

VALENTIN GUSEV (Moscow—Hamburg)

FINNIC NUMERALS FOR '8' AND '9' AND A POSSIBLE PARALLEL FROM SAMOYED*

Abstract. The paper deals with a suffix contained in the Finnic numerals for 'eight' and 'nine', such as the Estonian *kahe-ksa* and *ühe-ksa*. Taking into consideration the forms of some southern varieties of Finnic, such as Votic and Livonian, it is proposed to reconstruct the Proto-Finnic suffix **-ksama/*-ksämä* and compare it with the segment *-saa* in Tundra Enets *eesaa*, Forest Enets *neesaa* 'nine', tracing them back to Proto-Uralic **-ksama*.

Keywords: Finnic languages, Samoyed languages, numerals, Uralic etymology.

The Uralic numerals for 'eight' and 'nine' have always been a puzzle for etymologists. While in most Uralic languages they are obviously related to the roots 'one', 'two' or 'ten', thus meaning, presumably, 'two to ten' and 'one to ten', the exact nature of this relation is unclear. The aim of this paper is to propose just a step towards the final solution by establishing a link between the Finnic and some Samoyed data.

Finnic languages are not an exception to this puzzle. Numerals like Est. *kaheksa*, *üheksa*, Fin. *kahdeksan*, *yhdeksän* etc. are, beyond any doubt, derived from **kakte* '2' and **ükte* '1', but their last segment remains unexplained. At present, there are two competing explanations.

E. Itkonen (1973) suggested that *eksä(n)* may have been originally a stem of the negative verb *e-*, followed by the reflexive suffix *-k-*, the 3SG marker *-sä* and, in the case of *kahdeksan*, the dual marker *-n*, and the whole would have once meant 'one/two do not exist, are absent [from ten]'. Another view is that the second part of these numerals goes back to the Indo-European borrowing **teksä* 'ten' (Parpola 1999). The former view is supported, i.a. in Honti 1993 : 110; UEW 807 and in SSA (1 : 271; 3 : 488), and EES (s.v.) takes both hypotheses for possible.

However, in the most recent collection of Uralic etymologies, Luobbal Sámmol Sámmol Ánte (Aikio) rejects both of them, rightly noting that neither **eksä(n)* nor **teksä* are really attested in any Uralic language, and, moreover,

* I am deeply indebted to Fedor Rozhanskiy for the consultations and help with the literature on Finnic languages.

that a compound like "two-ten" would rather mean 'two tens = 20' and not 'ten minus two' (Luobbal Sámmol Sámmol Ánte (Aikio) s.v. *üktiksä(n)*). Aikio subsumes under the Proto-Uralic **üktiksä(n)* 'nine' only the Proto-Finnic **ükteksän* : *ükteksä-*, Proto-Mordvin **vejksə* and Proto-Saamic **ukcē* ~ **okcē(n)* ~ **gkcē*,¹ the latter most probably being an early borrowing from Proto-Finnic. At the same time he rejects the Permic and Mari forms with the same meaning, which were considered as cognates earlier. The same is said to be true for the Proto-Uralic **kahteksan* 'eight'. As concerns the second part of these forms **(i)ksa(n)/*(i)ksän*, its origin remains unknown.

Recently, Vladimir Napol'skich (Нарольских 2012 : 208—209) has suggested another etymology for the Saamic-Finnic-Mordvin **kahteksa(n)/*üktiksä(n)* and Permic **kjkjaməs/*ökməs*: **kekta-hta-k-əs(-ən)*, **ükte-ktä-k-əs* in the former case and *kekta-hta-m-əs*, **ükte-ktä-m-əs* in the latter, where **-hta-k* is the nominal abessive (= abessive case) marker, **-hta-m* is the adjectival abessive and *-əs* the nominalisation affix. However, the last part of the Finnic forms *-an* (*-am* in oblique case forms) remains obscure; Napol'skich adds it in brackets without any explanation. Besides, attaching a nominaliser to an already nominal form (and, moreover, a case form) also seems somewhat strange.

