code is used to render explicit much of morphological phenomena. The 8 Finnish vowels (i, ü, u, e, ö, o, ä, a) are written with only five symbols: I, E, A, O, U. Similarly, the 18 Finnish consonants are written by the following morphophonemes: M, P, V, N, T, S, L, R, K, H. In addition a prosodemic symbol, #, and even more abstract operators: one for vowels □ and three for consonants X, Q, τ are used. All the examples and sample paradigms throughout this chapter are recorded using the morphophonemic code. Here are some of the clearer examples given by D. Abondolo.

1) examples of vowel harmony: the front-prosodic # SAVU is read as sävy 'nuance' versus the unmarked back-prosodic SAVU is read as savu 'smoke'

2) examples of gradation:

KORPPI-N is read as korpin 'raven' - genitive singular (The geminate sequences PP TT KK are read as single PTK)

SAMPE-N is read as samme-n 'sturgeon' - genitive singular (PTK assimilate fully to a nasal to their left)

3) examples of the comparative suffix:

KORKEA-MPA is read as korkeampi 'taller', cf. genitive singular KORKE =MPA-N is read as korkeamma-n (The A final in the comparative suffix =MPA is read as i in the nominative singular).

The Finnish Text consists of:

A : text in orthography; B : morphophonemic code; C : morpheme-by-morpheme gloss of B;

D : paraphrase of C; E : free translation.

Chapter 6 (*Mordva*, pp. 184-218), written by Gabor Zaicz from the Peter Pazmany Catholic University, Piliscsaba, Hungary is an introduction to the grammar and lexicon of Mordva. Mordva speakers today occupy third place in the Uralic family, after Hungarian and Finnish. Two distinct literary Mordva languages, Erzya and Moksha differ chiefly in their phonology, but also, to a lesser degree, in their morphology. Two other ethnic groups, the Karatay and Terjuxan, no longer use Mordva. The description of Mordva is based on the Erzya literary standard but with reference, where appropriate, to the Moksha literary standard and also to non-literary dialects.

The Mordva languages are characterized by many typologically interesting features:

1) Erzya has the smallest vowel inventory in the Uralic family (i, e, a, u, o)

- 2) Both Erzya and Moksha have indefinite and definite paradigms in the noun declension.

The definite declension is formed by morphemes following case endings. According to G. Zaicz, these morphemes all derive from demonstrative pronouns. Definiteness may concern not only common nouns, but also in some syntactical functions toponyms (when functioning as the subject) and personal names.

- 3) Secondary and tertiary declension.

The secondary declension may be obtained by attaching definiteness suffixes to most already inflected case forms. Thus to the indefinite inessive form of *moda* 'earth, ground', *moda-so* 'in the ground', one can add the definite nominative singular ending - *ś*, yielding *moda-so-ś* 'that which is in the ground'. Tertiary, essentially synonymous, forms also exist in which the - *śeś* etc. endings are added to an inflected form augmented by -*ń* e.g. nominative singular *moda-so-ń-śeś* (*ś*, *ń* denote palatal s,n).

- 4) Indefinite and definite conjugations in both Mordva languages, with the definite conjugation having 28 suffixes for the expression of not only the person of the subject but also the person of the object. This type of definite conjugation is not found in any other Fenno-Ugrian language. Use of the definite conjugation presupposes (1) that the verb is transitive (2) that there is a definite direct object, explicit or implied, and (3) that the aspect is perfective.

According to the author of this chapter 'the full definite paradigm evolved during the separate life of Mordva, but the core around which it formed is probably much older' (p.197).

- 5) Alongside the indefinite and definite conjugations G. Zaicz also distinguishes in Mordva a predicative conjugation for adjectives, noun phrases and adverbs when used as predicates. The following example for the noun phrase is given: *kudo-so-nzo-l'-in* - 'I was in his/her house' (*kudo* - house, *kudo-so* - in the house, *kudo-zo* - his/her house, *kudo-so-nzo* - in his/her house, *l'* - past tense marker, *in* - the first person suffix). The predicative conjugation takes the same person suffix as the indefinite conjugation. To be entirely accurate, one can speak not about a conjugated verb but about a conjugated predicate. The last feature is a similarity between the Mordva languages and the Samoyedic.

The section on Lexicon concerns mostly loans: Iranian (Scythian, Sarmatian, Alanic), Baltic, Tatar, Chuvash, Russian (several thousands of words are of Russian origin). As for Iranian loans G. Zaicz, following E. Lewy and G. J. Stipa, writes that 'Iranian influence was not limited to the lexical sphere; ... a great deal of the definiteness-marking and agreement

phenomena of Mordva may be attributed to Iranian interference, altering Mordva typologically to resemble more inflecting types of languages such as (Iranian) Ossetian' (p.213).

Chapter 7 (*Mari*, pp. 219-248) written by Eeva Kangasmaa-Minn from the University of Turku, Finland deals briefly with two literary variants of the Mari language: Eastern (Meadow) Mari and Western (Hill) Mari. The base for the description is Eastern Mari with some references made to Western Mari. Incidentally, in the book mentioned above, 'Uralskie jazyki' the two separate chapters have been devoted to these variants of Mari.

According to the author in Mari there are 'a great many gaps in the morphological system' which are 'smoothed with the help of syntactic constructions' (p.236). For example, 'the category of number is in statu nascendi' (p. 229). One of the ways that the plurality of a noun can be expressed is in the singular and followed by a verb in plural.

Verb inflection in Mari is characterized by the following peculiarity: namely for all tenses there are two conjugations, called *em-* and *am-* conjugations after their first-person singular present indicative endings. 'The precise mechanics of the development of two inflectional patterns' - claims the author - 'have not been adequately explained' (p. 229). The functional distribution of the two conjugations, if any, is also not clear. 'There are in fact about a dozen verb pairs of which the transitive member belongs to the *em-* conjugation and intransitive counterpart belongs to the *am-* conjugation' (p. 235). Here are the following examples given by E. Kangasmaa-Minn: *kodem* 'I leave' (tr.), *kod-am* 'I remain', *woz-em* 'I drop, let fall', *voz-am* 'I fall'. But transitivity does not explain the original difference between the two conjugations cf. *kol-am* 'I hear' and *kol-em* 'I die'.

