

# The Enets Text of the Lord's Prayer from Witsen's Book

EUGENE HELIMSKI  
Moscow-Budapest

0. „Nicolaes Witsen wurde im Jahre 1641 geboren und starb im Jahre 1717. 1664–1667 weilte er mit einer niederländischen Gesandschaft in Moskau und sammelte Angaben über die Völker in Nord- und Mittelasien, sowie in Nordosteuropa. Er interessierte sich auch für die Sprachen dieser Völker. Sein Buch enthält mehrere Wörterverzeichnisse und das 'Vaterunser' in mehreren Sprachen.“ (From Tibor Mikola's „Einleitung“ in WITSEN–MIKOLA 1975.)

1. Published and reprinted at least seven times (WITSEN 1692, 1705, 1785: 890–891; DONNER 1932: 5–6; WITSEN–MIKOLA 1975: 81–82 + Photomechanischer Nachdruck; NÉMETH 1991: 95), the translation of the Lord's Prayer into the *Turuchansche Samojeden Spraek* did not undergo any detailed linguistic treatment. The words and forms from this text has been excerpted for an Enets vocabulary (KATZSCHMANN–PUSZTAY 1978) and partly discussed in a review of this book (HELIMSKI 1982); a short passage has been devoted to it in a survey of Enets linguistic materials (HELIMSKI 1985: 306). The text certainly deserves more attention – at least as the first attestation of the Enets language, but also due to its unexpectedly high quality and to the presence of certain archaic features that later have been lost in both Tundra (*Somatu*) and Forest (*Bae, Pee-Bae*) Enets. The author of the present paper attempted to interpret and analyze the Enets Lord' Prayer from Witsen in the course of the field work among the Tundra Enets in late 1970s, with the assistance of two native speakers of the language – Aleksandr (*S'un'iku*) Tuglakov (born 1936) and Xol'u Kaplin (1910–1980). In some cases, however, the treatment of problematic fragments became possible only after the computer-aided systematization of all Enets field materials has been accomplished, partly also after taking the historical and comparative aspects into consideration.

2. The Enets Lord's Prayer has been published by N. Witsen in Romanized transcription (with some features of the 17th cent. Dutch orthography). This must be a transliteration of the original rendering with Cyrillic letters, which is tentatively – and certainly only very approximately – reconstructed in the second column. This original version could not be completely exact: for example, it lacked the symbol for the glottal stop, a very frequent Enets phoneme; the distinction between word-initial segments *je-* and *e-* was probably lost, because before the 18th century the Cyrillic *e* was normally used in place of both Modern Russian *e* and *ə*. The transliteration brought further complications forth: the Cyrillic *x* was alternatively (and apparently without any system) rendered with *ch* or *cs*, probably also the Cyrillic *ю* with *iu* or *ui*, and the Cyrillic *y* – with *u* or *oe*.

Modi Jeseje,  
teio  
nacho naare.  
Todi Nilo  
toreke chuzuiro.  
Todi nacsiaro toretusu.  
Todi aguaaro toretusu,  
Tone na chonaar,

моди есее,  
теио  
нахо нааре.  
тоди нило  
тореке хүцюро.  
тоди нахиаро торетусу.  
тоди агуааро торетусу,  
тоне на хонаарь,

i Jachona.	и яхона.
Modi Puiresiudava Kirva	моди пуиресюдава кирва
Toratsui	торацю
mena erecsone.	мена ерехоне.
I Kai	и кай
nena nojna oteine,	нена ноинна отеине,
tone imodinana kalodie	тоне и модинана калодие
neine oteoponede.	нейне отеопонеде.
Iro sirene	иро сирене
ta ora basiedo,	та ора басиедо,
i role sirene	и роле сирене
kodago choro.	кодаго хоро.
Tone Todi Tonea	тоне тоди тонеа
Nasciaro,	нахиаро,
i Nichoro,	и никоро,
i su Voeraaro,	и су вурааро,
i Reine,	и реине,
Bodera.	бодера.