So, the fragment **(i)ksa(n)/*(i)ksän* is still not fully explained. As I will try to show in this paper, it may have a cognate in Samoyed.

In what follows, Section 1 will give a short overview of the numerals for '8' and '9' and the peculiarities of their declension compared with their "neighbours" '7' and '10' in different Finnic languages. Then an alternative (in fact, existing but forgotten) reconstruction for Proto-Finnic will be proposed. Section 2 will present the Samoyed data and point to a possible parallel, and in Section 3, the resulting etymology will be briefly discussed.

1. Stems of numerals for 'eight' and 'nine' in Finnic

Inflection of nominals (as well as of verbs) in Finnic languages involves an intricate system of stem alternations, which cannot always be predicted by rules. This is also true for the numerals 'eight' and 'nine', as well as for 'seven' and 'ten' — "omituiset *n*-loppuiset lukusanamuodot" ('strange forms of numerals ending by *n*') in Setälä's (1899 : 400) terms.

In tables below, the stem alternations of these numerals are illustrated with the forms of NOM.SG, GEN.SG, PART.SG or PART.PL and also with the corresponding ordinal numeral.

In the northernmost varieties of Finnic, such as standard Finnish and Karelian, the words for '8' and '9', as well as for '7' and '10', form a separate inflectional class with a final *-n* in NOM.SG, but without it in other forms (illustrated here with GEN.SG and PART.SG forms); the latter stem is also used to form ordinal numerals:

F i n n i s h

NOM.SG	<i>seitsemä-n</i>	<i>kahdeksa-n</i>	<i>yhdeksä-n</i>	<i>kymmen-en</i>
GEN.SG	<i>seitsemä-n</i>	<i>kahdeksa-n</i>	<i>yhdeksä-n</i>	<i>kymmen-en</i>
PART.SG	<i>seitsemä-ä</i>	<i>kahdeksa-a</i>	<i>yhdeksä-ä</i>	<i>kymmen-tä</i>
ORD	<i>seitsemä-s</i>	<i>kahdeksa-s</i>	<i>yhdeksä-s</i>	<i>kymmen-es</i>

¹ All the etymologies cited in this paragraph are Aikio's (Luobbal Sámmol Sámmol Ánte (Aikio)).

K a r e l i a n

NOM.SG	<i>seiččeme-n</i>	<i>kaheksa-n</i>	<i>yheksä-n</i>	<i>kymmen-en</i>
GEN.SG	<i>seiččeme-n</i>	<i>kaheksa-n</i>	<i>yheksä-n</i>	<i>kymmen-en</i>
PART.SG	<i>seiččemy-ä</i>	<i>kaheksu-a</i>	<i>yheksy-ä</i>	<i>kymmen-tä</i>
ORD	<i>seiččeme-s</i>	<i>kaheksa-s</i>	<i>yheksä-s</i>	<i>kymmen-es</i>

In other languages, such as Estonian and Veps, *kaheksa* and *üheksa* have no *-n* in the nominative and they behave as plain vowel stems, displaying no trace of any nasal. In Veps, the same is true for *seičeme* '7' and *kümne* '10'. In Estonian, *kümme* '10' also has no final *-n* in the nominative, but has preserved it in the oblique stem; *seitse* '7' has no *-n* at all, and the penultimate *-m* appears in oblique stems only.

E s t o n i a n

NOM.SG	<i>seitse</i>	<i>kaheksa</i>	<i>üheksa</i>	<i>kümme</i>
GEN.SG	<i>seitsme</i>	<i>kaheksa</i>	<i>üheksa</i>	<i>kümne</i>
PART.PL	<i>seitsmeid</i>	<i>kaheksaid</i>	<i>üheksaid</i>	<i>kümneid</i>
ORD	<i>seitsmes</i>	<i>kaheksas</i>	<i>üheksas</i>	<i>kümnes</i>

V e p s (Зайцева, Муллонен 2007 : 74, 115, 119, 412)

