

An old Selkup wordlist made into a modern Selkup dictionary

Nordselkupisches Wörterbuch von F. G. MAL'CEV (1903). Herausgegeben von Eugen Helimski und Ulrike Kahrs. (Hamburger sibirische und finnisch-ugrische Materialien I.) Hamburg, 2001.

The dictionary under review is representative of a current boom in Selkup lexicography. Two other dictionaries have appeared in this decade, the lexicographic volume of the Northern Selkup handbook produced by Moscow selkupologists (Kazakevitch & Kuznetsova & Helimski 2002) and the much-awaited dialectological dictionary based on the collections of Finnish fieldworkers (Donner & Sirelius & Alatalo 2004). Furthermore, three practical dictionaries of varieties of Selkup, the Northern Selkup school dictionary (Irikov 1988), the dictionary of the Narym dialect of Central Selkup (Bykonya & Kim & Kuper 1994) and the dictionary of the Ket dialect of Southern Selkup (Alatalo 1998), have enriched our understanding of the Selkup lexicon. When the vocabulary sections of Helimski (1983) and Kuznetsova & Kazakevitch & Ioffe & Helimski (1993) are added, it is possible to fully appreciate how active the field has been in recent decades. These endeavours also need to be contrasted with the achievements of earlier generations, as there had only been three field researchers whose materials ended up in dictionaries: Castrén's collections were first published in a contrastive context by Schiefner (Castrén & Schiefner 1855) and later in a full exposition of Selkup data by Lehtisalo (Castrén & Lehtisalo

1960), Hajdú made Pápai's notes available (Pápai & Hajdú 1952) and Erdélyi (1969) compiled the lexical data in Prokof'ev and his associates' publications in and on the incipient Northern Selkup standard language. Otherwise, there were few contributions to the study of the Selkup lexicon other than the republication of pre-Castrén wordlists by Donner (1932) and the textbook glossaries by Szabó (1967) and Hajdú (1968).

About F. G. Mal'cev, the original author of the dictionary, we know little except that he was a private citizen of the town of Turukhansk and that he or his heirs sent the manuscript to the famous siberiologist, G. N. Potanin, in Tomsk, from whose collections it was transferred to library archives. The Selkup data recorded by Mal'cev shows exceptionally high quality and internal consistency, which alone suggests that he may have been a native speaker of Selkup, and the documents discovered by the editors seem to confirm that the Mal'cevs in the region are indeed Selkups. The entries number 1,693, which includes some duplicates and productive compounds, but the coverage of the basic Northern Selkup lexicon is nevertheless quite comprehensive.

Beside Mal'cev's person, the introduction deals with modern fieldwork on the dialect that resembles his most closely. The editors made a special data-checking trip to the village of Farkovo. The introduction is followed by a dialectological survey identifying twenty-one points in which Mal'cev's data shows interesting differences from what is generally known about Northern

An old Selkup wordlist made into a modern Selkup dictionary

Selkup and described in the first place by Kuznetsova & Helimski & Grushkina (1980), some of which are, as far as I can see, suggestive of real phonological and morphological discrepancies warranting further investigation. The last of these points discusses the words that are not otherwise known from Northern Selkup, and, since they number only about thirty, it would have been useful to include a full list of such words either there or in the indexes.

The third section of the volume is the dictionary itself. Each entry consists of a running number, the Selkup word and its Russian translation as recorded by Mal'cev and followed by the editors' comments, where they occur, on the translation, the German translation, also provided by the editors, and the corresponding Selkup word in phonological transcription as it is known from Helimski's lexical database (cf. Kazakevitch & Kuznetsova & Helimski 2002). Its arrangement follows the order found in the original manuscript, which means that it begins with a number of thematic sections such as trees, metals, fish, birds, animals and various tools, significantly including shamanistic paraphernalia. The larger part of the dictionary is, however, organized alphabetically according to the Russian translations. To me, it would have made sense to use the Russian words as the headwords of the entries, not only to make their order transparent, but also to be faithful to the original exposition and, for the sake of maximal clarity, to keep Russian, German and Selkup data in distinct blocks in each entry.