In Mari there is the group of three past tenses referring to states and events which the speaker has personally witnessed and, parallel to this, the group of three past tenses referring to states and events which the speaker has not personally witnessed. A past tense belonging to the second group is called by E. Kangasmaa-Minn a 'non-witnessed past'. This is also characteristic of some Uralic (ObUgrian, Permian etc.) and not only Uralic languages (e.g. Quechua, Kurdish, Bulgarian, Turkish etc.). In literature, a similar category, not necessarily connected with past tense indicative but also with other tenses and other moods (cf. quotative mood in Estonian and inferential mood in Nganasan) appears under many names such as 'indirectal', 'quotative', 'absentive', 'inferential', 'narrative', etc. Many scholars considered Uralic indirectal as a phenomenon due to Turkic influence. However, a Finnish scholar, A. Künnap, is of the opinion that analytical past tense forms used in

indirect meaning 'do not seem to have required any examples from outside their own language family' [7].

Other interesting feature of Mari, is that the second – and third person singular possessive suffixes 'also act as indicators of definiteness, thus functioning as article surrogates' (p.229). Further peculiarity is derivation=(g)e which forms predicatives from colour words e.g. sar 'yellow' (attr.), sar=e 'yellow' (pred. sing. and plur.).

A group of Fenno-Ugrian languages which are genetically closely related are the Permian languages (Udmurt, Komi), which are undoubtedly descending from proto-Permian. The next three chapters are devoted to these languages.

These are: Chapter 8 (*Permian*, pp. 249-275), Chapter 9 (*Udmurt*, pp. 276-304), and Chapter 10 (*Komi*, p. 305-326). Chapter 8 is written by Timothy Riese from the Institute for Finno-Ugric Studies, University of Vienna, Chapter 9 by Sandor Csucs from the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, and Chapter 10 by Anu-Reet Hausenberg from the University of Tallinn.

Since the 1920s, three literary Permian languages have been in use: Udmurt in the Udmurt Republic (Udmurtia), Komi-Zyrian for the Zyrians in the Komi Republic and Komi-Permyak for the Zyrians in the Komi-Permyak Autonomous Region to the south of the Komi-Republic. Timothy Riese (Chapter 8) claims that the linguistic policy of the early years of Soviet power was for the most part highly beneficial to the speakers of smaller minority languages. However he criticizes the creation of the Komi-Permyak literary language (a result of the language reforms of the 1920s) for two reasons: 1) The dialectal differences between Komi-Zyrian and Komi-Permyak are 'much smaller than the differences between the dialects of most western European languages and are by no means large as to justify speaking of two distinct languages. The opinion that we are dealing with two separate languages has never been accepted outside the Soviet Union' (p.250). Furthermore the author writes that 'the creation of a separate literary language would have been more justified in the case of Yaz'va Dialect than in the case of Komi-Permyak, but this was not essayed because of the small number of speakers' (p. 255). (the Yaz'va Dialect is spoken by 3-4,000 people in the northeastern portion of the Perm' Oblast, and it has preserved a number of features that have been lost elsewhere). 2) The creation of two literary languages where one would have sufficed, has split a nationality into two segments and 'served to estrange the Komi-Permyak from the Komi-Zyrians and has made the struggle of both groups for linguistic development and survival all the more difficult' (p.251).

Here it must be stated that in spite of this opinion, in the guide-book *Ural'skie jazyki* published in 1993 'the Komi-Permyak is treated as a separate language and a separate chapter has been devoted to a description of it. The author of Chapter 10, Anu-Reet Hausenberg, also criticizes the creation of the Komi-Permyak literary language claiming that 1) «Permyak literary norms... are not based on any one natural dialect. 2) 'Such differentiation has contributed to a further weakening of the Komi language in its struggle for existence' (p.307). In addition, the author writes about intensive Russification that began in the 1950s.

In her brief history of literary standard, Hausenberg mentions the missionary Stefan Khrap (14th century), who devised an alphabet consisting of Ancient Greek, Aramaic and old Slavonic letters with Komi owners' marks. This alphabet was used to some extent until the seventeenth century.

T.Riese, the author of Chapter 8, approaches the Permian languages i. e. Udmurt (Votyak) and Komi (Zyrian) synchronically and diachronically. Discussing phonology he emphasizes that unlike the diachrony of the Permian consonants, the diachrony of the Permian vowels is very complex and controversial. 'Many attempts have been made to derive the proto-Permian vowel system (and its descendents, the proto-Zyrian and proto- Votyak systems) from pFU [proto-Fenno- Ugrian] but hitherto the task has proven well nigh insurmountable... A survey of the etymological material reveals that most proto-Permian vowels have at least two pFU forebears' (p.265). Another interesting feature of the Permian phonological diachrony is the drastic shortening of words that occurred in the transition from pFU to proto-Permian. (Due to these sound changes, most not-borrowed Komi and Udmurt roots are monosyllabic)

e.g. pFU *pilwe 'cloud' >proto-Permian *pil> Zyrian piv

The consequence of this process is the lack of vowel harmony in the Permian languages, unlike many other Fenno-Ugrian languages. 'The massive vowel changes in the first syllable and the wholesale reduction and loss in the second eradicated vowel harmony already in pPN [proto-Permian]' (p. 266).

The characteristic morphological features of Permian languages include:

- 1) The great number of cases. Hausenberg mentions seventeen cases for Komi Zyrian and twenty four for Komi-Permyak. She does not, however, give rules for the use of case suffixes as S. Csucs does for Udmurt (Udmurt has 15 cases). Here it should be emphasized that the numbers of cases for Komi-Zyrian and Komi-Permyak are not consistent with those given by Russian collective comprehensive publications on Uralic languages [3], [9] [10]. The latter, are all consistent in stating that in Komi- Zyrian there

are 16 cases and in Komi-Pemyak 17. This discrepancy may be due to that the boundaries between case suffixes and derivational suffixes are far from clear-cut.