The left column below contains the suggested reconstruction of the old Enets text in phonemic transcription, and the right one – its literal (partly at the expence of grammatical and stylistic adequacy) translation. However, this literal translation remains so close to the canonical text that any comments to its content are hardly necessary.

(1) <i>mod'i</i> (2) <i>esee?</i>	Our father
(3) <i>te?io</i> (4) <i>ŋaaχona</i> (5) <i>aRe</i>	in the upper heaven being.
(6) <i>tod'i</i> , (7) <i>n'ilo</i>	Thy name
(8) <i>tore?</i> (9) <i>keχut'uRo</i>	so (is) for worshipping.
(6) <i>tod'i</i> (10) <i>ŋaaχi?aro</i> (8) <i>tore?</i>	Thy reign so should come.
(11) <i>tōsu</i>	
(6) <i>tod'i</i> (12) <i>agu?aro</i> (8) <i>tore?</i>	Thy grandeur so should come
(11) <i>tōsu</i>	
(13) <i>tone</i> (4) <i>ŋaaχona</i> (5) <i>aRe</i>	as in heaven being
(14) <i>i</i> (15) <i>jaaxona</i>	also on the earth.
(1) <i>mod'i</i> (16) <i>puoo</i>	For our further living bread
(17) ( <i>j</i> ) <i>iret'uRowa?</i> (18) <i>kirwa</i>	you should give us today.
(19) <i>toRat'u</i> (20) <i>nena?</i> (21) <i>jereχone</i>	And leave
(14) <i>i</i> (22) <i>kae?</i>	to us our debts,
(19) <i>nena?</i> (23) <i>nooina?</i> (24) <i>oteine?</i>	as also we ...
(13) <i>tone</i> (14) <i>i</i> (1) <i>mod'ina?</i> (25) ...	our debtors.
(26) <i>neine?</i> (24) <i>oteo</i> (27) <i>ponede?</i>	Do not us
(28) <i>iRo</i> (29) <i>s'iRene?</i>	bring into an evil deed,
(30) <i>taora?</i> (31) <i>baa</i> (32) <i>s'iedo?</i>	and shelter us
(14) <i>i</i> (33) <i>roola?</i> (29) <i>s'iRene?</i>	from the Arch(-enemy).
(34) <i>kodagoχoRo</i>	
(13) <i>tone</i> (6) <i>tod'i</i> (35) <i>tonea</i>	As yours is

(10) <i>ŋaaxi?aro</i>	your reign,
(14) <i>i</i> (36) <i>niχoro</i>	and your power,
(14) <i>i</i> (37) <i>suwuRaaro</i>	and your perfection / weal,
(38) ( <i>j</i> ) <i>irei?ine</i>	along the lives.
(39) <i>bodeRa</i>	That's all.

3. Below the numbered word of the Enets text are listed, being supplicated, whenever possible, with parallels from Modern Tundra (T) and Forest (F) Enets based on the author's field records, with references to KATZSCHEIMANN-PUSZTAY 1978 (KP + number of the word entry in this vocabulary), occasionally also with parallels from other Enets linguistic sources and with comments. It is important to mention that for F we indicate the basic (morpho)phonemic forms, which sometimes differ considerably from those which occur in the usual pronunciation (but appear in the „accurate orthoepic style”, mainly among the elderly speakers of Forest Enets). The discussion of certain points of special interest will carried over to the next section of this paper.