Manuscript entries which are identical or nearly so have been replaced by a single full entry and a reference to it. Closely similar entries have occasionally been retained, and their connection can

only be detected via indexes; for instance, 'Siberian pine' is dealt with in entries 2 and 1106, as a compound and a single word respectively, and cross-references would have been useful in such cases (as sometimes used; for example, entry 1217 is referred to in entry 122 for 'bear', but not vice versa). The fourth section can be understood as an extended Selkup index covering largely the same data as the third section but with headwords in phonological transcription, followed by Mal'cev's original records and German translations. The fifth section is the German index, and the sixth and last consists of a one-page Northern Selkup wordlist also found in Potanin's collections.

It goes without saying that the overall quality of the editorship has been excellent. Some critical remarks may be in order on small details, and I go through a couple of the initial thematic sections to give an idea of what they might be like. As for tree names, the German translations in entries 5–7 are unnecessarily complicated and misleading, since simply 'Kiefer', 'Fichte' and 'Tanne' instead of 'Kiefer, Fichte', 'Tanne, Fichte' and 'Edeltanne' would have been fine, and in 9, 'Weidengebüsch' could have been replaced by just 'Weide'. In entry 39, the fish species dace is correctly identified as *Leuciscus leuciscus*, while *Leuciscus waleckii*, referring to a Far Eastern species, is not called for; as a side-note, scientific names of species should preferably be printed in italics, even in contexts where italics have other functions as well.

Among bird names, identifications of species are by and large impeccable, and correct German and scientific names have been assigned to Mal'cev's descriptive names, such as in entry 52 "black white-winged duck", which is recog-

nized as the velvet scoter, but it would have been useful to add the standard Russian names as well, in this particular case ‘тытпан’. The current scientific name of the golden-eye is *Bucephala clangula*, which replaced “*Anas clangula*”, given in entry 56, back in the 19th century. The “blue-necked diver” in entry 57 is most probably black-throated diver (*Gavia arctica*) rather than the white-billed diver (*Gavia adamsii*), which is further confused with a North American species, the great northern diver (*Gavia immer*), because only the former has bluish grey on its neck and is common in Selkup lands while the white-billed species is only found closer to the Arctic Ocean. By contrast, it is more than probable that the two swan species are correctly identified, but “*Cygnus minor*” in entry 60 is obsolete as a scientific name (like “*Anser minutus*” in 61) and *bewickii* is misspelled (the exact scientific name of the sub-species in question would be *Cygnus columbianus bewickii*). The bird in entry 66 has remained unidentified, but the description points unequivocally to the redpoll (*Carduelis flammea*, Birkenzeisig, чечетка). If entry 75 refers to the peregrine falcon (*Falco peregrinus*), which is quite possible, then the following entry describing its “winter” variety (the editors have made up the German names “Sommerfalke” and “Winterfalke”) undoubtedly alludes to the gyrfalcon (*Falco rusticolus*), but the picture is confused by the appearance of “Winterturmfalke” (another non-existent bird name) in (the first of three entries numbered) 81, and the corrected translation ‘buzzard’ is unexpectedly repeated in entry 79, suggesting that two different species have been known to Mal’cev and presumably to Selkups in general. Russian *лунь* would be ‘har-

rier’, and hen harrier (*Circus cyaneus*) breeds in the area, but is strictly migratory. The Selkup name in entry 80 means literally “human-faced animal” and Mal’cev has amusingly translated it as “parrot”. The editors have correctly identified the bird in question as an owl, and it may be suggested that the species is either the great grey owl (*Strix nebulosa*), which is relatively common in the region, or the Ural owl (*Strix uralensis*), which is perhaps rarer but, in my view, gives a more exact impression of the human face. Curiously, *syatuqtyangk*^o, a similar name, is used in Forest Nenets ‘Vogel von der Art des Uhus, aber klein und ohne Ohren, frisst Eichhörnchen (Name daher, dass sein Gesicht an einen Samo jeden erinnern soll)’ (Lehtisalo 1956: 432), a derivative of *syāq* ‘face’, but again, I am not sure which of the two *Strix* species it refers to, although *uralensis* is also the smaller of them. The third of the entries numbered 81 also has the odd translation by Mal’cev “wild pigeon”, but here it is quite possible to identify the species since the “mute cuckoo” suggested by the Selkup name can hardly be anything but the Oriental cuckoo (*Cuculus saturatus*, Hopfkuckuck, глухая кукушка).

