

Enets

General remarks - sources and texts - critique and transcription

Michael Katzschmann

(24.01.2012)

Content

Introducing remarks

Exploited texts

Citation and annotation

General Overview of the grammatical .Sources

General Overview of other .Sources

ED

Tereščenko

General remarks to the text editions of Sorokina/Bolina and Labanauskas

Sorokina/Bolina (SoBo)

Labanauskas 2002

Labanauskas 1996 = Folklóre narodov Tajmyra I

Informants and informers/collectors

SoBo

Labanauskas

List of Informants

Problems of Handling the Texts and their Reproduction/Reedition

Samples' choice

Russian Data

Literary genres

Individual writing practices of single informers

Amendments/.Corrections/.Transcription/.Translation

Transcription

e-graphemes

Palatalisation

Prime examples

Particular phonemes

Introducing remarks

The following overview is part of a planned English survey of Enets. On behalf of this, larger texts, sketches and reports had/have to be exploited. Some of the main difficulties are described here. As preparatory works, grammatical tables

(<http://www.nganasanica.de/enzgrtab.pdf>),

several word lists

(http://www.nganasanica.de/enz_lex.pdf)

and derivations (as for example

http://www.nganasanica.de/enz_abl.pdf)

as well as negation sentences

(<http://www.nganasanica.de/enznegverb.pdf>)

- as optional benefit to the Vienna project **Typology of Negation in Ob-Ugric and Samoyedic Languages/Typologie der Negation in den obugrischen und samojedischen Sprachen** (<http://www.univie.ac.at/negation/index.html>) - have been/will be collaterally and successively posted here.

This work is unfortunately dependent on personal mood cycles benefitted to the up to now (un)done scientific work, varying between rage and anger (sometimes even desparation), seldom hope. Florian Siegl expressed this similarly in his critique on the „achievements“ of contemporary mainly Russian research, which is part of an introductory **History of Enets studies - a condensed survey** (<http://lepo.it.da.ut.ee/~flos/Studies.htm>), which is recommended looking at. As part 2.5 he writes:

„An unused monopoly - 70 years and still no material on Enets!“

„As foreign scholars were not allowed to enter Siberia for fieldwork after the end of the First World War Soviet linguists were in the privileged position of having a scientific monopoly on Enets studies. As it has become obvious under 2.3., the Hungarian impact on Enets studies has been quantitatively enormous. In times when Soviet scholars had the exclusive privilege on Siberian languages they did not see the need to publish their fieldnotes. After 18 sentences (= 2 texts) on Enets during 50 years of research, Mikola and Pusztay published their small notes and improved the situation and it is perhaps needless to say, that the quality of their transcriptions beats the Russian transcription with ease..

In a nutshell, the archives of the Herzen Institute (Tatiana Bulgakova, p.c. Tartu 2004) and Helimksi's personal archive might contain tons of raw unpublished material, though quantitatively the best material comes from those researchers who had the least chances to do research on Enets - in a foreign surrounding and through a foreign language - and they even published it. According to T. Bulgakova, even nowadays foreigners are not allowed to work on the material stored at the Herzen Institute - even after more than a decade after ‚the collapse‘.

A small amount of texts was published in 1992 and in 2002 by Kazis Labanauskas in Dudinka. This demonstrates, that concerning Enets studies, not researchers involved with the Herzen Insitute and/or the Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg but the so called „periphery“ make the good work.“

The criticized state has unfortunately not changed or advanced perceivably ever since, though two new publications could be taken into account.

Soroki na, I ri na Petrovna (2010): **Éneckij ázyk. Sankt-Peterburg : Nauka**, 410 p.

For years of waiting Sorokina's is **Éneckij ázyk** disappointing. It seems to lean at Tereščenko's **Nganasanskij ázyk** but misses the target by a country mile on over 400 pages. In contains many of old and new errors and some new not really convincing ideas or theories. Maybe that's why she avoids the term grammar in this concern.

Siegl, Florian (2011): *Materials of Forest Enets : an indiginous language of northern Siberia.* (Dissertationes Philologicae Uralicae Universitatis Tartuensis 9) Tartu : Univ. Pr., 455 p. [Autor's PDF / prepubl., distributional edition]

It is to hope, that Siegl polishes up (t)his dissertation before final publishing.

In spite of or maybe because of the available texts the state remains still disastrous, as the following notes are documenting.

Exploited texts

- S = **Soroki na, I. P.; D. S. Bolina: Éneckie teksty.** St.Pbg. 2005, 304 p. (ISBN) = http://iling.spb.ru/nord/materia/ency_tit.html (cited as SoBo)
- L = **Labanauskas, Kazis I. (Sost.) (2002): Vehi drevnih putej: istoriqeskie predani á nganasan. Sankt-Peterburg** p. 194.

- W = Sorokina, Irina Petrovna ; Bolina, Daría Spiridonovna (2001): **Énecko-russkij i russko-éneckijslovarí. Sankt-Peterburg: Prosveúenie**, 309 [311] p. (cited as EWb or ED)
- D = Sorokina, Irina Petrovna ; Bolina, D. S. (2009): **Éneckij slovarí s kratkim grammatiqeskim oqerkom : okolo 8.000 slov . Sankt-Peterburg : Nauka**, 2009, 488 p.
- T = Tereúenko, Natalía Mitrofanovna (1973): **Sintaksis samodijskih ádykov: prostoe predloxeNi e. Leni ngrad**, 322 [323] p.

Other exploited publications are not part of the present description.

.Citation and annotation

The material is transcribed as described beneath and translated into English. If possible the Russian translation is preserved to document possible differences. Sometimes the sources combine several (main) clauses arbitrarily. This abstruse punctuation has been changed, for example using dots instead of commas as far as possible, at least cited. So the presently redundant (irrelevant) sentences are cut off (without annotation). Therefore one and the same sentence number is used for different „parts“ of the original sentence sequence. Subordinate clauses are usually cited as found in the sources, seldom replaced by dots. This implies of course cutouts of phrases for grammatical reasons as well.

The formally use of the Leipziger glossing rules (LGR) in own special lines beneath the examples is for economic reasons generally neglected. If needed grammatical notes are given in square brackets directly in the text after the concerned word. Redundant markings like SG or AOR are avoided. Other cases like DU, PL or PRT are of course labelled.

The source of information are placed in angle brackets at the end in two variants:

SoBo / Labanauskas											
1	0	2	0	3	0	4	0	5	0	6	Examples
S	:	89	,	13	-	4357	.	m	=	g9	<S:89,13-4357.m=g9>
S	:	9	,	43	-	475	.	b	=	A1	<S:9,43-457.b=A1>
L	:	1	:	78	-	8	.	b	=	A9	<L:1:78-8.b=A9>
L	:	12	:	136	-	766	.	m	=	f9	<L:12:136-766.m=f9>

- 1: Source: S(oBo), L(abanauskas)
 2: Text numeration
 3: Sentence numeration (SoBo: „,“), pagination (L: „,“)
 4: Record number of data-files
 5: Dialect: b(aj)/FE, m(adu)/TE
 6: Informant (Alphabet, capital letters = Baj, small letters = Madu), collector (digits) (se below)
 0: Orientation marks

The SoBo texts are taken of the internet version and are lacking pagination for this reason.¹ But the text and sentence numbers can be found easily in the print edition. A plus is the knowledge of informers and informants, which can be used fruitfully for analysis and correctures (see below).

T and W refer the Baj-dialect. They show lexical and sentence/phrase material, which is marked by (.l) and (.s):

¹ The text was transliterated by a textprogramme, so the mistakes - if not corrected by me - are original! The texts of Labanauskas had to be typed manually. So mistakes might be my own.

