

Eberhard Winkler, Udmurt, München 2001 (Languages of the World. Materials 212). 85 pp.

The book is the first relatively developed Udmurt grammar in English. To tell the truth, the courage of the author living so far away from the native-speaking community to create such a work was amazing for me at first. But reading the book — notwithstanding all the inevitable mistakes and problematic interpretations — assured me that his attempt has been successful. Since after the appearance of the standard (but not especially reliable) Udmurt grammar in Russian more than thirty years have passed, the appearance of any new book in this field is a great event. That is why my review on E. Winkler's book happens to be long and critical enough: for a bad book one or two pages full of irony would be enough, but a good and important book needs a thorough criticism to make it still better.

First of all, some comments about the historical and sociological part of the book:

"...in 360 schools is Udmurt teaching language and school subject, mostly in first classes. Those schools are located exclusively in rural areas" (p. 5). According to the annual report of the Ministry of Education of the Udmurt Republic at the end of the 90s, there were 410 schools with Udmurt language, which is the teaching language in the first four classes. After that all other subjects are taught in Russian and the Udmurt language and literature are taught only as subjects. Already at the time of preparing the book, there had for years existed some schools (and kindergartens) with the Udmurt language in the cities of the Udmurt Republic including Iževsk. However, to find precise information is not a simple task even for a person like me living in Iževsk, to say nothing of a foreigner. Not only the Udmurt State University in Iževsk (not the University of Iževsk) (p. 6) but also the Pedagogical Institute in Glazov (Northern Udmurtia) offers a possibility to study the Udmurt language and literature on high-school/

university level. Mention should be made also of the pedagogical colleges in Možga, Debesy, Jar and Uva, which have played and still play a very important role in the growth of national intellectuals.

The Language Law bill, finally passed through the State Council (December 2001), was for a long time not approved in Udmurtia, not or at least not only "due to the strong opposition of the majority of its inhabitants" (p. 6): first of all, such statements, though they may be found in many publications, have no proof, since no attempt had been made to find out the real public opinion about this subject. According to everyday observations, a general understanding of the necessity of establishing the official status of both the Udmurt and the Russian languages, undoubtedly dominates in Udmurtia. The Constitution of the Republic proclaims both languages (Udmurt and Russian) to be official state languages; in 1994 the State Programme on preservation and development of the Udmurt language and the languages of peoples forming compact communities in the Udmurt Republic was adopted.

In no way are the Besermians "udmurtized Tatars" (p. 6): this old formula was based on the traces of former presence of Islam among them. However, the traits of Islam should not obligatorily originate from the Tatars and there are no other evidences (linguistic, ethnological, historical) of Tatar origin of the Besermians. Moreover, though the Besermians live and lived before among the Čeptsa Tatars, they always stayed explicitly aloof of them. On the other hand, some traits in their traditional culture, as well as information from written historical sources (they were still called *Chuvash* in the beginning of the 16th century) point to their old connection with the Chuvash. Taking into account all the facts, the Besermians should be considered either the former Southern Udmurts living once in close contacts with the Muslims of Volga Bulgharia as a social group sub-

ordinated to the latter and thus adopted some prestigious traits of the Islamic Turkic culture, or originally a Turkic-speaking group (a part of Bulghars), which — as the forefathers of the Chuvash and may be of the Christian Tatars — was never fully muslimized and being a group of relatively low social position, looking for saving their non-Islamic identity later mixed with the Southern Udmurts and adopted their language (for more information see bibliographies in Напольских 1997 : 52—53; 1997а; Попова 1998).

E. Winkler writes about eight sub-dialects of the peripheral Southern (not simply "peripheral" as in the book!) dialect area (p. 6). The real number of them may be open for discussion, but, anyway, it is not eight: in V. K. Kel'makov's short course (Кельмаков 1998), seven are mentioned (Šošma (in Tatarstan and Mari El), Kukmor (in Tatarstan), Bavly (in Tatarstan and Bashkiria), Tatyšly and Bui-Tanyp (both mainly in Bashkiria and partly in Perm District), Kanly (in Bashkiria) and Krasnoufimsk (in Sverdlovsk District) with "etc." added after the list (a really strange approach in a book written as introduction into dialectology!). After a more accurate generalization by R. Š. Nasibullin and S. A. Maksimov two small sub-dialects are added: Taškiči (in Bashkiria) and Šagirt-Gondyr (in Perm District) (the map first appeared in Максимов 1999, published in Максимов 2001; Насибуллин 2000, a new, revised version in Максимов 2001) forming thus a list of nine. As it can be seen, the peripheral Southern dialects are spread not only in Tatarstan and Bashkiria (after E. Winkler), but also in Perm and Sverdlovsk (Jekaterinburg) Districts and in Mari El Republic.

The statement "lexicon, morphology and syntax [of the Udmurt dialects] are nearly identical" (p. 6) makes an impression that more important are the phonetic differences, which is not true: the differences in syntax, in some morphological features and especially in lexicon among the Udmurt dialects are very often more important for mutual understanding than the peculiarities in

the pronunciation of affricates and vowels.

According to the traditional scheme E. Winkler dates the end of Udmurt-Chuvash and the beginning of the Udmurt-Tatar language contacts back to the 13th century, the time of Mongol invasion (p. 6). However, though the Mongol invasion (first half of the 13th c.) was an important historical event, there are good grounds to suppose the contacts of ancient Udmurt with Z-Turkic language(s) of Kypchak (and probably Oghuz) type (later — Tatar and Bashkir) began already before the 13th century and the contacts with R-Turkic (Volga Bulghar, later — Chuvash) were still active in the second half of the 14th century (Напольских 1997 : 51).

Historically utterly wrong is the statement: "during this time [9—13 cc.] the Udmurt paid tribute to the Chuvash" (p. 6): the ancient Southern Permians (ancestors of the Udmurts) depended on the Volga Bulghars (whose direct linguistic, but only linguistic!, descendants are the Chuvash), and probably paid tribute to them, but what the book says sounds like, e.g., "in the first century B.C. the Germans paid tribute to the Brazilians".

Now — on to the linguistic part proper, where there are more subjects to be discussed than there are points to be corrected.

"All vowels occur in the first and the non-first syllable, in suffixes *u* is very rare and *g* does not appear at all with the exception of *evgl* 'there is no'" (p. 8). Actually, *evgl* 'there is not; no' and *gjtgd* 'I don't know' contain no suffix being frozen forms of past tense (*ej val* 'was not' and *ej tod(j)* 'I didn't know') and are the only two words, where *g*, which normally does not occur in non-first syllable, appears in the non-first syllable at all.

Writing about "portmanteau-suffixes" with more than one function as *-o* in *mjno* 'I'll go' (FUT/1SG) or *-i* in *mjni* 'I went' (PRET/1SG) (p. 13) E. Winkler does not take into consideration a possibility of analyzing these words as *mjn-o-∅* and *mjn-i-∅* with "zero-morpheme" marking 1SG (E. Winkler recog-

nizes the existence of this kind of morphemes in Udmurt (p. 13)), though this is obviously more correct, both synchronically (cf. the paradigm of future tense: *mjn-o-ø* 'I'll go', *mjn-o-d* 'thou wilt go', *mjn-o-z* 'he/ she'll go' etc. where *-o-* is undoubtedly a marker of future tense; *-i-* has the same function in preterit) and diachronically (the old marker of 1SG in cited forms is supposed to have fallen off in most cases, but appears in forms with question particle *-a*: *mon no mjnom-a?* 'shall I also go?').

The forms of personal pronouns as, e.g., *til'edlj* '(to) you (PL; DAT)' can only historically be analyzed as *til'-e-d-lj* and here *-e-* hardly marks the dative as *-lj* does (cf. p. 14). Synchronically *til'ed-* is here surely not analyzable suppletive stem of *ti* 'you (pl.)' and the same suppletive stems have also other personal pronouns (*mon* 'I' — *mjn-* and *ton* 'thou' — *tjn-* in dative, ablative and genitive, *mi* 'we' — *mil'em-* and *ti* 'you' — *til'ed-* in dative and instrumental). It seems, however, that E. Winkler does also recognize these difficulties while writing: "in some cases [of pronominal declination] a pleonastic PX forms a unit with the CX" (p. 33).