A few shortcomings in a selection of the dictionary have been discussed above but they are negligible and never genuinely impair the use of the dictionary, especially if the user knows both Russian and German to some extent. Misprints appear to be rare, but in entry 380, not ‘sweat’ is given as “но”, and bad hyphenation in entry 196 has yielded “Wer-kaxt”. A less fortunate technicality involves the marking of the palatal lateral as “*l*” which is unaesthetic, poorly legible and not in accordance with Finno-Ugrian Transcription, which uses a double character *l*.

An old Selkup wordlist made into a modern Selkup dictionary

All in all, the dictionary is a superb addition to the Selkup lexicographical tradition and a crucial resource for anyone interested not only in the language but also in Selkup material culture and natural environment.

Tapani Salminen

- Alatalo 1998 = Ярмо Алатало: *С'ўссызуй эжипсан: кэткый кўлани*. (Словарь селькупско-русский и русско-селькупский на кетском диалекте селькупского языка.) Максимкин Яр & Хельсинки.
- Bykonya & Kim & Kuper 1994 = В. В. Быконя & А. А. Ким & Ш. Ц. Купер: *Словарь селькупско-русский и русско-селькупский*. Томск: Томский региональный отдел Министерства по делам национальностей и региональной политике & Томский государственный пединститут.
- Castrén & Schiefner 1855 = M. ALEXANDER CASTRÉN'S *Wörterverzeichnisse aus den samojedischen Sprachen*. Bearbeitet von ANTON SCHIEFNER. (Nordische Reisen und Forschungen von Dr. M. Alexander Castrén [8].) St. Petersburg.
- Castrén & Lehtisalo 1960 = Castréns Ostjaksamojedische Aufzeichnungen. – *Samojedische Sprachmaterialien*. Gesammelt von M. A. Castrén und T. Lehtisalo. Herausgegeben von T. Lehtisalo. (MSFOu 122.) Helsinki. 3–261.
- Donner 1932 = *Samojedische Wörterverzeichnisse*. Gesammelt und neu herausgegeben von KAI DONNER. (MSFOu 64.) Helsinki, 1932.
- Donner & Sirelius & Alatalo 2004 = *Sölkupisches Wörterbuch* aus Aufzeichnungen von KAI DONNER, U. T. SIRELIUS und JARMO ALATALO. Zusammengestellt und herausgegeben von Jarmo Alatalo. (LSFU 30.) Helsinki.
- Erdélyi 1969 = ISTVÁN ERDÉLYI: *Selkupisches Wörterverzeichnis: Tas-Dialekt*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. [Uralic and Altaic Series 103. Bloomington: Indiana University Publications, 1970.]
- Hajdú 1968 = HAJDÚ PÉTER: *Chrestomathia Samoiedica*. Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó.
- Helimski 1983 = EUGENE HELIMSKI: *The language of the first Selkup books*. (Studia Uralo-Altica 22.) Szeged.
- Irikov 1988 = С. И. Ириков: *Словарь селькупско-русский и русско-селькупский*. Пособие для учащихся начальной школы. Ленинград: Просвещение.
- Kazakevitch & Kuznetsova & Helimski 2002 = О. А. Казакевич & А. И. Кузнецова & Е. А. Хелимский: *Очерки по селькупскому языку: тазовский диалект. 3: Русско-селькупский словарь; разнопрофильные селькупские словари*. Москва: Издательство Московского университета.
- Kuznetsova & Helimski & Grushkina 1980 = А. И. Кузнецова & Е. А. Хелимский & Е. В. Грушкина: *Очерки по селькупскому языку: тазовский диалект I*. Публикации отделения структурной и прикладной лингвистики, серия монографий 8. Москва: Издательство Московского университета.
- Kuznetsova & Kazakevitch & Ioffe & Helimski 1993 = А. И. Кузнецова & О. А. Казакевич & Л.

