

Enets

General remarks - sources and texts - critique and transcription

Michael Katzschmann

(13.03.2014, corr. 18.08.14)

Content

Introducing remarks

Exploited texts

Citation and annotation

General Overview of the current grammatical .Sources

Sorokina/Bolina (new)

Siegl (new)

General Overview of the exploited .Sources

ED

Tereščenko

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

Sorokina/Bolina (SoBo)

Labanauskas 2002

Informants and informers/collectors

SoBo

Labanauskas

List of Informants

Problems of Handling the Texts and their Reproduction/Reedition

Literary genres

Individual writing practices of single informers

Amendments/.Corrections/.Transcription/.Translation

Transcription

e-graphemes

Palatalisation

Prime examples

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 and 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 desperation),

seldom hope. Florian Siegl expressed this similarly in his critique on the „achievements“ of contemporary mainly Russian research, which was part of an introductory **History of Enets studies - a condensed survey** (<http://lepo.it.da.ut.ee/~flos/Studies.htm> <no longer available>), which is recommended looking at. As part 2.5 he wrote:

“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 field notes. 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 Helimki's personal archive might contain tons of raw non-published 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 Institute and/or the Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg but the so called ‘periphery’ make the good work.”

The criticised state has unfortunately not changed or advanced perceivably ever since. In spite of or maybe because of the available texts it should be described still as disastrous, as the following notes are documenting.

Exploited texts

- S = **Sorokina, 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. (only texts, 78ff.)
- l = id. but just the grammatical sketch of Maddu (p. 40-62)
- d = **Sorokina, Irina Petrovna ; Bolina, Daría Spiridonovna (2001): *Énecko-russkij i rusko-éneckijslovarí***. Sankt-Peterburg: Prosveüenie, 309 [311] p. (cited as d)
- D = --, -- (2009): ***Éneckij slovarí s kratkim grammatiqeskim oqerkom : okolo 8.000 slov***. Sankt-Peterburg: Nauka, 2009, 488 p. [978-5-9818730-4-1]
- T = **Tereüenko, Natalía Mitrofanovna (1973): *Sintaksis samodijskih ádykov: prostoe predloxenie***. 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. Some abstruse punctuation has been changed, for example using dots instead of commas if both sentence parts contain finite verbs, not at least to facilitate citations, i.e. to omit irrelevant parts (sentences). Unfortunately the (internal)

document number couldn't be changed because they stay parts of the same file entry. 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
S	:	89,13	;	312	-	4357	.	m	=	g9
S	:	9,43	;	37	-	475	.	b	=	A1
L	:	4	:		-	648	.	b	=	F9
L	:	8	:		-	168	.	m	=	d9
l	:	61			-	752	.	m		

- 1: Source: S(oBo), L(abanauskas)
- 2: Text numeration, (SoBo:) sentence numeration aufter “;”
- 3: page after “;” (SoBo), “;” other sources
- 4: Record number of data-files
- 5: Dialect: b(aj), m(adu)
- 6: Informant (Alphabet, capital letters = Baj, small letters = Madu), collector (digits) (se below)
- 0: Orientation marks

The SoBo texts have an internet and print version. In regard to the later the page was included (in later versions) after “;”. This implies that the looked up lexemes might be found on the following page, when the pagination changes amongst/amidst the sentence(s). In three cases this happened between the sentence number and the sentence. Here the following page had been cited. In other sources the page follows as usual “:” but without space.¹ A plus is the knowledge of informers and informants, which can be used fruitfully for analysis and corrections (see below). The Maddu Sketch (p. 40-62) of Labauskas was added later to the Material and got “l” as source for technical reasons.

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

Tereščenko / Sorokina-Bolina						
1	0	2	0	3	0	4
T	:	266	-	370	.	s
T	:	022	-	022	.	l
d/D	:	14 201	-	62	.	s
d/D	:	12 276/290	-	2	.	l

- 1: Sources:
T(ereščenko 1973)
SoBo: Enets Dictionaries: d (ERRE) (2001); D (ER) (2009)
- 2: Pagination (the Russian part of the ERRE (“d”) after “l”, further entries after “/”)

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.