It is not true, that the PX/3SG *-(j)ez* in its nominalizer function can be added to every form of a word to transform it into a noun (p. 13): at least finite verbal forms and the main infinitive (in *-nj*) are not nominalized with *-(j)ez*.

A short comment is needed about "the plural marker *-(j)os* occurs outside the area of the nouns, namely with postpositions and particles as, for example, *kad'* 'like': *vižtem kad'jos ez valale soje* stupid like-PL NV/PRET-3PL verstehen [sic! — V.N.]-NF/PRET DEM-ACC 'Such stupid did not understand it'" (p. 14). First, the correct English translation of this example would be 'those seeming to be stupid did not understand him/her'. Second, using the suffix *-(j)os* with, e.g., *kad'* is not possible without a noun followed by the postposition: *kad'jos* itself means nothing. To understand the real function of *kad'(jos)* in this phrase one should compare it with variant without *kad'*: *vižtemjos ez valale soje* 'the stupid

(PL) did not understand him/her' — *kad'* is put here between *vižtem* 'stupid' and the plural marker *-jos* to form additional meaning of incomplete quality or indefiniteness ('not definitely stupid, but those who are like stupid or seem to be stupid').

Saying that very often the later Russian (international) loan-words as *konferencija* 'conference' etc. are agglutinating suffixes to the stem without *-ja* (IN: *konferencijn*) and exceptions are "personal nouns" like *Estonija* 'Estonia' and *Marija* 'Mary' (p. 14), E. Winkler is not completely right: personal names are often declined with a full stem, but not always. Some cases may be explained as depending on the stress: (examples with dative) *Marija* — *Marijalj* '(to) Mary' but *Jul'ija* — *Jul'ilj* etc. The names of countries oftener obtain the same "shortened" stem as, e.g. (IN) *Estonijn* 'in Estonia', *Udmurtijn* 'in Udmurtia', *Rossijn* 'in Russia' (here the form *Rossijajn* may be used — probably again according to the stress) etc. In language usage the choice of the stem in these cases is not unified and seems to depend on idiolect or free will of the speaker (one may say *konferencijajn*, too) — though the tendency goes in the direction of the shortened stem in general. Only in the old orthographic rules of the year 1936 (§13) an attempt was made to regulate this problem: the borrowed Russian and international stems in *-a/-e* should be declined with shortened stems (*part'ija* '(political) party' — *part'ijn* 'in the party', *brošura* 'brochure' — *brošurijn* etc.), except of the words in *-Ceja*, *-Cja* and *-Cjo* (*šemja* 'family' — *šemjajn* etc.).

Oponymy between *mert'cem* 'splinter' and '(it) went into (PERF); gone into (PART)' (p. 14) is an illusion: the matter is that both the languages which were used to write the book (German) and to publish it (English) have no difference in the meanings of 'splinter as a small sharp fragment of wood, glass etc.' (Russ. *щепка*, *осколок*, Udm. *šel'ep*, *čag*, *čal'ep*) and 'splinter as a sharp fragment of wood etc. stuck under skin and causing pain' (Russ. *заноза*, Udm. *mert'cem*, *šyrpu*). Thus, Udm. *mert'cem* 'splinter' (Russ. *заноза*) is simply substantivized perfect

participle *mertčem* from *mertčijnj* 'to come into, to stick into'.

Whether the occurrence of plural forms of nouns after numerals is "a young phenomenon" (p. 15) or "a secondary phenomenon" (p. 38) nobody actually knows, but it is hardly "due to Russian influence" (p. 15), because the use of two forms (with plural suffix and without it) after numerals is important for expressing nuances as it can be seen, e.g., in using the examples given (only without plural suffix) in the book: *vit' ad'ami* 'five men' (better: 'five persons') and *tros pol* 'many times'. If the persons mentioned are determined in any way, the plural marker is desirable if not obligatory. Cf. for example: *vit' vižmo ad'amios* 'five clever persons' or with names: *vit' ad'amios liktizj: Vaša, Gała, Apipa, Mekva no Kužma* 'five persons came: Vaša, Gała, Apipa, Mekva and Kužma' — the plural is better here. On the other hand, it can hardly be said *tros poljos* at all — may be only (rather theoretically) in case one would like to emphasize an enormously great number of times. There is also a tiny difference between the phrases like (ГСУЯ I 75—76): *ta busijš vit' tonna* (SG) *žeg aramjn* 'there have been reaped five ton(s) (precisely) rye from this field' and *ta busijš vit' tonnaos* (PL) *žeg aramjn* 'there have been reaped five tons (approximately) rye from this field' which should have been mentioned in the grammar.

It is questionable if one should at all speak about *singularia tantum* in Udmurt: certainly, the word *vgj* 'butter' (p. 15) is used, as a rule, in singular, but the form *vgjos* meaning 'oils' (in chemistry or in oil industry) or 'different sorts of butter' is just possible. As for *pluralia tantum*, which according to E. Winkler are also absent in Udmurt (p. 15), some cases may be added, e.g., *možgaos* 'inhabitants of Možga' (*možga* in singular does not mean a person living in Možga). Ascribing the plural forms of nouns meaning paired things (incl. body parts etc.) to simply Russian influence (p. 16) is oversimplification. First, the word *bam* given as an example in the book (*bamjos* 'cheeks') has two meanings:

'cheek' and 'face' (the last is etymologically older) and therefore a form with the plural marker as, e.g., *bamjosad* 'in thy cheeks' may be used to differentiate it from *bamad* 'in thy face', though to say 'one cheek' the form *pal bam* lit. 'half cheek/ face' cited in the book is used. Second, it is possible to find numerous examples from texts of different kind and age with preferring forms like, e.g., *šinjosad* 'in thy eyes (PL)' to *šinmad* 'in thy eye(s) (SG)' — again, the plural forms seem to be used to emphasize definiteness, special attitude etc. (cf. also *šinmaz učkjsa veranj* 'to speak looking in the eyes (SING)', to speak directly — *šinjosaz* (PL) is hardly possible here) and should not be plainly explained only by Russian influence.

"The suffixes of the local cases without a vowel are used, when nouns denoting a locality end in *-a*, cf. *korka-n* 'in the house', *korka* 'into the house', *korka-š* 'out of the house'" (p. 17). Actually, this is true only for the words *korka* 'house' and *kuala* 'house of old type without a stove; traditional sanctuary'.

While arguing that the use of the marked accusative may not always be explained only by definiteness "in narrow sense" but that it is also connected with resultativity, totality and animacy, E. Winkler draws an example: "*mon žuk/žuk-ez ši-i* I porridge(-ACC)/-ACC eat-PRET/1SG 'I have eaten (the) porridge'" (p. 20). First of all, the Udmurt "first past tense" in *-i-* (*-a-* in the verbs of "second conjugation") has no perfective meaning itself and, therefore, is not usually translated into English with perfect ('I have eaten') but with simple past ('I ate') — this mistake may be due to literal translation of the original German text ('ich habe gegessen'). Another problem is that the phrase is interesting due to some comments (which probably were not appropriate in the concise grammar) to make clear the possible role of the marked accusative and the use of the two past tenses in Udmurt: E. Winkler is right when writing "the marked accusative is used if the object itself is focused, whereas the unmarked is employed if the action itself bears the logical accent" (p. 21), and

the difference between *mon žuk šii* and *mon žukez šii* is not merely 'I ate porridge' and 'I ate the porridge' (with definite object marked by ACC suffix), the second version may also mean 'I have eaten (all) the porridge!'. The Udmurt "first past tense" on *-i-* (*/-a-*) is actually not preterite in classical sense — in the same way as the "second past tense" in *-em* (*/-am*) is not perfect: the first is used to mark only the action which took place in the past (either finished or not) without any attention to its results, the second — to mark the existing result of the action without concerning if the action really took place and how, where and when. Therefore, e.g., the "second past tense" often has perfective meaning: the results of the action are evident; and at the same time it is often used to mark indefiniteness and is also called "past indefinite tense" (Russ. *прошедшее неочевидное время*) in grammars: it is not known, if the action really took place. So, in our example *mon žuk(ez) šii* it is not the verb in the "first past tense" (*šii* '(I) ate') which is responsible for perfectiveness/imperfectiveness (the verb means only that the action took place in the past), but the form of the object: when not marked the noun means only the object to concretize the meaning of the verb (what kind of meal was eaten or has been eaten; therefore, this case may be interpreted as a kind of incorporation of the object: 'I porridge-ate' — if one wants to find incorporation in Udmurt — s. below on evidentiality and ergative), when marked with the accusative suffix the noun means a definite object (or rather "definitely the object": the accusative affix breaks the connection between the nominal and verbal stems and, therefore, there is no way to speak about incorporation here) — the concrete kind or a m o u n t of porridge which was eaten, differentiating the total object from the partial one (cf. — with the same example and terminology, though with more superficial explanation (Кондратьева 2000 : 102)) and providing thus the verb with perfective meaning.