- Ю. Иоффе & Е. А. Хелимский: *Очерки по селькупскому языку: тазовский диалект. 2: Тексты; словарь*. Москва: Издательство Московского университета.
- Lehtisalo 1956 = T. LEHTISALO: *Juraksamojedisches Wörterbuch*. (LSFU 13.) Helsinki.
- Pápai & Hajdú 1952 = HAJDÚ PÉTER: Pápai Károly szelkup szójegyzéke. – *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 54: 141–184.
- Szabó 1967 = LÁSZLÓ SZABÓ: *Selkup texts with phonetic introduction and vocabulary*. (Uralic and Altaic Series 75.) Bloomington: Indiana University Publications, 1967.

A chrestomathy of the Nganasan language

Chrestomathia Nganasanica. Szerkesztette WAGNER-NAGY BEÁTA. (Studia Uralo-Altaica: Supplementum 10.) Szeged & Budapest, 2002. 306 pp.

Chrestomathia Nganasanica, the first comprehensive Nganasan textbook, is a compilation of work by three authors, with the following division of labour: Sándor Szeverényi wrote the section on research history (19–25) and prepared the chapter on lexicon (139–144) as well as the texts (193–266), jointly with Beáta Wagner-Nagy, Zsuzsa Várnai wrote the phonology and morphophonology chapter (33–69), and Beáta Wagner-Nagy, also the editor of the volume, wrote the sections on the Nganasan community (13–19), transcription and orthography (27–32), morphology (71–137) and syntax (145–185) as well as exercises (187–192) and additional materials (267–306), which include a Nganasan–Hungarian vocabulary. It also contains maps drawn by Miklós Mets, photos by Beáta Wagner-Nagy, Florian Sobanski and Eugene Helimski, and drawings by the Nganasan painter Motümiaku Turdagin (died 2002), originally done for *Язык нганасан* by Momde and Aron (1991).

The great strength of *Chrestomathia Nganasanica* is that it collects and summarizes information from a large number of sources, many of which are not easily accessible because only a few copies were printed in the first place and what was printed was never widely distributed. It also differs from a typical chrestomathy in that it goes beyond what has already been published by incorporating recent research by the authors, including re-editions of many texts. The list of references is divided into several sections covering general works, language, culture, sociolinguistics, history, films and electronic sources, which is perhaps not the best solution for the occasional reader. Furthermore, references are often missing within the text in cases where the relevant information is perhaps common knowledge to the authors and Nganasan specialists in general, but other users of the book would have benefited greatly from having explicit mentions and full bibliographical details of the relevant sources, particularly when the statements in the book are paraphrases of the texts of other authors. It would have also been helpful to have relevant literature mentioned in each chapter and section. A minor issue is the lack of num-

A chrestomathy of the Nganasan language

bering of the many tables and examples, of which there are often many on one page. An easy way of referring to them would have been especially welcome when the book is used in the classroom, but this is obviously a matter of publishing tradition. In general, as a detailed description of all parts of the Nganasan language, the book makes a good manual and, in particular, a useful textbook for students of Samoyed competent in Hungarian, especially because it contains exercises as well as a key to them.

In the foreword, reference is made to *Chrestomathia Samoiedica* (Hajdú 1968), in which Nganasan is, aside from general remarks, only represented by a page-long text with a brief commentary. Curiously, the incorrect year 1966 is mentioned here, and the book is not included in the bibliography. Small technical oversights and misprints are evident here and there in *Chrestomathia Nganasanica*, some of them more annoying than others, such as Matthias Alexander “Catrén” on page 305 or “Терентьев” on page 296, or when they appear in language material such as “u” instead of Cyrillic y on page 30, **bəŋka* instead of *bəŋkə* ‘üreg’ on page 31, or **d’esj* instead of *d’esj* ‘apa’ on page 64, suggesting the need for more careful editing and proof-reading. A cumulative consequence of the sparse references, even in cases when the examples are based on a specific source, and the overly numerous misprints is that the reader cannot easily check a suspicious piece of data. For example, on page 79, in the sentence *Koudu kantü”ə čiiirü” tagə* ‘The sun has disappeared behind the clouds’, the correct form of the verb should be *kantuu”ə*, as shown by Zhdanova & Kosterkina & Momde (2001: 61).