NOM.SG	<i>seičeme</i>	<i>kahesa</i>	<i>ühesa</i>	<i>kümne</i>
GEN.SG	<i>seičemen</i>	<i>kahesan</i>	<i>ühesan</i>	<i>kümnen</i>
PART.PL	<i>seičemid</i>	<i>kahesid</i>	(no form given)	(no form given)
ORD	<i>seičemenž</i>	<i>kahesannž</i>	<i>ühesannž</i>	<i>kümmennž</i>

The third pattern is typical for some southern idioms such as the Votic and Livonian languages and the Mulgi and Hiiu dialects of Estonian, where the numerals for 'eight' and 'nine' have *-m(V)* added in their oblique stems. See the following V o t i c forms (Маркус, Рожанский 2017 : 466—468, 470—471):

NOM.SG	<i>sejtse</i>	<i>kahesa</i>	<i>ühesä</i>	<i>tšümme</i>
GEN.SG	<i>sejttseme</i>	<i>kahesseme</i>	<i>ühesseme</i>	<i>tšümmene</i>
PART.SG	<i>sejtsemä</i>	<i>kahessema</i>	<i>ühessemä</i>	<i>tšümmenä</i>
ORD	<i>sejtsemäjž</i>	<i>kahessemajž</i>	<i>ühessemäjž</i>	<i>tšümmenäjž</i>

In L i v o n i a n, *m* is absent from the case forms, but appears in ordinal numerals for '7', '8' and '9' (see Kettunen 1938 s.v.):²

NOM.SG	<i>sejš</i>	<i>kõ'däks</i>	<i>i'däks</i>	<i>kim</i>
ORD	<i>sejšmāz</i>	<i>kõ'däksmāz</i> ³	<i>i'däksmāz</i>	<i>kimdāz</i>

In Hiiu and Mulgi dialects, variative forms with and without *m* are attested:

H i i u E s t o n i a n (Kokla 2015 s.v.)

NOM.SG	<i>seitse</i>	<i>kaheksa,</i> <i>kahesa</i>	<i>üheksa,</i> <i>ühisa</i>	<i>kümme</i>
GEN.SG	<i>seitsme</i>	<i>kaheksme,</i> <i>kahesa</i>	<i>üheksme,</i> <i>ühisme</i>	<i>kümne</i>
PART.SG	<i>seitsend</i>	<i>kaheksmed,</i> <i>kahesad</i>	<i>üheksend,</i> <i>ühesmed,</i> <i>ühismed</i>	<i>kümmend</i>
ORD	<i>seitsmes</i>	(no form given)	<i>üheksmes</i>	<i>kümnes</i>

² In the Salaca dialect of Livonian, however, 'eighth' and 'ninth' had *n* instead of *m*: *kādiksnes*, *ūdiksnes* (Kettunen 1938 s.v.).

³ See also the instructive *kõ'däksmin* (Viitso, Ernštreits 2012 s.v.).

M u l g i E s t o n i a n (Laande, Todesk 201 s.v.)				
NOM.SG	<i>seidse</i>	<i>katese, katesse,</i> <i>katessa</i>	<i>ütesse, ütese,</i> <i>ühessa, üessa</i>	<i>kümme</i>
GEN.SG	<i>.seitsme</i>	<i>.katsme,</i> <i>katessa</i>	<i>ütesse, ütese,</i> <i>ütesseme, ütse,</i> <i>ühessa, üessa</i>	<i>.kümme</i>
PART.SG	<i>seitset</i>	<i>kateset, .katset,</i> <i>katesemet, katessat</i>	<i>ütesset, ütaset</i> <i>ühessat, üessat</i>	<i>kümmet</i> <i>kümment</i>
ORD	(no form given)	<i>.kätmes</i>	(no form given)	<i>.kümnes</i>

The numerals '7' and '10' are given here for the sake of comparison; details of their behaviour do not concern us here. On the other hand, as concerns the inflection of '8' and '9', historically the three types exemplified above are in fact two: the second type (Estonian-Veps) is the same as the first (Finnish-Karelian) after the loss of the final *n* (see, e.g., Suhonen 1988 : 294) or, at least, is historically indistinguishable from it. So in this respect the Finnic languages are split in two groups: those which have no *m(V)* segment in their oblique stems, and those which have.

