

Romb. = E. I. Rombandejeva, Russko-mansijskij slovař dlja mansijskoj školy. Leningrad 1954.

russ. = russisch

s. = siehe

S. = Seite

schwed. = schwedisch

Sg. = Singular

slaw. = slawisch

syrj. = syrjänisch; I = Ižma-, IU = unterer Ižma-, L = Luza-, LU = unterer Luza-, Le. = Letka-, P = permischer, PO = ostpermischer, Pr. = Prup-, S = Sysola-, Peč. = Pečora, U(d). = Udora-, V = Vyčegda-, VO = oberer Vyčegda-, VU = unterer Vyčegda-Dialekt

tat. = tatarisch

Ter. = Tereškin (= Terjoškin)

tscher. = tscheremissisch; (s. Beke, CserNytan.) nyK = Kozmodemjansk-, kCar = Carevokokšajsk-Čeboksary-, kP = (ost)permischer, kUfa = Ufa-, kM = Malmyž-, kUr. = Uržum-, kE = Bergtscheremissischer Dialekt; ny = west-, k = ost-

ung. = ungarisch

vgl. = vergleiche

VNGy = Munkácsi Bernát, Vogul népköltési gyűjtemény. I — IV. Budapest 1892 — 1921.

weps. = wepsisch; E = südwepsisch, Ma = Matvejanselkä-, Ši. = Šimjärvi-, So. = Šokšu-, Stj. = Šoutjärvi-Dialekt; V V V = Vepsa - venähine vajehnik. Moskva — Leningrad 1936; Ä = Onegawepsisch

Wied. = Wiedemann

wog. = wogulisch; J od. Jk. = Jukonda-Dialekt, K = Konda-Dialekt, KM = Dial. an der mittleren Konda, KO = Dial. an der oberen Konda, KU = Dial. an der unteren Konda, LM = Dial. an der mittleren Lozva, LO = Dial. an der oberen Lozva, LU = Dial. an der unteren Lozva, N = nördlicher Dialekt, Ob = Dial. am Ob, P = Pelymka-Dialekt, Si. od. Sy. = Sygva-Dialekt, So. = Sosva-Dialekt, T = Tavda-, Tj. = Tavda-Janyčkova-, V = Vagilsk, VN = Nord-Vagilsk-Dialekt, VNK = Kama-Dialekt (am Nord-Vagilsk), VS = Süd-Vagilsk-Dialekt

wot. = wotisch

wotj. = wotjakisch; J = Jelabuga-, G = Glazov-, K = Kazań-, M = Malmyž-, MU = Malmyž-Uržum-, S = Sarapul-Dialekt

z.B. = zum Beispiel

Komi Zyryan's second past tense

In contemporary Komi Zyryan there are four indicative verb tenses: the present, the future, the first past and the second past.¹ Morphosyntactically the second past tense stands apart from the other three. In the Komi Zyryan literary language, based on the Syktyvkar dialect, this tense lacks singular and plural forms in the first person. Perhaps more interestingly, it is morphologically unique in the Komi system of tenses, in that in the negative conjugation it is the verb which takes the personal suffixes and not the negative particle. The verb conjugates precisely as it does in the affirmative. The following table will give some idea of the morphosyntactic differences between the first and second past tenses:

First Past Affirmative

Second Past Affirmative

The Verb *munny* 'to go'

1 pers. sg. <i>muni</i>	—
2 pers. sg. <i>munin</i>	<i>munömyd</i>
3 pers. sg. <i>munis</i>	<i>munöma</i>
1 pers. pl. <i>munim</i>	—
2 pers. pl. <i>muninnyd</i>	<i>munömnyd</i>
3 pers. pl. <i>munisny</i>	<i>munömaös'</i>

¹ The Second Past is variously known as: the perfect (B. A. Serebrennikov, *Kategorii vremeni i vida v finno-ugorskikh jazykakh permskoj i volžskoj grupp*, Moscow, 1960, p. 58.) (hereafter Serebrennikov, *Kategorii vremeni*); the unwitnessed past (neočevidnoje prošedšeje vremja) (D. V. Bubrikh, *Grammatika literaturnogo komi jazyka*, Leningrad, 1949, p. 124); the unwitnessed resultative past (neočevidnoje-resul'tativnoje prošedšeje) (V. I. Lytkin, *Sovremennij komi jazyk*, Syktyvkar, 1955, vol. I, p. 214).

First Past Negative

1 pers. sg. *eg mun*2 pers. sg. *en mun*3 pers. sg. *ez mun*1 pers. pl. *eg (-oj) munöj*2 pers. pl. *en (-öj) munöj*3 pers. pl. *ez munny*

Second Past Negative

—

*abu munömyd**abu munöma*

—

*abu munömnyd**abu munömaös'*

The first past follows the pattern of verb conjugation seen in the present and future tenses but the second past formally stands alone.

Semantically too, the second past is isolated from the basic tense series of present, future and first past, and it is its semantic function which we shall review in this article.