- (1) *mod'i* 'I, my', *mod'ina?* 'we, our (Pl.): same in T F; KP 745. Concerning the use of *mod'i* in the plural meaning see 4.1.
- (2) *esee?* : cf. T F *ese* 'father', 1Pl. *esea?* ~ *eseba?*; KP 404. Concerning the preservation of vowel harmony see 4.2.
- (3) *te?io* : T *te?io* 'upper, which is above'; KP 1467. Derived from the adverbial stem *te?i-*, which, according to M. A. Castrén, occurred also in the Baicha dialect (F): B *te?ido*, Ch. *te?iro* 'von oben', etc.
- (4) *ŋaaxona* : T F *ŋaa* 'God, heaven', Loc. *ŋaaxane*; KP 934. See 4.2, 4.3.1.
- (5) *aRe* : T *aðe*, but F *eðe* Part. Praes. of 'to be' (cf. KP 36, 367, 935 with other forms of this verb). See 4.3.5, 4.4.6.
- (6) *tod'i* : T *tod'i* 'thou, thy', but F *uu*; KP 1498 (and 1606). See 4.4.2.
- (7) *n'ilø* : T F *n'i?* 'name', 2Sg. *n'ilø*; KP 900.
- (8) *tore* (or *tore?*) : F *tore* ~ *tore?* 'tak, so'; KP 1487. Cf. T *teino* ~ *teino?*, but M. A. Castréen indicates also Ch. *tote* 'so', *toté* (= *totee*) 'so beschaffen'.
- (9) *kexut'uRo* : T *kaxa*, F *kixø* 'deity, idol'; KP 502. The potential regular verbal derivative of this noun is T \**kaxus-*, F \**kixus-* 'to treat/to be treated as a deity, as an idol – to worship/to be worshipped', Part. Debit. T \**kaxut'uðo*, F *kixut'uðo*. It is likely that the corresponding verbal form existed in Old Enets or was easily – and really ingeniously coined to render *да святымся* 'hallowed be' from the Russian Lord's Prayer. However, the ambiguous spelling (-ke chuzulro) leaves places also to other conjectures. See 4.3.5 and 4.4.6.
- (10) *ŋaaxi?aro* : T *ŋaaxi* 'tsar, king' (literally 'the celestial one', derived from (4) *ŋaa*). Again, as in (9), we can reconstruct the derivational chain: *ŋaaxi* > VDN *ŋaaxis-* 'to treat/to be treated as a king – to reign' > Nom. Act. *ŋaaxi?a* 'reign, kingdom' > 2Sg. *ŋaaxi?aro* (this form is quite comprehensible to the Tundra Enets speakers, though it does not occur in everyday speech).
- (11) *tøsu* : T F *tø-* (in certain paradigmatic forms: *to-*, *tu-*) 'to come', Debit. 3Sg. subj. T *tor'u*, F (?) *tusu* (A. Tuglakov, a speaker of T, identified *tusu* as the F correspondance of T *tor'u*; there was no opportunity to check this information with native speakers of F); KP 1488.

(12) *agu?aro* : T F *aga* 'big'; KP 10. In this case, similar to (9) and especially to (10), the derivational chain is actually attested as T *agu?*- 'to consider big, great, to exalt' > Nom. Act. *agu?a* 'exaltation, glorifying, greatness, grandeur' > 2Sg. *agu?aro*.

(13) *tone* 'as well, as'. This word occurs in the text three times, its spelling and meaning being always the same. Otherwise it does not appear in Enets materials, though can be possibly identified either with *tone*, *tonne* 'there, then' in Forest Enets sources (KP 1487) or with T *tone* *путь*, let it be that'.

(14) *i* : T F *i* 'and, also'; KP 253 (< Russ.).

(15) *jaaxona* : T F *d'aa* 'earth, land', Loc. *d'aaxane*. Concerning the distinctions between the Old and Modern Enets forms see 4.2, 4.3.1, 4.3.2.

(16) *puoo* : T *puoo* 'which is behind; further (of time)'; derived from adverbial stem T F *puo-* (KP 1136, 1156, 1176). It is worth mentioning that in the traditional Northern Samoyedic worldview the future is what lies behind (not before!) the present day.