Tereščenko/ W ~ D							
1	0	2	0	3	0	4	Examples
T	:	011	-	7	.	s	<T:011-7.s>
T	:	205	-	697	.	l	<T:205-697.l>
W	:	116 212	-	3006	.	s	<W:116 212-3006.s>
W	:	28 204/247	-	473	.	l	<W:28 204/247-473.l>
D	:	266	-	5737	.	l	<D:266-5737.l>

- 1: Sources: T(ereščenko 1973), Enets Dictionary: W (=2001), D (=2009)
 2: Pagination (the Russian part of W is after „|“ with „/“ for further pages)
 3: Record number of data-files (sometimes omitted because omittable)
 4: s(sentence/phrase), (mono) l(exikal) entries
 0: Orientation marks

Sometimes the entries of the Russian-Enets part of the dictionary are cut, marked with three dots, unless they are the only finds. The missing data can be found in the lexical files (cf. <W:171...-151.l>, <W:1250-4494.s>).

So the part after the hyphen is irrelevant for citation and serves only internal purposes. It's only recommended to regard the dialect (after equal sign) anyhow.

General overview of the grammatical .sources

Despite a larger interest in Enets in the last decades, the achievements are relatively meager - if existent at all. Mostly they are restricted to limited studies treating with special, mostly phonetical or morphonological aspects. No grammar has been published since 1854! It is apart from Tereščenko's (1966) or Prokof'ev's (1937) grammatical sketch up to now still the only support at all, though it was collected in just a three week's time. Castrén himself apologises for its incompleteness. Indeed there is a lot of paradigms which can be transferred and used just by changing some of the altered phonemes. Other might serve to demonstrate the relatively few changes.

General overview of other .sources

W ~ D

The dictionary of 2001 (cited as W[wörterbuch]) serve rather practical needs. This school dictionary by Sorokina/Bolina contains - according to my current count - about 2.134 lexical and 2.629 syntactical/syntagmatical or phrasal entries.² The Enets and the Russian parts are mostly congruent. There are some minor differences in writing. To mark stems, the authors use phrases or syntagms, so the negation with verbs or declining nouns. Analysing the lemmata abstract, morphonological insights can be gained. This leads - similar to the Ng. dictionary - to an overview of (frequent) derivations and stem alterations. This and some example sentences compensate the lack of grammatical sketches as usual in former Russian dictionaries.

Unfortunately there is a considerable large amount of inconsistencies, contradictions and/or probably mistakes in the W. Many data are missing for defining stems correctly. This reduces the value of the W only marginally, provided we keep these possible facts in mind. The majority of material seems to be trustworthy as far as it can be under the unliteral state of the Enets at all.

The statements to the 2009 (cited as D[ictionary]) edition (just Enets-Russian) is nearly the same. Many mistakes remained uncorrected, many new ones were added. Now Sorokina tries to deliver more verbal pairs introducing more *-gu/ku-* examples. Furthermore she tries a grammatical sketch as usual in earlier times in Russian dictionaries. But this is unfortunately as identical with as erroneous to her earlier description **Ėneckij ázyk // Ázyki rossijkoj**

² The counting depends on the acceptance of phonological variants as own entries.

Federacii i sosednih gosudarstv III. Moskva 2005, 470-479 and should not be taken as reliable!

Most remarkable is the absence of nearly all é-lemmata. The book ends abrupt in a paragraph.

Tereščenko

To get a first overview the Syntaksis of Tereščenko (1973) is utmost helpful, not at least because of their appreciable uniformity of the material. Beside Mikola she is the most accurate scientist in treating the material. Both distinguish the two glottal stops perfectly.

Tereščenko published a real grammatical treasure trove waiting just to be recovered. Though she arranged her material more **by** syntactic than **by** grammatical demands, it can be rearranged easily once more for other grammatical purpose. That's why some sentences contain aspects Tereščenko didn't even thought of.

General remarks to the text editons of Sorokina/Bolina and Labanauskas

There are two larger text editions of Sorokina/Bolina (2005) and Labanauskas (2002). Both containing mainly FE, but TE texts also. Both are problematic alike. They are somewhat careless with their editons. So they seems to contain a larger amount of sometimes not easily detectable writing errors. They are easier to prove with SoBo, because the text is edited in Internet as well, and could taken over and transformed automatically. The Labanauskas texts had to be handled manuel, so that there could be mistakes by myself.

The syntax of Enets seems to be more free than for example in Ng. and contains more redundant naral (speech) elements (fillers?) than can be translated adequately. So the Russian translation slipped not seldom off, especially in Labanauskas. Maybe the collectors should have insisted on a more accurate utterance of the informants, or insisting on an unbroken, stringent reproduction of the stories. (This is dealt with more detailt on another place.) This makes texts partly worthless and incomprehensible. Some sentences make definitely no sense! The ambiguity (homonymy) of Enets morphonology led to ambiguous interpretations, which is assisted by the equivocation of Russian too.

Both editions share a small number of informants, so some of the texts are more or less congruent or in large parts overlapping. Those were sometimes interesting comparing them.

Sorokina/Bolina (SoBo)

There are some commentaries included to each story, sometimes enlightening, sometimes trivial but mostly avoiding problems. The few derivational remarks divided by dialekts on two page near the end summarize the most frequent derivations.

Labanauskas

A merit of Labanauskas are the grammatical sketches of FE and TE (!) in the first part of his work, unfortunately not as relevant a the obove mentioned. The FE syntactical material basis mainly on Tereščenko (1973). Maybe some songs and their notes should be mentioned. They are disregarded here at all!

.Informants and Informers/Collectors

Because of nicknames or omitted father names, the correlation of informants and texts is sometimes confusing (cf. the overview in SoBo: 341f.), some are not even mentioned:

Aš'apkina, Nina
Ivanov, K. V.
Pal'čin, Al. Serg.
Silkin, I. I.
Silkina, O. I.
Turutina, T. P.

others are overhanging (not represented with a text):

- ? Pal'čina, L. N.
- ? Ivanov, Afanasij
- ? Bolina (Pal'čina) M. N. (1931)

Baj (FE)

Text	Collector	Informant	Born	Famely/Clan	Year	IC
Myths and Legends						
001	Sorokina	Pal'čin, N. S.	1910	Čor	1969	A1
002	Sorokina	Pal'čin, N. S.			1969	A1
003	Glukhij/Susekov	Pal'čin, N. S.			1980	A3
004	Glukhij/Susekov	Pal'čin, N. S.			1980	A3
005	Sorokina	Pal'čin, N. S.			1969	A1
006	Glukhij/Susekov	Pal'čin, N. S.			1980	A3
007	Glukhij/Susekov	Pal'čin, N. S.			1980	A3
008	Bolina, D. S.	Pal'čin, N. S., [cf. L02 [1]]			1991	A2
009	Sorokina	Pal'čin, N. S.			1969	A1
010	Sorokina	Pal'čin, N. S.			1969	A1
011	Sorokina	Čardu (Bolina), N. P.	1937	Moggadi	1974	B1
012	Bolina, D. S.	Pal'čin, N. S.			1991	A2
013	Bolina, D. S.	Bolin, S. P.	1927	Moggadi	1991	C2
014	Sorokina	Jamkin, K. D.			1969	D1
015	Bolina, D. S.	Pal'čin, N. S.			1991	A2
016	Bolina, D. S.	Bolin, S. P.			1991	C2
017	Sorokina	Jamkin, K. D.			1969	D1
018	Bolina, D. S.	Bolin, S. P.			1991	C2
019	Bolina, D. S.	Bolin, S. P.			1991	C2
020	Bolina, D. S.	Bolina (Silkina), E. I.	1955	Baj	1991	E2
021	Pal'čin, V. N.	Pal'čin, N. S.			1991	A6
022	Bolina, N.N.	Bolina (Silkina), V. N. [~ L05]			1991	F4
023	Bolina, D. S.	Pal'čin, N. S. [~ L03]			1991	A2
024	Sorokina	Silkina, D. A.	1950	Baj	1969	G1
025	Bolina, D. S.	Bolin, S. P.			1991	C2
Tales and Traditions						
026	Sorokina	Silkina, D. A.			1969	G1
027	Sorokina	Silkina, D. A.			1969	H1
028	Sorokina	Bolina, L. N.	1951	n.A.	1985	I1
029	Sorokina	Bolina, L. N.			1985	I1
030	Sorokina	Bolina, L. N.			1985	I1
031	Sorokina	Bolina, L. N.			1985	I1
032	Sorokina	Bolina, T. N:	1953	Moggadi	1969	J1
033	Sorokina	Bolina, N. N.	1961	n.A.	1969	K1
034	Sorokina	Bolin, V. N.	1953	Moggadi	1969	L1
035	Sorokina	Ašl'apkina, Nina	1955		1969	M1
036	Sorokina	Bolin, J. S.			1969	N1
037	Sorokina	Silkina, D. A.			1969	G1
038	Bolina, N.N.	Silkina (Bolina), M. N.	1929	Moggadi	1991	O4
039	Sorokina	Silkina, D. A.			1969	G1
040	Sorokina	Bolin, V. N.			1969	L1
041	Sorokina	Ašl'apkina, Nina			1969	M1
042	Sorokina	Silkina, D. A.			1969	G1
043	Sorokina	Silkina, D. A.			1974	G1