It is the former group, including most of the Finnic idioms, that has served as the base for the generally accepted reconstruction. Setälä (1899 : 200, 400) proposed parallel reconstructions for '8' and '9' in Proto-Finnic: **kahteksa-/kahteksama-* and *ühteksä-/ühteksämä-*, but since then the forms with *-ma/-me* have, as it seems, been ignored or judged as secondary, created, for instance, by analogy with the forms of the numeral '7'.⁴

However, an opposite scenario is also possible. In this case, the development of the stems 'eight' and 'nine' at the first stage would have been similar to that of other old *mA*-stems, such as 'heart', 'sour' and the caritives: in the nominative **mA* was replaced by *n*;⁵ then in many Finnic languages (but not in Finnish and Karelian) the final *n* was dropped, as shown in the following table (for NOM and GEN):

	'heart'	'sour'	'nameless'	'eight'	'nine'
Finnish	<i>sydän</i> <i>sydämen</i>	<i>hapan</i> <i>happaman</i>	<i>nimetön</i> <i>nimettömän</i>	<i>kahdeksan</i> <i>*kakdeksama-n</i>	<i>yhdeksän</i> <i>*yhdeksämä-n</i>
Estonian	<i>süda</i> <i>südame</i>		<i>nimetu</i> <i>nimetu</i>	<i>kaheksa</i> <i>*kaheksama</i>	<i>ühiksa</i> <i>*ühiksama</i>
Votic ⁶	<i>süä</i> <i>süä ~</i> <i>süämee</i>	<i>apaa</i> <i>appamaa</i>	<i>nimeto(n)</i> <i>nimettomaa</i>	<i>kahesa</i> <i>kahesseme</i>	<i>ühesä</i> <i>ühesseme</i>

At the next stage, in languages like Finnish or Estonian, the declination of **kakteksan* and **ühteksän* would have been re-built — probably based on the analogy with '7' and '10' or with just one of them: e.g., in Finnish, instead of *kahdeksan* : **kahdeksaman*, the pattern *kahdeksan* : **kahdeksan* emerged, similar to *seitsemän* : *seitsemän* and *kymmenen* : *kymmenen*. Only some southern idioms have preserved the old pattern.

⁴ Though Setälä (1899 : 402) believed that, on the contrary, '7' and '10' had acquired their *-mV-* segments through the analogy with '8' and '9'.

⁵ Presumably, after the loss of the last vowel and a change of **m* to **n*, but the details of this process are not relevant here.

⁶ The Votic forms are taken from Маркус, Рожанский 2017 and from "Vadja keele sõnaraamat" (VKS 2013).

Such a scenario at least does not seem less plausible than the traditional one.

Let us now turn to Samoyed data.

2. 'Nine' in Samoyed

For 'eight', all Samoyed languages except Selkup use the old compound **kitV(n)-tettä*, which most probably goes back to 'two/twice four' (Janhunen 1977 : 71); Selkup expresses 'eight' with expressions like Taz *šittj čaŋkijl' köt* 'two absent ten'. Neither of these is related to Finnic and will not be considered here. Expressions for 'nine' are given below; they are surprisingly different for such a small and relatively young language group:

Nganasan	<i>ŋamiajtümə</i>
Tundra Enets ⁷	<i>eesaa</i>
Forest Enets	<i>neesaa</i>
Yurak	<i>näessa</i> (17 th century, Хелимский 2000 : 55)
Tundra Nenets ⁸	<i>xasawa ju?</i> 'Nenets ten', <i>xabej ju?</i> 'Ostyak ten'
Forest Nenets	<i>kašem</i> " <i>ju?</i> 'Nenets ten'
Selkup	<i>ukkiŋ čaŋkijl' köt</i> 'one missing ten' (Alatalo 2004 : 224; Кузнецова, Хелимский, Грушкина 1980 : 285)
Kamas	<i>amitun</i> (Donner, Joki 1944 : 5a, 194a)
Mator	<i>obtənasta, obtənasta</i> 'one missing'; <i>togos</i> (Helimski 1997 : 326, 363)

The Selkup construction is parallel to 'eight' and fully transparent, meaning 'one missing ten', literally 'one be.absent-PT.PRS ten'. Also transparent is the Mator word, which consists of *obtə* 'one' and *nasta/nəsta* 'not having' (Helimski 1997 : 315, 326). Both are not relevant for us here. Mator *togos* is a borrowing from Turkic.

