https://doi.org/10.3176/lu.1979.4.15

Juha Janhunen, Samojedischer Wortschatz. Gemeinsamojedische Etymologien, Helsinki 1977 (Castrenianumin toimitteita 17). 186 pp.

The book to be discussed here will soon no doubt be appreciated as a classical and epoch-making one in the history of Samoyedic studies. This dictionary will become a handbook for all Samoyedologists as it summarizes the work of generations of scholars. The lexicological material used by the author is immense: it comprises all the available dictionaries, vocabularies, word-lists and necessary theoretical publications. The newest achievements of science have found their place in the book. Thus the Yurak dialect discovered recently by Chelimski has been included in the dictionary.

The book comprises only those stems that are represented both in North- (NS) and South-Samoyedic (SS) (at least by one language in each subgroup). The words found in one subgroup only are not included in the dictionary even if they have reliable Uralic etymologies. The words borrowed into Proto-Samoyedic (PS) from Turkic and other languages bear no special marks. The Fenno-Ugric counterparts of Samoyedic stems are never adduced

Every stem is supplied with a reconstruction. In case there are deviations from the normal development of the word they all are specially pointed out. Sometimes even two or more PS forms of the word are given if the forms in daughter languages presumably go back to different variants of the stem in the proto-language.

Dealing with cases where he cannot distinguish between two phonemes (when the corresponding word is lacking in the language that 'distinguishes them) the author uses special signs meaning that the reconstruction is not certain. Thus he writes $t^{1}ar\partial$ - 'ringen', $t^{1}ajwa$ 'Schwanz', where $t^{1} = c$, t (see p. 14), because these words are not represented in South-Selkup, the only dialect group discriminating between c and t.

This book is a logical continuation of the author's work «Adalékok az északiszamojéd hangtörténethez. Vokalizmus: Az első szótagi magánhangzók» (Néprajz és Nyelvtudomány XIX—XX, Szeged 1975— 76, p. 165—188). In that article Janhunen made a successful attempt to reconstruct the NS vocalic system, in this book he has suggested the reconstruction of the whole vocabulary. The question arises, however, whether the author claims this reconstruction to suit PS or only NS because his archetypes in the book generally coincide with the material given in the abovementioned article and the correspondences in SS are too often loose.

Sometimes the author gives two or more reconstructions for the same item, one being suitable for one language, the other for another one (see above). This diversity of reflexes shows that we still ignore many details of the development of phonemes; the reconstruction of PS, although Janhunen has contributed much to it, is as yet far from being over.

There are only four vowels of non-first syllables in the dictionary: $\hat{\sigma}$, \hat{a} , \ddot{a} and $\hat{\sigma}j$ or $\hat{\sigma}j\hat{\sigma}j$ (apart from $\hat{\sigma}$ — unknown vowel). $\hat{\sigma}j$ and $\hat{\sigma}j\hat{\sigma}j$ are used instead of all other vowel which in reality, as I believe, differed. In this respect I should like to refer to Chelimski's work «Реконструкция прасеверносамодийских (ПСС) лабиализованных гласных непервых слогов» (Конференция «Проблемы реконструкции» 23—26 октября 1978 г., Москва 1978, p. 123—126), in which an attempt is made to reconstruct some vowels of non-first syllables.

Janhunen's dictionary is an excellent piece of scientific research. Nevertheless, there are some critical remarks which can be made concerning it.

Sometimes the author introduces superfluous variants into his reconstructions which could have been avoided by more thorough analysis of the matter. E.g. Janhunen suggests a two-fold reconstruction for the words *tap3 (NS) ~ *tap3(SS) 'Baumstamm', *kampa (NS) ~ *kampa (Selk.) 'Welle' and a few others. It would be more correct to explain Selkup deviations as deriving from *tap3, "kampa.

The PS \hat{a} has three main reflexes in Selkup (this may give us grounds for surmising that there were three units in PS and not one): $we \sim e$ that are in complementary distribution with one another, o and u. There exist several other reflexes of minor importance as well, among them å which we shall consider below. The e(we) as a reflex of PS å is in complementary distribution with the Selk. a (o, \bar{a}) < a the first standing in all positions except before labials; the second - before labial consonants. The vowels o and u occur before labials, but never e(we) < PS a. afrom Sam. å occurs only before the labials. The examples for this rule are not numerous, but the rule knows no exceptions. * amt a ~ * amt a 'sich setzen, sitzen', Selk. åmt igo; *jåptå 'dünn', Selk. čāpti, čapti; *kåmpå 'Welle', Selk. gāmpi; *tåp3 'Baumstamm', Selk. tāB'; *kåptð (and its derivatives) 'kastrieren', Selk. gāpti, gopti.

The designation of the unit that is represented in Janhunen's reconstruction as ä is correct only for NS. There are facts that contradict its being a front and in general an ordinary vowel in PS. First, there are no traces of its frontness in other languages except in NS and perhaps Taigi, in Selkup it is almost always & (with its variants o and \bar{a}). Most other languages contain a non-front vowel likewise. Second, in Kamassian it does not palatalize a consonant before itself (but this can be of course disputed by attributing an early transition of it to a in Kamassian, before the palatalization). Third, it is reflected always by a in Kamassian and Koibal, which know numerous exceptions in the history of all vowels but this one. In Selkup this vowel also knows nearly no exceptions in its development. Fourth, in Selkup it is practically always long. Why has this sole phoneme undergone an exceptional development like this while being quite an ordinary vowel in PS?

The answer to the question is that this vowel was marked with a particular

feature. It was long, perhaps the only long vowel in the system. It made up a pair with 3 which was probably a short ă, if not in NS then in PS. From the point of view of typology it is by no means strange that only one pair of vowels (I mean $\hat{\partial} = \check{a}$ and $\ddot{a} = \bar{a}$) is opposed to one another as long and short. The low vowels of the middle row may have such a privilege (a similar system has been recorded in Vietnamese and Abkhazian). I think there is more reason to consider \ddot{a} to be a long \bar{a} (in this case the system was asymmetrical with no ä but with an å, where the place for the missing ä was filled in NS and probably in Taigi by \bar{a}), than to suggest a symmetrical system with an ä of anomalous behaviour.

In the dictionary there are nearly no errors in etymologizing. Still two mistaken etymologies should be pointed out. To my mind Janhunen's attribution of Selk. åtä 'zahmes Renntier' to the stem *teg is wrong. I adhere to my etymology: Selk. åtä is related to Nen. nade 'a calf born later than the others' (B. A. Терентьсв, Несколько самодийских этимологий. — СФУ XII 1976, p. 290-291). The word *teð has been lost by Selkup, but its derivative tettal 'rich' corresponding to Nen. teta (among the Samoyeds wealth is determined by the number of reindeer one has) has been preserved. The Kam. (C) phîri, (D) p'ēri 'Zaubertrommel' should have been put not within the stem *pe 'Schamanieren', but within the following one (derived from it) *penkär 'Zaubertrommel' the combination $*\eta k$ being reduced to *i* as in *senkä 'Auerhahn' > Kam. (D) sele and then assimilated by the preceding front yowel.

Juha Janhunen has enriched Samoyedic studies with a serious and necessary book of great importance.

V. A. TERENT'JEV (Moscow)