(17) (*j*)*irer'uRowa?* : *Tire-*, F *d'ire-* 'to live.' Part. Debit. *Tire'uδo*, F *d'ire'uδo*, 1Pl. -(*b*)*a?*; KP 292, cf. also *d'iriču* 'élet' (MIKOLA 1980: 229). See 4.3.3, 4.3.5, 4.4.7.  
Still, the suggested interpretation of *puiresiudava* as (16) + (17) is only tentative. There may be other comprehensible versions e. g. identifying it with (a) T *puo?* *irer'uδoba?* 'for our living further/into the future'; (b) T *pirer'uδoba?* 'for our cooking'; (c) T *puor'uδoba?* 'for our being well-fed, satiated' (or a certain other derivative of the stem *puos-* 'to be satiated'). Our interpretation of -da- in *puiresiudava* as -*Ro-* can also raises doubts, cf. the spelling of the same element in (9) *keχur'uRo*.

(18) *kirwa* : T *kiroba* ~ *kiriba*, F *kirba* ~ *kiroba* 'bread'; KP 507. See 4.3.3.

(19) *toRat'u* : T *teδa-*, F *toδa-* 'to bring, to give (here)', Debit. 3Sg. subj. T *teδat'u*, F *toδat'u*; KP 1502. See 4.3.5 and 4.4.6.

(20) *nena?* (the first letter in *mena* is obviously a misprint): T (rarely used) F *nena?* 'to us'; KP 883. More common is T *noona?* id. (KP 926). See 4.2.

(21) *jerexone* 'today': T F *d'ere* 'day', Loc. *d'erekxone*; KP 236. See 4.2, 4.3.2. Both Modern Enets dialects express the meaning 'today' by the word combination *eke d'ere* or *eke d'erekxone*, but in the 18th cent. the simple Loc. form was common in both Enets dialects: Tur. *Jerè chonè*, Mang. *dérehan* 'hodie' (G. F. Mueller, Mscr.).

(22) *kae?* : T F *kae-* 'to leave (vt)', Imper. 2Sg. subj. *kae?* (phonetically often [kai?, kaj?]); KP 436.

(23) *nooina?* : T *nooo* 'the one belonging to, the one close to', Pl. + 1Pl. *nooina?*; derived from the adverbial-postpositional stem *noo-* (KP 926), which attested also in the Forest dialect. See 4.2.

(24) *oteo, oteine?* : T *oteo* 'debt', Pl. + 1Pl. *oteina?* 'our debts'; KP 1010 (with wrong etymological attribution, see HELIMSKI 1982: 145). According to M. A. Castrén, the word *oteo* occurred also in the Baicha dialect (F): Concerning the vowel harmony in *oteine?* see 4.2.

(25) The interpretation of *kalodie* (or (-na) *kalodie*, because the previous word in the text reads *imodinana* instead *imodina*) remains an open question. The meaning must be close to 'to forgive, remit (debts)'. It is possible to think of: (a) a certain derivative of the verb *kae-* 'to leave' (cf. (20)); (b) T *kalodi-* 'to interfere, to be a hindrance', Praes. 1Pl. *kalodia?* (this passes very good phonetically, but is semantically out of place); (c) a form

related to F *nekorō-*, Nen. *nekal-* 'to drag, draw' (this option faces both phonetic and semantic problems), etc.

(26) *neine?* : T F *neo* 'the one belonging to, the one close to', Pl. + 1Pl. *neina?*; the word is related to (20) and other forms given in KP 883. See 4.2.

(27) *ponede?* : T F *poner-* 'to practise, to produce, to have, to take care of, to wear (etc.)', Part. Praes. Pl. *ponede?*; KP 1135, 1137–1143. The word combination (or compound) from Witsen's text also occurs in both modern dialects: T F *oteo ponede* 'debtor'.

(28) *iRo* : T F *iðo* 'do not!', Imper. 2Sg. of the negative verb; KP 254. See 4.3.5.

(29) *s'iRene?* : T F *s'iðina?* – *s'iðena?* 'us' (objective personal pronoun); KP 1292. See 4.2, 4.3.5.