- 2) The use of the singular second- and third- person possessive suffixes to indicate definiteness; second-person forms in such a function express closeness to collocutors, while third-person ones are neutral in this respect. (The use of possessive suffixes in such a function is, as it has already mentioned, also characteristic of Mari).
- 3) In the Udmurt verb, two conjugations may be distinguished, the first conjugation (i-stems) and the second conjugation (a-stems). (Komi has only one conjugation).
- 4) The indirect category connected with past tenses is also characteristic of Permian languages.

In the above mentioned 3 chapters concerning the Permian languages little space has been devoted to dialects. T. Riese, discussing vowel diachrony in Chapter 8, presents the developments of proto-Zyrian vowels in the Yaz'va and Upper Sysola dialects, and also deals with the developments of proto-Votyak vowels in the Beserman and south-western dialects. Hausenberg also devotes one section of Chapter 10 to dialects of the Komi language. At the end of this chapter there is a text not in the literary language but in the Sysola dialect. The author of Chapter 9, S. Csucs, however, writes only generally about Udmurt dialects, and fails to mention the names of any of the dialects, even that of Beserman dialect, which is a specific Udmurt dialect of a separate ethnic group. Here it is not out of place to add that the monograph *Jazyk besermjan* written by T.I. Tepljašina was published in Moscow in 1970 [8].

Unlike the Permian languages, the affinity of the next group of languages i.e. the ObUgrian languages (Chapter 11: *ObUgrian*, pp. 327-357; Chapter 12: *Khanty*, pp. 358-386; Chapter 13: *Mansi*, pp. 387-427) is not so obvious. Some scholars have called into question the existence not only of the Ugrian protolanguage and the Ugrian genetic group (ObUgrian + Hungarian) but even that of the ObUgrian genetic group. Abondolo and Viitso present such a view. In Chapter 14: Hungarian (Chapter 14 is discussed below) Abondolo writes: 'In fact what is traditionally termed 'Ugric' may itself have been more a Sprachbund than a node in the Uralic family tree (see now Viitso 1996, who speculates along these lines on the basis of the development of the consonants)' (p.428). Cf. also the discussion of the Chapter 1: Introduction). As to the ObUgrian genetic unity Abondolo also expresses negative opinion (in the Chapter 12: *Khanty*): 'From a historical-typological perspective, *Khanty* presents with a rather odd amalgam of central and peripheral Uralic

features... The closest congener of *Khanty* is almost certainly *Mansi*, but many of the *Khanty*/*Mansi* shared features could be Sprachbund convergence phenomena, and many aspects of their putative proto-language, proto-ObUgrian (most critically, the vocalism) have not been reconstructed in fully convincing detail' (p.358). The author of Chapter 11, Laszlo Honti (Finn-Ugic Seminar, Groningen, the Netherlands) does not share these views. In 1979 in his paper 'Characteristic features of Ugrian languages' he wrote: 'There is no reason to doubt the one-time existence of the Ugrian unity and Proto-Ugrian' [11]. In the Appendix to Chapter 11 L. Honti presents 5 shared features of the ObUgrian languages and 28 shared genetic features of the Ugrian group. As for the ObUgrian languages, the author admits that it is 'extremely difficult to reconstruct the history of proto-Ugrian and its daughter languages. Although *Ostyak* [*Khanty*] and *Vogul* [*Mansi*] share a good stock of inherited root and suffixal morphemes and common syntactic features, each of them also shows features which are characteristic of it alone, or which are present in it to a higher degree than in other, and in many instances the same or similar aims are achieved by different, historically unrelated, means, as in the case of the different *Ostyak* and *Vogul* passive morphemes' (p. 327).

The author of Chapter 13, Laszlo Keresztes (Institute for East European and Oriental Studies, University of Oslo, Norway) claims that the *Khanty* and the *Mansi*, although linguistically the closest relatives to the Hungarians, 'in terms of physical anthropology they are quite distinct' (p.389). Keresztes, following Honti, writes about the ObUgrian period and the common language proto-ObUgrian.

From typological point of view the ObUgrian languages are characterized by, for example, the following features:

1. The dual number for both nominals and verbs, and widespread use of the singular, e.g.
 - a) The singular follows numerals except for two e.g. in *Mansi* xus xum denotes: twenty men (literally: twenty man)
 - b) In spite of the existence of the dual, the singular is used for expression of evenness, including names of body parts and clothing connected with them occurring in pairs, for example 'eyes' is rendered by noun in singular and 'one eye' by a noun phrase denoting 'a half of eye'.
The use of singular, after numerals and for denoting evenness is also characteristic of other Uralic languages (which do not have the dual) e.g. *Hungarian*, *Mari*.
2. The structure of some numerals in *Mansi* e.g. 25 is *waat-n at* (i.e. five

toward thirty): waat - thirty, -n - lative ending, at – five or waat nopəl at: nopəl is a postposition.

3. Indefinite (or subjective) or definite (or objective) conjugations. Forms of the objective conjugation encode not only the person and number (singular, dual, plural) but also the number of a direct object which is definite. There are 27 endings to express these relations. According to Laszlo Honti, the author of Chapter 11, the reconstruction of the proto-ObUgrian 'objective conjugation is' wellnigh 'impossible' (p.348).

Definiteness of a object is implicit in the context. In addition the third person singular possessive suffixes can serve to mark definiteness (Cf. A similar function to the third person possessive suffixes in Mari and Permian languages). The author of Chapter 13, L. Keresztes claims that in Mansi 'there is no article' (p. 417). However, according to E. I. Rombandeewa in Mansi there are: the definite article an and the indefinite article akw, but their usage is restricted [3], [12].

4. Narrative (not witnessed) verb forms, used in Mansi in all tenses, types of conjugations, passive (Cf. also above, the passage on the Mari language). E. I. Rombandeewa treats narrative verb forms as a separate mood [12].
5. The precative in Mansi treated by some grammars as a mood. Precative suffixes lie somewhere between inflection and derivation. These follow a verb stem and to right of precative suffixes may occur temporal, modal and also passive suffixes.

