

близкородственных пермских языков с целью выявления общих значений, а также отличительных признаков.

Аналізу лексикологических вопросов пермских языков посвящена статья А. С. Боталовой «Лексические этюды (На материале пермских языков)» (с. 102—105), где анализируются некоторые лексические параллели на материале удмуртского, коми-пермяцкого и коми-зырянского языков.

Насущной проблемой удмуртского языкознания является изучение удмуртской фразеологии. Об этом — статья Г. Н. Лесниковой «Заметки о некоторых диалектных фразеологизмах в удмуртском языке» (с. 106—108), в которой автор на отдельных диалектных фразеологизмах показывает богатство и своеобразие удмуртской фразеологии.

Важную тему поднимает в статье «Восстановить и охранять народные названия населенных пунктов Удмуртии»

(с. 109—115) Л. Е. Кириллова. На многочисленных примерах она описывает процесс утраты народных названий населенных пунктов и считает, что наступило время, когда необходимо остановить этот процесс и сохранить живых свидетелей прошлого, содержащих ценную информацию об истории нашего края.

Как бы логическим продолжением ее является статья М. А. Самаровой «Отражение элементов язычества в микропонимии» (с. 116—123). Ее автор показывает, как важно сохранить национальные названия, содержащие исторические и этнографические сведения, а также данные о занятиях, верованиях, обычаях и традициях разных народов.

Собранные в анализируемом сборнике статьи адресованы не только специалистам удмуртского и финно-угорского языкознания, но и всем, кто проявляет интерес к удмуртскому языку.

С. Г. КОНЕВА (Ижевск)

<https://doi.org/10.3176/lu.1994.2.17>

А. И. Кузнецова, О. А. Казакевич, Л. Ю. Иоффе, Е. А. Хелимский, *Очерки по селькупскому языку. Тазовский диалект (Учебное пособие)*, Москва 1993. 196 pp.

We are, in fact, concerned with the second part of one and the same work, whose first instalment was published more than a decade ago already: А. И. Кузнецова, Е. А. Хелимский, Е. В. Грушкина, *Очерки по селькупскому языку. Тазовский диалект I*, Издательство Московского университета, 1980 (411 pp.). The first part mentioned is a grammar of the Taz dialect of the Selkup language and a very valuable supplementation as for the investigation of Selkup as well as of all the other Samoyed languages (see also my review on this part in *СФУ XVII* 1981, p. 73—78). Now the handbook of grammar has at long last come by a textual selection and a glossary.

As explained in the Introduction the book contains first published fairy tales of the Selkups inhabiting the basin of the ri-

ver Taz, and a Selkup-Russian glossary which makes it possible to read these fairy tales even without following the translation added to them. The fairy tales were collected during the expeditions to the Selkups in the years of 1970—73 and 1977. The first treatment of the fairy tales was carried out by Joffe, the publishing of them was assisted by Helimski. The fairy tales have been presented in the phonological transcription and provided with an interlinear translation. The glossary was compiled by Kuznetsova, with Kazakevič's help. The glossary is made up of the word stock containing both that of grammar and fairy tales. We also get to know that after this a Russian-Selkup glossary will be published as well as a series of thematical glossaries, including toponymical, inverse and word frequency ones, the editor of which will be Kuznetsova. The

book could be used for training the teachers of Selkup for national schools.

The Preface of the texts of the fairy tales (pp. 6—8) enlightens how verbal Russian translations have been presented. 28 texts of the fairy tales (pp. 8—43) and their Russian translations (pp. 44—88) follow. Both the texts and the sentences in the texts have been marked with figures. The verbal translations, as close as possible to the original, help to better understand the special characteristics of Selkup and to analyze its structure.

However, the verbal translation is not always possible. Such circumstances have been attempted to balance by means of an asterisk system. For example, in Text 1, sentence 12: *Ašša kuntaryk ēja nūn ija qällä\* pūlä\*, pōqyny mōtty imaqota šēra* (p. 8) 'He долго есть божий сын ушедши (= вскоре после ухода божьего сына), с\* улицы\* в\*\* чум\*\* старуха вошла' (p. 44) 'Not long has God's son left (= not long after the God's son's leaving), from\* without\* inside\*\* tent\*\* crone entered'. The asterisk system seems to go better here than the traditional system of hyphens. Applying the latter we would get the following: *Ašša kuntaryk ēja nūn ija qällä-pūlä, pōqyny mōtty imaqota šēra* 'He долго есть божий сын ушедши, с-улицы в-чум старуха вошла'. 'Not long has the God's son left, from-without inside-tent crone entered'. It would not be so bad but the system of hyphens is difficult to apply in such cases where the hyphens are needed for denoting the consistency of the words which are not placed side by side, e.g. 'inside\* this pot\*' in Text 2, sentence 87a: *na cinty* (p. 11) 'в\* этот котел\*' (p. 47) (we would have: 'этот в-котел' — 'this inside-pot').

The main part of the texts belongs to the Middle-Taz vernacular. The texts in the High-Taz vernacular are provided with a respective note and phonetical, morphological and lexical equivalents from the Middle-Taz vernacular. At the end of each text we find the name of the person who put it down, the date and place when and where it was put down and the name of the informant. Joffe and Helimski appear to have put down the majority of the texts.

The Preface to the Selkup-Russian glossary begins with an introduction into the methods of collection and treatment of the lexical material (pp. 89—93). The glossary pro-

duces the Middle-Taz word stock, the words peculiar to the High-Taz vernacular have been observed separately. Phrases were also collected in the course of the work (but they have not been presented in the glossary). Undoubtedly, an objective methodology has been applied to and great pains taken with collecting the words as well as clearing up their exact meanings. A part of the results of this work is reflected in the first instalment of the 1980 publication (see especially pp. 12—117 in it and my review of 1981, p. 75).

J. Erdélyi's "Selkupisches Wörterverzeichnis, Tas-Dialekt" (Budapest 1969, 316 pp.) is a most voluminous glossary of the Taz dialect. In comparison with it the Selkup-Russian glossary under observation specifies the pronunciation and the meaning of several words, and new words are added. In a number of cases the result is to be expected. It is so in the case of *ü* in *kūny* 'быстрина, стремнина' (p. 122) 'rapids' pro *ö* in *kōny* 'быстрина' (Erdélyi 1969, p. 106b) since in the Taz dialect Castrén had already fixed *ü* in *kyngesemel* 'reissend, быстрый' (M. A. Castrén, T. Lehtisalo, *Samojedische Sprachmaterialien*, Helsinki 1960, p. 51).

Further (pp. 93—98), the structure and characteristic features of the glossary are introduced, being followed by the glossary (pp. 99—196). The majority of the words in the glossary are referred to the first instalment of the work, to these pages of the 1980 publication where the respective word can be found. As the authors claim there are 2,716 word articles, containing 4,200 words and word combinations.

It is really a pleasure to admit that the book under review has been published at last. Thus an integral whole along with the earlier grammar of the Taz dialect has been completed. It is an essential contribution to the Uralistics. In addition to extending our thanks to the authors we would like to wish them a further success and express a hope that there would not be any hitherto obstacles for publishing the outlined Selkup thematical dictionaries. Last but not least, I would mention that in Helsinki the work on Kai Donner's Selkup collection of materials has been under way. All these publications outlined will be of great importance for the Uralistic studies.