(30) *taora?* : T *taara-*, F *toora-* 'to take to, to bring to, to deliver', Conneg. T *taara?*, F *toora?*; KP 1502 (where F *toora-* and *toða-* 'to bring, to give (here)' are erroneously mixed up). See 4.3.1, 4.4.6.

(31) *baa* : T *baa*, F *boa* 'bad'; KP 89, 128. See also HELIMSKI 1982: 140. See 4.4.6.

(32) *s'iedo?* : T F *s'ie?* 'thing, deed', Lat. *s'iedo?*; KP 1272.

(33) *roola?* : T *loola-* 'to shelter', Imper. 2Sg. subj. *loola?*. Neither this verb nor its nominal root (T *loo* 'shelter') seem to be attested in Forest Enets. Concerning *r-* see 4.3.4.

(34) *kodagoχoRo* : T *kodago*, F *kolago* 'winding, meandering; (T also) cunning, agile', El. T *kodagoχoðo*, F *kolagoχoðo*. It is worth attention that the anonymous translator of the Lord's Prayer into Enets managed not only to find an exact equivalent of the notion 'Arch-enemy, Satan' (cf. also T *kodago amuke* 'devil', lit. 'cunning demon'), but also to render the etymological form of Russ. *лукавый* (*избави нас от лукавого* 'deliver us from the evil one – the Arch-enemy'), which is related to Russ. *луга* 'bend, curve (of a river)'. See 4.3.5, 4.4.5.

(35) *tonea* : T F *tone-* 'to exist, to be (present)', Praes. 3Sg. subj. *tonea*; KP 1520.

(36) *nixoro* : T F *nixo* 'force, power', 2Sg. *nixoro*; KP 891.

(37) *suwuRaaro* : cf. T *sueða* – *sðeða*, F *soiða* 'good', T *sueðaa* 'the best', 2Sg. *sueðaaro*. But cf. also T *sou-* 'to be good' with potential derivational chain: > \**souða-* 'to be good (in the future)' > Nom. Act. \**souðaa* 'future weal' > 2Sg. \**souðaaro*. See 4.3.5. However, the ambiguous spelling (*su voeraaro*) leaves place to other interpretations – all perhaps in connection with the stem *sou-* – *soe-* – *sue-* 'good, to be good' (KP 1342, 1358).

(38) (j)*irei?ine* : T *ireo*, F *d'iree* – *d'irei* 'life', Pl. Prol. T *irei?ine*, F *d'iree?ine* – *d'irei?ine*; KP 292. See 4.4.7.

(39) *bodeRa* : T *bode* 'finish', 3Sg. *bodeða* (often used as an interjection: 'that's it! it's over!'; KP 132 (Castrén: *bodde* 'nur, allein'). See 4.3.5, 4.4.5.

#### 4.1. "I" as "we".

In Enets the personal pronouns of 1–2 Du. and Pl. are, from the formal viewpoint, the personal pronouns of 1–2 Sg. supplied with possessive suffixes of 1–2 Du. and Pl.:

T F *mod'i* 'I' – *mod'in'i?* 'we (Du.)' – *mod'ina?* 'we (Pl.)'

T *tod'i* 'thou' – *tod'idi?* 'you (Du.)' – *tod'ida?* 'you (Pl.)'

F *uu* 'thou' – *uud'i?* 'you (Du.)' – *uuda?* 'you (Pl.)'

These forms have probably ousted the original independent forms of non-singular pronouns (cf. Ngan. *mi(i)*, *ti(i)*, *miŋ*, *tiŋ*).