It is a question if one may speak about nominative forms of nouns func-

tioning as "possessive modifiers" (p. 19, 21) in constructions like *zarñi zundes* 'gold ring; ring of gold' (after E. Winkler) or *ñil derem* 'girl's dress' (also after E. Winkler). Since the word *to possess* means 'to hold as property, to own', the construction 'golden ring' (the right translation of Udm. *zarñi zundes*) can hardly be considered as possessive. The same may be said about *ñil derem* 'girl dress', which means, first of all not a dress possessed by a girl, but a dress made for girls (not for women) possessed probably still by a shop's owner. Also constructions with personal names as, e.g., *Paška Pedor* 'Paška's (son) Pedor' are not possessive: this does not mean that *Pedor* belongs to or is owned by *Paška* — but that this *Pedor* differs from any other person of the same name by the name of his father, *Paška*. So, the problem here is the definition of the noun and the adjective (and the adverbial) in Udmurt. The problem deserves special discussion, but what is evident for this review is that this kind of composing of two substantives in Udmurt are erroneously attested as possessive: these are a t t r i b u t i v e constructions. This mistake is, however, not E. Winkler's — it occurs in other existing Udmurt grammars too (see, e.g. ГСВЯ I 78).

The main function of terminative should be explained not as "aim or destination of an action" (p. 27) (for this there are illative and approximative in Udmurt) but as the final point of an action.

"In the habeo-construction the constituent expressing possession obligatorily bears the PX denoting the possessor. If the denotation is different, another structure must be used: *kin dorjñ (~ kiñj) knigaje?* who side-IN (hand-IN) book-1SG 'Who has my book?'" (p. 31). On the other hand, a construction of kind *tjad ta knigaje vañ-a?* thou-GEN this book-1SG is-IC 'have you got this my book (e.g. the book written by me or which belongs to me)?' is just possible: *knigaje* '(my) book' does not obligatorily demand the presence of the personal pronoun *mñam* 'my', and the genitive in Udmurt does not completely coincides with the genitive even in other FU languages like

Finnish or Mari having also a function which may be defined as adessive ('by me', 'at me') — many scholars used to do so (s., e.g. Емельянов 1927 : 138—139; Алатырев 1970, and others), cf. constructions like *mɨnam kɨniga van* 'I have got a book (not obligatorily my book)', lit. 'by me a book is' (therefore, while speaking Russian the Udmurt very often say *это — у меня книга* 'this is a book by me' instead of normal *это — моя книга* 'this is my book').

"If the postposition in question belongs to the group of declined/declineable postpositions, the PX is added in any case to the postposition otherwise the PX is added to the noun: *nɨlpiosɨ ponna* child-PL-1SG for 'for my children'" (pp. 31—32). First, the postposition *ponna* 'for' while being undeclineable can obtain possessive suffixes, cf. *ponnam* 'for me', *ponnad* 'for thou' etc. E. Winkler's thesis would be better illustrated by, e.g., *šurmi vamen* 'across our river' — with postposition *vamen* which can not bear possessive suffixes — opposing to, e.g., *šur duram* 'near my river, on the shore of my river', where the possessive suffix is agglutinated to the postposition stem *dur-* 'near, on shore of'. Second, if one would put another, declineable postposition in the same phrase, e.g. *nɨlpiosɨ dorɨn* 'at (home of) my children', one would also find the possessive suffix (*-i*) attached to the noun. The variant *nɨlpios doram* can mean only 'the children are at my home, by me' (and should thus rather be written *nɨlpios — doram* denoting absence of copula). The transformation of *nɨlpiosɨ dorɨn* into *nɨlpios doram* with preserving the meaning 'at (home of) my children' seems to be unnatural, not because of the postposition (declineable/undeclineable) but, to my mind, since the E. Winkler's grammar is maybe the first publication where such a problem is discussed, because of *person* denoted by the noun in 'at (home of) my children'. The noun denoting a person is more active than in case of a thing or an animal and, when put in the basic form (= nominative), is considered first as subject.

Paragraph 2.3.1.4. Definiteness (pp. 32—33) is described in a very strange

way: E. Winkler begins with just a statement "definiteness can be marked morphologically in Udmurt" but does not explain, in which way. Further on he draws some examples on the use of «definite suffixes» (DEFs) *-az*, *-jez*, *-ez*: *badžim-josaz gurtjosɨn* 'in the large villages'; *mon ta knigajez lɨdžɨi* 'I have read the book' (This would be simply a classical case of the marked accusative (see above) — suffix *-jez* is interpreted as "ACC" by E. Winkler too — if there were not the remark: "In the field of the accusative object the ending is traditionally classified as a case suffix" (p. 32). Hence, E. Winkler finds the suffix *-jez* to be primarily a definite being, merely traditionally classified as case suffix); *guždor vɨlɨn turɨnez čeber* 'on the meadow the grass is beautiful'; *kalikez tros* '(there is) a lot of people'.

These examples deserve serious reconsideration.

In *mon ta knigajez lɨdžɨi* 'I have read the book' we have, without any doubt, the normal accusative suffix. There is a reliable hypothesis of its origin from the possessive suffix of 3rd person singular (ОФУЯ III 146), but synchronically it is nothing more than a normal case suffix.

In *guždor vɨlɨn turɨnez čeber* 'on the meadow the grass is beautiful' *-ez* in *turɨnez* '(the) grass' functions really as a definite suffix ('this very grass'). But the suffix completely coincides with the possessive suffix of 3rd person singular and is just understandable: it is actually a possessive suffix! This can be proved also by putting of the possessive suffix of 2nd person singular (*-ed*) instead of it (*guždor vɨlɨn turɨned čeber* with the same meaning, the slight difference is that in this case grass would be meant, which is just here, near, that may be pointed at during the conversation): the latter may be used as markers of definiteness too (Кельмаков 1993 : 245), though in Udmurt not so often as in the related Komi languages. The well-known use of possessive suffixes of 3rd person singular for marking definiteness in Udmurt is mentioned by E. Winkler too (p. 29) and one of his examples occasionally illustrates the use of the 2nd person possessive singular suffix (*-ed*) in this function: *kined*

van korkad? 'who (+ PX2SG) is in your house' (as translated by E. Winkler) (p. 37), though at the same time this may be translated as 'who of yours (e.g. children) are in your house'.

At first I found myself just amazed and unable to understand comment concerning *kaljkez tros* '(there is) a lot of people': "the last example reveals another function of definite suffix [sic! — V.N.], namely a kind of partitive; literally 'of the people much'" (p. 32): Udm. *kaljkez tros* does in no way mean, literally or anyway, anything of sort 'of people much', this means literally 'his/her people much'; therefore, there is no trace of any kind of partitive here! The only explanation I can suggest is literal translation of the Russian equivalent of this Udmurt phrase: *много народа* lit. 'much of people' (with genitive), but what has this to do with Udmurt grammar? Putting aside this nonsense, it must be said that this example does not differ from the previous, and, in the same way, the alternative construction *kaljked tros* demonstrates the real meaning and affiliation of so-called "definite suffix" here.