The Nganasan form can be easily divided, too: it consists of *ŋamiaj* 'another; one of' and the caritive suffix *-(b)tumə*. The latter is not frequent in Nganasan, but does occur, e.g., in *torəbtumə* 'useless' (from *toru* 'profit, benefit'). It is, of course, directly related to the caritives in Finno-Ugric languages, including Finnic *-ttOmA-*, which was already mentioned in Section 1. A possible cognate of the Nganasan *ŋamiajtümə* is the Kamas *amitun* (Janhunen 1977 : 19, s.v. **ämäjtəmä*), which is derived from *ami* 'anderer' ((Donner, Joki 1944 : 5a). The suffix *-tun* is not attested elsewhere in Kamas.

A stem meaning 'another, one of' (PS **ämäj* 'anderer, zweiter', Janhunen 1977 : 19) is rather unexpected in the word for 'nine'. In both Nganasan and Kamas it is only attested as signalling a member of an opposition, always in the presence of something or someone it is opposed to, as in the following examples:⁹

⁷ The Tundra and Forest Enets forms are taken from the unpublished Enets dictionary by Eugen Helimski.

⁸ The Tundra and Forest Nenets forms are taken from Lehtisalo 1956 : 139b; the transcription is simplified and insignificant variants are omitted.

⁹ The examples from Kamas and Nganasan are taken, respectively, from the INEL Kamas Corpus (Gusev, Klooster, Wagner-Nagy 2019) and the Spoken Nganasan Language Corpus (Brykina, Gusev, Szeverényi, Wagner-Nagy 2018) developed at the University of Hamburg. The glossing and transcription are somewhat simplified.

(1) Kamas

Dī-m teinen am-nə-m ami-m karəld'a:n
 this-ACC today eat-FUT-1SG another-ACC tomorrow

'This one I will eat today, the other one tomorrow' (AA_1914_Head_flk.035
 = Donner, Joki 1944 : 97)

(2) Nganasan

Məlǰtu-tu ηamiaj, ηamiaj d'ondalaʔku buə-tu
 grumble-PRS another another calmly speak-PRS

'One of them grumbles, the other one speaks calmly' (JSM_090809_Life_nar.
 414).

We would rather expect that the numeral 'nine' contains a root meaning just 'one', like in Selkup, Mator or most of the Finno-Ugric languages, but for some reason we have the root for 'another' in this function in Nganasan and Kamas. Maybe this is a reflex of an earlier meaning of **ämäj*.

A different explanation of the Nganasan and Kamas forms was given by Klumpp (2005), who points out that Nganasan *-mə* cannot be directly related to Kamas *-n* and considers the second part of these forms as a direct continuation of the PS **ton* 'number' (in Kamas), and a derivate of it (in Nganasan), thus interpreting 'nine' as 'another number' (beginning a new counting segment). This accounts better for the meaning of the Nganasan *ηamiaj* and Kamas *ami*.

Whichever interpretation is true, both divide these numerals in the same way: *ηamiaj-tümə*, *ami-tun*, and this allows us to understand the Enets forms. In both Tundra Enets *eesaa* and Forest Enets *neesaa*, as well as Yurak *náessa*, the first part (Tundra Enets *ee*, Forest Enets *nee*) is likely to be an etymological cognate of the Nganasan *ηamiaj* and Kamas *ami*, as pointed out already by Janhunen (1977 : 19, s.v. **ämäj*təmə). In Forest Enets, *nee* still can be used as a separate word,¹⁰ though the attestations are very scarce, cf. an example from Helinski's dictionary of Enets:

(3) *nee kie-xe taa*
 another side-ADJ.LOC reindeer
 'reindeer on that side'

On the other hand, its derivatives *nee**ku(ju)*/*naaku(ju)* are widely used, see FE and examples from Сорокина, Болина 2009 : 262, s.v. *накую*: *накую биз бар* 'another bank of the river', *накую мя* 'neighbouring tent', etc.

