

держан с той лишь разницей, что в современном удмуртском языке они поменялись местами. Например: *абдраско* 1. спр. 'сомневаться, задумываться'; *адзиско* 2. спр. 'вижу, кажусь'. В современном удмуртском языке глагол *абдраны* относится ко второму спряжению, а *адзыны* — к первому.

Рядом с существительными и субстантивированными словами составитель приводит суффикс родительного падежа *-лэн*, подчеркивая принадлежность данного слова к этой части речи, например: *адзись лэнь* 'свидетель', *адзёмь лэнь* 'человек', *асушьянь лэнь* 'самохвальство'.

В словаре отмечены также наречия: *аскй или аскы*, нар. 'завтра', *берёнъ* нарчье

'назад', *буразь* нарч. 'направо'; союзы: *а* союз 'или, ли', *но* союз 'и', *но* союз 'же'; предлоги (в современном удмуртском языке — послелоги): *азинъ* предлог 'пред', *берё* предлог 'по, после', *динё* предлог 'до'; междометия: *ахъма*, междом. 'ах'.

В рукопись включены, хотя и не отмечены, и другие части речи, например, прилагательные: *азь-вьяль-адзись* 'прозраливый', *арьёмь* 'годовалый', *ась кустамъ* 'междоусобный' и т.д.

Изданный труд представляет большой интерес не только для специалистов по удмуртскому и другим финно-угорским языкам, но и для исследователей истории и культуры удмуртского народа.

Е. Б. БЕЛОВА (Ижевск)

<https://doi.org/10.3176/lu.1999.1.11>

Eugen Helimski, *Die matorische Sprache. Wörterverzeichnis — Grundzüge der Grammatik — Sprachgeschichte unter Mitarbeit von Beáta Nagy, Szeged 1997 (Studia uralo-altaica 41). 475 pp.*

In the Preface of his book E. Helimski claims that, off and on, he has dealt with the research and elaborating of the materials of Mator for over 20 years, essentially working through the manuscript materials in archival funds. But the publishing of the book was induced by Beáta Nagy, who was ready to systematize the word lists and enter them into the computer (p. 3).

Mator (also Motor, Mator-Taigi-Karagass) is an extinct Samoyed language which was still spoken in the first half of the 19th century in west Siberia, around the Sayan Mountains. The Mator language word lists are almost entirely collected and compiled by German and Russian travellers about Siberia. Additional data can be obtained from the neighbouring Turkic languages where some Mator substratum and adstratum as well as place names have been preserved. In the Introduction of his book E. Helimski introduces the division of Mator into three dialects — Mator (proper), Taigi and Karagass — and the approximate area where these dialects had spread (pp. 13–17). At large, it remained southwards from the area of another Samoyed language (pp. 13–

17), the Kamass (also Kamass-Koibal) language. (E. Helimski and myself, as researchers we are also "neighbours" that reflects most expressively in our short surveys on Mator and Kamass, respectively, published in the series of books "Языки мира" (The Languages of the World, see Хелимский 1993; Кюннап 1993). Before the Russian colonisation period the other neighbouring languages belonged to Turkic and Mongol languages, first of all.

According to E. Helimski the Mator settlement remains slightly southwards from the recent Samoyed proto-home. (This area of their proto-home remained inhabited only by south Selkups and Kamasses.) About 2000 years before the Samoyed proto-language was divided into four: north Samoyed, Selkup, Kamass and Mator (pp. 17–18). I don't find it possible to comment on these standpoints because I am too sceptical towards the idea of proto-homes and -languages to do this. I would only mention that based on Kalevi Wiik's hypothesis (Wiik 1996; 1997) I, too, suppose that the Samoyed language form in its earliest place of occurrence could be located in north-east



Europe (see first Künnap 1998 : 90) from where it later spread also to Siberia, partly perhaps as a result of the language change by the populations who earlier had spoken Paleosiberian and/or the so-called Altaic languages. The C allele of the Y chromosome typical of the population speaking mainly Uralic languages (and Russian) has spread in Siberia also among the speakers of Buryat and Yakut languages which permits again to suppose that earlier those must probably have spoken some Uralic form of a language (see Villems et al. 1998 : 180, 187—194), more exactly Samoyed languages. The Samoyed-speaking population, having substituted Buryat and Yakut languages for their own, together with Mator- and Kamass-speaking people could have successfully inhabited the area that E. Helimski referred to as a "recent Samoyed proto-home", thus being one of the fixed points in taking the Samoyed language form from north-east Europe as far as the south of Siberia (later the Yakuts migrated from there to the north part of central Siberia).