Thus, the above three examples do not contain anything what could be attested as "definite suffix": there are one accusative and two personal possessive suffixes. Only in *badžimjosaz gurtjosjn* 'in the big villages (only)' we deal with so-called deictic declension (Russ. *выделительно-указательное склонение*), which is used to mark the attribute of the object(s) to separate them from other objects of the same sort (ГСУЯ I 129), so in our example the meaning is something like 'in those of villages, which are big' or 'in the biggest villages only' — therefore the term "contrastive declension" suggested by V. K. Keľmakov is interesting (Keľмаков 1993 : 247). The tradition of defining the special "deictic" category and suffix was established by V. I. Alatyrev (Алатырев 1970; 1983 : 586—587), and E. Winkler's position is obviously based on the works of this scholar. However, strangely enough he does not completely follow V. I. Alatyrev's theory, according to which the declined forms of nouns with the same

"deictic" suffix (*-ez* in nominative) belong to the same category, e.g., *gurt* 'village' — *gurtlen* 'of village' (genitive) — *gurtlenez* 'the one of the village' — *gurtlenezlen* 'belonging to the one of the village' etc. E. Winkler considers the forms like *gurtlenez* as one of the types of derivative nouns, and the suffix *-ez*, which he finds to be in this case the possessive suffix of 3rd person singular, as one of nominal categorizers: "by means of PX3SG declined nouns can be "nominalized". Semantically, they are shortened, synthetic expressions of complex expressions, the nominalizer marking the known (from the context) part without designating it explicitly: *Ivanlen gurtlez* 'village of Ivan' — *Ivanlenez* 'that of Ivan'" — and further on, in a footnote: "the declension of those nouns is equal to nouns + DEF deviating in EL, EGR and TR from nouns + PX/3SG" (p. 43). Above, to differ his "DEF" suffix from possessive suffixes E. Winkler wrote: "the declension of nouns with the definite suffix is identical with that of nouns + PX/3SG except the following cases: elative (here *ez-iš* vs *-ištj-z*), egressive (here *-ez-išen* vs *išenj-z*) and transitive (here *-ez-eti* vs *-(j)eti-z*)" (pp. 32—33). First, the correct analysis of the mentioned compound suffixes is undoubtedly *-ištj-jz* and *išen-jz*. Second, what E. Winkler means here is actually the declension of "nominalized" (in his terms) nouns: *gurtlenez* 'the one of the village' (see above) — *gurtlenezjš* (after E. Winkler) 'from the one of the village' (elative) etc. The form *gurtlenezjš*, as well as the corresponding forms of egressive and transitive can appear only here — but not in case of other E. Winkler's "definite suffix" examples (*badžimjosaz gurtjosjn* 'in the large villages' or *kaljkez tros* '(there is) a lot of people' — in both cases there should be just the normal order of suffixes (ГСУЯ I 129): *badžimjosajštjz gurtjosjš* 'from the large villages' etc.). The problem is, however, more complicate: forms like *gurtlenezjš* (instead of *gurtlenezjštjz* with the normal order of suffixes as in the possessive declension) occur only in the mentioned works of V. I. Alatyrev. Since such forms are rare enough in real texts, I can't suggest just now any

examples to check V. I. Alatyrev's constructions, but my own feeling and consultations with reliable native-speakers makes me think that V. I. Alatyrev's abnormal forms are artificial enough or, at least, e.g., *gurtlenežjś* is — if ever possible — far less preferable than *gurtlenjštjz* etc. V. I. Alatyrev himself in his first work on "deictic" declension (Алатырев 1970 : 25—28) mentioned both forms, *gurtlenežjś* and *gurtlenjštjz*, and only in the latest version (Алатырев 1983 : 586—587) put the type *gurtlenežjś* as the only possible one without any explanation of this shift. Probably it was due to his wish to prove in this way the existence of a special, differing from the possessive, the "deictic" suffix in Udmurt (in E. Winkler's book this is the only argument). It should be noted that in his first brochure V. I. Alatyrev ascribed his abnormal suffix order (*-ežjś* instead of *-jštjz* etc.) also to the so-called definite declension of adjectives (Алатырев 1970 : 54) — this, however, is not accepted, and is mentioned by E. Winkler (cf. "the declension of adjectives + DEF is like that of nouns + PX3SG" (p. 40), i.e. *-jštjz* etc.) again without any explanation as to his preferences. E. Winkler does not include the forms with *-ez* as "nominalizer" into his examples of "definite suffix", so the reference to V. I. Alatyrev's examples here is of no use at all. On the other hand, what is important here is that E. Winkler cites in his book the paradigm of declension of *d e m o n s t r a t i v e* (i.e. definite!) pronouns *taiz* 'this very' etc. and concludes that the order of suffixes in all cases coincides with that of the nouns + PX3SG (p. 35).

So, there are at least three weak points in E. Winkler's discussion: 1) he does not follow the existing tradition of Udmurt grammarians consecutively (i.e. the V. I. Alatyrev's theory) about a special "deictic" declension category in Udmurt; maybe, he has his own, but he does not explain it and, anyway, 2) he confuses the Udmurt possessive suffix of 3rd person singular *-ez* (and also the accusative suffix *-ez*) in its function as definiteness marker and so-called "deictic" or contrastive suffix *-ez*; and 3) he accepts

V. I. Alatyrev's forms of "deictic" declension with the abnormal order of suffixes in elative, egressive and translative as the only possible ones (which is not right in itself) and ascribes them also to other cases with «definite» declension (which is utterly wrong). All this creates a complicated mixture of evident mistakes and unsolved problems.

Even from this short review it is evident that the problem of existence of special "deictic" or "definite" suffix in Udmurt is not sufficiently solved and is open for discussion. To my mind, since all these "deictic" or "definite" suffixes coincide completely (in all case forms) with the possessive suffixes of 3rd person singular, when one starts up from the actual forms of the Udmurt language, there is no need to speak about separate "deictic" or "definite" category in Udmurt: it would be just enough to mention the active use of the possessive suffix of 3rd person (and for many cases also of the 2nd person) singular in its special contrastive, definite and deictic function serving as the definite article. It was interpreted so in, maybe, the best existing grammar of Udmurt (Емельянов 1927 : 130), and the author of the "deictic" hypothesis did not suggest any argument against this interpretation except of an inane statement (Алатырев 1970 : 2): "suffix *-ez* bearing clearly definite function is already not a personal suffix".

E. Winkler is right writing "the reflexive pronoun is always inflected with PX. In the singular paradigm the endings are largely identical with those of the personal pronouns", but I can't understand what follows it: "(except ACC, here without *l...*)" (p. 35): there is no trace of *l* in the accusative singular of personal pronouns (*mone, tone, soje*)!

"Apart from this comparative function the suffix [comparative suffix *-ges/-gem*] can also express just the opposite, namely indicate the smaller degree of the quality; in this case the syntactical context differs from that of the real comparison in that there is [sic!] no compared constituent marked by the ablative or nominative + postposition *šariś* 'of, about'" (p. 41). This strange statement may be

found in other grammars, too, and is a result of superficial interpretation, which becomes clear with E. Winkler's examples reconsidered: *Sandjrlen čagjrges šinjosaz* 'in Sandjir's bluish eyes' (*čagjir* 'blue' + *-ges*) — this may be interpreted as 'in the eyes that are rather blue (than, e.g., black; but not so bright-blue)', *al'i mon no višiškošges* 'now I'm a little bit ill too' (*višiško* 'I'm ill' + *-ges*) — this means 'now I am rather ill than well (= not so much ill)'. So, the suffix *-ges* (*/-gem*) does not "indicate the smaller degree of the quality" but rather presence of some / some additional quantity of the quality, inclination of the speaker to fix this very quality, but not any other.

Udm. *jun mur* 'very deep, really deep' and *gord-gord* 'very red, bright red' do mean 'deepest' and 'reddest' and are superlative forms (p. 42) only as far as, e.g., English 'very good' does mean 'best' and may be considered as superlative.

Although the category of diminutive is not developed in Udmurt, the statement "there are no morphological means for marking.... diminutive" (p. 44) is not utterly right: in personal names and with denotations of relatives there suffixes *-ok* (*njl* 'girl, daughter' > *njlok* 'little/dear daughter'), *-aš* (*pi* 'boy, son' > *pjaš* 'little/dear boy') and some others are used (they all seem to be of Russian and Tatar origin) (ГСУЯ I 119) — though they may be considered not only as diminutive (Russ. *уменьшительно-ласкательные*), but also as a kind of vocative suffixes.

