1. Introduction. Seen to the number of native speakers, Ume Saami is one of the smallest languages of the Saamic family and the smallest of the Saamic languages in Sweden. According to Siegl (2017: 253), there are perhaps some ten remem-berers of Ume Saami today, all of whom are over 70 years old. Despite this grim outset — or maybe because of it — recent years have seen an increase in language revitalization efforts among the Ume Saami. The largest symbolical achievement of these efforts is, arguably, the official recognition of the Ume Saami orthography in 2016, in which the author of the dictionary under review was a driving force.

While there is an Ume Saami–German dictionary, compiled by Wolfgang Schlach-ter (1958), that work hardly fills the need of present-day Ume Saami trying to revi-talize their heritage language. The dictionary under review and Schlachter (1958) parallel each other in terms of quantity, both containing some 5000 Ume Saami lemmas each, but the latter is to a large extent inaccessible to the Ume Saami community. First, Schlachter’s dictionary has been out of print for a long time. Second, the number of Ume Saami literate in German can hardly be estimated as very high. Third, as mentioned above, the official Ume Saami orthography was adopted only in 2016, making the writing conventions of Schlachter’s dictionary dated. Finally, it is my impression that Schlachter’s dictionary is not very well known in the Saami community — this is evidenced by several references to the book under review as the first Ume Saami dictionary in social media. The number of graphemes is largely motivated by the intricate morphophonology of Ume Saami, which includes both consonant gradation and an extensive vowel system. While the graphemes not found in the majority language Swedish are commented upon in the dictionary (pp. 14—15), the phonological values of these graphemes are only briefly mentioned. For instance, the grapheme á is referred to as etymologically long a with no mentioning of either synchronic quality or quantity, or how it relates to the grapheme a. It can be noted that the Ume Saami orthography shares features both with its neighbor South Saami and with more northern Saami orthographies. The grapheme ü, which represents a close central rounded vowel, is not used in other contemporary Saami orthographies.

In the alphabetization of the dictionary, a and á are treated as variants rather than being listed separately. This is in line with Lule Saami lexicography, but in contrast with newer North Saami diction-aries, where a and á are alphabetized separately. As in the South Saami tradi-tion, i and ì are treated as variants. Some-what surprisingly, the graphemes u and ü are treated separately, the latter being placed between y and â in the Ume Saami–Swedish section of the dictionary. This stands in contrast with the presentation of the Ume Saami alphabet (p. 14, cf. above), where ü is placed between u and v. The consonant phonemes written
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with digraphs, \( nj, sj, tj, ts \) (representing \(/ń, š, č, c/\), are all treated under their first letter, as is custom in pedagogical Saami dictionaries.

The layout and presentation of the book is clear and familiar for those acquainted with other recent pedagogical Saami dictionaries published in Sweden (e.g. Israellson 2015 or Svonni 2013). In the Ume Saami–Swedish section, each Saami lemma is followed by morphological information (where relevant, e.g. consonant gradation), word class, Swedish translation(s) and sometimes also one or several example sentences. Where there is dialectal or other variation between different forms of a word, one of these forms is given as the main lemma, to which the other directs. For instance, both smerestit ‘ruminante’ and smeretsit ‘id.’ direct to the main lemma merestit ‘id.’, where the first two forms are also given. An asterisk is used to mark forms from the eastern dialects of Malå and Arvidsjaur. Where syncopated forms are found, these are given as main lemmas (e.g. the non-syncopated form gästatis ‘baptism’ directs to the syncopated lemma gästtis ‘id.’). Verbs are presented in the infinitive and nominals in the nominative singular (with exception of a few pluralia tantum, which are given in the nominative plural, e.g. biässijh ‘Easter’, måvkáh ‘pants’ and guaksagh ‘northern lights’). Adjectives are listed under their predicative form, followed by their attributive form. For grammatical words, inflected forms are sometimes given as lemmas. In some cases, the choice of these inflected forms seems somewhat arbitrary. For instance, the only form of the negative auxiliary verb given is the second person singular imperative ullah ~ allieh ~ ielieh (p. 155).

In Ume Saami, there are two suffixes marking the accusative singular of nouns, -b and -v. The first suffix is traditionally found in the western dialect area and the second suffix in the eastern dialect area (Larsson 2012 : 130—131; Siegl 2017 : 270—272). It is noteworthy that in the example sentences of the dictionary, both suffixes are used. At least in some cases, this variation can be attributed to faithfulness to the source material (see the accusative singular forms  dollub ‘fire’ and båtsuojbiäŋav ‘herding dog’ below).

In the Swedish–Ume Saami section, a Swedish lemma is followed by word class, Ume Saami translation(s) and morphological information for the Ume Saami translation (where relevant). Unlike in the North Saami–Swedish, Swedish–North Saami dictionary of Svonni (2013), morphological information is not given for Swedish words.