The precative suffixes express positive affect (-ke. -kwe-, dialectally -t' e-) or pity (-riś). Examples: xaajti=ke-t they are running, the dears, woje=riś=l-en - catch it, you wretch!

The suffixes-ke- and -riś- can be added to any part of speech, except for conjunctions. In case of nouns and adjectives the suffix -ke- functions as diminutive/affectionate and the suffix -riś- as diminutive/pejorative. The fact that verbs may take nominal diminutive suffixes for some scholars is one of the proofs of the indistinct boundaries between nominals and verbs in the Fenno-Ugrian languages [13]

6. The habeoconstruction. Unlike most Uralic languages Mansi and Khanty have a verb which means 'to have' instead of constructions with the verb to be (as for example in Hungarian) e.g. Tremjugan Khanty taj-, Sosva Mansi oońś-. The author of the Chapter 12, D. Abondolo, claims that the above mentioned verbs do not have credible etymology, but 'it is likely that each is a separate borrowing during a period of bi- and multilingual convergence with autochthonous language or languages now lost' (p.382).

7. The widespread use of the passive conjugation. Passive forms may be built to both transitive and intransitive verbs.
8. The innovated ergative construction (only in Khanty dialects, in particular in Vach and Vasjugan).
9. In connection with the above mentioned passive conjugation and ergative construction three basic sentence types can be distinguished in Khanty: active, ergative and passive (according to D. Abondolo).
 - a) 'In active sentences, the agent is in the nominative, any patient noun is also in the nominative, but a patient pronoun is in the accusative ...; the verb takes active (i.e. non-passive) suffixes.
 - b) In ergative sentences, the agent is in the locative ..., the patient is marked as in active sentences, and the verb takes active suffixes.
 - c) In passive sentences, the patient is marked as in active sentences and any agent is marked as in ergative sentences; the verb takes passive suffixes' (p. 376).

In Mansi, where there is no ergative. there are, of course, only two sentence types:

- a) active sentences
- b) passive sentences, where the agent is in the lative

In the discussion of chapters concerning ObUgrian it should be noticed that Khanty has no literary standard, and therefore all examples and paradigms are given mostly in the Tremjugan and Tromagan Khanty dialects. The text at end of the Chapter 12 is presented in Tromagan. (Tromagan is now spoken where Tremjugan was in the nineteenth century, along a tributary of the Ob.' (p. 362)).

Chapter 14 (*Hungarian*, pp.427-456) is the last chapter written by .Abondolo. Here, the author concentrates on some aspects which, despite the rich literature, ' have tended to be neglected, with emphasis on morphological typology and prehistory of Hungarian' (p. 428). As in the case of Finnish language, all examples, sample paradigms and final text are recorded using the special morphophonemic code with the reduction of 14 vowels to 5 (I, E, A, O, U) and the presentation of consonants as abstract ones. This code is given in capital letters using the sign # (as in the case of Finnish) and additional symbol, written as 3. The symbol # at the start of a root morpheme indicates front prosody 'in the manner a key signature before a sequence of tonal music' (p. 432). For example # LAVALAMA is read as levellem 'my letter'. The symbol 3 covers three short mid vowels: o, o, and e, which appear according to the rules of vocalic harmony for example in the

paradigm of a verb e. g. TUDT3K is read as tudtok 'you know', HIVS3M is read as hissem 'I believe'. Discussing verb inflection, Abondolo instead of using the traditional approach distinguishing two conjugations: subjective and objective, depending on the type of direct object encoded (definite or indefinite), speaks of 'two sets of person suffixes, each of which encodes a different sort of relationship between subject and object person. Suffixes of one set, termed centrifugal, are used when the person of the object is greater than that of the subject (e.g. first person subject/second-person object: 'I see you', or second-person subject/third person object: 'you see her'). Suffixes from the other set, termed centripetal, are used when the reverse relations obtains (e.g. 'she sees me'; 'they see you'). Centripetal suffixes are also used when there is no object at all ('they stand') or when the object is indefinite ('he makes coffee')' (p. 447). The enclosed figure shows centripetal and centrifugal verb person suffixes. The list of items for further reading does not include the important three-volume publication on the Hungarian language written by Majtinskaja [14].

The next 5 Chapters concern Samoyedic languages. These Chapters are: Chapter 15 (*Samoyedic*, pp. 457-479), written by Juha Janhunen from the Department of Asian and African Studies, University of Helsinki, Chapter 16 (*Nganasan*, pp. 480-515) by Eugene Helimski from the Russian State University for the Humanities, Moscow, Chapter 17 (*Nenets*, pp. 516-547) by Tapani Salminen from the University of Helsinki, Chapter 18 (*Selkup*, pp. 548-579), also by E. Helimski and Chapter 19 (*Kamassian*, pp. 580-601), written by Peter Simoncsics from the University of Budapest. As the above list suggests, no separate Chapter has devoted to Enets (to say nothing of the extinct Mator language). Samoyedic is conventionally classified as one of the two principle branches of Uralic. Unlike the Fenno-Ugrian branch, which shows a high degree of internal diversity, Samoyedic forms a coherent group.

According to the author of Chapter 15, Juha Janhunen, 'most of the modern Samoyedic-speaking ethnic groups are... composed of two major ethnohistorical components: a local component corresponding to the earlier indigenous population, and an immigrant component responsible for the Samoyedic language' (p. 457). Samoyedic and Baltic-Fennic languages 'represent opposite geographical extremes of the Uralic family' and 'are in many important respects equally and similarly conservative' (p. 461). Therefore these languages, along with Mordva and Saamic, are of great importance for the reconstruction of proto-Uralic. One interesting lexical phenomenon is that Fenno-Ugrian languages 'posses common basic numerals from 1 (or, at least 2) to 6, of which only two have cognates in Samoyedic. Moreover, of these,

only the item for '2' occurs in identical functions in Samoyedic and Finno-Ugric, while the cognate of the Finno-Ugric item for '5' appears in the function of '10' in Samoyedic.' (p. 476). Chapter 15, similarly to the other chapters in this book devoted to a group of languages, is presented mostly in a diachronic plane. References and further reading are, as elsewhere, inserted at the end of the Chapter. In addition, at the end of each section of the Chapter 15 there is brief information on literature recommended for further reading.