The segment *-saa* so far remains opaque; etymologically, it can represent **-sāmā*, *-sāmə*, **-sāmā*, or the same combinations with **-w-* or zero consonant between the two vowels.

Finally, let us turn to Nenets. The Tundra Nenets *xasawa juʔ* and the Forest Nenets *kašemʔ juʔ* are what Honti (1993 : 202) called "das zweifellos seltsameste Zahlwort in der ganzen uralischen Sprachfamilie". Literally they mean 'Nenets ten', and, as if to confirm that there is not any misunderstanding, 'ten' can be expressed as *luca juʔ* 'Russian ten' (alongside simple *juʔ*, though). Such expressions were attested as early as in the 17th century by Gerhard Friedrich Müller in Pustosersk: *chäsöwö jū* '9', *luze ju* '10'.¹¹

¹⁰ Its other meaning is 'left', which presumably has developed from 'another'.

¹¹ Müller's field notes in the Russian State Archives of Ancient Documents (РГАДА, ф. 199, д. 7, № 513, л. 25).

However, their semantics is really so strange, that one can think of a recent folk etymology (which is also considered possible by Honti (1993 : 203)). On the other hand the final syllables of Tundra Nenets *xasawa* / Forest Nenets *kasama* exactly correspond phonetically to Enets *-saa* (in this case this segment would be reconstructed as PS **-sãmã*), and it may be hypothesised that this expression was primarily something like **xa-sawa ju?* 'one-missing ten'. Later the first word was mistaken for *xasawa* 'man; Nenets', the whole being understood as 'nine = Nenets ten'. Basing on this, in some dialects the new designation *luca ju?* 'Russian ten' was invented for 'ten'.¹²

A similar explanation can be hypothesised for Nganasan. Probably it had initially a form like **ŋamiaj-šumu*, a cognate of the Enets and Yurak forms, but its second segment, being totally opaque, was replaced with *-t'ümə*, yielding the more transparent *ŋamiajt'ümə*.

Whatever solution will be accepted for Nenets and Nganasan, it will have no effect on the treatment of the Enets form, where the segment *-saa* is clearly detachable. The claim of this paper is that this segment — most probably together with the Nenets *-sawa/-sama* — goes back to PS **-sãmã* and is directly cognate to Finnic **-ksama*.

3. Discussion

The comparison of Finnic **s* and Samoyed *s* would lead to Proto-Uralic **ś* (in the traditional notation). It is known that Proto-Uralic **k* disappeared from before **s* in Samoyed, thus Proto-Uralic **ks* yielding Proto-Samoyed **t*, e.g. in **kaktä/kektä* > **kitä* 'two' (Janhunen 1977 : 33, 40). The same must have occurred before Proto-Uralic **ś*: Proto-Uralic **kś* > Proto-Samoyed **s*, as illustrated by at least one Proto-Uralic suffix: the so-called Connective-Reciprocal **-kśi* > Proto-Finno-Ugric **-kśi*, Proto-Samoyed **-sâ* (Salmiinen 2014 : 296–297). The rest of the correspondences are trivial. So, there is basically no problem in the development Finnic **-ksama* < Proto-Uralic **-kśama* > Proto-Samoyed **-sãmã* > Enets *-saa*.

In Saamic, Proto-Uralic **ś* would have become *ć*; however, the Saamic forms **gkcē* and **kākccē* must have experienced a loss of the middle syllable in **iktiksä-* and **kaktiksä-*, and moreover are likely to have been borrowed into Proto-Saamic from Finnic (Luobbal Sámmol Sámmol Ánte (Aikio)); so the Saamic consonants are in any case unrepresentative.

If we assume that the Proto-Uralic numerals contained **-m-*, this would also account for the Permic forms **ókmiš*, **kikjamš*, if *-s* is the ancient nominalisator, as suggested by Napoľskich (Нapoľских 2012 : 208–209). However, their *-m-* is explained by Napoľskich's etymology for Permic anyway.