In the interests of clarity and succinctness this investigation shall be conducted from a synchronic standpoint, for our subject is the usage of the second past in contemporary Komi Zyryan. Such an investigation is justified, for there has been a marked reluctance on the part of the Komi themselves to clearly define its function within the framework of the verbal tense system. This reluctance is not founded in a low frequency of occurrence of the second past, for in any corpus of material, whether conversation, verse, folklore, drama, journalism or literary prose, this tense is widely employed. The decision to restrict the bounds of the present article to a synchronic investigation of function in no way denies the interest which this tense presents historically. Robert T. Harms has proposed² that the existence of a system of two opposing past tenses in the Permian languages and in Mari is a reflex of a posited focus-system which operated in the hypothetical Uralo-Yukaghir Proto language. B. A. Serebrennikov believes that in Proto-Permian there was no such opposition and that its existence in Komi and Udmurt is due to parallel development.³ However,

² Robert T. Harms, 'The Uralo-Yukaghir Focus System: A problem in remote genetic relationship', in Paul J. Hopper, ed., *Studies in Descriptive and Historical Linguistics*, Amsterdam, 1977, pp. 301 — 16.

³ B. A. Serebrennikov, *Istoričeskaja morfologija permskikh jazykakh*, Moscow, 1963. See also V. I. Lytkin, K. Majtinskaja, K. Rédei, *Osnovy finno-ugorskogo jazykoznanija*, Moscow, 1976, vol. II, pp. 179 — 80.

because of its frequent incidence in the contemporary language, a rigorous definition of usage is vital for the student of Komi, and it is hoped that such a definition will prove to be of wider linguistic interest also.

II

V. I. Lytkin and D. A. Timushev in their short grammatical sketch of Komi⁴ devote only the following explanation to what is a complex and fundamental question for an understanding of the modern language: Разница в значениях первого и второго прошедшего времени заключается в том, что первое обычно выражает действие, совершившееся в присутствии говорящего, а второе - действие, свидетелем которого говорящий не был, о котором он судит по результатам действия или каким-либо косвенным путем.⁵

If one takes this explanation at its face value it would be fair to construe the second past as a tense of renarration, limited to action unwitnessed by the speaker. Logically, then, one would expect it to be used in the writing of historical events which the author did not personally observe. Even a cursory examination of such works in standard Komi Zyryan reveals the frequent employment of the first past alongside the second. One supposes that a basis for stating that the difference between the two past tenses consists of witnessed and unwitnessed action lies in the fact that the second past possesses no first person. This obviously indicates a trend, but much of its force is lost when one discovers that not only in Udmurt, but in four⁶ of the ten recognised dialects of Komi Zyr-

⁴ V. I. Lytkin, D. A. Timushev, 'Kratkij očerk grammatiki komi jazyka', in V. I. Lytkin, ed., *Komi-Russkij Slovar'*, Moscow, 1961, p. 886.

⁵ The difference in meaning between the first and second past tenses is summed up in the fact that the first usually expresses action which has occurred in the presence of the speaker, while the second — action of which the speaker was not a witness and about which he makes a judgment on the basis of the results of the action or by some other indirect means.

⁶ In the Udora and Ižma dialects there are forms for all three persons, singular and plural. In the Letka and Vym dialects there is a first person singular second past form. See V. A. Sorvacheva, 'Kratkij grammatičeskij spravočnik po dialektam komi-zyrjanskogo jazyka', in V. A. Sorvacheva, ed., *Sravnitel'nyj slovar' komi-zyrjanskikh dialektov*, Syktyvkar, 1961 (hereafter *Sorvacheva, Grammatičeskij spravočnik*), p. 482.

yan there are first person forms. Although there is an undoubted tendency to use the second past in cases of unwitnessed events, such a conclusion is a very inadequate explanation of its role.

Serebrennikov in his *Kategorii vremeni*⁷ takes issue with this narrow definition and posits that the most important and original use of this tense is as a *pure perfect*⁸ which expresses a completed action, the result of which is evident in the present. This tense therefore, semantically as well as formally, stands in opposition to the other three in that it focuses not on the action of the verb itself but on its end product, and consequently does not stress the temporal factor. Its role in the narration of unwitnessed action he terms the *modal'noje značenie* 'modal meaning'⁹ of the second past or perfect. We can summarise this position by saying that whereas the first past tense emphasises the process of the action of the verb, the second past is concerned with the result and as, generally, someone who has not witnessed the action cares solely about its result, the second past is frequently coupled with the idea of renarration.

Such a conclusion is correct, though only to a certain point. An examination of Komi material, either colloquial or literary, will show many instances where the use of the second past is determined neither by the sense of the pure perfect nor by the modal meaning. A third possibility, the influence of Russian on the grammar of Komi Zyryan¹⁰, can also often be ruled out.

In his grammar of Komi, Bubrikh¹¹ describes another use of the tense: in impersonal constructions. Often the subject is omitted and, if not, is usually found in the genitive case. There are many examples one could cite of this sort of occurrence. The role is of great interest because not only does it appear to be widely employed and have clear stylistic value in the contemporary language, but it also tends to point to an underlying expedient for usage which links the modal meaning with this impersonal use which, in turn, widens our perspective of the tense's focus function within Ko-

⁷ p. 59.