The equation mark in "particles = infinite auxiliary verbs" (p. 44) is certainly nonsense; as it is clear from context, E. Winkler means "frozen" verbal forms as *vań* '(there) is', *gvəl* '(there) is not' etc., which hardly may be defined as particles. The statement that "Udmurt has no conjugateable verb 'to be'" (p. 45) is not completely right: there is the conjugateable verb *lujnĭ* 'to be, to become, to happen', though it is not used as copula (it does not exist in Udmurt) and in existential clauses (where above-mentioned "frozen" verbal forms are used). Also the verbal stem, from which these "frozen" forms or at least *vĭlem* (second past tense, "perfect" in *-em*) and very

probably *val* (first past tense, preterite) had originated (**vĭljnĭ* 'to be, to live' — s., e.g. УРС 102), has been kept in the language in its different conjugational forms, used as the counterpart to *uljnĭ* 'to live' in a pair-verb: *ulom-vĭlom* 'we'll live, we'll be', *ulillam-vĭillam* 'they lived, they were once', *ulem-vĭlem* 'he/she lived, he/she was once', *ulon-vĭlon* 'life-existence' (nomen actionis) etc. It is interesting to note that enumerating the morphological and lexical means used in Udmurt to form past tenses, E. Winkler does not mention the verbal form *vĭlem* among "petrified verbal forms" (p. 47) used in the formation of past tense constructions, and rightfully attested this form as "perfect participle of the existential verb" (p. 51); to my mind, this should imply the existence of such a verb itself.

Personal conjugational suffixes of the Udmurt verb are not "identical" (p. 46) but similar to the corresponding personal possessive suffixes.

E. Winkler's classification of tenses and moods of the Udmurt verb (p. 46—54) represents one of the versions possible from the point of view of the present stage of the study of grammar. The scholars' ideas about the number and kinds of tenses in Udmurt evolved, in general, from two tenses (present and preterite) in F. J. Wiedemann's grammar of 1851 to the standard set of four synthetic tenses (preterite on *-i-*, perfect on *-em*, presence, future), to which after the works of T. Aminoff, A. I. Jemel'janov and finally of B. A. Serebrennikov four "real" (all four synthetic forms with the auxiliary petrified verb *val*) and four "indefinite" or "non-evident" (i.e., rather modal than temporal), with the auxiliary verb *vĭlem*, analytical forms of past tense were added (see reviews in Серебренников 1959 : 93—96; Загуляева 1984 : 45—46). In standard grammar (ГСУЯ I 196—208) four synthetic tenses are described and without serious consideration, eight analytical tenses with the auxiliary petrified verbs *val* and *vĭlem* are mentioned. To this set R. Š. Nasibullin added six analytical forms, two of which were considered by him as temporal (participle on *-em* + PX + *vań* '(there) is',

val '(there) was', mentioned already in Емельянов 1927 : 89, and others — rather as modals (e.g., participle in *-em* + PX + forms of *lujnǝ* 'to be' in all four synthetic tenses — a kind of optative) (Насибуллин 1984). In addition to this diversity of forms there exists a chaotic variety of definitions (preterite, imperfect, perfect, pluperfect, preteritum perfect, preteritum imperfect, historical imperfect, past non-finite, past continuos etc.).

E. Winkler enumerates three synthetic tenses: future, present, "preterite I" in *-i-* (called usually "first past tense"), and five analytical ones: "perfective preterite II" (R. Š. Nasibullin's participle in *-em* + PX + *vań* '(there) is'), "indifferent pluperfect I" ("preterite I" in *-i-* + *val*), "perfective pluperfect II" (R. Š. Nasibullin's participle in *-em* + PX + *val* '(there) was'), "iterative pluperfect III" (future + *val*), "durative pluperfect IV" (presence + *val*) (p. 49). There are at least three points to discuss here.

First, there is the problem of terminology. E. Winkler's set of preterites and pluperfects looks a bit strange: this implies the existence of perfect, too. At least two of R. Š. Nasibullin's forms meaning that "general action has already taken place" (p. 48) would be pure perfects and might be called "present perfect" (participle in *-em* + PX + *vań* '(there) is': *so šariš kǝleme vań* 'I have already heard about it', i.e. at the current moment I have already the results of hearing about it) and "past perfect" (participle in *-em* + PX + *val* '(there) was': *so šariš kǝleme val* 'I had already heard about it', i.e. to a moment in the past I had already the results of hearing about it) by analogy with, e.g., corresponding English forms. The difference between English and Udmurt forms becomes clear with the examples of a transitive verb with a definite direct object: Eng. *he has killed the bear* — the Udmurt equivalent should be *so gondjrez vijem*, with "second past tense" in *-em*, Udm. *solen gondjri vijemez vań* (with analytical "present perfect", and probably only with the unmarked accusative) should be translated into English as 'he already killed bears' (he has an experience in killing bears). So,

in English it is statal perfect, in Udmurt this would be actional perfect. All this would be possible if R. Š. Nasibullin's forms could be really considered as temporal: the problem is that they do not differ formally from normal habeo-constructions: *mǝnam so šariš kǝleme vań* 'I have heard about it', lit. 'by me it-about heard (my) is' ~ *mǝnam so šariš kǝgaje vań* 'I have a book about it', so the subject in this constructions is not the personal pronoun in genitive, but the nominalized participle on *-(e)m* ("nomen status" — s. below): *mar vań tǝnad?* lit. 'what is by thou?' — *mǝnam kǝleme vań* lit. 'heard (my) is by me', and the verb (*vań*) is not declined here (cf. in the English perfect the subject is pronoun: *who has heard?* — *I have heard*). Therefore, there is a great doubt if these constructions should be considered temporal verbal forms at all.

Second, one more "pluperfect" of those considered by B. A. Serebrennikov has been left out, the forms of so-called second past tense + *val*, e.g.: *so baštem val* 'he/she had taken (before)', which, according to B. A. Serebrennikov (Серебренников 1959 : 98), coincides in its function and usage with E. Winkler's "indifferent pluperfect I" ("preterite I" in *-i-* + *val*). Actually, this is the only one of the analytical past tenses to which the perfective meaning may be ascribed — other constructions with *val* (s. above) are in no way perfects, and, therefore, may hardly be called pluperfects. The omission of this form by E. Winkler might be due to the third point.

Third, the most questionable point is that E. Winkler does not include so-called "second past tense" (in *-em/-am*) into his list of Udmurt tempora. It is considered in the book as evidential mood (or — after terminology of other scholars — narrative or indirective or modus obliquus) (pp. 49—51). This E. Winkler's impact into the Udmurt grammar is utterly new and has no predecessors (except of, maybe, B. A. Serebrennikov's attestation of the synthetic forms with *vijem* (s. above) as "forms of non-evidential mood" (Серебренников 1959 : 96, 100) — but these synthetic forms are just

another thing and should be considered separately, cf., for example the use of the verb *lujnj* for formation of irreal modal forms mentioned above). Actually, the Udmurt "second past tense" denotes an action which is known only by its results and these results are what is evident and actual for the speaker. Therefore, at least four possibilities of concrete interpretation of an expression with "second past tense" appear: 1) pure perfective (statal perfect in this case) marking simply an action already completed, e.g.: *tol vuem iini* 'winter has already come'; 2) mirative (after E. Winkler (p. 50)), marking an unexpected result, a kind of surprise — as in E. Winkler's example: *vot ved', kiče ton ad'ami vjlemed!* 'well, that's what a sort of man you are!' (i.e. 'now I see — after your deed' or 'you appeared to be in this case'); 3) inferential (after E. Winkler (p. 50)), when one can suppose a former action from its results *kapkajež uštemjn, so bertem leša* 'the gate os open, he should have come back'; 4) evidential proper (after E. Winkler) or narrative — there is a source witnessed or presumed to have been witnessed — this case is widely used in folklore genres like fairy tales etc.: *odig krešt'jan bazare mjinjnj dašaškem* 'one peasant prepared to go to the market'.