- 3: Record number of data-files
- 4: s(yntactic/phrasal), (mono) l(exikal) entries
- 0: Orientation marks

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 current grammatical .sources

Despite a larger interest in Enets in the last decades, the achievements were 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 knew about its incompleteness apologises himself therefore. But a lot of paradigms can be useful just in changing some of the phonemes. Others might serve to demonstrate the relatively few changes.

Sorokina/Bolina

A new Enets-Russian dictionary (ER, 2009) contents a sketch as well, which is unfortunately just as defective as her earlier one *Éneckij ázyk* (cf. *Ázyki rossijskoj federacii i sosednih gosudars'tv* III. Moskva (2005), 470-479) and not at all comparable with which readers are used to in former Russian dictionaries.

Sorokina's *Éneckij ázyk* (2010) is at least a (very) individual approach to a contemporary description of TE (Sorokina herself avoids the term grammar which is not even mentioned as subtitle):

Sorokina, I rina Petrovna (2010): *Éneckij ázyk. Sankt-Peterburg : Nauka*, 410 p.
[ISBN 978-5-02-025581-4]

She orientates herself on her former publications especially concerning her rowing of verbal suffixes. Her promised syntactic overview can not really be detected. The very important negation was downgraded to a question of particles. But the work seems to contain some up to now non-published sentences of her collections.

Siegl

In 2011 Florian Siegl passed his PhD with a annotated digest of his field work collections. This publication² is replaced by a revised version:

Siegl, Florian (2013): *Materials on Forest Enets : an indigenous language of northern Siberia*. (MSFOu 267). Helsinki : Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, 523 p.
[9789525667455 / 0355-0230]

Siegl's *Materials ...* differ from Sorokina's "grammar" by working with a younger generation of Enets speakers and of course a describing manner. Summarizing the result the word "disappointing" gathers my subjective impression neutrally. A new approach is not always the best and Siegl missed his aim:

"(...) the present monograph is not primarily targeted at specialists of Samoyedic and Siberian languages, but should also be readable by linguists who are interested in languages in general" (p. 34)

unfortunately by miles.

² Siegl, Florian (2011): *Materials of Forest Enets : an indigenous language of northern Siberia*. (Dissertationes Philologicae Uralicae Universitatis Tartuensis 9) Tartu : Univ. Pr., 455 p. [978-9949-19-672-2 / PDF = 978-9949-19-673-9 / Distributed version]

Without going to much into details some of the main objections are:

- There is no introduction into the used transcription or notation of the material, especially the palatalisation is “alterating”.
- He usually is glossing CVC as C-VC instead of CV-C, which leads to misinterpretations, e.g. the general past *š* etc. is never *-Vš* but *-š* (this has been corrected only in the chap. 7.2.3.1: 262f. but remained all other examples), cf. e.g. (5-46: 161). In the later case *-δ-ud'* could not be understood. A similar misglossing is (7-23b+c!) *d'u-kn-iñ* dream-LOC.SG.-PX.GEN.1SG which should be read as *d'u-kni-ń* (of *d'u(δ)* ‘dream / **son (snovi deni e)**’ <D:123.1>) because LOC is always *ni* or *nu* with coaffix with nouns (*k.ni*). In some cases he doesn't even follow his own standards, e.g. in auditive (in heading *nu, nmu, munu*) is glossed correct as *-unu-* (7-185: 301) furthermore the assertive is notated sometimes as *ńu*^w and sometimes as *ńu*.
- Misleading terminology. E.g. the PROL and TRANSLAT are no “minor” cases at all. They are used more frequent than subsumed by Siegl.
- The omission or rather inconsistent (sporadic) and selective use of diachronic aspects and the insistence on a mere describing method leads to not really understandable features. E.g. concerning the VX1S.PST SK *-δu-d'* (!, not *-δ-ud'*) it would have been helpful to know that the former **-δum-d'* led to *d'* and not *-š* as usual after vowels.
- Principle errors in interpretation of some features. E.g. Tereščenko's statement concerning *buńi-* ‘probably not/**vedi ne**’ “used similar (**upotrebláetsá tak xe, kak**) to the verb *ńes* ‘not being’” (T66: 452) refers just to the related connegative (CN) and not to the semantic as the simultaneously mentioned *kêť'is* ‘almost/**qutí ne**’ suggests (cf. Siegl 2013: 311f.). As a matter of fact *buńi-* seems to be used as negating counterpart to the assertive (narrative) forms of the negating auxiliary *ńis* (cf. *ńu*^w), Siegl 2013: 295f., cf. Katzschmann 2013: *ńi-u*^N (<*ńi-m*~) ‘probably/**vedi**’³).