Further E. Helimski thoroughly introduces language sources of Mator, including also by means of photomechanical copies. In 1721 in the surroundings of the Sayan Mountains D. G. Messerschmidt is the first to record some of the first words in Mator (pp. 22—23). In the years of 1734—1740 G. F. Mueller registers the words of Mator (p. 31). What we have today is probably a copy by someone else on Pallas' 1722 collection of the Mator language material (p. 40). E. Helimski has published the manuscript of the recordings by Mueller and Pallas (a copy) both as a photomechanical copy and in the deciphered form (Helimski 1987). The next and the most productive collector of the Mator language material was G. I. Spasskij (p. 52) whose manuscript compiled in 1806 was published (Potapov 1957). When in 1847—1848 M. A. Castrén visited these places he did not find any speakers of the Mator language any more (p. 61).

No one of the three names of the dialects — Mator, Taigi, Karagass — have been offered an adequate explanation, admits E. Helimski (pp. 63—65).

The Introduction is followed by an extensive chapter on grammar (pp. 68—195). E. Helimski begins it by presenting the Proto-Samoyed system of phonemes (p. 68),

passes on to the sound system of Mator (p. 70) and then brings out substantial changes from the former to the latter: PS \**p* — Mat *b*, PS \**c* — Mat *t*, PS \**j* and ?\**l'* — Mat *č*, PS \**ǰ* — Mat *i* (p. 71). A more detailed contrasting of the two systems follows. I would only mention that I cannot agree with including the laryngeal stop consonant (ʔ) into the consonant system of Mator (p. 70) since there is no evidence about it in the Mator language material. This seems to be a clear voluntaristic case of "back-reconstruction".

The following presentation of the morphology in Mator is of special interest to me as a researcher of the history of morphology. It is full of E. Helimski's smart observations, ingenious interpretations and well-founded language-historical views. The treatment of the verb, however, raises various problems.

In addition to the possible Mator Vx2PSg ending *-ŋ* (p. 166) E. Helimski supposes that there are two cases of occurrence also for the possessive suffix *-ŋ* of the same person. "Möglicherweise wurde [---] genuine Endung durch eine türkische Entlehnung verdrängt: mat. *-ŋ* < türk. (u.a. chak[assisch]) *-ŋ* PxSg2. Zumindest aber das erste Beispiel ist als eine ganzheitliche Lehnform zu qualifizieren: [---] *aba* 'Vater' (< türk.): *abāng* 'pater', vgl. chak. *abay* 'dein Vater'; [---] *imāng* 'mater'" (p. 142). The supposition seems very reliable.

Beginning to observe the present tense in the indicative, E. Helimski writes, "Es ist zu bemerken, daß den *ŋ*-Präsensformen alle diejenigen Formen zugerechnet wurden, die in den Materialien meistens mit *-ŋ/-ŋ-* oder *-g/-g-*, viel seltener mit *-ŋg/-ŋg-* oder *-m/-m-* geschrieben sind (vgl. Künnap 1978 : 132, 141)." (p. 152). And so he further does observe them (pp. 153—157, 159—160). Such a treatment by E. Helimski proceeds obviously from two suppositions: 1) "Die grundlegenden Lautverhältnisse zwischen dem Ursamojedischen und Matorischen sind meistens trivial [---] In dieser Hinsicht kann das Matorische als eine der archaischen samojedischen Sprachen gelten" (p. 71). 2) In such an archaic language there cannot be other markers of the present tense but the one which can be reconstructed into Proto-Samoyed, i.e. \**-ŋ(a/e)-*, with the only exception of the *j*-marker of the present