⁸ loc. cit.

⁹ ibid., p. 65.

¹⁰ ibid. pp. 62, 64.

¹¹ op. cit. p. 125.

mi.¹² In this article we wish to establish the nature of this expedient and ascertain how it determines the use of the second past tense.

III

Leonard Bloomfield remarked: "The difference between *wrote* and *was writing* is so elusive and differs so much for different verbs and in different phrases, that the definer, after stating the main principles, cannot do better than to resort to a demonstration by means of examples."¹³

Following this pertinent advice we shall turn our attention to specimen samples from the modern language that illustrate the various definitions so far discussed regarding usage, and then to some samples which these are unable to satisfactorily explain. Улича ётар помас зэв кыз көлесаа катокмашина шыльөдö на сьöда лöстались асфальтсö, а мöдар помас нин морт судта гу кодйöмаöсь.^{14,15}

Here very clearly one has the sense that the narrator, involved in the *action* of flattening by the steamroller at one end of the street, is only concerned with the *outcome* of the digging, that is the existence of the hole, at the other. In the case of the verb 'to dig', the second past primarily emphasizes the *pure perfect* idea of result rather than action. Coupled with this is the inference that the writer did not personally witness the digging in the same way that he personally observes the flattening of the asphalt. Underlying both the perfect sense and the modal meaning is the idea of the narrator's subjective non-involvement in the action of digging: no temporal or spatial involvement, which presupposes no sensory

¹² It should be mentioned here that the second past is the preferred past tense in constructions using verbs in the *involuntary reflexive* voice. Such constructions are always impersonal in form. The subject, when specified, takes genitive or dative case endings.

¹³ L. Bloomfield, *Language*, New York, 1933, p. 280.

¹⁴ From a collection of satirical short stories by A. Matvejev, *Mikol, Marja da muköd'jas*, Syktyvkar, 1971, p. 36.

¹⁵ At one end of the street a steam roller with very thick wheels is flattening out the still darkly shining asphalt, while at the other end they had already dug a hole as deep as a man.

involvement in seeing or hearing the work being done, no emotional connection, nor detailed knowledge concerning how it was undertaken.

Another example from the same work will further highlight this: Вёлөмкө, велөдчыны Гордейыд *тиөктөма* ыстыны Олимпиада Тыринаос. Мыйла? Олимпиада воддза луннас сийөс зэв ёна *пинялөма*.¹⁶

Again the result of the insult and of the order are being stressed. The speaker witnessed neither the insult being delivered nor Gordej making his decision to send the miscreant away; the former, we gather, she discovered by hearsay, the latter by deduction. And yet once more there is the pervading idea of her own subjective non-involvement in the whole process.

An example of usage in colloquial speech: Став книгаысё нин *лыддьөма* зоотехниклысь.^{17, 18}

The completion of the action of reading and its intellectual benefits are here being emphasized. The means and manner of achieving this end were presumably unobserved by the speaker but, even if they were in part observed, this is not what is encompassed within the focus of the utterance. In the context the stress is on the speaker's total non-involvement in the achievement, for she is contrasting her colleague's intellectual attributes with her own lack.

We may now turn our attention to examples where the second past is featured in impersonal constructions. Such usage, generally, when contextually limited to works of a literary or scholarly nature, possesses a high stylistic value: Миян сборникын налысь *печатайтөма* став медся тёдчанасө да бурсө, и бара жө поэтыясөс *петкөдлөма* быд боксянь.^{19, 20}

¹⁶ It appears that Gordej had ordered that Olimpiada Tyrina be sent for training. For what reason? Olimpiada had grievously insulted him a few days earlier. p. 34.

¹⁷ *ibid.* p. 56.

¹⁸ She has already read all the books on zootechnics.

¹⁹ V. A. Popov, ed., *Komi poezija antologija*, Syktyvkar, 1967, (hereafter Popov, *Komi poezija*) p. 15.

²⁰ In our collection all their best and most significant works have been (literally 'it has') printed and thus the poets have been presented (literally 'it has shown') from every aspect.

It could be argued that here we have another case of emphasizing the results of the respective verbs. However, what is a much more apparent constraint in the use of the second past, given the formal style of the passage, is the desire to create a distance, for modesty's sake, between the writer and his literary creation. A parallel stylistic device is used in English with the passive and further with the first person plural *we* when, in fact, *I* is meant. Another example: П. Ключковльсь тані печайтöма кык кывбур.^{21,22}

In cases of colloquial usage the second past is employed in impersonal constructions but, at least superficially, with a different semantic weight. An example quoted by Bubrikh²³ with a first person singular subject is: Менам омöльсь абу полöма.²⁴

What interests us here is not the use of impersonal constructions (which are common in Komi Zyryan as in other Finno-Ugrian languages), but the effect the verb tense exerts on the meaning of such utterances. The second past in this example highlights the almost involuntary relationship between the narrator and the verb which here expresses his lack of fear. The fact that he did not experience the expected negative sensation was not owing to a conscious resolution to be courageous, fear simply did (and by implication does) not come in such circumstances.