As for the actual contents of the book, a number of critical remarks can

be made. On page 18, there is a table showing the Nganasan population between 1700 and 1989. The basic source of the section is not mentioned but it appears to be Krivonogov (2001: 139), who has taken the numbers from Afanas’eva (1990: 113–116). It turns out that the figures only cover the Avam Nganasans and the eastern group, the Vadey Nganasans, are not taken into account up to 1917, while the results of later censuses obviously include all Nganasans. Krivonogov’s 2001 book is not mentioned in the bibliography, and his name is misprinted as “Кривоно́в” in the reference to an earlier book on page 299.

The section on research history is highly informative, but because of a technical error, the references do not directly correspond to what is found in the bibliography, in which sources in Latin and Cyrillic scripts are kept separate in each section. Thus, references are given on page 24 as Helimski 2000a, Helimski 2000b, Dobžanskaja 1989 and Песни нганасан 1995, but in the bibliography we find Хелимский 2000a, Хелимский 2000b, Добжанская 1988 [sic] and Добжанская & Костеркина 1995 in their stead.

On pages 27–28 of the transcription chapter, the Nganasan phonemes appear in a table with correspondences between the Finno-Ugrian Transcription (without mentioning its name; reference is made to Setälä 1905, not included in the bibliography, but this must surely mean Setälä 1901) and the International Phonetic Alphabet as well as featural descriptions. A common misunderstanding concerns the role of the IPA: it is a transcription system by phoneticians for phoneticians, and linguists use and should continue to use their specific phonetic systems such as the FUT. Some of the IPA symbols chosen are less fortunate,

such as the “inverted a” for *a*. On the other hand, while “ə” is perhaps correct in IPA for the illabial back mid vowel, the phoneme in question should actually be written as *ɘ* instead of the conventional (for Nganasan specialists) *ə* in FUT. It is explicitly, and correctly, mentioned that the vowel is “nem redukált”; the following description of it as “svá” is obviously contradictory and simply wrong. The two (monomoraic) diphthongs *ʼa* and *ʼa* (“diphthongoids” in Helimski 1998: 485; the IPA correspondences are not correct) remain descriptively problematic, and are furthermore positionally restricted and idiolectally constrained. There is some confusion in the discussion on these vowels on page 41; cf. Helimski’s above-mentioned treatment.

The correspondences between Cyrillic orthography and Latin transcription are surveyed on pages 29–31. Occasionally they reflect the variation in pronunciation of a speaker or records of a researcher and not a particularity of the Cyrillic script, e.g., *dʼia* can be given as *dʼea* in transcription with the same plausibility as *dea* in orthography, and the same goes for the *u* as Cyrillic ⟨o⟩ alongside ⟨y⟩. Illustrative examples with references would have been welcome in such cases of real or apparent variation.

On pages 37–38, a quite basic misunderstanding occurs as to the status of dental obstruents. It is claimed that [δ] and [d] are phonetic variants of *t*, which is, of course, completely wrong, and indicates fundamental confusion between the concepts of allophonic variation and morphophonological alternation. In reality, [δ] and [d] are allophones of one and the same phoneme, plausibly symbolized as *d* (cf. Helimski 1998: 484), which contrasts with *t* just as *g* contrasts with *k*, for instance, and this is also

apparent in every other section of the book. There are some other, less crucial differences from Helimski (1998), such as that in *Chrestomathia Nganasanica* the contrast between non-native words and recent borrowings is conspicuously not highlighted.

There are many tables concerning phonotactics in the phonology section, but one crucial table describing the possible CV sequences, which obey a number of conspicuous and systematic restrictions, is nevertheless missing.

On page 40, the structure *ηəmurša* ‘table’, including an underlyingly *bs*-initial suffix is correctly explained on the basis of truncation: since a sequence of three consonants is impossible, the suffix loses its first consonant when it is attached to a consonant stem. The following example, *nakiürimtiiti* ‘(s)he tripled it’, derived from *nagiür* ‘three’, is not, however, an example of the related process of epenthesis, because the *ü* after *r* is in this case not an epenthetic but a stem-forming vowel.

On page 42, in the section on stress and rhythmic organization, the word *horəδʼaj* ‘leaf’ (which an anomalous *ʼδ*) is said to have the stress on the last syllable, but the explanation that the diphthong *ʼa* would have taken the stress is hardly correct, since *ʼa* is monomoraic and, furthermore, it should have lost its initial element after a palatal consonant. Another explanation is that the last syllable contains two moras, and in a moracounting language such as Nganasan, the stress is then regularly on the penultimate mora.