tense which E. Helimski treats of as an innovation in Mator (see about the two markers of the supposed Proto-Samoyed p. 153). In my opinion this treatment which proceeds from the pattern of a proto-language is quite ungrounded. Apart from E. Helimski, another researcher of Mator suffixes Piret Klesment appears more cautious when observing the suffixes of the Mator finite verb forms, treating the *n-*, *g-*, *y-* and *m-* suffixes separately from one another (Klesment 1995). I believe that such a caution — or, rather, the start from the Mator language evidence (as much as it is possible at all due to the inconsistency and unreliability of recorded texts) — is appropriate. Namely, it should be borne in mind that other Samoyed languages do not confine themselves in denoting the present tense (and/or aorist) with the suffix *y*, whatever the origin of those other suffixes from the point of view of "Proto-Samoyed" is. We probably do not question Kai Donner's accuracy in recording the Kamass language but this often reveals the *m*-marker of the present tense, e.g. *tenē-ma-m* ('ich denke') (see also Künnap 1994 : 96). Or who else but E. Helimski should know better than Nganassan uses *\*(n)t*-marker in the present tense (see, first of all, Хелимский 1994 : 216).

E. Helimski writes about the sibilant preterite marker, "Die lateinischen, deutschen und russischen Eingangswortlisten der mat. Sprachdenkmäler enthalten keine präteritalen Verbalformen (mit nur einer ausnahme). Trotzdem findet man manchmal unter den mat. Verben die Formen mit einem Suffix *-s-* (*-s-*) vor der Personalflexion. Es ist berechtigt zu vermuten, daß dieses Suffix dem PS *\*-s-* des Präteritums etymologisch wie auch semantisch entspricht." (p. 162). This exception is *кайтзе* 'заехал' ('drove in') (p. 163). A good example about the occurrence of the supposed preterite suffix before the personal marker (thus like in Nganassan and Selkup, not after it like in Nenets and Enets) is the word *кугадызымь* 'дышу' ('I breathe') (p. 163). According to E. Helimski in Mator one finds also a sibilant interrogative marker *-s-* in two cases, for instance *amgandutschaaras machenider* 'что ты плачешь' ('what are you crying about?') (p. 164). The situation appears considerably more complicated here and I have referred to it earlier already (Künnap 1994 :

96—97). At any rate, it is true that we can find in Mator a sibilant element which fulfills the function of the interrogative suffix in Nenets and Enets.

An interesting detail is revealed in the book under observation, viz. E. Helimski considers a sibilant as a proceeding point for the sibilant suffix of the infinitive in Samoyed languages (p. 168), not the form *\*-kš* like some other linguists have done (see, first of all, Mikola 1988). (In oral communication he has added that the Selkup infinitive suffix is of quite a different origin.) Here one can only agree with him (see also Künnap 1980). The infinitive marker in Mator occurs in the forms *-su*, *-zu*, *-sü*, *-zü*, *-si*, *-zi*, when merging into the following verb, there may also be *-s-*, *-z-* (pp. 168—169).

I cannot help pointing out here that the back-reconstruction of the Samoyed sibilant infinitive suffixes to the *\*k*-suffix only for the reason that the Selkup infinitive marker is of the *\*k*-type seems a typical instance about creating unreal consequences in modern languages, based on the pattern of a proto-language. Supposing that the modern Samoyed languages come from one and the same origin — Proto-Samoyed — we are also to suppose that all or at least the major part of the structure and vocabulary of these languages, including the infinitive suffix, go back to Proto-Samoyed. The end justifies the means and all the means are good. This is the way how the supposition about the origin of the *\*k*-type infinitive suffix comes into being. It is obvious, though, that it is impossible to go down to a single unified primary form, i.e. it remains unclear why the *\*k*-type suffix in Selkup was back-vocalic but front-vocalic in the other Samoyed languages. With a good grace, this can also be explained in a way, for instance, the other Samoyed languages could have added a *\*j*-type suffixal component (or something like that) to the primarily used back-vocalic *\*k*-type infinitive suffix. As far as I am concerned, there is an etymological and semantic connection between the Samoyed sibilant infinitive suffix and other sibilant deverbal nominal suffixes (see Künnap 1980), although in this case the Selkup *\*k*-type infinitive suffix will remain quite separate and aside. I trust that it can and may stay aside, although I, too, fail to see (yet) where it exactly comes from. To begin with, we should at least admit the



language evidence — it may be. Naturally, I never question the professional competence of the reconstructors of the Proto-Samoyed \**k*-type infinitive suffix — phonetically, the reconstruction is faultless. Another question is if it is really necessary or even inevitable.