A neutral function of the second past in impersonal sentences, and one which is widely employed, lies midway between the formal literary and the colloquial use noted above: Дипломатъяс йыльсь висьтавлöны, налы пö кывсö сетöмаöсь, медым дзебны асьыныс мöвпяссö.^{25,26}

Ми вермам сöмын шуны: сійö, мый вöчöма коми поэзияын ветымын во чöжөн, муртыштны позьтöм ыджыд да тöдчана.^{27,28}

²¹ *ibid.* p. 13.

²² Only two of P. Kločkov's poems are (literally 'it has') printed here.

²³ *op. cit.* p. 125.

²⁴ Literally 'Of me it was not afraid of evil.' (I am not afraid of misfortune.)

²⁵ A. Matvejev, *Mikol, Marja da muköd'jas*, Syktyvkar, 1971, p. 84.

²⁶ They say about diplomats, you know, that they are given the language to conceal their thoughts.

²⁷ Popov, *Komi poezija*, p. 16.

²⁸ We can only say this, that what has been done in Komi poetry in the course of fifty years is immeasurably great and noteworthy.

In meaning such constructions resemble passives yet, in grammatical terms, are active sentences with unspecified subjects. In such the second past demonstrates to the full the tenuous subject-verb concord which sets it apart from the other three verb tenses in Komi. Constructions of this type are, in essence, focus devices which emphasize once again the detachment and lack of concern which the speaker has toward the subject of the verb, being chiefly interested in the end product of the action on its object.

The view that the second past emphasizes the detached nature of the narrator's relationship to the action is corroborated by instances of usage in those dialects where first person forms are still employed in this tense. From the Ižma dialect: *Веськалэма ме мөдлаэ*²⁹ 'I turned up in a different place'. From Letka: *Ме войнас четчыллөма да пачлө лонтыллөма*³⁰ 'I must have got up in the night and fired the stove'. From Udora: *Меным пымовтчыны колө, ме простудитчөмө*³¹ 'I need to sweat, I have a cold coming on'.

In all of these examples from the non-standard language, the second past invokes the clear sense of non-involvement which the speaker feels toward the action which he has committed, or, as in the last quotation cited, is committed on his person. It creates an idea of vagueness or passivity in the face of the result between the narrator and the action. This proposal is far more empirically sound than saying that the second past is generally only used when the action has not been *witnessed* by the narrator. The tense is not limited to instances where the speaker simply does not visually or aurally perceive the process of the action.

An examination of its use with two basic verbs, *čužny* 'to be born', and *kuvny* 'to die' will amplify our appreciation of this determining trend in its application.

In a series of brief biographies of the poets featured in the publication³² there is an interesting alternation of first and second past forms with *čužny*. Василий Иванович Елькин (Иван Вась)

²⁹ Sorvacheva, Grammatičeskij spravočnik, p. 483.

³⁰ loc. cit.

³¹ loc. cit.

³² Попов, Komi poezija, p. 235.

чужліс³³ 1912 вося июль 15 лунö Сыктывкарын.³⁴

The immediately preceding biographical note concerns I. T. Čistal'jov, who: чужлöма 1893 воын Помöсдин сиктын 'was born in 1893 in the village of Pomösdin'.

This alternation cannot be explained by the pure perfect theory, by witnessed-unwitnessed variation, nor by the influence of Russian. An examination of the text reveals that the second past form is only found where there is an apparent lack of precise data concerning the event described, while the first past occurs both where the details are exact and, less commonly, where they are not fully supplied. In other words the tendency once more is to create a *space* between the action performed and the narrator, implying an element of incertitude (and perhaps nonchalance) on his part toward the precise details of the action and, hence, avoiding too firm a factual commitment.

In a transferred use of *čuzŋny*, meaning 'to inherently resemble', the second past rather than the first is universally preferred: *Kod kod'ön bara te čuzömyd?*³⁵ 'Whom (in your family) do you resemble?'; *čuzöma dzik bat'ys kod*. 'He resembled his father in every way.' An analysis of this usage demonstrates the expected trend, a focusing on the result of the birth, and the speaker's total non-involvement with the action itself, his sole interest being centred on its consequences.

One says *vyl' tölys' čuzöma*,³⁶ '(the) new moon has appeared (literally 'been born')' with the second past but *čuzis vyl' mövp*,³⁷ 'a new idea has been born' with the first past tense. Here surely the stress is again on the speaker's uncertainty as to the process which causes the new moon to arise, whereas the birth of an idea is within his cognizance.

With the verb *kuvny*, generally speaking, the second past is used

³³ *Čuzlyny* is the temporary aspect infinitive form of *čuzŋny* and is often used in the past tense in the place of the basic verb. It appears in this context to be a free variant of *čuzŋny* with no especial extension of meaning. Here it is found in the third person singular, first past tense.

³⁴ Vasilij Ivanovich Yel'kin (Ivan Vas') was born on 15 July 1912 in Syktyvkar.

³⁵ This example and the one which immediately follows it are found in V. I. Lytkin, ed., *Komi-Russkij Slovar*, Moscow, 1961, p. 752.