The Northern Samoyedic languages exhibit exceptionally great morphophonological and morphological complexity. This is especially relevant to Nganasan (Tawgy). The Nganasans live in Taimyr Peninsula together with Dolgans, an ethnic group of mixed (predominantly Tungusic) origin. According to E. Helimski, the author of the Chapter 16, 'an important element of the ethnolinguistic situation in the area was the creation and functioning of the so-called 'Govorka'- a Taimyr Pidgin Russian with analytic grammar, which follows Ural-Altaic morphosyntactic patterns' (p. 481). Many elderly Nganasans still speak 'Govorka' fluently. Many Nganasans are also able to understand or even speak Dolgan (but usually not vice versa). Bilingualism Nganasan-Russian is also strictly unilateral: among the Russian-speaking population of Taimyr there does not seem to be a single person who speaks Nganasan. Helimski claims that 'this may be at least partly due to the extreme morphophonemic complexity of the language'. Morphophonemic complexity concerns mostly consonant gradation in both stems and suffixes, stem-final vowel and consonant alternations, and vowel harmony.

There is a degree of similarity between Nganasan consonant gradation and the corresponding phenomenon in Baltic-Fennic and Saamic. According to Helimski, «it seems highly improbable that these mechanisms could be separate and wholly independent developments on the western and eastern peripheries of the Uralic language-family tree. The similarity must be explained either by parallel influence of a common unknown substratum, or - and this is much more likely - by the phonologization of a phonemic mechanism that was already operating in the Uralic proto-language' (p.482).

Two kinds of gradation are distinguished in Nganasan: rhythmic gradation and syllabic gradation. The rhythmic gradation is connected with the rhythmic organization of words.

Longer words (with five syllables or more), very common in Nganasan, are usually divided in two, three or four - potentially even more - rhythmic groups. Each group typically contains two syllables (two phonological vowels), and the last group has two or three syllables. The boundaries between rhythmic groups are distinct: sometimes the break in articulation creates the acoustic impression of a glottal stop. The last group has, according to the

general rule, the main stress on its penultimate vowel, and all preceding groups receive additional stress on their first vowels. The rhythmic gradation of word-medial consonants affecting five deep-level morphonemes: H, T, K, S, S' and clusters (the same morphonemes with preceding nasals) consists in the alternative appearance of two grades, strong and weak depending on the phonological or morphonological environment (for example: in rhythmic gradation the weak grade of H is realized as b etc.). In general, the strong grade of rhythmic gradation appears after an odd number of vocalic morae (= phonological vowels) in the preceding part of a word and its weak grade appears after an even number of vocalic morae. The number of vocalic morae is normally counted on a phonological level and may differ from the number of phonetic vowels and phonetic syllables. For example: b'ai 'target', a phonetic monosyllable, is treated from the viewpoint of the rhythmic gradation as having two morae: so b'ai-r ə ki (not b'ai-rəgi) 'similar to a target'.

In general, the strong grade of syllabic gradation appears before the vowel of an open syllable, and its weak grade appears before the vowel of a closed syllable. It must also be noted that an intervocalic glottal stop ʔ always makes the preceding syllable closed. Also, the closed character of a syllable is determined by a deep level consonant ^c corresponding to a surface-level zero. According to E. Helimski it 'is a phonological reality from the viewpoint of proto-Nganasan (proto-Samoyedic) reconstruction' (p. 490). Syllabic gradation follows rhythmic gradation and is applied only to those units that are preserved in their strong grade by rhythmic gradation (the weak grades of rhythmic gradation e.g. g from K, b from H do not participate in syllabic gradation). Syllabic gradation functions in both nominal and verbal paradigms e.g. sing. nom. kuhu; plur. nom. kubu? (ʔ closes the syllable, so the weak grade) 'skin, hide'; sing. nom. kəntə; plur. nom. kəndəʔ; sing. gen. kəndə (with case suffix in the form the above mentioned deep-level consonant ^c) 'sledge'. Another kind of alternation is 'nutation'. It consists in the change of the above mentioned deep-level consonant when it is followed by H, T, T', K, or S' and is preceded by a nasal, being separated from that preceding only by a vowel or a vowel sequence. The nutation follows both rhythmic gradation and syllabic gradation. Neither type of gradation is applied to the output of nutation. Some deep-level clusters, e. g. NT, are preserved in its strong grade, contrary the conditions of both rhythmic gradation and syllabic gradation. For example, in mununtum 'I say' deep-level cluster NT remain unchanged in its strong grade despite the conditions of both rhythmic gradation and syllabic gradation. Following rhythmic gradation and before nutation this word would appear as: munu-^c TU-M (^cTU is a weak grade from MTU because it follows an even number of morae). Then the nutation takes place,

as it is followed by T and preceded by nasal N, being separated from that nasal by one vowel u.

Nganasan morphonology is additionally complicated by vowel harmony. Historically, vowel harmony consisted in the 'front : back' opposition. But secondary changes to vowel quality violated this original principle and 'it is more convenient to ascribe to each stem [mono- and bisyllabic] its harmonic class, first ('U-stems') or second ('Ī-stems') (p.492). The synchronic phonetic composition of stems is in many cases not sufficient to determine their harmonic class e. g. hon- 'to plait' is a U-stem (i. e. attached suffixes contain the vowel u) while hon- 'to have' is an Ī-stem (i.e. attached suffixes contain the vowel ĭ). In practice Nganasan vowel harmony is even more complicated.

Additionally there are stem variants which can be determined by morphological environment.

Another morphonological mechanism is truncation. The rule of truncation operates even before rhythmic gradation and syllabic gradation. Truncation works as follows: 1) 'a suffix that begins in a consonant cluster ousts a final ^c in the preceding morpheme or 2) loses its first consonant, if the preceding morpheme ends in a non-zero consonant' (p. 494) (i. e. other than ^c).