There is a lot of more inconsistencies in this work which hardly or never could be detected by non-specialists and its serious review will need a lot of a subeditor's efforts. The value of this work consists in describing a sociolect rather than of being a common Enets grammar. His work is rather comparable with a description of the Turkish idiom spoken by the younger generation with Turkish roots in German (large) cities in contrast to the parental language(s).

Many features remained insufficient documented, commented, or were not even touched at all. Siegl knew about this deficiencies and felt himself obliged to add some features from Tereščenko and even Castrén. At least the latter doesn't fit to his claim not to mix the synchronous and diachronous levels.

General overview of the exploited sources

ER (D) and ERRE (d)

The dictionaries published by SoBo serve rather practical needs. The first version was published in 2001 and contains an Enets-Russian and and Russian-Enets part (ERRE). A second just Enets-Russian dictionary was published in 2009. Though the first one had more the character of a school dictionary, the later shows a more scientific character with its short but neglectable grammatical sketch. It contains the same insufficiencies as has been published first by her in 2005.⁴

³ <http://www.nganasanica.de/enetsaffneg.pdf>

⁴ Soroki na, I. P. (2005): *Énecki j ázyk*. In: *Ázyki rossijskoj Federacii i sosednih gosudarstv* III. Moskva, 470-479.

This school dictionary by Sorokina/Bolina contains – according my current count – about 2.134 lexical and 2.629 syntactical/syntagmatical or phrasal entries.⁵ The Enets and the Russian parts are mostly congruent. There are some minor differences in writing. To mark stems or grammatical use of the lemmata, the authors use phrases or syntagmas, so the negation of verbs or declined nouns. Only by analysing the lemmata morphonological insights can be gained. This leads – similar to the Ng. dictionary – to an overview of (frequent) derivations and stem alterations, a work that has to be done separately. This and some example sentences compensate the lack of grammatical sketches as usual in former Russian dictionaries just rudimentarily.

The 2009 published just Enets-Russian version shows some new material but old deficiencies, scarcely any error was corrected but new ones added. Unfortunately the dictionary stopped abruptly on page 486 in the middle of words beginning with *é!* Though it should contain about 8.000 entries, there are about 6.000 lemmata for single words and phrases. Nevertheless my file shows nearly 11.600 entries including the additional phrases of the lemmata. The count of single entries offers nearly 30.600 words. None of this statistics fit to an 8.000-statement. Most of the material is congruent with the ERRE. Just 341 entries (including the *é*-words) can only be found in ER.

Unfortunately there are a lot of inconsistencies concerning the writings. There are about 2.500 supposed or possible deviant writings. Though most of them show just *de* instead of *dé* [*d'o*], or *s* instead of *š* some of them are problematic because of their subsequent wrong alphabetical filing.

Tereščenko

To get a first overview the Tereščenko's *Syntaksis* (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 (GS) 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 (SoBo) 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 particles (speech) elements (fillers?) than can be translated adequately. So the Russian translation slipped not seldom off, especially in Labanauskas. As we could learn from Siegl, the few remained informants had to retell the same stories over and over again, so sometimes the logical thread gets lost. That might explain the incomprehensibility of some texts. It might be interesting to investigate the informant sharing of some collectors. There are especially nearly identical texts in SoBo and Labanauskas.