So, as it can be seen, E. Winkler took into account three possible interpretations of "second past tense" (2., 3. and 4) but did not mention its main, perfective meaning. At the same time, if one takes the above three examples and changes the context a bit, one will find the forms of "second past tense" meaning something different: *kitjn ton vjlemed?* 'where have you been?' (before that moment), *so bertem* 'he has come back' (already), *so bazare mjinjnj dašaškem* 'he is ready to go to market' (already) etc. What remains in all contexts is the temporal meaning: the action took place in the past and has (or is supposed to have) brought about actual results. If one compares this situation with other Udmurt moods, be it indicative, imperative or conditional, one would always find that in any context the essence of the form is the estimation of the reality of action by the speaker. The so-called evidentiality in case of the

Udmurt "second past tense" is, thus, determined by context, not by the verbal form itself. Besides, be it evidential, indirective or modus obliquus — in any case the forms of the first person marking just evident and real action would look extremely strange. E. Winkler does not consider any one of them (only gives them in a paradigm table), but, e.g.: in a fairy tale the fox says to the wolf and the bear *mon jegumes pijsanj vunetiškem* 'I forgot to close our ice-hole' to explain the need to return home — the action is evident, the «second past tense» is used here to show that the fox suddenly remembered that it really forgot to close the ice-hole.

So, I can't agree with E. Winkler's very interesting interpretation of "second past tense" as modal category, though it should be noted that the problem of its place in the system of Udmurt verbal categories, as well as the real number and meanings of these categories deserve further discussion. The general approach to the description of a language is important: whether one describes it starting from its own forms and internal nature, or one tries to put it into Procrustean bed of presupposed scheme (very often depending on current fashionable trends which change once a decade). Following the second approach one could find in Udmurt not only evidential mood but also, e.g., ergative — cf.: *so iz das gon d jr vijem, taiz — vit' gine* 'that one killed ten bears, this one — only five' (agens marked with suffix and unmarked direct object of transitive verb) and *so kulem* 'that one died' (unmarked agens by intransitive verb) — s. also about "incorporation" above.

The verbal forms on *-a-* opposing to the parallel on *-j-* (*lobanj* 'to fly (here and there)' ~ *lobijnj* 'to fly (at the moment, in one direction etc.)') and the verbs with suffixes *-lj-* and *-ll'a-* should be defined not as irresultative (which is preferred by E. Winkler), but rather as iterative or frequentative (which is only mentioned as possible) (p. 55), since, e.g., *gjrjlnj* (< *gjrjnj* 'to plough') means 'plough some places here and now' (E. Winkler's translation) and *so ta busjos gjrjlem* is 'he has

ploughed these field many times' or 'he used to plough / to have ploughed this field'.

The paragraph 2.4.5.2. Participles (p. 57—59) contains a number of misinterpretations. First, E. Winkler considers participles in *-š*, *-(e)m*, (with those in *-(e)mjn* as a variant of this), *-(o)no* and *-mon* — evidently after ГСУЯ I 260—269. However, there is another, and, maybe, the most important participle in Udmurt — the forms in *-(o)n*: *kare mjnon šures* 'way going to the town / way to go to the town' (< *mjnjn* 'to go'). In ГСУЯ I 111—114 these forms are considered as nouns and actually they can be and, as a rule, are nominalized and appear as nomina actionis: *uljn* 'to live' > *ulon* 'life', *kuljn* 'to die' > *kulon* 'death' etc., but the original affiliation of these forms with participles was brilliantly demonstrated in a special article (Калинина 1984). The facility of nominalization of these participles does not yet lead to the final disappearance of the participle meaning of forms in *-(o)n* but provides a scholar with a unique possibility to observe the evolution of a pure morphological suffix into the word-building one. The same situation applies to the participles in *-š*: almost every one of them can be and is nominalized and functions as nomen agentis; according to E. Winkler "there are cases [only? — V.N.] of nominalizing" (p. 57), which is not right. Besides, his example "*ljktiš luoz = ljktoz* 'he will come'" (p. 57) is also wrong: this is actually a classical case of nomen agentis in *-š*, and *ljktiš luoz* does not mean 'he will come' as (*so*) *ljktoz*, but 'there will be a coming person; somebody will come'.

The participles in *-(e)m*, although they may, as a rule, possess passive meaning with transitive verbs, should hardly be defined as "PART PERFECT/PASS" (p. 57): there is no passive/active opposition in Udmurt participles and very probably in the Udmurt verb at all (also the verbs in *-šk-* are rightfully described as reflexive but not passive (p. 55)), cf.: *vu vajem njl* 'the girl, who brought water', where *vu* 'water', *vajem* 'brought (part. perf.)' (< *vaj-* 'to bring' + *-em*), *njl* 'girl'.

The statement (in case of the passive attributive use [of the participles in *-(e)m* — V.N.] the agent appears in the GEN and ABL: *solen/soleš ljdžem kniga* 'the book read by him/her' (p. 57—58)" is at least not complete, since very often the agent stays in instrumentalis: *ta ad'amijen jbem gondjr* 'the bear shot by this man (INSTR)' and the construction *solen ljdžem kniga* looks rather as an attributive (or possessive) construction and, therefore, the correct form is *solen ljdžem knigajez* (with possessive suffix) and, correspondingly, the form with agent in ablative (E. Winkler does not explain why two cases may be used and what the difference between them is) implies the accusative of the object (or, of the possessed), e.g. *soleš ljdžem knigaze tijnid šotiško* 'I give you the book read by him/her'. The example *so ljktem* 'he/she has come' contains undoubtedly no participle, but the finite form of the second past tense. So E. Winkler's comment "this form of the PART is identical with the 3SG of the s[o-]c[alled] PERF having evidential meaning" (p. 58) has no sense. The same should be said about the next example *so ber kj'emed kad* 'he probably came late' — translated (i.e. as finite form) by E. Winkler himself and without any comment (p. 58), but there is a mistake, it should be either *ton ber kj'emed kad* 'thou probably hast come late' or *so ber kj'em kad* 'he probably has come late'.

Writing that the participles in *-(e)m* may be declined (p. 58, 61) E. Winkler means actually not the participles but their nominalized counterparts (these participles are also very often nominalized and E. Winkler mentions this (p. 58); their nominalized forms may be put into the system of other nominalized adverbs and defined as nomina status: *užanj* 'to work' > *užaš* 'worker' — nomen agentis, *užan* 'work (in general)' — nomen actionis, *užam* 'worked, something already worked up' — nomen status). To understand the real attribution of the *višem* 'illness' (< *viš-* 'to be ill' + *-em*) in E. Winkler's example *višemenjm ta užež ej leštj* 'because of my illness I didn't do this work' (p. 61) the form considered by E. Winkler as participle may just be

replaced by a normal noun: *silttēlen* (*seren*) *ta užez g̃j leštj* 'because of the storm (*silttēl*) I didn't do this work'. In the same way E. Winkler considers so-called participles in *-(e)m̃jn* as inessive (*-jn*) forms of the participles in *-(e)m* (p. 58). These special forms are used only as predicates (E. Winkler notes this, but without "only" (p. 58)) and are traditionally considered as a separate kind of participles (ГСВЯ I 268–269), that looks a bit artificial. E. Winkler's suggestion ("participles" in *-(e)m̃jn* = inessive of forms in *-(e)m*) being more preferable than the traditional approach may be accepted but only with one correction: these are already nominalized forms, not proper participles: cf. E. Winkler's example *djšetiš ljktēmjn* 'the teacher has come' (better, than 'arrived' as in the book (p. 58)), lit. 'the teacher is in the status of having come' — and *djšetiš klassjn* 'the teacher (is) in the classroom', with a normal noun in the inessive. Therefore, it is also clear that the negative form is here not *-(j)mte* (*ljktēm* 'come (part. perf.)' ~ *ljktjmtē* 'not come'), but the analytical form with *evgl* 'no, not': (E. Winkler's example) *šures tupatēmjn evgl* 'the road (better, than 'path' as in the book (p. 58)) is not repaired' — cf. *ta šures nulesk̃jn evgl* 'this road is not in the forest'.