³⁶ loc. cit.

³⁷ loc. cit.

where vagueness exists regarding the details of the death: *važön kuvtöma*,³⁸ 'he died a long time ago'. Contrast this with the employment of the first past in: *F. V. Popov kuvs'is zev tomön, 1922 voyn*.³⁹ 'F. V. Popov died very young, in 1922.' Once again we find that the pure perfect and modal meaning theories do not suffice in explaining with the verb *kuvny* the first past/second past alternation in usage.

The second past appears⁴⁰ to be the preferred past tense where one is speaking of the death of animals: *vöv kulöma*⁴¹ '(the) horse died', and *šyr kulöma* '(the) mouse died'. If such is the case, then the second past is again stressing the detachment, this time of an emotional nature, between the narrator, on the one hand, and the action and subject of the verb, on the other.⁴²

IV

The examples cited above provide us with a conviction that the so-called modal meaning of the second past tense, where its usage is limited to events which the narrator has not personally observed, though it denotes a tendency, falls far short of explaining the function of the tense. It is manifest that the second past stands in opposition, not to the first past alone, but to all three temporal tenses both in its morphosyntactic characteristics and in its semantic function within the language. We have observed not a few instances where the second past is employed in situations which the speaker not only has witnessed, but in which he has participa-

³⁸ *ibid.* p. 329.

³⁹ Popov, *Komi poezija*, p. 239.

⁴⁰ Unfortunately, within our corpus there is no abundance of examples of animal deaths so we can only indicate what seems to be a trend on the strength of the agreement in the two instances discovered.

⁴¹ This example and the one which follows are found in V. I. Lytkin, ed., *Komi-Russkij Slovar'*, Moscow, 1961, p. 329.

⁴² It is a common phenomenon in languages that the death of humans is distinguished from that of animals, presumably for reasons of differing emotional involvement. It is not that the state of death is intrinsically different between the two, but that one's attitude is emotionally conditioned. This distinction can be marked lexically, as in Hungarian (*meghal* 'die (of humans)'; *múlik* 'die (of animals)' and 'pass (of time)'), or morphologically, as appears to be the case in Komi Zyryan.

ted. In addition there have been examples where the first past tense has appeared in terms of action which the narrator has plainly not personally observed. The loss of first person forms of the second past tense in standard Komi Zyryan and in many of its dialects would indicate that there is a tendency for its use in renarration, but further we cannot go. Serebrennikov's theory that the second past is a *pure perfect* tense which is employed to stress the end product of the action rather than the process of its execution goes far in explaining the constraints upon its usage. It also shows us, by implication, that the second past is not a strictly temporal tense in that it is not primarily concerned with the timing of the action as such or its completion, but with its results which are, in fact, evident in the present.⁴³ Because the emphasis is on the action's present results it can generally be interpreted as having taken place in the past. For this reason alone the second past is a *past* tense. Thus the unique form of the tense, commented on at the commencement of the article, marks the functional isolation of the second past within the verbal system of Komi Zyryan.

It is also sound to suggest that the modal meaning quite naturally evolved from the emphasis of the tense on the end product of the action. However, our corpus of examples demonstrates that to say the focus of the second past is limited to the result and the conditions in which it occurs is empirically unsatisfactory. The second past tense is usually concerned to include within its focus the subjective attitude of the speaker to the action he is reporting. In the most superficial sense this is a question of his lack of visual perception as defined in the *modal meaning*, but its bounds are much wider. The tense reflects the narrator's deliberate spacing of himself from the action of the verb. His reasons for so doing can be one of many, and so the conditions governing the tense's usage

⁴³ Often there is a nuance, particularly in its participial usage, that the second past describes the result of continuous or frequentative action which is still on-going in the present. Witness this example from A. Matvejev, *Mikol, Marja da muköd''jas*, Syktyvkar, 1971, p. 52: *Götyrys taj oz, tydalö, šogs'y, jablög kod' banjöma*. 'It appears that his wife is not obviously miserable — she is so made up she looks like an apple (literally 'she has rouged herself like an apple')'.

are correspondingly subjective and complex.⁴⁴ This *space*, as we shall call it, can serve the purposes of the narrator in several ways. In the most formal style it separates the modest author from his creation and so carries a sense of decorum. In those dialects which preserve first person forms, there is the underlying idea of "I didn't know what I was doing, but..", stressing on behalf of the speaker the involuntary nature of his action. Linked to this the space can excuse the speaker his incertitude or his lack of rigor to the factual detail of his account.

The narrator's detachment from the action of the verb expressed by the second past tense can be in the spatial/ temporal terms of not being present when it occurred; in sensory terms of not being consciously occupied with it, though present; in emotional terms of being mentally or spiritually unaffected by it. The second past is preferred when the speaker does not intellectually grasp the process which produces the result he observes.