E. Helimski writes, "Eine spezifische Verbalendung *-sin* (*-šin*, *-zin*, nach *-r*-Stämmen auch *-čim*), die wahrscheinlich die grammatischen Bedeutungen von Präsens (?) und Sg1 synkretisch ausdrückt, kommt nur in der karagassischen Mundart vor. [---] Komposition und Ursprung der Endung *-sin* [---] sind unklar. Das Element *-š-* (*-z-*) ist hier kaum ein Präteritumzeichen [---]" (pp. 165—166). I have attempted to analyse this Mator suffix in one of my papers (Künnap 1994 : 103—109). Since this suffix occurs in the 1PSg forms where only in two cases it has been used with the expected ending *-m* (as referred to also by E. Helimski, see p. 166), in my article mentioned above I consider it possible that it is the ending *-n* of the 2PSg altogether (Künnap 1994 : 109). Actually, it is not directly obligatory to suppose that the Nganasan 2PSg ending *-ŋ* is original, it could really have developed from the primary form \**-n*. The supposed by E. Helimski 2PSg ending *ŋ(g)* in the pair of words *iingchónda* '(?) du schläfst nicht' ('(?) you don't sleep') precedes *h*, allowing to suppose the assimilation \**nh* > *ŋh*. On the other hand, in the absolute word-final position the original *-n* may have been preserved. I would not exclude (on the same page of my article) the possibility that in the case of the Mator *-sin* it could even turn out to be the Turkic 2PSg suffix *-sVn*, *-sVŋ*: the *n*-ending variety is, for instance, well known in Tuva (from among Turkic languages) which is a neighbouring language of Mator. These all are, certainly, just possibilities since there is no evidence or material of proof there.

In the extensive treatment of derivation it attracts attention that in the case of compound verbs the Mator language uses auxiliaries before the main verb in the infinitive or in the main form (p. 188), so, in the latter, without any "connecting" suffix. E. Helimski regards it the usage in Turkic as an example. But it is just the peculiarity of the infinitive in Mator whereas Turkic languages as well as Kamass use the gerund in such a position. Actually, in Mator, too, it is the gerund here

(E. Helimski speaks about the Mator infinitive as about the infinitive-gerund, see p. 168). In this aspect Mator stands closer to Selkup than to Kamass, the *l*-gerund in Kamass is strictly independent. (Quite a different fact is that the respective *l*-forms both in Selkup and Kamass can probably be connected with at least Turkic languages from all other Siberian non-Uralic languages, see Klesment 1997.)

The main body of the book contains a commented word list (pp. 196—385) with 1134 key-words to which 20 toponymies are added. The word list is convenient to handle thanks to the registers of meanings presented in German-Latin and Russian, also thanks to the index of the words (partly also suffixes) of Proto-Samoyed, Enets, Kamass, Nenets, Nganassan, Selkup, Proto-Uralic and Proto-Finnic-Ugric, Finno-Ugric, Turkic, Mongol, Tungus, Yenissey, Russian and other languages. As I do not feel very much at home in word etymology, I would not begin commenting the commentaries on the word list. It is obvious, though, that the word list contains numerous loan-words from other languages, particularly from Turkic languages that is only to be expected. Returning to the problem of the Mator laryngeal stop, in the word list we can often come across back-reconstructed words as phonologized entry words containing the laryngeal stop, for which the actual recordings of the Mator language give no reason, e.g. *oʔb* ~ *oʔm* 'eins, ein' ('once, one') (p. 326). True enough, in Kamass the same numeral occurs in the form *oʔb* ~ *oʔm* but so what?