The obvious drawback of the etymology proposed here is that it leaves aside the Mordvin numerals such as the Moksha *кафкса* '8', *вейхкса* '9' and Erzya *кавксо* '8', *вейксэ* '9', which have been believed so far to be the only full cognates of Finnic. Proto-Uralic **-ś* would yield *ś* in Mordvin; and even an eventual reduction of **-kśama* to **-kśə* could not explain the change of **ś*

¹² There is no evident etymology for the first segment *xa/ka* so far. Very tentatively, one can think of an otherwise unattested cognate of TE *kaa* 'partner, mate' (functionally equal to Nenets *ŋabi*, Nganasan *ŋa*); or of Nenets *xəw* 'side; partner' with a subsequent haplology **xəw^osawa* → *xasawa*.

to *s*. We have to leave this question open.¹³ However, the new etymology seems more promising, because, on the one hand, it explains the facts of Finnic better, including the segment *-mV* in languages like Votic and Livonian; and, on the other hand, it finds them a cognate from Samoyed.

Address

Valentin Gusev
Institute of Linguistics (Moscow), Universität Hamburg
E-mail: vgoussev@yandex.ru

Abbreviations

DE — E. H e l i m s k i, Dictionary of Enets [Manuscript]; **FE** — O. K h a n i n a, A. S h l u i n s k y, Forest Enets wordlist / Словник лесного энецкого языка [Manuscript]; **VKS** — Vadja keele sõnaraamat. 2., täiendatud ja parandatud trükk, Tallinn 2013. <http://portaal.eki.ee/dict/vadja/>.

NOM — Nominative; **GEN** — Genitive; **PART** — Partitive; **SG** — Singular; **PL** — Plural; **ORD** — ordinal numeral; **PT.PRS** — Present Participle; **ADJ.LOC** — locative adjective.

REFERENCES

- A l a t a l o, J. 2004, Sölkupisches Wörterbuch, Helsinki (LSFU XXX).
- B r y k i n a, M., G u s e v, V., S z e v e r é n y i, S., W a g n e r - N a g y, B. 2018, Nganasan Spoken Language Corpus (NSLC). Version 0.2. Publication date 2018-06-12. Archived in Hamburger Zentrum für Sprachkorpora. <http://hdl.handle.net/11022/0000-0007-C6F2-8>.
- D o n n e r, K., J o k i, A. J. 1944, Kamassisches Wörterbuch nebst Sprachproben und Hauptzügen der Grammatik, Helsinki (LSFU VIII).
- G u s e v, V., K l o o s t e r, T., W a g n e r - N a g y, B. 2019, INEL Kamas Corpus. Version 1.0. Publication date 2019-12-15. Archived in Hamburger Zentrum für Sprachkorpora. <http://hdl.handle.net/11022/0000-0007-DA6E-9>. — The INEL Corpora of Indigenous Northern Eurasian Languages. <https://www.slm.uni-hamburg.de/inel/>.
- H e l i m s k i, E. 1997, Matorische Sprache. Unter Mitarbeit von Beáta Nagy, Szeged (Studia Uralo-Altaica 41).
- H o n t i, L. 1993, Die Grundzahlwörter der uralischen Sprachen, Budapest (Bibliotheca Uralica 11).
- J a n h u n e n, J. 1977, Samojedischer Wortschatz, Helsinki (Castrenianum toimitteita 17).
- K e t t u n e n, L. 1938, Livisches Wörterbuch mit grammatischer Einleitung, Helsinki (LSFU V).
- K o k l a, P. 2015, Hiiu sõnaraamat, Kärkla. <http://www.eki.ee/dict/hiiu/>.
- K l u m p p, G. 2005, Die '9' im Kamassischen und Nganasanischen. — Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia. Vol. 10, 65–66.
- L a a n d e, A., T o d e s k, T. 2013, Mulgi sõnaraamat, Abja-Paluoja—Tallinn—Tartu. <http://www.eki.ee/dict/mulgi/>.
- L e h t i s a l o, T. 1956, Juraksamojedisches Wörterbuch, Helsinki (LSFU XIII).
- L u o b b a l S á m m o l S á m m o l Á n t e (A i k i o, A.), Uralic Etymological Dictionary (draft version of entries A–Ć). https://www.academia.edu/41659514/URALIC_ETYMOLOGICAL_DICTIONARY_draft_version_of_entries_A_Ć_.
- S a l m i n e n, T. 2014, Suomalais-samojedilaisia muotovertailuja. — Juuret marin murteissa, latvus yltää Uraliin, Helsinki (MSFOu 270), 291–302.