044	Sorokina	Silkina, D. A.			1969	G1
045	Bolina, D. S.	Pal'čin, N. S.			1991	A2
046	Sorokina	Bolina, L. N.			1985	I1
047	Sorokina	Bolina, L. N.			1985	I1
048	Sorokina	Bolin, V. N.			1969	L1
049	Sorokina	Bolina, L. N.			1985	I1
050	Sorokina	Silkina, D. A.			1974	G1
051	Bolina, D. S.	Bolin, S. P.			1992	C2
052	Sorokina	Pal'čin, N. S.			1969	A1
053	Sorokina	Silkina, D. A.			1969	G1
054	Sorokina	Bolina (Silkina), V. N.			1974	F1
055 ⁺	Mikola, T.	Bolin, N. D. [1967: 3]	1929	Moggadi	1967	P5
056 ⁺	Mikola, T.	Bolin, N. D. [1967: 2]			1967	P5
057	Pal'čin, V. N.	Pal'čin, N. S.			1991	A6
058	Sorokina	Bolin, J. S.	1953	Moggadi	1969	N1
Tales including Russians						
059	Sorokina	Silkina, D. A.			1974	G1
060	Bolina, D. S.	Bolin, S. P.			1991	C2
061	Bolina, D. S.	Pal'čin, N. S. [cf. L02, 2]			1991	A2
Songs						
062	Sorokina	Silkina, D. A.			1969	G1
063	?	Pal'čin, V. N.	1958	Čor	1991	Q7
064	Pal'čin, V.N.	Pal'čin, N. S.			1991	A6
Daily Life Tales						
065	Sorokina	Bolina, M. A.	1927	o.A.	1969	R1
066	Sorokina	Silkina, D. A.			1974	G1
067	Sorokina	Pal'čin, N. S.			1969	A1
068	Sorokina	Bolin, J. S.			1969	N1
069 ⁺	Mikola	Bolin, N. D. [1967: 1]			1967	P5
070 ⁺	Mikola	Bolin, N. D. [1967: 4]			1967	P5
071	Sorokina	Bolina (Silkina), V. N.	1929	Baj	1969	F1
072 ⁺	Glukhij/Susekov	Čardu (Bolina), N. P. [cf. L02, 14]			1980	B3
073 ⁺	Glukhij/Susekov	Ivanov, K. V. [cf. L02, 14]	1920	Čor	1980	S3
074 ⁺	Glukhij/Susekov	Ivanov, K. V. [cf. L02, 14]			1980	S3
075	Sorokina	Bolina (Silkina), V. N.			1969	F1
076	Sorokina	Pal'čin, Al. Serg.	1912		1969	T1
077	Sorokina	Bolina, N. N.			1974	K1
078	Bolina, N. N.	Pal'čin, N. S.			1991	A4
079	Sorokina	Jamkin, K. D.	1912	(verh. ~) Čor	1969	D1
080	Sorokina	Čardu (Bolina), N. P.			1969	B1

Maddu (TE)

Text	Collector	Informant	Born	Famely/Clan	Year	IC
Mythological Materials						
81	Sorokina	Tuglakova, D. M.	1937	Lodoseda	1977	a1
82	Sorokina	Silkin, N. S.	1910	Baj	1977	b1
83	Sorokina	Kaplin, T. N.	1924	Solda	1977	c1
*84	Labanauskas	Kaplin, H. N. [=L02:8]	1910	Solda	1978	d9
Tales						
85	Sorokina	Nouko Pil'ko	1965	Sado	1977	e1
86	Sorokina	Nouko Pil'ko	+		1977	e1
87	Sorokina	Kaplin, H. N.	+		1977	d1
*88 ⁺	Labanauskas	Silkin, I. I.	?		1973	f9
*89 ⁺	Labanauskas	Turutin, T. P.	?		1973	g9
*90	Labanauskas	Turutin, T. P.	?		1973	g9
Daily Life Tales						
91	Sorokina	Kaplin, H. N.	+		1977	d1
92	Sorokina	Kaplin, H. N.	+		1977	d1
93	Sorokina	Kaplin, H. N.	+		1977	d1
94	Sorokina	Kaplin, H. N.	+		1977	d1
95	Sorokina	Kaplin, T. N.	+		1977	c1
96	Sorokina	Kaplin, H. N.	+		1977	d1
97	Sorokina	Kaplin, T. N.	+		1977	c1
98	Sorokina	Tuglakov, N. M.	1932	Lodoseda	1977	h1
99	Sorokina	Silkina, O. I.	1932	Baj	1977	i1
100	Sorokina	Tuglakov, N. M.	+		1977	h1
101	Sorokina	Kaplina, D. H.	1920	Solda	1977	j1
*102	Labanauskas	Silkin, I. I. [= L12]	?		1973	f9

- Labanauskas uses š/w instead of ç (cf. 2002 where he uses ç as well). In other sources w is used in russian loanword. ⁺ corrected by means of the original texts. IC = Informant/Collector. There is a contradiction concerning the sources L14=B3 vs. S73=S3 (cf. sentences (920) and (33)).

⁺ Part of **Fol'iklor narodov Tajmyra I** (1992) as well.

Except the year there is no further information about text 73 but it is connected and published together with text 74 in SN4 and can be codified on behalf of this. Included earlier published texts:

Mikola (1967) = 55, 56, 69, 70

SN 4 = 2 (155), 3 (150), 4 (151), 6 (148), 7 (153), 72 (146), 73 (144), 74 (154), 85 (158) - (the numbers in brackets refer to the pages.)

Labanauskas 2002

Labanauskas' Sources (p. 331, cf. p. 3)				
Text	Informant	Residence	Year	IC
0.1	Silkina, M. N.	Potapovo	1992	O9
0.2	Pal'čin, V. N.	Potapovo	1992	Q9
0.3	Pal'čin, V. N.	Potapovo	1992	Q9
0.4	Pal'čin, V. N.	Potapovo	1992	Q9
0.5	Pal'čin, N. S.	Potapovo	1992	A9
0.6	Pal'čin, N. S.	Potapovo	1992	A9
1	Pal'čin, N. S. [~ SoBo 8]	Potapovo	1992	A9
2	Pal'čin, N. S. [cf. SoBo 61]	Potapovo	1992	A9
3	Pal'čin, N. S. [~ SoBo 23]	Potapovo	1992	A9
4	Bolina (Silkina), Vera Nikolaevna [<> SoBo]	Potapovo	1992	F9
5	Bolina (Silkina), Vera Nikolaevna [~ SoBo 22]	Potapovo	1992	F9
6	Bolina, Marija Nikolaevna	Potapovo	1994	O9
7	Silkin, Ivan, Ivanovič	Voroncovo	1973	f9
8 ⁺	Kaplin, Xolju Nikolaevič [~ SoBo 84]	Voroncovo	1978	d9
9	Silkin, Ivan, Ivanovič	Voroncovo	1973	f9
10	Silkin, Ivan, Ivanovič	Voroncovo	1973	f9
11 ⁺	Silkin, Ivan, Ivanovič	Voroncovo	1973	f9
12 ⁺	Silkin, Ivan, Ivanovič [= SoBo 102]	Voroncovo	1973	f9
13	Tuglakov, Nikolaj Maksimovič	Voroncovo*	1984	h9
14 ^{**}	[Čardu, N.P.] [~ SoBo 72] Ivanov, K. V. [~ SoBo 73.74]	Potapovo	1980	B3 S3

⁺ Part of **Fol'iklor narodov Tajmyra I** (1992) as well.