The participles in *-(o)no* are defined as PART PRS PASS (p. 58), which is hardly acceptable: s. above the impossibility of dividing the category of passive in Udmurt. Although in this case the passive meaning of transitive verb stems is more evident, but cf., for example, *vjl' zavodjn užano ad'amios* 'the people who are to work in new plant' or *vjž tupatono užašjos* 'workers who are to repair the bridge' etc. Most important is the temporal attestation: if it can be made at all, these should be defined as future participles, since the coming, need, desire, i.e. the future of the action is, what remains in the meaning of any expression with these forms. This is implicitly recognized by E. Winkler, too: one and the same example *solen ljdžono knigajez* (this variant, given on p. 70, as also a corresponding form with ablative-accusative *soleš ljdžono knigaze* on p. 77, is more correct than

solen ljdžono kniga on p. 58 — *solen ljdžem kniga* 'the book read by him/her' discussed above) is translated as 'the book which must be read by him/her' on p. 58, where E. Winkler tries to prove his definition of the future participle, but as 'the book which will be read by him/her' on p. 70, where he probably forgets, that this participle is "present", — both translations are right and the future action is what is in common in them.

An evident mistake, but not E. Winkler's own, is the statement that the negative form of the future participle in *-(o)no* are forms in *-(o)ntem* (p. 58). For example, *ljdžontem kniga* 'unreadable book' is not a form opposite to *ljdžono kniga* 'a book to be read' but to *ljdžjmon kniga* 'a book able to be read'. Only in special contexts of appraising may *ljdžono kniga* mean 'the book deserved or recommended to be read': *ta tuž umoj, odno ik ljdžono kniga* 'this is a very good book, obligatorily to be read', and in such cases they may form an opposition to *ljdžontem kniga*: *ta tuž urod, vokšo ljdžontem kniga* 'this is a very bad, utterly unreadable book', but the original difference of their functions can be seen also here. Obviously the mentioned cases made the authors of standard Udmurt grammar (ГСВЯ I 264) consider the forms in *-(o)ntem* to be the negative forms of the participles in *-(o)no*, and E. Winkler here follows the tradition. Historically the forms in *-(o)ntem* are probably negative forms of the participles in *-(o)n* (s. above), which is clear from their morphological analysis (*-(o)n* + *-tem*, abessive suffix of adjectives). Taking into account all the possibilities without critical analysis, V. K. Keľmakov simply considers the forms in *-(o)ntem* as negative counterparts of all the three kinds of participles, in *-(o)n*, *-(o)no* and *-mon* (Кельмаков 1998 : 155).

However, some short comments and corrections are also needed:

Concerning the Udmurt Cyrillic alphabet, it is written "Five sounds lacking in Russian are indicated with diacritical marks" (p. 8). This is not completely right: the letter *ü* is used for the sound *i*, which is present also in Russian: the letter different from the normal *u* (=

sound *i*) marks only the non-palatal character of the preceding consonant.

Since the English *to finish* means 'to bring or come to an end, to complete, to cease' and Udm. *dugdĭnj* — 'to stop, to interrupt, to pause, to break' the sentence *mon užamĭš dugdi* should not be translated as 'I finished my work' (p. 26), which implicitly means 'I completed my work' (something like *mon užme bĭdĭ* in Udmurt), but 'I stopped/interrupted my work' (= 'I am not working now, but the work may be not yet completed'). The same: *kopamĭš digdiz* 'he finished digging' (p. 61) = 'he stopped digging'.

The phrase *djšetiše džsetski* should be translated not as 'I became a teacher' (p. 26) but rather 'I (have) studied to become / to be a teacher'.

The example *so... mĭni* is translated as 'he/she go-PRET/1SG' and 'he/she went' (p. 22). Actually, *mĭni* means 'I went', for *so* 'he/she' form PRET/3SG *mĭnjz* should be used (or *mon mĭni* 'I went'). The same: *mon solĭ ukšo šotiz* 'I gave him money' (p. 59) = *mon solĭ ukšo šoti*.

Udm. *anaj nĭlze kitiz vožiz* is correctly translated into English as 'the mother took her daughter by the hand' (p. 27). However, I can't agree with the literal translation of the phrase, where the verb *vožiz* is interpreted as 'take-PRET-3SG': Udm. *vožĭnj* (infinitive) does not mean 'to take' but 'to hold, to keep' (sometimes also 'to have!'). The wrong translation here concerns phraseology: in Udmurt it is said *kĭti vožĭnj* lit. 'to hold along hand', in English — *to take by hand*.

Udm. *tĭnad pĭramed bere kuno vuiz na* is translated lit. 'after your gone in, guest came yet', 'After you had come in, there arrived still guests' (p. 62). The correct translation is 'after your visit there were other guests too' (*pĭramed* < *pĭranĭ* 'to come in (many times), to visit').

ton vetliškod bere, mon no mĭno 'When you go, I'll go too' [p. 62] = rather 'since/if/as far as you go, I'll go too'. English *when* can also be used in sense of 'if', but in this case such translation may be interpreted in another way (*when* = 'at the moment, when'). The mistake came probably from the translation from German (German *wenn* 'if'); *bere* as con-

junction should be better translated not as 'when' (p. 15) but 'since, as far as'.

koške 'leave!' IMP. 2SG (p. 11) = IMP. 2PL; since the English word *leave* has the meaning 'to go away' (Udm. *koškĭnj*) and 'cause to remain, abandon' (Udm. *keltĭnj*, *analtĭnj*) the translation 'go away!' would be more preferable.

og-ogmĭ dorĭn does not mean 'we together' (= Udm. *mi čoš(en)*) (p. 37), but 'we by us / at home of one another of us'.

mon ton dorĭ pĭriško val, no ton gurtad vĭljmtejed 'I wanted to visit you, but it seemed, that you haven't been at home' (p. 48) = 'I was about to visit you, but you was not at home' (Russ. 'я было зашел к тебе, но тебя не оказалось дома') — here E. Winkler understands the form of the "second past tense" as "evidential mood", and hence the mistake: in his translation the speaker is not sure whether the person was at home or not (therefore the meaning of the phrase is a bit strange), whereas the real situation, as it is described by the sentence, is: I wanted to visit you and I even came (and may be entered the house), but it happened so, that you was not at home (I had not known about it beforehand) and therefore my visit failed. Thus, the meaning of "second past" tense is pure resultative or statal perfect here.

mon ug šĭišķĭ nánez 'I do not eat that bread' (p. 54) may be better translated as 'the bread I do not eat' (e.g., I eat only cheese); 'I do not eat that bread' would be something as *so nánez mon ug šĭišķĭ*.

Udm. *gožtĭtĭnj*, causative from *gožtĭnj* 'to write' should not be translated into English 'to let write' (p. 45, 56, 65) (main meaning of English *to let* is 'allow to') but 'to make (somebody) write' — the Udmurt causative forms, as a rule, mean actually forcing some other person to carry out the action, not only a permission to do something. The source of this mistake is obviously the translation: cf., e.g., German *schreiben lassen* with meaning a bit closer to the one of Udm. *gožtĭtĭnj* than the English *to let write*.

žugiškĭsa kĭllĭnj 'fight (often, constantly)' (p. 60) with the verb *kĭllĭnj* 'to lie' is a special dialectal southern construction, which from the point of view

of standard language sounds comical = Udm. *žugiškjsa uljnj* 'to live fighting'.

ižjsa vujnj 'have a good night's sleep' (p. 60) should be rather translated 'to sleep until (a moment)' or 'to have slept enough, to have had enough time to sleep'.

The "preposition" (after ГСUY I 316, actually an adverb) *og* should be better translated not 'about' (p. 62), which allows many interpretations, but 'approximately', that is the only meaning of the Udmurt word.

val evgl is not the negative form of *val* '(there) was' (p. 65), *val evgl* means actually '(there is) no horse', negative of *val* '(there) was' is *gj val*.

korka gs 'the door of the house, front door' (p. 71) = 'house (main) door'. There is no marker of definiteness here.

ton važ valad, kin luono tinjd 'you early have understood, who will be necessary for you' (p. 75) = 'you early have understood, who should you become' (i.e., what profession or education should you choose) — there is no trace of 'be necessary for you' in the phrase.

The name of paragraph 2.4.4.4 *Fiktivnost* comes obviously from a working version of the manuscript — the Russian word in this case has no sense, since in may be replaced by the English form of the same Latin stem (*fictivity* — ?).