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.

⁵ The counting depends on the acceptance of phonological variants as own entries.

Labanauskas

A merit of Labanauskas are the grammatical sketches of FE and TE (!) in the first part of his work. The FE syntactical material basis mainly on Tereščenko (1973), the TE material (40-62) seems to be completely new and was later added marked as “1”. The songs and their notes can only be mentioned. They are disregarded here at all, because this genre owns some difficulties and deviances which should be examined separately!

.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	Pal'čin, N. S.			1980	A3
004	Glukhij	Pal'čin, N. S.			1980	A3
005	Sorokina	Pal'čin, N. S.			1969	A1
006	Glukhij	Pal'čin, N. S.			1980	A3
007	Glukhij	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 ⁺	T. Mikola	Bolin, N. D. [1967: 1]			1967	P5
070 ⁺	T. Mikola	Bolin, N. D. [1967: 4]			1967	P5
071	Sorokina	Bolina (Silkina), V. N.	1929	Baj	1969	F1
072 ⁺	Glukhij	Čardu (Bolina), N. P.			1980	B3
073 ⁺	Glukhij?	Ivanov, K. V. [vgl. L02, 14]	1920	Čor	1980	S3
074 ⁺	Glukhij Susekov, V. A.	Ivanov, K. V. [vgl. 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.

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**	[Ivanov, K. V.] (<i>Skazki</i> , 144, 154)	Potapovo	1980	S3

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

** *Skađki narodov Sibirskogo Severa*. 4, Tomsk 1981, 144, 154. (The text is obviously an adaptation of two there published texts collected by Ja. Glukhij and V. A. Susekov from K. V. Ivanov, *1920, Čor-member. Cf. SoBo text 74)

Labanauskas published Enets texts⁶ 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).

⁶ Part IV (p. 182-330) presents historical issues, traditional tales and myths of Enets but only in Russian!

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
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 Bajs.

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

the/a SoBo-version (from 1969)

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

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

(...)

d'oa sokuotè sértiða [*<sèrtiða>*] , *mal'čada sérti* [*<sèrti>*] ‘Djoo put on the sokuj, put on the malitsa / **dëa sokuj na nego nadel, mal i qu ne nego nadel** ‘ <S:2,4-112.b=A1> ,*taðabè paggiða sértiða* ‘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>*] *tjrahan d'oðtabiða* , *mana: kuńrubihuj* ‘Djoo beat the Rotten Stub [EN] with his fist, said: let's go together / **dëa po gni lomu peníku kulakom udari l, skazal: davaj pobexi m vdvoem** ‘ <S:2,5-113.b=A1> ,*posa sorekuda tjrahambiða, manā:* ‘He beat Rotten Stub with his fist, said [EN] / **d. udari l kulakom po peníku 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 , baduń mujri , baduń kogartahuguðu* ‘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, baduń mujri* , *baduń nèkoradiń* ,Stay (be) here, my roots are strong, I've to root them out / **podoxdi, korni u mená krepkie, á ih vydernu** ‘ <L:1:82-303.b=A9> ,*posa sore* [*<sorè>*] *budimoa , toð kuńruða* [*kuðriða*] ^ *ań* , *d'oa sokood mal'ča peri kadaða* ‘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 dëa navsegda unes** ‘ <S:2,7-115.b=A1> ,*posa soreku budimua, toð kuńruð* [*kuńrið*] *ań* , *d'oo taðabè paggiða péri kadiða* , / **suhoj penek powevelilsá i pobexal, unosá s soboj wamanskuú odexdu** ‘ <L:1:82-304.b=A9> ,*d'oa mambi: tèða* [*<teða>*] *mäkuń tobuń* , *ńibimi šij* [*<si>*] *kouðtada* [*<koustada>*] ‘Djoo said: now when I get home, the gammar will scold me / **dëa 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> ,*tèða mékuń tobuń mènšèj ši* " *kaudtada* , / **teperí, kogda á pri du v qum, staruwka mená otrugaet** ‘ <L:1:82-306.b=A9> ,*d'oa mana: tonè èhuñaj pagiduń* , *ńobčik kodaða* , *tèrak ènču tohuñaj* ,... / **dëa govorit: podoxdi, odexdu vse ravno sebe dostanu, kogda bogatye lúdi pri edut** ‘ <S:2,9-117.b=A1> ,*tonè èhuñaj, pagiduń kodað, tètèg ènčuv* " *tohuñaj* ‘ / **ladno, odexdu sebe vse ravno dostanu, kogda pri edut bogatye lúdi** ‘ <L:1:82-307.b=A9> ,*d'oa ńib'ü mät tojða* ‘Djoo came to the gammer's tent / **dëa v dom babuwki pri wel** ‘ <S:2,10-118.b=A1> ,*d'oo mènšè mét tojð* ‘ / **d. vernulsá v qum staruwki** ‘ <L:1:82-308.b=A9> ,