The above mentioned types of alternation does not exhaust all the possibilities. The abundance of morphological alternations results in great diversity of both radical and suffixal allomorphs. For example, there are ten allomorphs of the renarrative mood suffix written as HAMHU. These allomorphs ^c range from -h^uambu as in kou-h^uambu-ʔ 'they are said to remain' to -b'ahĭ, as in kolĭdĭ-b'ahĭ-ʔ 'they are said to be fishing' (p.489).

E. Helimski, unlike other authors describing Nganasan, classifies alternations and accounts for their mechanisms (cf. the description of Nganasan by N.M. Tereščenko in *Jazyki narodov SSSR* [10] where the author only mentions Nganasan alternations by giving examples).

Nganasan morphology, especially the morphology of verbs, is also characterized by great abundance and complexity. There are the following types of conjugations in Nganasan: 1) subjective, 2) objective with singular, dual and plural object and 3) objectless (or reflexive). Nganasan distinguished between perfective and imperfective verbs. Perfective verbs take only the suffixes of the present perfect (and render the corresponding meaning) and imperfective verbs take only the suffixes of the present continuous. The system of moods is particular is highly developed in Nganasan. Helimski mentions 11 moods stating that 'this list is not exhaustive' (p. 503). These are: 'indicative, interrogative (used in interrogative sentences and in relative sentences), inferential (or latensive, used for reporting events which the speaker

did not witness directly), renarrative (mood of reported speech), irrealis (used to denote imaginary results of unfulfilled conditions), optative (used to denote desirable, but hypothetical events), admissive-cohortative ..., debitive (or obligative, used to denote a future action which is considered proper), obsessive (not-yet-accomplished action), prohibitive (warning against the action)' (ibidem). Apart from present perfect and present continuous in Nganasan there are the following tenses: past, past perfect, future-in-the past (this latter denotes an action that was suppose to be done). These types of conjugation, tenses, moods and analytical negative construction composed of negative verb + connegative - all inflected in singular, dual and plural result in several hundred finite verb forms. Non-finite forms are also numerous and include: the imperfective verbal noun, the perfective verbal noun, the preterite verbal noun, the present participple, the future participle, the future in-the-past-participle, the abessive participle, the passive participle, the verbal adverb, the verbal adverb of immediate precedence (e.g. kotu gas'a 'having just killed'), the conditional-temporal verbal adverb, the preterite temporal adverb, and the future conditional verbal adverb. Deep structure of Nganasan verbal forms and selected fragments of paradigms are presented in enclosed Table 16.2.

Nouns in Nganasan distinguish number (singular, dual, plural), 8 cases, a possessivity category (as in most Uralic languages) and a predicativity category (typical of Samoyedic languages). The possessive forms of the second person singular are often used to specify nouns as definite and occasionally definiteness is expressed also by possessive forms of the third person singular. Predicative forms are used as predicate without copulae in the present indicative or in other tenses with corresponding forms of the verb *ij-* 'to be': *mənə n'aam* 'I am Nganasan', *mənə n'aam is' üəm* 'I was Nganasan'.

The source of Nganasan text at the end of Chapter 18 is fieldwork.

The Nenets language is also characterized by numerous phonological processes: postvocalic obstruent weakening e.g. *ya* 'earth': *yada* 'his/her earth', postconsonantal continuant strengthening e.g. *yar* 'side': *yark^{na}* 'in the side', preobstruent loss of the non-nasalizable glottal stop (e.g. *yaq* 'strand of hair': *yata* 'his/her strand of hair'), preobstruent nasalization of the nasalizable glottal stop (e.g. *yah* 'soot': *yanta* 'his/her soot', presonorantal loss of the nasalizable glottal stop e.g. *yah* 'soot': *yal^o* 'your soot', (^ocalled schwa in the examples denotes an over-short vowel or a vowel not-pronounced at all). Morphological processes include vowel harmony, assimilations, alternations, suffix initial change, internal changes, truncation, (the truncation concerns suffixes with two initial consonants where the first consonant

is lost when attached to a stem with final consonant), palatalization and depalatalization.

Nenets verbal categories contain inter alia 16 moods (according to T. Salminen, the author of Chapter 17): the indicative, the imperative, the conjunctive, the necessitative, the interrogative, the imperfective probabilative, the perfective probabilative, the obligative, the imperfective approximative (renders e.g. the meaning 'he seems to stand'), the perfective approximative (renders e.g. the meaning 'he seems to have stood'), the futuritive approximative (renders e.g. the meaning 'he seems to be going to stand'), the superprobabilative (renders e.g. the meaning 'he probably stands'), the hyperprobabilative (renders e.g. the meaning 'he must have stood'), the narrative, the reputative (renders e.g. the meaning 'he is supposed to stand'), the desiderative.

The nominal inflectional categories include: number, (singular, dual, plural), case, nominal declension (absolute, possessive, and predestinative). The predestinative is formed by a special suffix preceding the respective possessive suffixes and renders such ideas as e. g. 'knife for him'. Besides the nominal declension, there is also nominal conjugation (a similar category with reference to Nganasan is called by E. Helinski the predicativity category). When predicates, absolute forms are conjugated for tense.

The policy of Russian and Soviet power in relation to Nenets is criticized by T. Salminen: 'The islands of Novaya Zemlya in the Arkhangelsk Province received their first inhabitants only in the nineteenth-century, when Russian government brought in Nenets families in order to strengthen its claim to sovereignty over the islands' (p. 517). Subsequently, 'Because of nuclear experiments beginning in the 1950s, the inhabitants of Novaya Zemlya were resettled in urban settlements on the continent, which effectively led to the loss of native language command among the Nenets in question' (p. 518).

The description of Selkup refers to the Middle Taz dialect. As Helinski, author of the Chapter 18, states 'the differences between any adjacent idioms are minimal, but for example the Taz dialect (North) and Middle Ob' Dialect (South) are mutually incomprehensible, differing as much as Russian and Polish or Udmurt and Komi' (p. 549).

Unlike Northern Samoyedic (Nganasan, Nenets), Selkup language is characterized by its richness of the phonemic inventory of vowels (25 vowels) due to quantitative opposition and to tense/lax contrast.