The three stem variants, S1 in the nominative singular of nouns and the verbal adverb, S2 in the genitive singular and the connegative, and S3 in the genitive plural and the present tense of perfective verbs, have been well under-

stood since Helimski's groundbreaking work, summarized in Helimski (1994; 1998: 493). On page 49–50, another triplet of stems, called T1, T2 and T3, is introduced, but their status remains unclear and their function poorly explained. It seems that operating with the accepted stem system yields much more satisfactory results in the description of Nganasan morphophonology and morphology, and there is no sign of T-stems in the morphology chapter at all.

For clarity's sake, incorrect word-forms added for comparison, such as **mađu* (as opposed to the correct *matu*) etc. on page 51, should have been marked with an asterisk as here and not just with “és nem”.

The list of suffixes according to their phonotactics on pages 53–54 would require some revision to make it consistent. For instance, the tilde (~) is supposed to be used to mark sequences that cannot occur word-finally, but it is also attached to the nomen actionis *-bsa*, which, however, is the actual ending found in the absolutive nominative singular of those nouns. Some suffixes are given in allomorphic form, e.g. the suffix of optative is given as *-hja~*, when it would be more informative to resort to the basic forms of the suffixes, such as *-HAA* as the optative suffix. The sequence C^VV is illustrated by *-ŋ'a* as the variant suffix of the interrogative in the reflexive conjugation, but the suffix in question usually appears in the forms *-ŋa* and *-ŋj* only. The perfect future suffix is misprinted as **-sutəd'əə* and should read *-sutəd'əə* instead.

There is some overlap between the phonology and morphology chapters because the stem types and the corresponding morphophonological alternations are discussed in both (pages 49–51, 59–60 and 71–76), which is, perhaps,

reasonable in a textbook. In the first two tables on page 77, the use of different stem labels for the dative (lative) and locative case forms may appear confusing because gradation is not taken into account, unlike in Helimski (1998: 498). The S1 in the nominative singular *kintə* ‘füst’ is thus different from the S1 in the dative (lative) singular *kindətə*, which is superficially similar to the S2 in the genitive singular *kində*, but the examples make the picture sufficiently clear to a reader who has mastered the basics of gradation.

The glossing of examples is non-standard throughout the book: while hyphens are used in glosses to indicate suffixes, there are no corresponding hyphens in the Nganasan material.

The morphology chapter, while generally lucid and error-free, contains quite a lot of repetitions from the phonology chapter, such as the stem types, referred to above, or the morphophonological vowel alternations (pages 50–51, 74–75 and 104). At the same time, little attention is paid to a number of issues, even when they play a role in the literature. For instance, the treatment of the distinctive function of the third person plural possessive suffix (‘one of many’) is limited in comparison with Tereshchenko (1979: 154). Similarly, the dual and plural forms of the predestinative declension found in Tereshchenko (1979: 107) are left out of account.

The description of Nganasan derivational morphology, including the meaning, sentential use, and allomorphy of derivational suffixes, is very detailed. This section is based on Wagner-Nagy's monograph (2001), and some of the comments by Leisiö (2004) on the treatment of a number of verbal suffixes are applicable here, particularly with regard to the suffixes listed in *Chrestomathia*

Nganasanica on pages 132–135. It would have been possible to integrate the derivational section into the main morphology chapter, especially because the latter covers many derivational patterns concerning adjectives and minor word-classes (pages 86–89) that are not markedly different from the nominal derivation presented in the other section. Minor points: the second of the moderative suffixes on page 88 is attached to S2 rather than S3; on page 97, **tijk^uamjntə* should be *tijkⁱamjntə*; on page 102, the verb *sojbusa* is not biaspectual but imperfective (3sg *sojbutu*), and its perfective counterpart is *sojbuoda* (3sg *sojbuu^o*; Kosterkina & Momde & Zhdanova 2001: 155); in the last table on page 108, devoted to the objective conjugation, it should read *čeniđiəđi* instead of *čeniđia* (which belongs to the subjective conjugation); in the last table on page 111, last line, it should read *kontuŋəədu* and not **kontiŋəədu*, and *nünəəđij*, not **nünəəđij*; on page 130, the suffixes in 1.4 and 2.2 are one and the same suffix and, contrary to the claim made there, are attached to the same type of stem.