Apparently due to this transparent relationship between pronouns, the non-marked singular pronoun can be used as an attribute with the non-singular meaning, if its master has

the non-singular possessive marker ('my table-our' instead of 'our table-our - my-our table-our'). Besides the two examples in Witsen's text (under (1)), we can indicate numerous similar constructions attested in Modern Tundra Enets:

*mod'i n'inena?* 'на нас, above us'; *mod'i d'udanena?* между нами, among us'; *mod'i nooina?* наши ближние, those close to us' (cf. *mod'i noooi?* 'мой ближний, the one close to me'); *mod'i d'igua tiaba?* 'у нас нет оленей, we have no reindeers / our reindeer is absent'; *mod'i d'aana? neone?* 'по нашей земле, through our land'; *mod'i nebona? kaneda?* 'от нас уйдут they will go from our place'; *mod'i tōōna sueba d'erea?* 'ада наш может быть хороший день будет, perhaps our day will be good'.

Such constructions are no less correct than those without the omission of *-na?*, *-(b)a?*: *mod'ina? d'udanena?* 'among us', *mod'ina? d'igua tiaba?*. Other possible constructions of the same structure, like *mod'i d'udanen'i?* 'among us two', *mod'i d'udanedi?* 'among you two', *mod'i d'udaneda?* 'among you', are qualified by the native speakers as acceptable, but were not found in recorded Enets texts. There seem also to be no examples for the omission of *-na?* etc., when *mod'ina?* etc. are used not as attributes but as sentence subjects.

For Forest Enets cf. the objective forms of personal pronouns in Du. and Pl. (after PROKOF'EV 1937: 86): *mod'i s'iden'i?* = *mod'in'i? s'iden'i?*, *ū sid'ed'i?* = *ūd'i? sid'ed'i?*, *mod'i s'iden'a?* = *mod'ina? s'iden'a?*, *ū s'ideda?* = *ūda? s'ideda?*.

Cf. also the typical emphatic constructions like *mod'iχoriono* / *mod'iχorion'i?* / *mod'iχorion'a?* 'even I / we (Du.) / we (Pl.)' – formally 'I + even + Px1Sg/Du/Pl.'; similar constructions are characteristic also of Nenets (Nj. *man' I*, *man'n'a?* 'we', *mas'm'ān* 'but I', *mas'm'ānna?* 'but we' – LEHTISALO 1956: 247) and Nganasan (where, incidentally, they are based on plural personal pronouns: *mil'iānð* / *mil'iāni* / *mil'iāni?* 'only I / we (Du.) / we (Pl.)' – formally 'we (Pl.) + only + Px1Sg/Du/Pl.', see HELIMSKI 1994: 215).

#### 4.2. Vowel harmony or its traces.

The study of vowel harmony in Nganasan leads to the conclusion about its Proto-Samoyedic origin (HELIMSKI 1993, 1994: 199ff.), so that the well-known unsystematic phenomena of consonantal harmony in Nenets (cf. for example, *nu-na* < \**nu-n̥ta* 'standing' vs. *n'i-n'a* < \**i-n̥ta* Part. Praes. of the negative verb) can be safely regarded as archaic relics rather than innovative developments. A specific peculiarity of the Nganasan, presumably also of the Proto-Samoyedic, vowel harmony must be taken into consideration: it is affecting the vocalism of suffixes (which is determined by the phonetic quality of the last vowel of the stem), while the vowels of the stem itself may be harmonically heterogenous. The modern Enets dialects do not seem to have any systematic traces of the vocal harmony in their morphophonemics. It is therefore of exceptional relevance that we find such traces in Old Enets (OE – below this abbreviation is used for the language of the Lord's Prayer):

- The locative marker (PSam. \**kðna* / \**kðne*) appears twice as *-χona*, with velar stems: (4) *ŋaaxχona*, (15) *jaaxχona*, and once as *-χone*, with a palatal stem: (21) *jereχone*. Both T and F generalized the variant *-χone*.
- The possessive suffixes of 1Pl. (PSam. \*-*mas* / \*-*met*, \*-*nat* / \*-*net*) appear several times as *-e?*, *-ne?* with palatal stems: (2) *esee?*, (24) *oteine?* (here the "harmonically relevant" vowel is that of the second syllable), (29) *s'iRene?*, and once as *-na?* with a velar stem: (23) *nooina?*. The picture is somewhat spoiled with (20) *nena?* and (26) *neine?*: these two words could be expected to be harmonically similar (*nene?*, *neine?* or – in case if the harmony does not automatically reflect the synchronic phonetic properties of vowels, as

it does not in Nganasan – *nena?*, *neina?*); possibly it is just a result of mis-spelling (cf. (33) *roola?* – written as *role*). Both T and F generalized for 1Pl. the velar variants.