We would posit then that the second past tense in Komi Zyryan is indeed a focus device which primarily demonstrates the uncertain or uninvolved position which the speaker holds toward the action of the verb and, in particular, consequently points to his attention being focused on the results of that action rather than on the way it was performed. From this starting point it can readily be seen how this aspect of the second past is linked inseparably to its pure perfect function, which focuses on the end product of the action even when there is no need to stress the narrator's position with regard to it. Such a proposition would plainly subsume the simple 'witnessed-unwitnessed' opposition or the 'modal meaning' and provide a basis for understanding the drift in the dialects of Komi Zyryan towards shedding first person forms, and the compensating preference for impersonal construction.

When this definition of use is applied to Komi Zyryan texts containing passages with varying stylistic values, it is found to answer many of the problems which were left unresolved by previous theories. Two examples may be quoted from Serebrennikov,

⁴⁴ It is presumably the complexity and the high degree of subjectivity underlying the employment of the second past which has caused reluctance on the part of the Komi grammarians to define its function.

Kategorii vremeni in ⁴⁵ which the first past is used where, according to the pure perfect and modal meaning view, the second would be expected. However, both are fully contained within the constraints of our proposition. "Тани йирсьомаось да шойччомаось, гашкӧ, и узисны," шоннитис Петя да зэв радпырысь видзӧдліс ёртыс выльӧ. ⁴⁶

The contextual situation is that two boys are endeavouring to track down a herd of elk and on the evidence of different traces presume that they have located the spot where the herd stopped for a period. The transition from the second past to the first in the course of the utterance indicates Petja's rising excitement on finding the place and signals his increasing sense of involvement with the herd, thus closing, in his imagination at least, the *space* of non-involvement.

The second example is taken from a folklore tale: *Лэччис салдат адӧ. Чортгяс сійӧс кватитисны да медся жар биас мӧдісны кыскыны.* ⁴⁷

The first past is used here to stress that, although the narrator did not personally witness the events he is here describing, he is emotionally gripped by his story and feels himself a part of the action.

There is an interesting parallel to this in Mari where evidence exists that a narrator may move from Past II to Past I when he is renarrating a story at points where his excitement is aroused, reverting to the original Past II when this wanes. ⁴⁸

ROBIN W. BAKER

⁴⁵ p. 65.

⁴⁶ "They were grazing and resting here and.. hey! probably they even slept here!", Petja whispered joyfully and looked at his companion.

⁴⁷ The soldier climbed down into hell. The demons seized him and set about dragging him into the fiercest flames.

⁴⁸ E. Kangasmaa-Minn, 'The So-Called Past Tenses in Cheremis', in T. A. Sebeok, ed., *American Studies in Uralic Linguistics I*, Bloomington, Indiana, 1960, p. 117.

Slavonic influence upon the language of the Old Permian texts¹

I

It is rather surprising that the Old Permian writings have attracted little attention from philologists and historical linguists in the English-speaking world. They date back 600 years and constitute "the oldest literary monuments of any Uralic language except Hungarian".² Less specifically, perhaps, they are of interest in that they represent an attempt to resolve the difficulty which has confronted every translator of literary texts, working on a hitherto unwritten language, of preserving the character of that language in a way which its speakers appreciate as natural, while fully expressing the content of the source. The extent to which the Permian translations satisfy these aims forms the subject of the present paper. The discussion will be devoted mainly to questions of the lexicon and orthography employed and to the syntactic parameters of Modifier-Head Noun constructions and the use of conjoiners. The syntactic analysis will concentrate primarily on the Biblical passages found in the corpus of the Old Permian translations as these can be compared more readily than the purely liturgical portions not only with the Church Slavonic source, but also with the Greek original.

¹ My gratitude is due to Raija Bartens who read through a draft of this paper and made several helpful suggestions concerning it. These have been taken up and are reflected in the final version. I alone, however, bear the responsibility for such inconsistencies and deficiencies which remain.

² C. A. Ferguson, 'St Stefan of Perm and Applied Linguistics', in *To Honor Roman Jakobson*, vol. I, The Hague, 1967, p. 644.

II

The term *Old Permian* is something of a misnomer but is retained here thanks to its long-established and general usage, *Old Zyryan* would be more appropriate as the speech variety upon which the texts were based was the Komi-Zyryan dialect spoken in the Lower Vychegda region of north-eastern European Russia in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries,³ within the territory referred to in the Russian chronicles as *Perm' Vychegodskaya*. Prior to Russian settlement in the area, commencing in the eleventh century, the Vychegda basin was solely the domain of Uralic tribes, particularly the Komi-Zyryans who spoke a dialect of the Permian branch of the Finno-Ugrian languages. Extant specimens of Old Permian are small in number containing only about eight hundred to nine hundred words of connected text.⁴ However, this body of material is sufficient to allow conclusions to be reached regarding the accuracy of the translations and the influence exerted by Slavonic upon them in the fields of lexicon and grammar.