The chapter on lexicon contains a lot of etymological data and even historical phonology in concise format, and presents a useful overview of the topic. Some of the individual etymologies need to be challenged, and Samoyed specialists in particular should acknowledge that the Janhunen–Sammallahti wordlist, summarized in Sammallahti (1988), is the only standard for the Uralic background of the Samoyed lexicon.

The chapter on syntax is solidly descriptive, following Tereshchenko (1973) in most points but also showing steps forward, such as the conclusion on page 146 that verbal adverbs can function as subjects of a clause (cf. Tereshchenko 1973:

151), and the discussion of the interesting and complicated topic of the three conjugation types, of which objective and reflexive are not obligatory, is both deep and detailed (pages 160–164). Word order is plausibly explained on pages 170–171 with reference to the communicative structure by identifying the topic and focus in the sentences, passive and causative constructions are covered thoroughly (pages 175–177), and Russian influence on infinitive constructions (2.2 on page 180) is analyzed perceptively. Much of the discussion on negation (pages 150–153) is actually about the morphology of the negative verb rather than anything syntactic, and the inclusion of the construction with the verb *ŋuəli-* ‘of course’ among semantically negative forms is dictated by the purely formal criterion, as it is accompanied by the connegative of the main verb. Even minor mistakes are few: on page 148, in the second example, *hijgiri* should read *hungiri*; on page 149, *təədⁱj buəduj* *debtuda* is not a manner adverbial but a temporal infinitive construction.

The collection of text samples consists mostly of extracts from Labanauskas (2001), which contains folklore texts, but also examples of various genres from other publications as well as a dialogue from Wagner-Nagy’s field material, published for the first time. Republished materials were also re-transcribed, and several of them are presented in the original Cyrillic versions as well. The standard of editorship has been high, as shown by the negligible number of misprints. The same goes for the Nganasan–Hungarian vocabulary, although it does not, contrary to its promise, contain quite the whole corpus of words found in the book.

The bibliography is divided into a large number of thematic sections, which

A chrestomathy of the Nganasan language

makes it difficult to locate a particular publication. There are also several misprints, especially in Cyrillic text, and page numbers are often missing where they should be included.

To sum up, *Chrestomathia Nganasanica* is a detailed and thorough textbook that gives its readers an unprecedented opportunity to obtain a systematic overview of a superbly fascinating language. The minor shortcomings that have been mentioned in this review, of which the authors are probably well aware, do not undermine the general usefulness of the volume in the least. If, however, a new edition of the chrestomathy is to be published one day, there are a couple of serious suggestions we would like to make. The number of source references should be multiplied and each chapter should have its basic sources listed in detail. The division of the book into chapters and sections should also be made more systematic and consistent, with unnecessary overlaps eliminated. As splendid as it is that a manual of a Uralic language is published in a Uralic language, it might also be considered that a revised version should appear in German, especially because the editor is equally competent in that language. But even in its present form, *Chrestomathia Nganasanica* deserves unreserved praise and its editor and the other authors hearty congratulations for a job well done.

Larisa Leisiö
Tapani Salminen

Afanas'eva = Афанасьева, Г. М. 1990:
Nganasany. 2: Традиционная система воспроизводства nganasan:

Проблемы репродукции обособленных популяций. Москва: Институт этнологии и антропологии.

HAJDÚ PÉTER 1968: *Chrestomathia Samoiedica.* Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó.

Helinski = Хелимский, Е. А. 1994: Очерк фонологии и словоизменительной морфологии нганасанского языка. – *Таймырский этнолингвистический сборник. 1: Материалы по нганасанскому языку и шаманству.* Москва: РГГУ. 190–221.

HELIMSKI, EUGENE 1998: Nganasan. – *The Uralic languages.* Edited by Daniel Abondolo. London & New York: Routledge. 480–515.

Krivosnogov = Кривоногов, В. П. 2001: *Народы Таймыра.* Красноярск: РИО КГПУ.