* Texts 13 and 14 are erroneously related (fn., p. 3) to the Potapovo dialect (cf. sources SoBo)

** There are several inconsistencies concerning the publication. First of all it seems to be an uncomplete adaptation of three former in **Skađki narodov Sibirskogo Severa 4 (Tomsk 1981, 146f. 144f., 154f.)** published texts collected by Glukhij und Susekov (G/S) from N. P. Čardu (B) (not explicitly mentioned in Labanauskas!) (cf. SoBo text 72) and K. V. Ivanov (S) (cf. SoBo text 73.74). Maybe Labanauskas possessed a former skript, because several sentences can't related at all. So the sentences (874-921) as completely assigned to (B), though (874-880) are not congruent with **Skađki**. Also the sentence partitions are different. The transkription varies anyway noticeably in all three sources. The following concordance regards the sentences which could fairly identified:

L14	G/S	SoBo	IC
(874/881-921	4-32	72	B3
922-932	27-38	73	S3
933-953	2-21	74	S3

Labanauskas published Enets texts³ from Potapovo (songs, [1-6], [13-14]) as well as Voroncovo ([7-12]). The songs [0.] are until further notice excluded, because of an usually higher degree of unintelligibility. Although the material seems to be more homogene, there are numerous deviances, debt to the several below discussed problems. (Examples of) Notes for the songs are to be found as well (p. 75-77).

The stories are due to the spare material subjects, in most cases similar to SoBo's - as shown below.

Text L02 [1:1-ca. 180] is in most passages identical with SoBo [8], only the orthography distincts in many cases (see below).

³ Part IV (p. 182-330) presents historical issues, traditional tales and myths of Enets but only in Russian!

Labanauskas 1992 = Folklóre narodov Tajmyra I

This collection contains Enets texts published later partly in Labanauskas (2002) (8, 11, 12) and/or Sobo (8, 11, 89, 90). The notation is slightly different, (at a quick glance) using consonantal geminates, or rather *d* instead of *δ*!

There is a only Russian text by Dolgich (**Kak poávi li sí belonosye gagary**) as well.

List of Informants

Informants of SoBo and Labanauskas 2002 (L:)				
	Informant	Birth	Family/Clan	Text
A	Pal'čin, N. S.	1910	Čor	1-10, 12, 15, 21, 23, 45, 52, 57, 61, 64, 67, 78 L: 1, 2, 3
B	Čardu (Bolina), N. P.	1937	Muggadi	11, 72, 80 L: 14 (874?-921)
C	Bolin, S. P.	1927	Muggadi	13, 16, 18, 19, 25, 51, 60
D	Jamkin, K. D.			14, 17, 79
E	Bolina (Silkina), E. I.	1955	Baj	20
F	Bolina (Silkina), V. N.	1929	Baj	22, 54, 62, 71, 75 L: 4(#SoBo?), 5
G	Silkina, D. A.	1950	Baj	26, 37, 39, 42, 43, 44, 50, 53, 59, 66
H	Silkina, D. S.			27
I	Bolina, L. N.	1951		28, 29-31, 46, 47, 49
J	Bolina, T. N.	1953	Muggadi	32
K	Bolina, N. N.			33, 77
L	Bolin, V. N.			34, 40, 48
M	Aš'apkina, Nina	1955		35, 41
N	Bolin, J. s.	1953	Muggadi	36, 58, 68
O	Silkina (Bolina), M. N.	1929	Muggadi	38 L: 6
P	Bolin, N. D.	1929	Muggadi	55, 56, 69, 70
Q	Pal'čin, V. N.	1958	Čor	63
R	Bolina, M. A.	1927		65
S	Ivanov, K. V.			73, 74 L: 14
T	Pal'čin, Al. Serg.	1912		76
a	Tuglakova, D. M.	1937	Lodoseda	81
b	Silkin, N. S.	1910	Baj	82
c	Kaplin, T. N.	1924	Solda	83, 97
d	Kaplin, H. N.	1910	Solda	84, 87, 91-94 L: 8
e	Nouko Pil'ko	1965	Sado	85, 86
f	Silkin, I. I.			88, 102 L: 7, 9, 10, 11, 12
g	Turutin, T. P.			89, 90
h	Tuglakov, N. M.	1932	Lodoseda	98, 100 L: 13
i	Silkina, O. I.	1932		99
j	Kaplina, D. H.	1920	Solda	101

Sources: In Labanauskas (*) statements of ages are missing. Texts 88, 89, 90, 102 are recorded 1973 in Voroncov. Text 84 of 1978 is not located, but it's the same informer of Sorokina. The informers of text 82 and 99 are obviously married Bajš.

Collectors

1 = Sorokina	5 = Mikola, T.
2 = Bolina, D. S.	6 = Pal'čin, V. N.
3 = Glukhij/Susekov	7 = ?
4 = Bolina, N.N.	9 = Labanauskas

Problems of Handling the Texts and their Reproduction/Reedition

In translations in some cases additional (unusual) hyphen are used to highlight phrasal or semantic entities, as ‚six-hundred‘ or ‚not-knowing‘.

We have to decide between ethnological material (folklore) published mainly only in Russian (cf. Dolgich 1962, Labanauskas 2002) and texts conjoined with Russian translations. The stories are due to the spare material subjects resp. themes in most cases similar or alike. As Siegl already noticed, the few native speakers are questioned witnesslike and can't add more substantial facts anymore, rather leave them out. Furthermore the collectors seem(ed) not to insist on textual accuracy. So the „translations“ are rather descriptive than exact and sometimes mere fantasy and far beyond the line. They seem to be done successively but not in parallel. Because of their fragmentariness and ambiguousness the up to now published texts can be called almost qur'anic. Even the original absence of vowel diacritics there is comparable with the drop of vowels and GS (glotis stops) here.

There are identic forms (cf. *kuńrubihuj* below) and similar syntagmas in slightly deviant environment, but not identic sentences. The themes are simply modulated. Due to the insufficient documentation (scribal errors, idiolects, unknown lexis, rudimentary grammatical descriptions, cultural background) of Enets, the topic of original sentences is scarcely comprehensible. Projected to the competence of some collectors this led realiter to a circulus vitiosus. (cf. Siegl's critic)

This is documented for example by the countless versions of the simple (minded) Djoo (Djoa) stories. An impression can be found in SoBo and Labanauskas (2002), were the same informant N. S. Pal'čin (^A) served two informers - SoBo (¹) and Labanauskas (²) - as source. With small variants the story is alike. The only difference is the collecting year. The emendations are as usual until further proposals, cf.

the/a SoBo-version (from 1969)

Labanauskas version (from 1992) both told by N. S. Pal'čin (^A):

d'oa (2) ‚Djoo / **dĕa** (2)‘ <S:2,0-108.b=A1>

(...)