The author of the first Old Permian translations was St Stefan of Perm' (Stefan Permskiy, known by Soviet commentators as Stefan Khrap), a man of remarkable abilities. A Russian, born in Velikiy Ustyug in the mid-fourteenth century, Stefan learned to speak Komi-Zyryan in his childhood. According to his contemporary and biographer Epifaniy Mudryy, Stefan, on becoming a monk, lived in the Rostovskiy Monastery from 1365 to 1379. This monastery was renowned for its library which contained a wealth of books in many languages including, of course, Church Slavonic and Greek, and Stefan acquired a knowledge of the latter at this time.⁵ He was convinced that his vocation was to conduct missionary work among the pagan Komi and was persuaded that this could best be realised if certain religious texts were available in the Zyryan vernacular.⁶ Thus, he set about the creation of an ortho-

³ V. I. Lytkin, *Istoricheskaya grammatika komi yazyka, chast' pervaya*, Syktyvkar, 1957 (hereafter V. I. Lytkin, *Istoricheskaya grammatika*), p. 31.

⁴ loc. cit.

⁵ G. S. Lytkin, *Zyryanskiy kray pri episkopakh permskikh i zyryanskiy yazyk*, St Petersburg 1889 (hereafter G. S. Lytkin, *Zyryanskiy kray*), pp. 4–5.

⁶ It is noteworthy in this context that Academician I. Lepekhin on visiting the Zyryans in 1771 observed that they appeared "more zealous and diligent

graphy which would best suit the phonology of Komi-Zyryan⁷ and then commenced the task of translating from Church Slavonic and Greek into Lower Vychegda Zyryan. What will be argued below is that Stefan, though drawing mainly from Greek in orthography and lexicon, leaned upon Church Slavonic for syntactic structures and for providing a theoretical model for his Old Permian translations.

III

Stefan's task was daunting; not only was the Zyryan language ill-equipped to express the semantic range and the syntactic complexity of the source texts, but also the Komi resisted, at least initially, his missionary efforts. The opposition which he encountered can be attributed in part to traditional adherence to their age-old shamanistic beliefs and, in part, to "a growing opposition to the Russians who... were now beginning to take a position of economic and political dominance."⁸ For these reasons Stefan most assiduously endeavoured to keep Russian lexical borrowings and the Cyrillic script, at least explicitly, out of his translations. In this regard he showed himself more sensitive and conscientious than many of the Biblical translators of minority languages who were to follow him in Russia. It is interesting to note in passing the attitude of the great nineteenth-century pioneer of Finno-Ugrian studies, A. J. Sjögren, to the translation of Scripture into the Finno-Ugrian languages through a Slavonic medium: "Sjögren

in their Christian faith than do the other peoples concerning whom I have had occasion to write." He attributes the origins of this holy zeal to the pioneering work of St Stefan Velikopermskiy and, in particular, to his achievement in translating 'the most essential religious books into the Permian language' and giving to them a writing system. He remarks that the clergy entrusted with the spiritual oversight of "the Mordvins, Tatars and other idolatrous souls" would do well to emulate his example. (I. I. Lepekhin, *Dnevnyye zapiski puteshestviya po raznym provintsiiam rossiyskogo gosudarstva v 1771 godu*, vol. III, St Petersburg, 1780, pp. 241 — 50).

⁷ According to G. S. Lytkin (*Zyryanskiy kray*, pp. 4 — 5) this was done in 1372, while his namesake cites 1375 as the approximate date (V. I. Lytkin, *Istoricheskaya grammatika*, p. 31).

⁸ C. A. Ferguson, 'St Stefan of Perm and Applied Linguistics', in *To Honor Roman Jakobson*, vol. I, The Hague, 1967, p. 644.

knew that Gusev had prepared an Olonets Karelian translation of St Matthew's Gospel and he hoped to obtain a copy. For four days they examined the work together and argued about the finer points of the translation. Sjögren believed that it followed the Slavonic original too closely in vocabulary and style. As his knowledge of Olonetsian rapidly improved he was able to make several constructive suggestions which were finally accepted by Gusev."⁹

The linguistic challenge which faced Stefan is analogous in many ways to that which confronted the first translators of Greek texts into Old Church Slavonic. They, like Stefan, were native speakers of the source language and were required to adapt the recipient language in such a way as to convey necessarily more complex syntactic relationships and express semantic notions alien to the native speakers of that language. According to Josef Kurz¹⁰ the first Old Church Slavonic translators, unlike their successors, were in the main successful in remaining faithful to the spirit of the Slavonic linguistic medium while managing to capture the sense of the Greek. In his view, though the original Old Church Slavonic texts were influenced by Greek, they were not slavishly modelled on it. This is not to say, however, that "between Old Church Slavonic and the Macedonian-Bulgarian dialect spoken in the environs of Salonica, which represents its base, we can... place an equals sign. In order for the first Slavonic language in an appropriate form to satisfy the requirements regarding its use, it had to be reworked in many respects."¹¹

This had the consequence of creating a literary medium which

⁹ Michael Branch, A. J. Sjögren: Studies of the North, *Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 152, Helsinki, 1973, pp. 79 —80. In the light of the above it is somewhat ironic to read the comments of a native Komi, G. S. Lytkin, on Sjögren's (1823) Zyryan translation of Matthew's Gospel: "A. Sjögren... peppered his Zyryan translation with Russian words and conjunctions in such profusity that I, on reading his translation first of all in the 1850s, did not comprehend the meaning of his Zyryan version and was forced to turn to the Slavonic text for assistance." (G. S. Lytkin, *Zyryanskiy kray*, p. 37). It ought to be mentioned in fairness to Sjögren that the influence of Russian was felt much more strongly in Zyryan in the nineteenth century than in Stefan's era.