For the Udmurt consonant (actually Fremdkonsonant that occurs only in the latest Russian loan-words) χ *ch* is used (*kolchoz* (p. 22, 71), *kolchoznik* (p. 57), besides, the right transcription of the last word should be *kolchoznik*).

On p. 51 the examples of the imperative are the introduces like "Examples (*liktjnj* 'to come') — and there are given examples of verbs *mijnjnj* 'to go', *liktjnj* 'to come', *užani* 'to work' without translation.

The verb *lujnj* is interpreted as 'to get, to become' (p. 52) and even 'can' (p. 53), but the main meaning of the verb is 'to be, to become' (as on p. 65), all other meaning depend on concrete constructions.

And finally, here are corrections of some mistakes in translation and misprints:

kuas 'in his skin' (p. 8) = *kuaz* (in contrast to *kuas* 'ski'); *vui* 'come (3SG/PRET)' (p. 8) = 1SG/PRET (or *vuiž* 3SG/PRET); *kjlljnj* 'lie' vs *kjll'jnj* 'remain' (p. 10) = *kjllj-*

nj 'remain' vs *kjll'jnj* 'lie'; *kart* 'man' (p. 15, 24, 64, 68) = 'husband' (obviously a result of translation from German: *Mann* 'man; husband'); *kjšno* can mean 'woman', but in pair with *kart* 'husband' (s. above): *kjšno-jen karten* etc. (p. 15, 24, 64, 68); this word has its main meaning 'wife' (obviously a result of translation from German: *Frau* 'woman; wife'); *kureg* 'chicken' (p. 15) = 'hen'; *djšetiš* 'teacher' (p. 19) = *djšetiš* 'teacher'; *arúa* 'year' (p. 21) = 'week' (*ar* 'year'); *gazetiš* 'from a newspaper' (p. 26) = *gažetiš*; *vjn* 'sister' (p. 28, 31) = 'brother' (better 'little brother', elder brother is *agaj*), 'sister' ('little sister') is *suzer*; *troz* 'much' (p. 32) = *tros*; *mjnamezleñ gurtelen* (p. 34) = *mjnamezlen gurtelen*; *kudizlj pijedlj kor-ka puktid?* 'for which one of your did you build a house?' (p. 37) = 'for which of your sons did you build a house?'; *bjdes* 'all' (p. 38) = 'whole, complete'; *van* 'all' and *van* 'there is/are' are not "identical" (p. 38), these are homonymous, as it is correctly written in a footnote on p. 45; *njmos* 'quarter' (p. 39) = *njmos*; *trosges* 'very' (p. 41) means actually 'much more' (*tros* 'much' + comparative suffix *-ges*) and *tros* is in no way a "particle" (p. 41). E. Winkler's thesis (use of the comparative suffix with particles) could better be illustrated by something like *mon soje tuž jaratiško* 'I love her very much' ~ *mon soje tužges jaratiško* 'I love her much more' (*tuž* 'very'); *šintem-peltem* 'careless' (p. 43) = 'breakneck'; *vjlem evgl* negative form for *vjlem* (p. 45) = *evgl vjlem*; *evgltem* 'lacking' (p. 45) = 'person lacking possessions, pauper; nonsense, small and unimportant thing'; *žus vad'sjš* 'opposite the plank' (p. 50) = 'above the bench'; *potjnj* 'leave' (p. 53) = 'to go out' ('leave' — Udm. *kel'tjnj*); *gj* 3SG PRET of negation verb (p. 54) = 1SG PRET; *perěšmanj* 'to get older' (p. 55) = *perěšmjnj*; *porjaz* 'talk a walk-PRET/3SG' (p. 59) = 'stroll-PRET/3SG'; *čirdjnj* 'to sing' (p. 60) = 'to sing (of birds)'; *ben* 'surely not (in yes/no interrogative sentences)' (p. 62) = 'yes, well, so it is' (probably, the mistake comes from the English translation of German *doch*, which itself is a very good equivalent for Udm. *ben*); *sultono* 'to stand-PART' (p. 73) = 'to stand up-PART' ('to stand' is *sijlnj* in Udmurt); *sjčē*

kuraškisa 'asking for it' (p. 75) = 'begging in this way'.

To finish this review I'd like to underline that all the noted mistakes and shortcomings do not deminish the contents and importance of E. Winkler's book. Many of these weak points have their origin not in the author's poor knowledge of the subject, but in bad translation, insufficient literature and existing erroneous tradition. The criticism and spirit of discussion are oxygen for real science. Unfortunately, in the Udmurt linguistics they are traditionally replaced by silent acceptance of everything written by those belonging to the club or by

mutual compliments and, therefore, most of the problems remain unsolved and new ones produced by historiographical deficiencies permanently appear, and this can be seen also from this review. Here, first, I hope to have made all the necessary corrections to free the readers of E. Winkler's book from the need to deal with bothersome trifles and thus, second, to reveal real problems existing in Udmurt linguistics, and wish the new ideas suggested in the book might start a discussion. The reviewed book forms a good background for making new steps in the study of Udmurt grammar.

REFERENCES

- А л а т ы р е в В. И. 1970, Выделительно-указательная категория в удмуртском языке. (Расширенный доклад на III Международном конгрессе финно-угроведов в Таллине), Ижевск.
- 1983, Краткий грамматический очерк удмуртского языка. — УРС.
- Грамматика современного удмуртского языка I. Фонетика и морфология, Ижевск 1962; II. Синтаксис простого предложения, Ижевск 1970; III. Синтаксис сложного предложения. Ижевск 1974 (= ГСУЯ I—III).
- Е м е л ь я н о в А. И. 1927, Грамматика вотского языка. Ленинград.
- З а г у л я е в а Б. Ш. 1984, Сложные формы давнопрошедшего времени в некоторых удмуртских диалектах. — Вопросы грамматики удмуртского языка, Ижевск.
- К а л и н и н а Л. И. 1984, Категориальная сущность причастий на -(о)н. — Вопросы грамматики удмуртского языка, Ижевск.
- К е л ь м а к о в В. К. 1993, Удмуртский язык. — Языки мира. Уральские языки, Москва.
- 1998, Краткий курс удмуртской диалектологии, Ижевск.
- К о н д р а т ь е в а Н. В. 2000, Особенности выражения прямого объекта в удмуртском языке в зависимости от характера глагола объекта [sic! — В.Н.]. — Проблемы синхронии и диахронии пермских языков и их диалектов, Ижевск (Пермистика 6).
- М а к с и м о в С. А. 1999, Северно-удмуртско-коми ареальные лексико-семантические параллели. Диссертация на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук, Ижевск.
- 2001, Соотношение исторических пластов лексики в удмуртских диалектах по данным I вопросника ДАУЯ. — Сборник к 225-летию выхода в свет первой удмуртской грамматики, Ижевск.
- Н а п о л ь с к и х В. В. 1997, Введение в историческую уралоистику, Ижевск.
- 1997а, "Бисермины". — О бесермянах, Ижевск.
- Н а с и б у л л и н Р. Ш. 1984, О некоторых аналитических формах глагола в удмуртском языке. — Вопросы грамматики удмуртского языка, Ижевск.
- 2000, Удмуртские диалекты — идеальный объект для лингвогеографических исследований. — *Studia ad geographiam linguarum pertinentia*, Tallinn (Eesti Keele Instituudi toimetised 6).
- Основы финно-угорского языкознания, т. 1—3, Москва 1974—1976 (= ОФУЯ I—III).
- П о п о в а Е. В. 1998, Семейные обычаи и обряды бесермян, Ижевск.
- С е р е б е р е н н и к о в Б. А. 1959, О действительном количестве

*Reviews * Обзоры и рецензии*

глагольных времен в удмуртском языке. — ЗУдмНИИ, вып. 19.
Удмурт-ӓуч словарь. Удмуртско-русский словарь, Москва 1983 (= УРС).

M a k s i m o v S. A. 2001, Pohjoisudmurtin murteiden ja komin kielen areaalisia leksikaalisia yhtäläisyyksiä. — JSFOu 89.

VLADIMIR NAPOLSKICH (Iževsk)