d'oa sokuotè sértiĭda [<ser̥t̥iĭda>] ‚mal'čada sértiĭ [<ser̥t̥iĭ>] ‚Djoo put on the sokuj, put on the malitsa / **dĕa sokuj na nego nadel, mal i qu ne nego nadel**‘ <S:2,4-112.b=A1>

taĭabè paggiĭda sértiĭda ‚He put on the shaman clothes / --‘ <L:1:82-299.b=A9>

(In the following sentence the unique and unclear *kuńrubihuj* is striking, which might be a variant of *kon-* ‚to come/to become‘:)

d'oa posada sore [<sorè>] *tĭrahan d'oĭtabiĭda* ‚mana: *kuńrubihuj* ‚Djoo beat the Rotten Stub [EN] with his fist, said: let's go together / **dĕa po gni lomu penĭku kulakom udari l, skazaL: davaj pobexi m vdvoem**‘ <S:2,5-113.b=A1>

posa sorekuda tĭrahambiĭda, manā: ‚He beat Rotten Stub with his fist, said [EN] / **d. udari l kulakom po penĭku i skazaL**‘ <L:1:82-300.b=A9>

kuńrubihuj! ‚Let's go together / **davaj vdvoem pobexi m!**‘ <L:1:82-301.b=A9>

posa sore [*< sorè*] *mana: tonè èhuñaj , baduñ mujri , baduñ kogartahuguđu* ,Rotten Stub said: Stay (be) her, my roots are strong, I'd like to root them out (cut them?) (first) / **gniloj penek govorit: eüie podoxdi, korni moi krepkie, korni otorvu** ^{<S:2,6-114.b=A1>} ,

posa soreku manā: ,Rotten Stub said / **suhoj penek skazaL:** ^{<L:1:82-302.b=A9>} ,

tonè èhuñaj, baduñ mujri" , baduñ nèkoradın ,Stay (be) here, my roots are strong, I've to root them out / **podoxdi, korni u mená krepkie, á i h vydernu** ^{<L:1:82-303.b=A9>} ,

posa sore [*< sorè*] *budimoa , tođ kuñruđa [kuđriđa] ^ ań , d'oa sokood mal'ča peri kadađa* ,Rotten Stub moved, then, coming again, Djoo took his parka and the malitsa finally (ever) off / **suhoj penek zaweveli lsá, potom kak pobexi t, sokuj i mal i qu dēa navsegda unes** ^{<S:2,7-115.b=A1>} ,

posa soreku budimua, tođ kuñruđ [*<kuñriđ*] *ań, d'oo tadabè paggiđa péri kadiđa , / suhoj penek poweveli lsá i pobexal, unosá s soboj wamanskuú odexdu* ^{<L:1:82-304.b=A9>} ,

d'oa mambi: tēđa [*< tēđa*] *mākuñ tobuñ , ñibimi šij* [*< si*] *kouđtada* [*< koustada*] ,Djoo said: now when I get home, the gammar will scold me / **dēa govorit: sej qas domoj pri du, babuwka mená zarugaet** ^{<S:2,8-116.b=A1>} ,

d'oo manā: ,Djoo said / **d. skazaL:** ^{<L:1:82-305.b=A9>} ,

tēđa mékuñ tobuñ mēnsèj ši" kauđtada , / teperí, kogda á pri du v qum, staruwka mená otrugaet ^{<L:1:82-306.b=A9>} ,

d'oa mana: tonè èhuñaj pagiduñ , ñobčik kodađa , tèrak ènču tohuñaj ,... / dēa govorit: podoxdi, odexdu vse ravno sebe dostanu, kogda bogatyē lúdi pri edut ^{<S:2,9-117.b=A1>} ,

tonè èhuñaj, paggiđuñ kodađ, tèrèg ènčuv" tohuñaj , / ladno, odexdu sebe vse ravno dostanu, kogda pri edut bogatyē lúdi ^{<L:1:82-307.b=A9>} ,

d'oa ñib'ü mät tojđa ,Djoo came to the gammer's tent / **dēa v dom babuwki priwel** ^{<S:2,10-118.b=A1>} ,

d'oo mēnsè mét tojđ , / d. vernul sá v qum staruwki ^{<L:1:82-308.b=A9>} ,

ñib'ü mana: pagi kuna ? ,The gammer said: where are the clothes / **babuwka govorit: gde odexda ?** ^{<S:2,11-119.b=A1>} ,

mēnsēda manā: , / ta sproqi la: ^{<L:1:82-309.b=A9>} ,

tadabè paggiđ kuna"? , / **gde tvoá wamanskaá odexda?** ^{<L:1:82-310.b=A9>} ,

d'oa mana: ñi mambi pagišiđa pérñi tonè , pérñihud sértijnuš [*< sèrtijnuš*] ,Djoo said: you did not tell me, that there are relatives without clothes, dress the relatives / **dēa govorit: ty ne govori la mne, qto u tebá rodná bez odexdy estí, odel tvoú rodnú** ^{<S:2,12-120.b=A1>} ,

d'oo manā: , / d. otveti L: ^{<L:1:82-311.b=A9>} ,

kérit manadoš [!]: , / **ty xe sama govori l, ...** ^{<L:1:82-312.b=A9>} ,

pagišiđa pérñi tonè! , / **qto u tebá estí rodstvenni ki bez odexdy** ^{<L:1:82-313.b=A9>} ,

pérñihud sértijnuš , / vot á i odel ih ^{<L:1:82-314.b=A9>} ,

d'oa ñib'jud mana: tonè èhuñaj , tèrak ènču tohuñaj , ñobčik pididın pagidiñ kodađ' ,Djoo said to the gammer: ... / **dēa babke govorit: podoxdi, bogatyē lúdi pri edut, vse ravno i spugaú-i h, odexdu-sebe dostanu** ^{<S:2,13-121.b=A1>} ,

- tonè èhuñaj, tèrèg ènčuv" tobtu, ñobčik piđiđjn, paggiđuñ kodađ , / ladno, esli pri edut bogatye lúdi, á toxé i spugaú i dostanu sebe odexdu* ‹L:1:82-315.b=A9› ,
- d'oa iñi kod'i , kiudnuü nèrad' ,Djoo slept obviously (NEG), it became morning / dëa, koneqno, spal, utrom vstal* ‹S:2,14-122.b=A1› ,
- d'oo iña kod'i" , kiudnuü nèriđ , / d. leg spatí, a utrom vstal i powel na ohotu, si lki osmatri vat* ‹L:1:83-316.b=A9› ,
- to d'ud'igon sira èbi ,During this time there was snow / v to vremá zi ma byla* ‹S:2,15-123.b=A1› ,
- to d'ud'igon mal'e sira èbi , / v éto vremá uxe byla zi ma* ‹L:1:83-317.b=A9› ,
- d'oa kuñ desid dedumubi añ desid kañi ,Djoo somehow (?) went hearable to the catching loop, came again to the catching loop / dëa, kak vsegda si lki vsegda proverál, tak k si lkam i powel* ‹S:2,16-124.b=A1› ,
- kad'aš kañi, dešid modjud' kañi , / vo vremá ohoty d. nawel kakoe-to qumovi üe* ‹L:1:83-318.b=A9› ,
- d'oa obu d'od'igon dedumada šer obuho iđajd ođima ,During the time Djoo was going some dwelling appeared / dëa, v éto vremá, poka hodi l po delam, v kakoe-to qumi üe vywel* ‹S:2,17-125.b=A1› ,
- obu d'ud'igon d'oo d'ađumada šer obuho iđajd ođjma , / --* ‹L:1:83-319.b=A9› ,
- d'oa iđajhid ñob šedi [<šèdi] liđiko , katjđ šedi [<šèdi] ko ,Djoo found some antler bones out of the dwelling, the antlers of a (reindeer) bull / dëa v qumi üe odnu kostí lopatki hora nawel* ‹S:2,18-126.b=A1› ,
- iđajhid ño" šede liđku, katjè šede koa , / tam lezahla kostí, lopatka olená* ‹L:1:83-320.b=A9› ,
- d'oa malñiu: kuñ èki liđiku muda ,Well, Djoo sait: how are these bones to manage / dëa govori t: qto á s étoj kostíú sdelaú ?* ‹S:2,19-127.b=A1› ,
- bida iron manā: , / d. razmywlál:* ‹L:1:83-321.b=A9› ,
- kuñ èkké liđiku mudā? , / qto á mogu sdelatí iz étoj kosti?* ‹L:1:83-322.b=A9› ,
- d'oa liđida midrađa , mäta keod todađa ,Djoo took these bones, brought them aside his tent / dëa kostí poloxi l na sebá, k qumu pri nes* ‹S:2,20-128.b=A1› ,
- d'oo liđida midređa, méta kévod todađa , / on poloxi l kostí sebe na pleqo i pri nes na stoi bi üe* ‹L:1:83-323.b=A9› ,
- d'oa čiki liđida mujt' péda ,Djoo began to treat the bones / dëa étu kostí delatí stal* ‹S:2,21-129.b=A1› ,
- tođ čikohod čiki liđida mujt' péda , / zatem on prinálsá ee obrabatyvatí* ‹L:1:83-324.b=A9› ,
- liđida sjarah kodtjđa ,He froze the bones under the snow / kostí snegom oblepi l (obmorozi l)* ‹S:2,22-130.b=A1› ,
- ortè liđida sjarah kodtjđa , / snaqala oblepi l kostí snegom* ‹L:1:83-325.b=A9› ,
- točkuđa péhèn , tjarah kerta puáda kutjđjđa , točkuđa puáhadđa buá ođidj ,After this he beat himself with a log and fists on his nose, after this blood became visible out of his nose / potom polenom, kulakani sam svoj -nos bi tí stal, potom iz-svoego-nosa kroví vytaüi l* ‹S:2,23-131.b=A1› ,
- točkuđa kérta puáda tjarah kutjđađa , / zatem razbil kulakom sebe nos tak, ...* ‹L:1:83-326.b=A9› ,