3. Material. One major difference between Schlachter (1958) and the book under review is their respective source material. Schlachter’s dictionary is based on fieldwork carried out with one informant in the spring of 1940. The dictionary under review draws its material both from the author’s own fieldwork and from historical sources. The author’s own notes have been collected between the years of 1982 and 2005 in the areas of Vapsten, Umbyn and Ranbyn. Some 1800 words were collected together with a group of five Ume Saami during the years 2001—2004. Older sources include the aforementioned dictionary of Schlachter as well as unpublished word collections gathered by Axel Calleberg and Nils Moosberg during the first half of the 1900s (see Larsson 2012 for a further description of Calleberg’s and Moosberg’s work). Notably, even older sources have also been used, including a wordlist by Jonas A. Nensén noted down in 1825, the dictionary “Lexicon Lapponicum” (Lindahl, Öhrling 1780) and Pehr Fjellström’s translation of the New Testament (Ådde Testament 1755).
Also included in the list of references is Karin Wilson’s (2008) transliteration and linguistic description of Lars Rangius’s translation of the Gospel of St. Mark, completed in 1713. In other words, the source material of the dictionary spans some 300 years. One is left wondering why some newer sources do not seem to have been used, such as the Ume Saami wordlist in Knut Bergsland’s and Gustav Hasselbrink’s South Saami and Ume Saami reader (1957 : 72—74) or the field notes made by Tryggve Sköld in the 1950s and 1960s (see Siegl 2017).

The importance of older sources is clear when comparing the example sentences in the book under review with the dictionary of Lindahl and Öhrling (1780). In several instances, identical examples are found in the two books, although more than 200 years set them apart. For instance, the lemma dabbránit ‘to stick’ is exemplified with the sentence darvvie giädijde jah gárvuojde dabbráne ‘the tar sticks to the hands and clothes’ in Barruk (p. 44) and with the sentence Tarve käitit ja karwoit tabrana ‘id.’ (Lindahl, Öhrling 1780 : 453). The lemma gïlljuot ‘shout, yell, roar’ is exemplified with the sentence berre gyllja guh dållub vuajnná ‘the bear roars when it sees the fire’ in Barruk (p. 64) and with the sentence Bire kiljo ko tållåb wuoidna ‘id.’ (Lindahl, Öhrling 1780 : 145). Some example sentences are found in Schlachter (1958) — compare båtsuojbiäŋuv galggá båddiegiejiënsne ålggjet liärahtit ‘a herding dog should be taught in a leash at first’ (p. 28) and Biátsör-bienjöv galgà båddiegiejiënsu ål’geet liärahtit ‘id.’ (Schlachter 1958 : 179). While I personally would have liked to see the sources of example sentences noted in the dictionary, I understand that the inclusion of such information would have been done at the expense of the clear and accessible layout of a book not mainly targeted at scholars.

In the preface of the book, the author states that most words in the dictionary are gathered from traditional Ume Saami domains, but that it nevertheless contains some new words (p. 5). The representation of traditional domains is hinted in cases such as the Swedish lemmas for ‘reindeer’ and ‘snow’, which are corresponded by some 30 and 25 different Ume Saami terms respectively (with additional terms found under more specific lemmas, such as ‘male reindeer’). Newer words found in the dictionary under review but not in Schlachter (1958) include politikká ‘politics’, plásstja ‘plastic’ and girjjie-vuarkká ‘library’. Words found in a recent phrase list compiled by the Saami Parliament of Sweden (Sámas-parlör 2017) but not in Barruk 2018 include dahtore ‘computer’, tåga ‘train’, skættare ‘snowmobile’, crosa ‘motocross’, nëljejuvlijje ‘all-terrain vehicle’ (cf. Swedish fyrbjuling ‘id.’), másjkadallame ‘physical education’ and unnaveällja ‘younger brother’ (cf. Swedish lillebror ‘id.’). The dictionary contains a few omissions, such as only including names for three days of the week (Monday, Saturday and Sunday) and six months (January, February, March, May, June and December). Further, only two complex numerals are given (sixty and ninety) and only six ordinals (first, second, third, fourth, ninth and tenth). Although frequent in example sentences, the demonstrative dáhta ‘this (proximal)’ is missing as a separate lemma. A nice feature of the dictionary is the inclusion of both place names and personal names (e.g. Geäjrrá ‘Eric’).

4. Summary. Barruk 2018 is a milestone in Saami lexicography, being the first Ume Saami dictionary intended for an Ume Saami audience. Drawing from both historical and contemporary sources, it represents the core vocabulary of Ume Saami, with an emphasis on traditional linguistic domains. The dictionary is of great symbolic importance, serving as a visible token of a critically endangered language. It will without a doubt be much appreciated by the Ume Saami community.
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