'Phonetically lax vowels differ from corresponding tense ones by a less strained articulation and by a committant shift towards the central zone...and/or lower tongue-height' (p. 553). Selkup vowel inventory outnumbers consonant inventory (16 consonants). 'Numerous empty cells in the system of

consonants... open wide the possibilities for considerable allophonic variation' (p. 551). The positional allophones of the sole postvelar phoneme *q* are especially dispersed. Besides voiced, half-voiced, palatalized and implosive postvelar stops, as well postvelar fricative, their set includes the postvelar nasal and the postvelar trill. Discussing Selkup morphology E. Helimski introduces the notion of category of representation. The Selkup language has developed a system of morphological means for transforming the typical syntactic roles of parts of speech into one other. 'The regularity and productivity of such formations makes it expedient to treat them as inflectional rather than derivational' (p. 557). Each of 3 parts of speech has 4 representations: substantival, adjectival, verbal and adverbial. Here is a brief characteristics of these representations:

1. Adjectival representation of, for instance, the noun *qum* 'man, person' is *qumil* 'human'. Here E. Helimski distinguishes:
 - a) relative adjectival forms e.g. 'alakol' *lapī* 'boat-oar' - *alako* 'boat', *lapi* 'oar'
 - b) co-ordinative adjectival forms e.g. *alako-š'š'al* *lapī* 'an oar good for a boat'
 - c) locative adjectival forms: e.g. *alakooqil* *lapī* 'an oar (which is) on the boat'
2. The verbal representation of nouns is 'usually treated in descriptive grammars as predicative forms of substantives' (p.562). For example: *qumāāk* 'I am a human being'. A special marker of verbal representation of nouns is followed by person suffixes which are similar to the verb suffixes of the subjective conjugation. When it is necessary to render meanings of tense other than indicative present, the relevant forms of the verb- 'to be' are used.
3. The adverbial representation of nouns e.g. *qumik* 'humanly'.
4. The substantival representation of verbs comprises *nomina actionis* e.g. *qopta* 'finding, seeing' from *go* 'to find, to see'.
5. The adjectival representation of verbs comprises five participles: present participle, past participle, caritive participle
6. The adverbial representation of verbs is as follows:
Present verbal adverb, past verbal adverb, caritive verbal adverb
7. When used non-attributively as independent substantives, adjectives are declined like nouns (= substantival representation of adjectives).
8. The adverbial representation of adjectives e.g. *somak* 'well' from *soma* 'good'.
9. Combinations of such adverbial forms (or of truncated adjectival stems) with existential verbs are used as predicates and can be viewed as com-

pound verbal representations of adjectives e.g. 'som(a) *ēēŋa* 'is good'.

At present Kamassian is an extinct language. The last speaker died in 1989. However, Kamassian is one of the best documented among the Samoyedic languages thanks to the endeavours and hard work of its collectors: Mathias Alexander Castren, Aulis Joki and Ago Künnap.

The sample text at the end of Chapter 19 contains a Kamassian tale preceded by the discussion of its stylistics with some references to the Kamassian (and Samoyedic) poetic speech.

Kamassian is the only extinct language to which a separate chapter is devoted in this book. Other extinct Samoyedic languages such as Koibal and Mator are only mentioned.

This book does not deal at all with extinct Fenno-Ugric languages e.g. Merja language. The Merja people once occupied a vast territory (European part of Russia) and Merja language is a substratum for many Russian dialects and also a source of some geographical names (e.g. Moskva). On this subject two monographs have been published by O. B. Tkačenko (15,16). In this book only twice is mention made of the Merja (and Muroma) people: on p. 4 as 'mysterious Merja and Murom(a)' and on p. 213 in the sentence: 'Loans from Baltic may have travelled via Muroma or Merja (two extinct west Uralic languages)'

In the rest of this review, we shall first highlight a number errors, oversights and misprints and next present a brief general (favourable) assessment of the book edited by D. Abondolo.

Minor errors are as follows:

- 1) misprints:
 - on p. 351: aborginal instead of : aboriginal
 - on p. 421: hi/her instead of : his/her
 - on p. 554: on p. 533 : instead of: on p. 553
 - on p. 589 : LD instead of: LO
- 2) other errors:
 - on p. 419: *waat xum TWENTY MAN* 'twenty men' instead of: *xus xum TWENTY MAN* 'twenty man'
 - on p. 451 long vowels instead of: short vowels
 - on p. 539: *Sabl* instead of : *pAbl*

The transcription of Russian geographical names, ethnonyms, linguonyms, names of authors exhibits some inconsistencies. For example:

- 1) Cyrillic *x* is rendered by 4 ways:
 - a) as *x* e.g. *Xelimskij* (p.462)

- b) as h e.g. Helimski (at many points in this book)
- c) as kh e.g. Khanty (at many points in this book)
- d) as ch e.g. Vach (p. 358)
- 2) On the other hand ch renders two different consonants cf. Vach (p.358) : Vychegda, Pechora (p.306)
- 3) Other inconsistencies connected with the transcription:
 - Tavgy (p. 455) = Tawgi (p. 480)
 - Nizyam (p.328,359) = Nizjam (p.383)
 - Vasyugan (p.549) = Vasjugan (p.358)
 - Vakh (p. 549) = Vach (p. 358)

Two names are commonly used for ObUgrian languages:

Vogul: Mansi and Ostyak : Khanty. However in the same book only one name should be used, and used consistently. But in this book two different names are used. In the Chapter 11 L. Honti writes only about Ostyak and Vogul and the next two chapters describe Khanty and Mansi languages.

The organisation: first a group of languages is treated mostly diachronically, and next the chapters on separate languages leads to that same problems are repeated. This is particularly the case with the Permian languages and the ObUgrian languages.

In spite these (minor) errors and inconsistencies 'The Uralic languages' is an important synthetical work on Uralic languages, which takes into account the newest achievements of Uralistics. It is provided both for students and scientific workers.

Numerous tables and figures make it easy to understand many difficult grammar points of some of the Uralic languages.