In conclusion I have no words to express my appreciation and gratitude to Eugen Helimski who together with Beáta Nagy has published this reviewed book about a Uralic language extinct long since. Eugen Helimski has collected, systematized, analysed and commented practically on all the material that was available. One may argue about historical comments but it should not be forgotten that without this book we just would not have had so much material and analysis on Mator that could have been used in historical Uralistics, including the discussions on the historical problems of the Mator language. I thank you greatly, dear friends, for your time and labour consuming but so very necessary and successful work.

## REFERENCES

- Helimski, E. 1987. Two Mator-Taigi-Karagas Vocabularies from the 18. Century. — JSFOu 83.
- Klement, P. 1995. Monosuffixal Finite Verb Forms in Mator. — *Minor Uralic Languages: Grammar and Lexis*, Tartu—Groningen, 94—100.
- 1997. On the *l*-Type Gerunds in South-Samoyed and Altaic Languages. — *Western and Eastern Contact Areas of Uralic Languages*, Tartu, 53—58.
- Künnap, A. 1978. System und Ursprung der kamassischen Flexionsuffixe II. Verbalflexion und Verbalnomina, Helsinki (MSFOu 164).
- 1980. Über die Herkunft der Infinitivsuffixe im Samojedischen. — *СФУ XVI*, 286—293.
- 1994. Two Suffixes of Finite Verb Forms in Samoyed: *y* and *š*. — *Minor Uralic Languages: Structure and Development*, Tartu, 88—112.
- 1998. Breakthrough in Present-Day Uralistics, Tartu.
- Mikola, T. 1988. Geschichte der samojedischen Sprachen. — *The Uralic Languages. Description, History and Foreign Influences*, Leiden—New York—København—Köln, 219—263.
- Potapov, L. P. 1957. Zum Problem der Herkunft und Ethnogenese der Koibalen und Motoren. — JSFOu 59, 1—104.
- Villems, R., Adojaan, M., Kivisild, T., Metspalu, E., Parik, J., Pielberg, G., Rootsi, S., Tambets, K., Tolk, H.-V. 1998. Reconstruction of Maternal Lineages of Finno-Ugric Speaking People and Some Remarks on Their Paternal Lineages Inheritance. — *The Roots of Peoples and Languages of Northern Eurasia I*. Turku 30. 5.—1. 6. 1997. Turku (*Historica Fenno-Ugrica*), 180—200.
- Wiiik, K. 1996. Põhja-Euroopa rahvaste ja keelte päritolu küsimusi. — *KK*, 581—589.
- 1997. How Far to the South in Eastern Europe Did the Fenno-Ugrians Live? — *Fennoscandia Archaeologica XIV*, Helsinki, 23—30.
- Кюннап, А. 1993. Камасинский язык. — *Языки мира. Уральские языки*. Москва, 380—388.
- Хелимский Е. А. 1993. Моторско-тайгийско-карагасский язык. — *Языки мира. Уральские языки*, Москва, 372—379.
- 1994. Очерк морфонологии и словоизменительной морфологии нганасанского языка. — *Таймырский этнолингвистический сборник. Выпуск первый. Материалы по нганасанскому шаманству и языку*. Москва, 190—221.

AGO KÜNNAP (Tartu)

**Р. Н. Игнаева, Классификация имен числительных в марийском языке (Проблема статуса и функции). Диссертация на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук, Йошкар-Ола 1997.**

4 апреля 1997 года на заседании Диссертационного совета Д 64401 по присуждению ученой степени доктора наук в Марийском государственном университете состоялась защита кандидатской диссертации Р. Н. Игнаевой «Классификация имен числительных в марийском языке (Проблема статуса и функции)» (Научный руководитель — доктор филологических наук профессор И. С. Галкин). Официальными оппонентами выступили доктор филологических наук И. В. Тараканов и кандидат филологических наук З. К. Иванова. Выбор темы прежде всего обусловлен слабой

разработанностью категории имени числительного в марийском языкознании, с одной стороны, а с другой тем, что как наиболее абстрагированный и поэтому исторически мало изменяющийся класс слов, числительное представляет собой ценный материал при сравнительно-историческом изучении родственных языков. Актуальность работы определяется и возрастающим интересом к воспроизведению системной картины жизни предков марийцев на начальном этапе зарождения их познавательной деятельности, направленной на логико-грамматическое толкование языковых фактов.