ñib'ü mana: pagi kuna ? 'The gammer said: where are the clothes / **babuwka govori t: gde odexda ?**' <S:2,11-119.b=A1> ,

mènsèda manā: ' / ta sproqi la:' <L:1:82-309.b=A9> ,

taðabè paggið kuna" ? , / gde tvoá wamanskaá odexda?' <L:1:82-310.b=A9> ,

d'oa mana: ñi mambi pagišida pérni tonè , pérnihud sértijnuš [< sértijnuš] 'Djoo said: you did not tell me, that there are relatives without clothes, dress the relatives / **dëa govori t: 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> ,

paggišida pérni tonè! ' / qto u tebá estí rodstvenni ki bez odexdy' <L:1:82-313.b=A9> ,

pérnihud sértijnuš ' / vot á i odel ih' <L:1:82-314.b=A9> ,

d'oa ñib'jud mana: tonè èhuñaj , tèrak ènçu tohuñaj , ñobčik piðidjñ pagidiñ kodad' 'Djoo said to the gammer: ... / **dëa babke govori t: podoxdi, bogatye lúdi pri edut, vse ravno i spugaú-ih, odexdu-sebe dostanu**' <S:2,13-121.b=A1> ,

tonè èhuñaj , tèrèg ènčuw" tobtu, ñobčik piðidjñ, paggiðuñ kodad ' / 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 iñá kod'i" , kiudnuü nèrið , / d. leg spatí, a utrom vstal i powel na ohotu, si lki osmatrivat' <L:1:83-316.b=A9> ,

to d'ud'igon sjra 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 sjra èbi ' / v éto vremá uxe byla zi ma' <L:1:83-317.b=A9> ,

d'oa kuñ desid deðumubi 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 deðumada šer obuho idažd odima ,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'aðumada šer obuho idažd oðjma , / --' <L:1:83-319.b=A9> ,

d'oa idažhid ñob šedi [< šèdi] ljdiko , katjð 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> ,

idažhid ño" šede ljdku, katjè šede koa ' / tam lezahla kostí, lopatka olená' <L:1:83-320.b=A9> ,

d'oa malñiu: kuñ èki ljdiku muda 'Well, Djoo said: 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 ljdiku mudā? ' / qto á mogu sdelaú iz étoj kosti?' <L:1:83-322.b=A9> ,

d'oa liðida midraða , mäta keod toðaða ‘Djoo took these bones, brought them aside his tent / **dëa kostí poloxil na sebá, k qumu pri nes**’ <S:2,20-128.b=A1> ,

d'oo liðida midreða, méta kévod toðaða ‘ / **on poloxil kostí sebe na pleqo i pri nes na stoi bi üe**’ <L:1:83-323.b=A9> ,

d'oa čiki liðida mujC péða ‘Djoo began to treat the bones / **dëa étu kostí delatí stal**’ <S:2,21-129.b=A1> ,