- puähađda buä ođjma , / qtoby kroví potekla* ‹L:1:83-327.b=A9›,
d'oa šeđida [‹šeđida] lįđi űol' kodtèđa , tè osađurou méđa , kerta bujahanda ,Djoo freezed the
 bones of the antlers strongly, reindeer meatlike he smeared it with his own
 blood / **děa kostí lopatki silíno zamorozi l, sdelal pohoxej na olenie
 máso svoej krovíú** ‹S:2,24-132.b=A1›,
*d'oo lįđi űul''' kodtèđa, kérta buähanda tēa ossarahaš méđa , / krovíú i zmazal sneg na
 kosti, zamorozi l, i poluqilosí kak by máso ‹L:1:83-328.b=A9›,
d'oa lįđida ped parida ní puñada ,Djoo put the bones outside on a drying rack / **děa kostí na
 uli qe na suwi lku poloxil** ‹S:2,25-133.b=A1›,
*tođ čikohod lįđida ped kadađa, parēda ní puñada , / potom éto máso on poloxil na
 labaz* ‹L:1:83-329.b=A9›,
kod'iahađad'i kiudnuüi èđđuda tērak ènčiu toa ,In the morning, after they slept, the reindeer
 vehicles of the rich people came / **posle togo kak oni pospali, utrom,
 bogatye lúdi na uprǎxke priwli** ‹S:2,26-134.b=A1›,
*kiudnuüi kod'iahađdu tērēg ènčuv" èđuš toa" , / utrom sleduúüego dná priehali
 bogatye lúdi* ‹L:1:83-330.b=A9›,*

(...)

.Samples' choice

Grammatical examples and items were given mostly in full sentences, in which they are embedded. This bloats this publication only subjectively. As mentioned already there exist no or just a few text surviving without difficulties for publication. Thereover they wouldn't cover of course not even the main aspects of the Enets grammar. The selected sentences shall adjust this lack. In cases of doubt, rather some more example is added than omitted.

In this spirit the Russian translation had been retained as well. This seemed to be beneficial for controlling not only the English translations which might contain of course and out of question - but hopefully not to much - errors. Beside of this it would have meant more effort, to delete as to offer them. But where they didn't exist, they were not added obsessively.

The examples are taken mainly from Tereščenko (**Sintaksis**, 1973), Sorokina/Bolina (SoBo, Texts published in the Internet), the Enets Dictionaries (W = 2001, D = 2009) and partly and if needed Labanauskas (2001). For technical reasons the Sorokina/Bolina dictionary of 2001 is marked by W in the sources, that of 2009 by D, because their content is not fully congruent. In "D" nearly the whole è lexik has been omitted!

The samples were chosen subjectively, but under the aspekt of relevance and quality of edition and are not claiming completeness, although less frequent phenomena might be cited completely. Other samples are present in different sources, from which only one was chosen.

The original samples contain partly more than one sentence devided just by comma. Here the redundant parts had been cut adequately. This is not marked explicitly.

Though it was not intended to drop doubtful cases generally, it would have overburden this publication listening them extensively. That's specialist's work. Nevertheless in some cases alternatives are itemized.

.Russian Data

If possible beside English notes and translations, the Russian data are added. They accrued quasi as by-product analyzing the material, because it's the first language of translation. Although Russian isn't common to some users, it'd be inexpedient to omit them by mainly two reasons. First of all the Russian aspectual system is nearer to Samoyedic than other here applied languages. Even English can't reflect the included varieties of the verbal system. On the other hand it might be an appropriate controlling of the sometimes hardly understandable Enets material for those knowing Russian.⁴ Misunderstandings can occur as in English as in Russian alike. Benchmark was in any case the Enets itself.

Literary genres

All texts belong to two literary genres, the epic *śudbiča* and the *d'eriču*. The further are possibly adopted from the Nenets, where they have a long tradition. The names of the actors point this out. The Enets counterpart seems to have got lost.

The *d'eriču* are dealing with the daily life, as his connection with the verb for ‚telling‘ shows. They are parts of campfire conversation. It's the form of myths and legends found in SoBo. Maybe it should be mentioned, that Labanauskas (2002) published some (noted) songtexts as well, which have been excluded here for some reasons.

.Individual writing practices of single informers

The comparison with original (already earlier published) texts shows more or less serious differences and misinterpretations. Some of them are mentioned above. In **Mikola** (1967) the divergent use of *e*-graphemes has been ignored (*e* after palatals and *ε* instead of *é*, which should be better depicted as *è*). Only later (since 1980) Mikola used *è* (*e*) in his publications.

The **Glukhij/Susekov** texts were published earlier (SN 4, 144 ff.) and corrected here accordingly. They show some writing peculiarities: *θ* instead of *s*, **w'** instead of *š*, *ϕ* instead of *ϕ*, *ϕ* instead of *e* - same as Mikola - after palatals, which are marked generally, so they had to distinct even *i* und *ī*. They don't use *é* (*è*), that's why *e* after nonpalatals is ambivalent and might be *é* or *è*. It is possible, though rather unlikely, that the diacritic with **ort é orné** (Glukhij 1981: 154, sentence 4 = SoBo 74,4) refer to *é/è*. They turn up without visible reason - other than stress - with other vowels *á* and *ú*, so **tará** (a.a.O. sentence 3), **batúda** (a.a.O. sentence 15). Geminated vowels are geminated and no long vowels, which are marked with colons. Instead of *h* generally *γ* is used. The Russian graphemes *ě* and **ú** should be read *jo* and *ju* (cf. **w'ujjup'i da**, a.a.O. sentence 8). Unusual is the palatalization of even *δ* (cf. **lyδ'i**, a.a.O. sentence 10), which is here considered as unpalatal like *ñ*.

Labanauskas' *çú* has been changed to *šu* (cf. **qu**) ~ *ši* (*çi*, cf. **qi**, **omutí**, **qεδεgon** L02:139) as he (?) did in SoBo generally. The long vowels are mostly marked like *ā*, *ī*, *ē*, *ō*, but *uu* instead of *ū*. He marked only one kind of GS, mainly the voiceless one.

⁴ The data vom ED had to be selected corresponding to the special issue. So from several translation „proposals“ only one or two could have been chosen.