However, the preservation of vowel harmony in OE was probably only partial. The suffix of Part. Praes. (PSam. \*-nta / \*-nte / \*-ta / \*-te) appears as -de, -Re with velar stems: (5) *aRe*, (27) *ponede?* (the same generalization in T F -de, -de).

#### 4.3. Other archaic phonetic features of OE.

4.3.1. OE did not go through the assimilative developments *ao* > *aa*, *axo* > *axa*, which are characteristic of both T and F: (30) *taora?*, (4) *ηaaχona*, (15) *jaaxona*.

4.3.2. OE preserves \*-j- as *j-* (cf. T F *d'*–; however, *j-* was still preserved until recent times): (15) *jaaxona*, (21) *jerexone*.

4.3.3. OE has word-medial *-w-* in place of T F *-b-*: (17) (*j)iret'uRowa?*, (18) *kirwa*. However, in the initial position the development \**w* > *b* already took place: (31) *baa*, (39) *bodeRa*.

4.3.4. Like other early Enets sources, OE has word-initial *r-* in place of T F (also Ch. B) *l-*: (33) *roola?*; see HELIMSKI 1981: 128–129, 1985: 305.

4.3.5. Like many other Enets sources (including Ch. after M. A. Castrén), OE has a certain vibrant in place of PSam. \*-t-, T F -δ-. This phonetic (rather than phonological) feature has been discussed in detail earlier (HELIMSKI 1985: 305–306). In the transcriptions above I tried to distinguish this vibrant ("R") from *r*, though normally they are both marked with the same letter: (5) *aRe*, (9) *kexut'uRo*, (19) *toRat'u*, (28) *iRo*, (29) *s'iRene?*, (34) *kodagoχoRo*, (37) *suwuRaaro*, (39) *bodeRa*. It is, however, very probable that *R* and *r* (\*-t- and \*-r- / \*-l-) did never completely coincide in any Enets dialect. At least in one (though problematic) word we have (17) (*j)iret'uRowa?* spelt as *-iresiudava*: this may indicate the possibility of perceiving *R* as a *d*- or *δ*-type sound.

#### 4.4. Dialectologically relevant features of OE.

In an earlier paper I confined myself to the following short remark: „Turuchansche Samojeden Spraek' bei N. Witsen ... -r-Variante des Tundradialekts, vgl. *todi* 'du', *ba* 'schlecht' ... , -ra Px3Sg.” (HELIMSKI 1985: 306). The situation seems, however, to be somewhat more complicated.

4.4.1. In most cases the OE forms coincide with the forms in both T and F (or are equally similar to both): (1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, 14, 15, 17–19, 21, 22, 24, 26–32, 35, 36, 38). We must add here also several instances where the comparable data from F may be lacking simply due to the insufficiency of available linguistic materials (3, 10, 12, 16, 23, 33, 37).

4.4.2. (6) *tod'i* (OE and T) is a common archaism (F *uu* 'you' is borrowing from the Ket language).

4.4.3. (8) *tore(?)* and (20) *nena?* seem to be lexical items only recently lost or half-forgotten in T.

4.4.4. (11) *tôsu* may be a specific verbal form (or an archaism) common to OE and B – if only our information concerning this form is adequate.