toð čikohod čiki liðida mujt' péða ‘ / **zatem on prinálsá ee obrabatyvatí**’ <L:1:83-324.b=A9> ,

liðida sjarah kodtíða ‘He freezed the bones under the snow / **kostí snegom oblepil (obmorozil)**’ <S:2,22-130.b=A1> ,

ortè liðida sjarah kodtíða ‘ / **snaqala oblepil kostí snegom**’ <L:1:83-325.b=A9> ,

točkuða péhèn , tjarah kerta puáda kutíðjða , točkuða puáhaða buä odidj ‘After this he beat himself with a log and fists on his nose, after this blood became visible out of his nose / **potom polenom, kulakami sam svoj-nos bi tí stal, potom iz-svoego-nosa kroví vytaüil**’ <S:2,23-131.b=A1> ,

točkuða kërta puáda tjarah kutíðaða ‘ / **zatem razbil kulakom sebe nos tak, ...**’ <L:1:83-326.b=A9> ,

puáhaða buä odjma ‘ / **qtoby kroví potekla**’ <L:1:83-327.b=A9> ,

d'oa šèðida [<šèðida] liði ñol' kodtèða , tè osadurou méða , kerta bujahanda ‘Djoo freezed the bones of the antlers strongly, reindeer meatlike he smeard it with his own blood / **dëa kostí lopatkí silíno zamorozil, sdelal pohoxej na olenie máso svoej krovíú**’ <S:2,24-132.b=A1> ,

d'oo liði ñul'' kodtèða, kërta buáhanda tèa ossarahaš méða ‘ / **krovíú i zmazal sneg na kosti, zamorozil, i poluqil osí kak by máso**’ <L:1:83-328.b=A9> ,

d'oa liðida ped parida ní puáða ‘Djoo put the bones outside on a drying rack / **dëa kostí na uliqe na suwi lku poloxil**’ <S:2,25-133.b=A1> ,

toð čikohod liðida ped kadaða, parèða ní puáða ‘ / **potom éto máso on poloxil na labaz**’ <L:1:83-329.b=A9> ,

kod'iahaðad'i kiudnuü èðduda tèrak 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 upráxke pri wli**’ <S:2,26-134.b=A1> ,

kiudnuü kod'iahaðdu tèrèg ènčuv'' èduš toa'' ‘ / **utrom sleduüüego dná priehali bogatye lúdi**’ <L:1:83-330.b=A9> ,

(...)

Literary genres

All texts belong to two literary genres, the epic *šudbiča* 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 camp fire conversation. It's the form of myths and legends found in SoBo. Maybe it should be mentioned, that Labanauskas (2002) published some (noted) song texts 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 **Glukhijs/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*, *ρ* instead of *ϕ*, *ϕ* instead of *e* - same as Mikola - after palatals, which are marked generally, so they had to distinct even *i* and *ī*. The don't use *é* (*è*), that's why *e* after non palatals is ambivalent and might be *é* or *è*. It is possible, though rather unlikely, that the diacritic with *orté orné* (Glukhij 1981: 154, sentence 4 = SoBo 74,4) refer to *è/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 *ŭ* should be read *jo* and *ju* (cf. *wujju'ida*, a.a.O. sentence 8). Unusual is the palatalisation of even *δ* (cf. *lyδ'i*, a.a.O. sentence 10), which is here considered as non-palatal like *ñ*.

Labanauskas' *çŭ* 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.

.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 commata. These have resplace (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.⁷ 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 description⁸

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'ïðu' arumumb'i". tuðuku" nol'kut' peubi". tuðuku" o:t' peub'i" 'The children (claves) of the female reindeers grew up. They start to collect mushrooms. They started to eat mushrooms. / **Vaxenok teláta bolíwimi stanovátsá. Za gri bami begatí naqi naút. gri by kuwatí naqi naút'** (SN4: 144, Sentece 13 [SBV corrected])

⁷ One of this cases might be *torseltorsi* 'such', cf. *torsè* (T) ~ *torsi* (EWb) ~ *torseltorsi* (SoBo) (~ *torsé*/(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).