.Amendments/.Corrections/.Transcription

To get partly usable/consistent texts, a lot of corrections or amendments with numerous compromises had to be done. There is a rather confusing punctuation in the original texts (mostly) separating main sentences, i.e. several sentences with finite verb each just by commas. These have replaced (unmarked) by full stops, if needed or useful. So in citation only the relevant part with finite verb is used. This concerns mostly in the verselike divided and counted SoBo material. It's most likely at the actual level of „Enetsology“, that there are improvements to the worse or just misinterpretation.⁵ Aside individual writings there had to be considered in particular the competences of:

1. the informants, i.e. their idiolect and of
2. the informers/collectors and their habit of description⁶

Aside from Mikola's or Pusztay's there is not even one fitting (published) text, which can be used without difficulties as grammatically and logically coherent linguistic introductory text. The connected difficulties in nearly all of their specifications can be demonstrated in the following sentence. It derived from the adaption of a text published in 1981 by SoBo and Labanauskas. This sentence is only transferred here in latin letters under attention to the probable GS. The palatalisation is original:

d'oyaðe" n'ïdu' arumumb'i", tuðuku" nol'kut' peubi", tuðuku" o:t' peub'i" ‚Die Kinder der Rentierkühe wurden groß, sie fingen an Pilze zu suchen (?), sie fingen an Pilze zu essen / **vaxenok teláta bolíwimi stanovátsá, za gribami begatí naqinaút, griby kuwatí naqi naút**‘ (SN4: 144, Satz 13 [SBV korrigiert])

Adaption by SoBo:

d'ohaðe níðu arumumbi" tuðuku" nol'kut' péubi" [<peubi'] , tuðuku" oot' péubi" [<peubi'] ‚id.‘ <S:73,13-3673.b=S3>

Adaption by Labanauskas (his Russian translation differs somewhat):

d'ohodè néðu arumumbi", tuðuku nol'kut' péubi", tuðuku ot' péubi" , / telát vzrosleút, naqi naút begatí v poi skah gri bov, kormátsá i mi ‘ <L:14:139-897.b=S3>

These sentence varieties are self-explanatory. The concerning matters will be discussed later (cf. palatalisation, *e*-graphemes, GS). Solely *d'oyaðe" ~ d'ohaðe ~ d'ohodè*, cf. *d'ohod'* ‚female reindeer / **vaxenka (sanka olená)**‘ <W:321170/232-577.b> shall be pointed out. Nothing could be added but the consternation about the present conditions.

Another example is, original sentence:

te? p'i d'eθa(γ)n o:mumb'i?, d'ernujo te? n'i o:r' d'ernujo an(i)? pow'i r'ëub'i? metu?
k'i :yun ,Oleni noqíú, proxladno kogda, kuwaút, dnem oni ne edát opátí krugom
hodát, quma okolo‘ (Glukhij 1981: 144,10)⁷

Labanauskas' version:

⁵ One of this cases might be *torseltorsi* ‚such‘, cf. *torsè* (T) ~ *torsi* (EWb) ~ *torseltorsi* (SoBo) (~ *torsél*/(relative frequent) *torsy*), but by the premises *torséltorsy* are acceptable just the writing *se* should be replaced by *sé* (cf. *še*), what is redundant in some cases (cf. palatality).

⁶ Without any doubt the use of *elé* (cf. *e*-graphemes) in *čezegon* ‚with a lasso‘ <S:72.20-3645.b=B3> ~ *čézégon* ‚id.‘ <L:14:139-914.b=S3>, *deur* ‚Tundra‘ [GenSg] <S:100,11-4686.m=h1> ~ *déur* ‚id.‘ <L:14:140-954.b=S3> is individually founded, consequent and tolerable. Only **čezègon* or **dèur* would be questionable.

⁷ Glukhij's/Susekov's diacritics are somewhat strange. They mark (redundant) front vowels and palatal consonants, cf. *d'e-* but *te?*. Labanauskas and SoBo should have noticed this!

pi desahon [<*dèsahon*] *ōmumbi"*, *derénoü tēa" né" or"*, *derénoü ań pošireubi" métu kehun* , / **vo vremá noqnoj prohlady oleni edát. dínem xe ne edát, a hodát krugom okolo quma** ‹<L:14:139-893.b=S3>

SoBo's version:

tè" pi desahon [<*dešahon*] *oomumbi" dernuü ní oor" dernuü ańi' pošireubi"* , *mätu' kihun* , / **oleni noqíú, kogda prohladno, kuwaút, dnem oni ne edát, dnem opátí vse vremá krugom hodát okolo quma** ‹<S:73,10-3670.b=S3>

There are not less than 10 of 12 deviances in 13 possibilities (!) (*oo* ~ *ō* is a graphemic problem) and nearly all of the relevant possibilities.

Glukhij/Susekov	Labanauskas	SoBo
te"	-	<i>tè" +</i>
d'eθa(γo)n	<i>dèsahon</i>	<i>dešahon</i>
metu?	<i>métu +</i>	<i>mätu'</i>
n'i	<i>né"</i>	<i>ní +</i>
d'ernujo	<i>derénoü</i>	<i>dernuü +</i>
te?	<i>tēa"</i>	<i>tè" +</i>
an(i)?	<i>ań +</i>	<i>ańi' +</i>
k'i:γun	<i>kehun</i>	<i>kihun +</i>
o:r'	<i>or"</i>	<i>oor"</i>
o:mumb'i?	<i>ōmumbi" +</i>	<i>oomumbi"</i>

Counting points SoBo are leading 6:3. This is nevertheless a disastrous result referred to 13 possible points (+)!

There are easier cases. For example, if there were „variances“ in the very same text, it had to be decided, not necessarily statistically but most presumably on facts, relying on the comparison with other texts of the informant or collector. In some remaining cases like unique words, (mor)phonological premisses had to be considered. There is a pretty good example for both possibilities in the already mentioned text:

aprel' d'iri pe tahon ,in the end of April / **v konqe aprel á mesáqa** ‹<S:73,1-3661.b=S3>
maj d'iri petahon ,in the end of May / **v konqe maá mesáqa** ‹<S:73,3-3663.b=S3>

Although *tahon* ,after‘ could be a postposition, *pe* remains unexplaiable, so *pe tahon* could be correct, but not explained. Before most of the other cases of this word, used only by K. V. Ivanov (S) has been written down by the collector (3) as *petahon*, this has to be excepted for the time being: cf. *maj d'iri petahon* ,in the end of May / **v konqe maá mesáqa** ‹<S:73,3-3663.b=S3> , *debišeda d'iri petahon* ,in the end of September / **v konqe sentrábrá** ‹<L:14:139-903.b=S3> . The original is **petayon** (Glukhij 1981: 144).

The ceteria are basing on the work with the material, so circular arguments can't completely be excluded in these cases. This could have been avoided by originally diligent text edition.

Cutting obviously or supposed conjunct word „l“ for casually or intended (?) writings, i. e. *kańi^Clńim* ,... became - ain't⁸ / **stal vedí** ‹<S:13,203-1155.b=C2> in connection with the „pseudo-negation“, the habeo-constructen *tonèlètam*⁹ or phrases *ńoblkutuj* ,once / **odnaxdy** ‹, as well as mistakenly writings „ ^ “, i.e. *oburu*“ ^ *liťińa^C* ,the things are hanging / **veüi visát** ‹<S:13,87-

⁸ „- ain't“ is used to express the strange affirmative negation of Enets (stressing affirmative sentences using the general negations (*bu*)ńi- + CN ,not ...‘).

⁹ Writings are due to the collectors. So this might be doubtful, because there seem to exist two variants (like in Ng.). One is the mere composition of *tonè* (~ *tonj*) ,there‘ + ESSE, the other one is an analysing (melted) form, in which both elements form already a verbal stem. This happens/happened with *d'aggu(-)* ,not-beeing‘ as well.

^{1037.b=C2>} in other cases is used. The cutting is an absolute prerequisite for a proper derivation analysis. An originally or mistakenly wrong cutting was reversed by „_“, cf. *iho_ńea^C sajdur^C*, we won't fight / **ne budem voevatí** ‘ [] ^{<S:17,88-1383.b=D1>}, *sér_otagujna^C*, we dressed ourselves / **my vypolnáli** ‘ [] ^{<S:71,16-3536.b=F1>}.

Some of the examples document the insertions of ^N or ^C for not noted but supposed or required voiced or unvoiced GS.

Transcription

There is no real elaborated transcription for Enets. The appropriate literature offers relatively few clues concerning an adequate transcription. First of all

Urmančieva's latinized and palatalized itexts:

<http://www.philol.msu.ru/~languedoc/corpus/enets/enets-01-otpusk.xhtml> (cf. hints in some publications of Helimski (2000: 119-130, 56-59, 60-67¹⁰))

Mikola, Tibor (1967): Enzische Sprachmaterialien. In: *ALH* 17, 59-74. [hung. version Szamojéd nyelvtanulmányok. In: *NyK* 66 (1964), 35-42, 279-284]

Cyrillic and palatalized

[Glukhij] **Glukhij, Ároslav Andreevi q**; Susekov, V. A. (1981): **Éneckie teksty: Skazki i bytovye teksty**. In: **Skađki narodov Si bi rskogo Severa 4**, 144-159.