Labanauskas = Лабанаускас, К. И. 1992: *Фольклор народов Таймыра. 3: Нганасанский фольклор.* Дудинка: Таймырский окружной центр народного творчества.

Labanauskas = Лабанаускас, К. И. 2001: *Ня" дүрүмү" туобтугуйса. Нганасанская фольклорная хрестоматия.* Дудинка: Таймырский окружной центр народного творчества.

LEISIÖ, LARISA 2004: On Nganasan derivational morphology (Beáta Boglárka Wagner-Nagy: Die Wortbildung im Nganasanischen). – *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 58: 22–66.

Momde & Aron = Момде, А. Ч. – Арон, Н. М. 1991: *Язык нганасан.* Норильск: Творческий коллектив «Аргиш».

SETÄLÄ, E. N. 1901: Über die transskription der finnisch-ugrischen sprachen. – *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 1: 15–51.

- SAMMALLAHTI, PEKKA 1988: Historical phonology of the Uralic languages. – *The Uralic languages: description, history and foreign influences*. Edited by Denis Sinor. (Handbuch der Orientalistik 8: Handbook of Uralic studies 1.) Leiden: E. J. Brill. 478–554.
- Tereshchenko = Терещенко, Н. М. 1973: *Синтаксис самодийских языков*. Ленинград: Наука.
- Tereshchenko = Терещенко, Н. М. 1979: *Нганасанский язык*. Ленинград: Наука.
- WAGNER-NAGY, BEÁTA BOGLÁRKA 2001: *Die Wortbildung im Nganasanischen*. (Studia Uralo-Altaica 43.) Szeged.
- Zhdanova & Kosterkina & Momde = Жданова, Т. Ю. – Костеркина, Н. Т. – Момде, А. Ч. 2001: *Словарь нганасанский и русско-нганасанский*. Санкт-Петербург: Просвещение.

Ein längst fälliges Handbuch

JOHANNA LAAKSO: *Our otherness. Finno-Ugrian approaches to Women's Studies, or vice versa*. (Finno-Ugrian Studies in Austria 2.) Wien: Lit-Verlag 2005. 197 S.

Die Auslandsfinnougristik hat traditionell andere Aufgaben als das Fach in Estland, Finnland und Ungarn, worauf die Verfasserin zu Recht in ihrer Einleitung hinweist (S. 14). Während in den finnougrischen Ländern die Finnougristik mittlerweile fast eine kleine Randwissenschaft ist, neben der die Einzeldisziplinen wie beispielsweise finnische Linguistik, ungarische Literaturwissenschaft oder estnische Folkloristik zu großen Fächern ausgewachsen sind, gilt für das nichtfinnougrische Ausland nach wie vor, daß unter dem Nenner "Finnougristik" alles vereinigt wird, was mit den Ländern und Kulturen zu tun hat, in denen eine finnougrische Sprache gesprochen wird. Wohl auch aus diesem Grunde ist es kein Wunder, daß das erste Buch, das sich explizit mit der Genderforschung innerhalb der Finnougristik befaßt, aus diesem nichtfinno-

ugrischen Ausland kommt. Verantwortlich dafür ist die Wiener Lehrstuhlinhaberin Johanna Laakso, die 2002 auch die Ausrichterin des ersten Symposiums zur Genderforschung in der Finnougristik war.

Das Buch verfolgt zwei Ziele, die im Untertitel mehr oder weniger exakt angedeutet werden. Zum einen geht es darum, innerhalb der Finnougristik die Genderforschung zu etablieren und auf interessante Forschungslücken und -ansätze hinzuweisen, zum zweiten sollen finnougristische Perspektiven der allgemeinen Genderforschung zur Horizonterweiterung verhelfen. Dabei ist der Titel, der von "unserer Andersartigkeit" spricht, offenbar absichtlich ambig: Ob damit das Fach Finnougristik im Gegensatz zur einseitig indoeuropäisch geprägten allgemeinen Linguistik gemeint ist oder die Frauen oder gar die Schnittmenge der beiden Gruppen, zu der in diesem Fall die Autorin zweifelsfrei gehört, bleibt offen. Diese gewollte Ambiguität ist indes nicht unproblematisch, denn die Bezeichnung des Forschungsgebiets, um das es geht, als