⁸ 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 **čézègon* or **dèur* would be questionable.

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 héðu 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:321170/232-577.1> shall be pointed out. Nothing could be added but the consternation about the present conditions.

Another example is, original sentence:

te? p'i d'əθa(γo)n o:mumb'i?, d'ernujə te? n'i o:r' d'ernujə an(i)? pow'ir'əub'i? metu?
k'i γun 'Oleni noqíú, proxladno kogda, kuwaút, dnem oni ne edát opátí krugom
hodát, quma okolo' (Glukhij 1981: 144,10)⁹

Labanauskas' version:

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

SoBo's version:

tè" pi dešahon [<dešahon] oomumbi" dernuü ní oor" dernuü aňi 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
<i>te"</i>	-	<i>tè" +</i>
<i>d'əθa(γo)n</i>	<i>dèsahon</i>	<i>dešahon</i>
<i>metu?</i>	<i>métu +</i>	<i>mätu'</i>
<i>n'i</i>	<i>né"</i>	<i>ni +</i>
<i>d'ernujə</i>	<i>derénoü</i>	<i>dernuü +</i>
<i>te?</i>	<i>tēa"</i>	<i>tè" +</i>
<i>an(i)?</i>	<i>aň +</i>	<i>aňi' +</i>
<i>k'i γun</i>	<i>kehun</i>	<i>kihun +</i>
<i>o:r'</i>	<i>or"</i>	<i>oor"</i>
<i>o:mumb'i?</i>	<i>omumbi" +</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:

⁹ Glukhij's/Susekov's diacritics are somewhat strange. They mark (redundant) front vowels and palatal consonants, cf. *d'ə* but *te?*. Labanauskas and SoBo should have noticed this!

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 unexplainable, 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 **petahon** (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 „|“ for casually or intended (?) writings, i. e. *kañi^C |ñim* ,... became - ain't / **stal vedí** <S:13,203-1155.b=C2> in connection with the “pseudo-negation” or affirmative negation (cf. Katzschmann 2013¹⁰), the habeo construction *tonèlètam*¹¹ or phrases *ñoblkutuj* ,once / **odnaxdy**‘, as well as mistakenly writings “ ^ ”, i.e. *oburu*“ ^ *litiña^C* ‘the things are hanging / **veüi visát**‘ <S:13,87-1037.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_ñea^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 offer relatively few clues concerning an adequate transcription. First of all

Urmančieva's latinised and palatalised texts:

<http://www.philol.msu.ru/~languedoc/corpus/enets/enets-01-otpusk.xhtml> (cf. hints in some publications of Helimski (2000: 119-130, 56-59, 60-67¹²))

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

Cyrillic and palatalized

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

Passim there are some latinised examples in some of the reports (cf. Labanauskas, 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.

¹⁰ published in/as: <http://www.nganasanica.de/enetsaffneg.pdf>

¹¹ 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.

¹² No palatalisation in front of *e* with non-palatal consonants. He does not differ between *é* (*esee*“ ,Vater“, cf. H 2000: 60-67), cf. *neš* (Wb) *ñeš* ,being open‘ (S77: 203), So *b'i ! iroñed* ,beneath you‘, *iroñeñ* ,beneath me‘, *mi* ,in‘, *m'eon* ,along sth.‘, i.e. he differs *e* bei marking the palatalisation.

***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), *ɛ* with non-softened but softenable and *ɛ̣* with velar consonants. In Latin transcription the following (accented) forms are used here so far: *e*, *é* (*ɛ*) and *è* (*ɛ̣*). Most of the Russian scientists (Urmančieva, Helimski, Glukhij/Susekov and Ryžova) get along with just two *e*-variants¹³ in latinised examples, so *é* and *è* are (internally) combined as *ê* (internally) by myself.¹⁴