Passim there are some latinized examples in some of the reports (cf. Labauskas, Ryžova etc.). The main problems are - as mentioned already - in a large part due to unsolved phonetic-phonological questions, there among the *e*-graphemes, the palatalisation and the marking of GS.

e-graphemes

Here the classification of *e*-graphemes follows Mikola (1984). He stated comprehensibly, that *e* appears mainly in connection with palatal or softenable (mouillierbar), *ε* with non-softened but softenable and *ε̇* with velar consonants. In Latin transcription the following (accented) forms are used here so far: *e*, *é* (*ε*) and *è* (*ε̇*). Most of the Russian scientists (Urmančieva, Helimski, Glukhij/Susekov and Ryžova) get along with just two *e*-variants¹¹ in latinized examples, so *é* and *è* are (internally) combined as *ê* (internally) by myself.¹²

Palatalisation

The palatalisation is marked with *d'*, *ń*, *l'*, the phonemes *š/ç*, *č* are *per se* palatal and there is no need to mark them explicitly. Other consonants except *ñ* and *đ* (?) get softened or palatalized in front of front vowels (*e*, *i*). The absence of **Ů** in these cases leads to the opinion that **á** (*ä*) might be allophonic to *é* at least in first syllables. There are very few cases like *ibl'ajgu* ~ *ibl'ejgu* (in the latter case *a* might become *e* before *j* (cf. ОКр)).

Prime examples

Cyrill.	Lat.	references
đi	<i>d'i</i>	cf. <i>odi</i> (odói) [odi], as/like / kak ^{<W:1266-4555.s>} (cf. <i>kati</i> [kati], girl')
çi	<i>š'i</i>	
qi	<i>č'i</i>	

¹⁰ No palatalisation in front of *e* with non-palatal consonants. He does not differ between *é* (*ese*" ,Vater", cf. H 2000: 60-67), cf. *něš* (Wb) *ńeš* ,being open' (S77: 203), So *b'i ! irońed* ,beneath you', *irońeń* ,beneath me', *mi* ,in', *m'eon* ,along sth.', i.e. he differs *e* bei marking the palatalisation.

¹¹ This is possible via the explicit marking of palatalization. Here *e* *es* needed, because only the „traditional“ palatals are marked.

¹² The work with the materials revealed a highly individual concept esp. concerning the *e*-graphemes. Under this aspect initial corrections had to be retracted under special regard of informers and informants, unless there were discrepancies in one and the same text.

si	<i>si</i>	
ší	<i>š</i>	
qí	<i>č</i>	
ní	<i>ň</i>	

Initially *e* and *i* are not jotted, cf. *ire-* (M), *d'ire-* ,live, to' (**i re-**, **di re-**), *iron* (B), *iron* (T) ,under' (**i ron**, **iron**). Postconsonantal they usually indicate palatalisation except after *ň* and *š*. In connection with *d* there exists a non-palatal variant, cf. *odjδ* ~ *odiδ* [odiz] ,plant', *odi* (**odói**) ,how' [odi] <W:1266-4555.s>, *odj* ,lad' | *katj* ,girl' <S:11,10-581.b=B1>, *kati* ,id.' <S:88,6-4309.m=f9>, *kati* ,id.' <T:033-50.s>.

2. as for the vocalism:

á, **ú** and **ě** principally have to be valued differently and individually. After palatals (*d'*, *ň*, *l'*, *š/č*, *č*) they correspond with *a*, *u* and *o* (after vowels here as *ja*, *ju*, *jo*), after softenables (all remaining: *b*, *k*, *m*, *plf*, except: *ň*, *š*) only **á** appears which corresponds with [ä?], a possible allophone to *e* resp. *é*.

For more details concerning **á**, **ú**, **ě** and special cases see the chapter palatalisation! (Not part of this introduction!)

Particular phonemes

Cyrill.	Lat.	references
á	<i>ä</i>	dá → <i>d'a</i> ,earth' bák → <i>bäk</i> ,neck' (cf. bəkoda → <i>békoda</i> ,id.' <S:74:14-3713.b=S3>) iblájgu → <i>ibl'ajgu</i> ,young' (cf. ibl'ejgo → <i>ibl'ejgo</i> ,id.') má → <i>mä</i> ,tent / qum <S:1,38-39.b=A1> ,cf. mε' → <i>mé'</i> ,id.' <S:14,27-1183.b=D1>
á		
e	<i>e</i>	
ě	<i>è</i>	bunék → <i>bunèk</i> ,dog' (cf. bunyk → <i>bunìk</i> ,id.')
ε	<i>é</i>	bεrta → <i>bérta</i> ,to throw' (cf. bárta → <i>bärta</i> ,id.')
oŸ	<i>č</i>	

* only in a few sources like Tereščenko. Here it is used in abstract morphophonemes, which vary between *u* and *o* (*moŸga*, *muga*, *moga* > *mčga* ,forest', *ňahon/ňahun* > *ňahčn* ,weather/heaven/god' LocSg)

Vowel + á

Cyrill.	Lat.	references
а́а	<i>aja</i>	kaá ~ kaj á ^{<S:36:24-4280.m=e1>} → <i>kaja</i> ,sun' kaá ~ kaj á ^{<S:1:94-95.b=A1>} → <i>kaja</i> ,to stay/to remain'
е́а	<i>eja</i>	→ , 'LW
и́а	<i>ija</i>	→ , 'LW
ј́а	<i>ija</i>	→ , 'LW
έа	<i>éja</i>	peá → , forehead'
э́а	<i>èja</i>	seá → ,to sink' ^{<W:128b>} (cf. syá → <i>sija</i> ,to drown')
ýа	<i>ija</i>	syá → <i>sija</i> ,to drown' (cf. seá → ,to sink' ^{<W:128b>})
о́а	<i>oja</i>	soá-, <i>sojaj</i> ^{<S:10:21-550.b=A1>} , <i>çoj á</i> ^{<S:7:10-292.b=A3>} → <i>soja-/šoja</i> ,to give birth/ to be born'
uá/úá*	<i>uja</i>	buá ~ buj á ^{<S:4:10-184.b=A3>} → <i>buja</i> ,blood' (cf. buj eda → <i>bujeda</i> ,id.' ^{<S:102:42-4754.m=B9>})
о́а	<i>-ja</i>	→
и́а	<i>-ja</i>	→

* an *uje* (**uj**e) cluster occurs sometimes, possibly as derivation: cf. *puje* (**puj**e), stone' ^{<S:1:26-27.b=A1>} , *puè* (**pué**) ,id.' ^{<S:9:72-504.b=A1>} (*pu* ,id.') | *puja* (**puá**) ,nose / end of sth. / pike', *puina* ,nose' ^{<T:155.s-229>} ,

The clusters are limited to a few stems, cf. the unique word: *šmeá* ,snake / *zmeá* RL' ^{<W:411202>} | **ij** á → *ija* [?] *sija* ,to hide os. / **skrytí** á' ^{<S:3:20-172.b=A1>} | **mui** i á ~ **muj** á ~ **muá** ,to take / to make'

Vowel + ú

vowel clusters: *aju*, *eju*, *éju*, *èju*, *iju*, *oju*, *çju*, *uju*

vowels clusters: *d'u*, *nu*, (in loanword: *lü*, *rü*, *tü*)

Vowel + ë

аë	<i>ajo</i>	aë → Abl. (Augment/Vokativ): kébéhaëu → <i>kèbèhajou</i> ,harm / beda ' kaðäë → <i>kaðajo</i> ,grandmother (Voc.)'
----	------------	---

Vowel + vowel (except á, ú, ë)

The material remains mostly unchanged because it belongs to the sphere of gap vowel, which can appear in most different clusters. Should there be any rules, they'll have to be detected in a special investigation.