¹³ It is worth noting, however, that the Mordvin segment *-ksə* could be compared with Mari *-(k)š* in Meadow Mari *кандаш(е)* '8', *индеш(е)* '9' and Hill Mari *кӓндакш(ы)* '8', *ӓндекш(ы)* '9', whatever the origin of their first parts.

- Setälä, E. N. 1899, *Yhteissuomalainen äännehistoria*, Helsinki.
- Suhonen, S. 1988. *Geschichte der ostseefinnischen Sprachen*. — *The Uralic Languages. Description, History and Foreign Influences*, Leiden—New York—København—Köln, 288—314.
- Viits, T.-R., Ernštreits, V. 2012, *Līvõkiel-ēstikiel-le kiel sōnārōntōz. Liivi-eesti-lāti sōnaraamat. Libiešu-igauņu-latviešu vārdnīca*, Tartu—Rīga.
- Зайцева Н. Г., Муллонен М. И. 2007, *Новый русско-вепсский словарь*, Петрозаводск.
- Кузнецова А. И., Хелимский Е. А., Грушкина Е. В. 1980, *Очерки по селкупскому языку. Тазовский диалект*, Москва.
- Маркус Е. Б., Рожанский Ф. И. 2017, *Современный водский язык. Тексты и грамматический очерк*. 2-е издание, исправленное и дополненное, Санкт-Петербург.
- Напольских В. В. 2012, *Реконструкция числительных и реконструкция систем счисления: уральские языки*. — *Числа в системе культуры*, Москва, 197—219.
- Сорокина И. П., Болина Д. С. 2009, *Энецкий словарь с кратким грамматическим очерком*, Санкт-Петербург.
- Хелимский Е. А. 2000, *Об одном переходном северносамодийском диалекте*. — Е. А. Хелимский, *Компаративистика. Уралистика. Лекции и статьи*, Москва.

ВАЛЕНТИН ГУСЕВ (Москва—Гамбург)

ПРИБАЛТИЙСКО-ФИНСКИЕ ЧИСЛИТЕЛЬНЫЕ ДЛЯ '8' И '9' И ВОЗМОЖНАЯ САМОДИЙСКАЯ ПАРАЛЛЕЛЬ

В статье рассматривается суффикс, содержащийся в прибалтийско-финских числительных 'восемь' и 'девять' — таких, как эстонские *kahe-ksa* и *ihe-ksa*. С учетом форм южных прибалтийско-финских идиомов (водского, ливского и других) предлагается реконструировать праприбалтийско-финскую форму **-ksama/-*ksämä* и сопоставлять ее с сегментом *-saa* в тундровом энецком *eesaa*, лесном энецком *neesaa* 'девять', возводя их вместе к прауральскому **-kšama*.

VALENTIN GUSSEV (Moskva—Hamburg)

LÄÄNEMERESOOME '8' JA '9' NING VÕIMALIK SAMOJEEDI VASTE

Artiklis käsitletakse 8-t ja 9-t tähistavate läänemeresoome arvsõnade osist *-ksa/-ksä* (nt. eesti *kaheksa* ja *iheksa*). Lõunapoolsete läänemeresoome keelte (eesti murrete, vadja, liivi) vormidest lähtudes rekonstrueerib autor läänemeresoome algkuju **-ksama/-*ksämä* ning eenetsi võimalikule vastele *-saa* (tundraeenetsi *eesaa*, metsaeenetsi *neesaa* 'iheksa') tuginedes uurali algvormi **-kšama*.