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 *ň* and *δ* (?) get softened or palatalised in front of front vowels (*e*, *i*). The absence of *Ů* in these cases leads to the opinion that *ǎ* (*ä*) might be allophone 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
<i>dí</i>	<i>d'i</i>	cf. <i>odi</i> (<i>odóí</i>) [odi] ,as/like / <i>kak</i> ^{<W:1266-4555.s>} (cf. <i>kati</i> [kati] ,girl')
<i>çí</i>	<i>ši</i>	
<i>qí</i>	<i>či</i>	
<i>sí</i>	<i>si</i>	
<i>çí</i>	<i>š</i>	
<i>qí</i>	<i>č</i>	
<i>ní</i>	<i>ń</i>	

Initially *e* and *i* are not jotatised, cf. *ire-* (M), *d'ire-* ,live, to' (*ire-*, *dire-*), *iron* (B), *iron* (T) ,under' (*iron*, *iron*). Postconsonantal they usually indicate palatalisation except after *ň* and *δ*. In connection with *d* there exists a non-palatal variant, cf. *odjδ* ~ *odiδ* [odiz] ,plant', *odi* (*odóí*) ,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:

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

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

¹³ This is possible via the explicit marking of palatalisation. Here *e* is needed, because only the „traditional“ palatals are marked.

¹⁴ 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.

Particular phonemes

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

* only in a few sources like Tereščenko. Here it is used in abstract morphophonemes, which vary between *u* and *o* (*moŸa*, *muga*, *moga* > *mçga* ,forest' , *ñahon/ñahun* > *ñahçn* ,weather/heaven/god' LocSg)

Vowel + á

Cyrill.	Lat.	references
áá	<i>aja</i>	<i>kaá</i> ~ <i>kajá</i> <S:86:24-4280.m=e1> → <i>kaja</i> ,sun' <i>kaá</i> ~ <i>kajá</i> <S:1:94-95.b=A1> → <i>kaja</i> ,to stay/to remain'
eá	<i>eja</i>	→ , 'LW
íá	<i>ija</i>	→ , 'LW
já	<i>ija</i>	→ , 'LW
εá	<i>éja</i>	<i>peá</i> → , forehead'
éá	<i>èja</i>	<i>seá</i> → ,to sink' <W:128> (cf. <i>syá</i> → <i>sija</i> ,to drown')
yá	<i>ija</i>	<i>syá</i> → <i>sija</i> ,to drown' (cf. <i>seá</i> → ,to sink' <W:128>)
oá	<i>oja</i>	<i>soá-</i> , <i>sojaj</i> <S:10:21-550.b=A1> , <i>çojá</i> <S:7:10-292.b=A3> → <i>soja</i> / <i>šoja</i> ,to give birth/ to be born'
uá/úá	<i>uja</i>	<i>buá</i> ~ <i>bujá</i> <S:4:10-184.b=A3> → <i>buja</i> ,blood' (cf. <i>bujεða</i> → <i>bujεða</i> ,id.' <S:102:42-4754.m=f9>)
óá	- <i>ja</i>	→
íá	- <i>ja</i>	→

* an *uje* (*uje*) cluster occurs sometimes, possibly as derivation: cf. *puje* (*puje*) ,stone' <S:1:26-27.b=A1> , *puè* (*puè*) ,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: *ðmeá* ,snake / *zmeá* RL' <W:41|202> | *ijá* → *ija* [?> *sija*] ,to hide os. / *skrytísá* <S:3:20-172.b=A1> | *mui íá* ~ *mujá* ~ *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

<i>aë</i>	<i>ajo</i>	<i>aë</i> → Abl. (Augment/Vokativ): <i>kébéhaëu</i> → <i>kébèhajou</i> ,harm / <i>beda</i> ' <i>kaðaë</i> → <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.

.Russian Data

If possible beside English notes the Russian data are added. They accrued quasi as by-product analysing 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 at least for those knowing Russian.¹⁵ Misunderstandings can occur as in English as in Russian alike. Reference centre was in any case the Enets material itself.

¹⁵ The data of the ED had to be selected corresponding to the special issue. So from several translation „proposals“ only one or two could have been chosen.