4.4.5. In the reflexion of \**l*t, \**r*t OE coincides with T and differs from F: (34) *kodagoχoRo*, stem *koda* < \**kðrta* (cf. Nen. *χära* 'curve, bend', En. F *kora* id., *kolago* 'winding, meandering'). Cf. also (39) *bodeRa*, stem *bode* 'finish' < \**wðlt-* (cf. Nen. *wäla* id., Ngan. *bðltu* id.).

4.4.6. There are very important, and presumably quite old, distinctions between T and F in the reflexes of certain Proto-(Northern-)Samoiedic vowels (especially of the diphthongs corresponding to *æe* in Nenets). There are 5 instances of this type in the text under

examination, and in three cases the reflexes in OE are close to those in T: (5) *aRe*, (30) *taora?*, (31) *baa*: in one case OE and F are opposed to T: (19) *toRat'u*; and in one case OE seems to differ from both T and F: (9) *keχut'uRo*.

4.4.7. The spelling does not give us an opportunity to find out whether the word-initial \*i- has developed before a non-nasal consonant into \*ji- (as in F, which now has *d'i-*) or remained intact (as in T), see HELIMSKI 1985: 304. Therefore above the ambivalent transcriptions have been used in such instances: (17) (*j*)*iret'uRowa?*, (38) (*j*)*rei?ine*.

#### Literature

DONNER 1932: *Samojedische Wörterverzeichnisse*, gesammelt und neu herausgegeben von KAI DONNER. Helsinki (MSFOu 64).

HELIMSKI 1981: Хелимский, Евгений. Этимологические заметки по энецкой ономастике. – СФУ 17: 119–130.

HELIMSKI 1982: Хелимский, Евгений. Rev. of Katzschmann–Pusztay 1978. – СФУ 18/2: 135–147.

HELIMSKI 1985: HELIMSKI, EUGEN. *Die Feststellung der dialektalen Zugehörigkeit der enzischen Materialien*. – *Dialectologia Uralica. Materialien der ersten Internationalen Symposions zur Dialektologie der uralischen Sprachen*, herausgegeben von W. VEECKER. Wiesbaden (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo–Altaica 20). 303–308.

HELIMSKI 1993: Хелимский, Евгений. *Прасамодийские \*Э и \*Ӧ: прауральские источники и нганасанские рефлексы*. – In: Hajdú Péter 70 éves. Budapest.

HELIMSKI 1994: Хелимский, Евгений. *Очерк морфонологии и словоизменительной морфологии нганасанского языка*. – Таймырский этнолингвистический сборник. Вып. 1: Материалы по нганасанскому шаманству и языку. Москва, 190–221.

KATZSCHMANN–PUSZTAY 1978: KATZSCHMANN, MICHAEL; PUSZTAY, JÁNOS. *Jeniszej–Samojedisches (Enzisches) Wörterverzeichnis*. Hamburg (Fenno–Ugrica 5).

LEHTISALO 1956: LEHTISALO, TOIVO. *Juraksamojedisches Wörterbuch*. Helsinki (LSFU 13).

MIKOLA 1980: MIKOLA, TIBOR. *Enyec és nganaszan nyelvi adalékok*. NyK 82: 223–236.

NÉMETH 1991: NÉMETH, ZSIGMOND. *96 gleiche Texte in uralischen Sprachen (Vaterunser)*. Szombathely (Az uralisztikai tanszék kiadványai 3).

PROKOF'EV 1937: ПРОКОФЬЕВ, Г. Н. Энецкий (енисейско-самоедский) диалект. In: Языки и письменность народов Севера, ч. 1. Языки и письменность самоедских и финно-угорских народов. Москва–Ленинград, 75–90.

WITSEN 1692, 1705, 1785: WITSEN, NICOLAES. *Noord en Oost Tartaryen*. Amsterdam.

WITSEN–MIKOLA 1975: N. Witsens Berichte über die uralischen Völker. Aus dem Niederländischen ins Deutsche übersetzt von TIBOR MIKOLA. Szeged (SUA 7).