Besides Uralists specialists on Turkic and Iranian languages may be interested in this book (lexical and grammatical borrowings from these languages exist in most Uralic languages). On the other hand, typologists and comparatists may also have a concern in the book in question. Interesting typological traits of Uralic languages include:

- 1) Rhythmic and syllabic gradation. E. Helimski writes about the 'absence of typological parallels in other languages of the world' (p. 482) to Baltic-Fennic, Saamic and Samoyedic gradation.
- 2) More than two degrees of quantity (as in Estonian) ('A very small number of languages have more than two degrees of quantity Estonian is known to have three contrastive lengths in both vowels and consonants' [5, p. 3430])
- 3) Vowel harmony in many Uralic languages
- 4) Subjective and objective conjugations in Hungarian, ObUgrian, Mordva and Samoyedic

- 5) Analytical negative verb constructions in some Uralic languages composed of conjugated negative auxiliary verb + unconjugated connegative
- 6) Category possessivity in most Uralic languages
- 7) Syntax predominantly characterized by no conjunctions and subordination expressed by non-finite verb forms

Uralic comparistics (beside Indo-European comparistics) belongs to most highly developed. However, many problems remain unsolved e.g. internal subdivisions of Fenno-Ugrian languages, external connections of Uralic languages etc. Therefore it may be supposed that 'The Uralic languages' edited by D. Abondolo is not the last synthetical work on this language family.

REFERENCES:

1. Sinor, D. (ed.) (1988), *The Uralic Languages. Description, History and Foreign Influences* (Handbuch der Orientalistik, 811), Leiden: E.J. Brill
2. Janhunen J. (1991), *Towards a Handbook of Uralic Studies*, FUF Bd 50 H.1, pp. 96-100 [The review of Sinor D. (ed.), *The Uralic languages*]
3. *Ural'skie jazyki* (1993) (Jazyki mira) Moskva: Nauka
4. Viitso, T. – R. (1996), *On Classifying the Finno-Ugric Languages*. [in:] *Congressus Octavus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum Jyväskylä 10.-15.8. 1995*, P.4 Jyväskylä: Moderatores pp. 261-263.
5. Asher, R.E. (ed.) (1993), *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, Vol. 1-10, Oxford: Pergamon Press.
6. Nordling, C. O. (1996), *A New Theory on the Genesis of the Finnish Language*. [in:] *Congressus Octavus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum Jyväskylä 10.-15.8.1995* P. 4 Jyväskylä: Moderatores pp.221-224.
7. Künnap, A. (1994), *On the Uralic Indirectal*, UAJb Bd 13, pp.18-27.
8. Tepljašina, T. I. (1970), *Jazyk besermjan*, Moskva: Nauka.
9. *Osnovy finnougorskogo jazykoznaniya: Marijskij, permskie i ugorskie jazyki* (1976) Moskva: Nauka.
10. *Jazyki narodov SSSR* (1966), T.3, *Finno-ugorskie i samodijskie jazyki* Moskva: Nauka.
11. Honti, L. (1979), *Characteristic Features of Ugric Languages (Observations on the Question of Ugric Unity)*, Acta Linguistica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae T. 29, pp. 1-26.
12. Rombandeeva E.I. (1973), *Mansijskij (vogul'skij) jazyk*, Moskva: Nauka.

13. Beke O (1960), *Nomen und Verbum*, Acta Linguistica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae T. 10 pp. 369-381.
14. Majtinskaja K.E. (1955-1960), *Vengerskij jazyk*, č.1-3 Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR.
15. Tkačenko O. B. (1985), *Merjanskij jazyk*, Kiev: Naukova dumka.
16. Tkačenko O. B. (1989), *Očerki teorii jazykovogo substrata*, Kiev: Naukova dumka.

FOLIA ORIENTALIA
VOL. 35 1999
PL ISSN 0015-5675

REVIEWS

Metin A k a r, ed.: *Doğu Akdeniz – Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi*, Band 1 (1998), Gazimağusa 1998, pp. 192. ISSN 1302-0110.

Es mag kaum verwundern, daß eine Abteilung für Türkische Sprache und Literatur in der Türkei, deren Aufgabe in erster Linie darin besteht, Gymnasiallehrer heranzuziehen, irgendwann beginnt, eine Fachzeitschrift herauszugeben. Angenehm überraschen mag es uns aber, wenn diese Abteilung erst seit so kurzer Zeit besteht – nämlich zu diesem Zeitpunkt ungefähr drei Jahre –, wie die Abteilung für Türkische Sprache und Literatur der *Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi* (Eastern Mediterranean University; im folg.: DAÜ). Die besagte Universität in Famagusta (Nord-Zypern), die eine staatliche Universität mit privatem Status ist, blickt nunmehr auf ein zwanzigjähriges Bestehen zurück. Die Unterrichtssprache ist, außer in o.g. Abteilung, englisch.

Nach zweijährigem Bestehen hat die Abteilung für Türkische Sprache und Literatur nun den ersten Band ihres Publikationsorgans vorgelegt, welches alljährlich im September erscheinen soll. Der Inhaber der Zeitschrift *Doğu Akdeniz – Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi* [Zeitschrift für Türkische Sprache und Literatur] ist, in Vertretung der DAÜ, Prof. Dr. Metin AKAR, der auch Leiter der Abteilung für Türkische Sprache und Literatur ist. Der vorliegende Band präsentiert elf Artikel, von denen einer auf englisch vorliegt, und sieben Besprechungen, unter diesen ebenfalls eine auf englisch. Von Mitarbeitern der DAÜ liegen hier zwei Artikel sowie sechs Besprechungen vor. Die anderen Autoren präsentieren verschiedene Universitäten der Türkei, eine der Besprechungen liegt aus dem Ausland (Polen) vor. Der erste Band der *Doğu Akdeniz* beinhaltet folgende Aufsätze:

[1] Musa DUMAN: *Damak Ünsüzlerinin Klâsik Osmanlı Türkçesi Dönemindeki Gelişmelerine Dair* (S. 1-26). — Auf Grundlage verschiedener (Transkriptions-) Texte, erarbeitet M. Duman die Entwicklung der Klusile *q, k, ğ, g* für die Zeit des klassisch Osmanisch-Türkischen (16. Jh. – erste