¹⁰ J. Kurz, 'Problematika issledovaniya sintaksisa staroslavjanskogo yazyka', in *Issledovaniya po sintaksisu staroslavjanskogo yazyka*, ed. Josef Kurz, Prague, 1963 (hereafter Kurz, 'Problematika'), pp. 8 — 10.

¹¹ *ibid.* p. 12.

was not identical to the spoken language. Nonetheless, the achievement of the first translators rests in that the works which they produced were Slavonic in essence and, as such, were intuitively understood by speakers of the vernacular language. It was, presumably, with knowledge of this precedent that Stefan approached his translations into Lower Vychegda Zyryan.

IV

Stefan's first task was the creation of an orthography and in this he clearly displayed considerations which formed the basis of his attitude to his work. He could have used the Cyrillic alphabet with some modification as is the practice with the Komi-Zyryan literary language today. However, he elected to distance himself from overtly Slavonic associations as far as possible and, though exploiting the resources of the Greek and Russian Slavonic alphabets, he developed a writing system which belied this influence.¹² It must be said that Stefan, both in the creation of the orthography and in lexical innovation, admittedly to a lesser degree, drew more heavily from the Greek than the Slavonic model. Generally it is only where Greek does not offer an adaptable equivalent that Cyrillic characters provide the inspiration for the Old Permian graphemes. Stefan appears to have worked the Greek and Cyrillic letters in

¹² It should be mentioned in this context that G. Stipa has posited that certain of the characters in the Old Permian alphabet owe their origin to the orthographic conventions of Caucasian and Iranic literatures (see Günter Stipa, 'Der Ursprung der permischen Schrift', in *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Wiesbaden, 1961, pp. 342 — 64, and G. J. Stipa, 'Der Ursprung der permischen Schrift', in *Congressus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum* (Budapest, 1960), Budapest, 1963, pp. 281 — 7). This is an interesting and thoughtful proposal which V. I. Lytkin concedes is a possibility that cannot be discounted (see V. I. Lytkin, 'Über die Geschichte der syrjänischer Literatur', *Ural-altaische Jahrbücher*, XXXIV (1962), p. 214. In the same paper Lytkin suggests the likelihood of some religious works in Komi prior to the advent of Stefan). Stipa's findings demand and deserve greater discussion than they can be afforded in the present article concerned, as it is, with Slavonic influence. However, it is clear that owing to the lack of historical documentation compounded with the fact that his account tends to undermine the veracity of the single contemporary account of the origins of the Old Permian writing system, viz. that of Epifaniy, it can only be treated as hypothetical. In any case, it is indisputable that Greek and Cyrillic characters provide the model for *some*, if not all, of Stefan's graphemes.

such a way as to resemble the *pas''yas* of the Komi. These were markings made mainly on wood which served to signify ownership in addition to representing magical symbols used in occult rites.¹³ According to G. S. Lytkin "the word *pas* denotes a sign, a stigma, a brand, a symbol. They are made on parcels of land, on sacks in which grain is transported for grinding, on trees in the forest to mark the existence or direction of a path... also on sticks and oblong pieces of wood used in various household calculations; finally these signs were made on the *pas* or tally itself. The adoption of the pagan tally-calendar in Christian tradition is attributed to St Stefan."¹⁴

Thus, although the majority of graphemes were in reality based on Greek and Cyrillic characters, they were written in a way which gave them the angular appearance characteristic of the Komi *pas''yas*. Stefan's genius in adaptation can be seen by comparing, from the table provided by G. S. Lytkin,¹⁵ the *pas''yas* found on the ecclesiastical calendar with the graphemes he employed in the Old Permian alphabet. The impression of visual likeness is remarkable though closer examination confirms, for example, that the Greek letter *nu* provides the model for the symbol representing the phone *n* and that Slavonic *yat'* is the source of the character which denotes, according to V. I. Lytkin, the closed *e* phoneme of fourteenth-century Zyryan.¹⁶ Stefan's motive in this harmless deception was an attempt to distance his mission in the eyes of the pagans from the baser aspirations of the contemporary Russian colonists in Perm' Vychegodskaya and to appeal to their inherent appreciation of the *pas''yas* as something genuinely Komi.

His success in disguising the ultimate derivation of his alphabet and in its originality of style is evidenced by the fact that in the fifteenth century the Old Permian script enjoyed "a certain popularity" among Muscovite scribes, who employed it as a means of secret writing, presumably for amusement.¹⁷ As a series of signs

¹³ V. I. Lytkin, *Istoricheskaya grammatika*, p. 34.

¹⁴ G. S. Lytkin, *Zyryanskiy kray*, p. 21.

¹⁵ *ibid.* p. 24.

¹⁶ V. I. Lytkin, *Drevnepermiskiy yazyk*, Moscow, 1952 (hereafter V. I. Lytkin, *Drevnepermiskiy yazyk*), p. 90.

¹⁷ *ibid.* p. 75.

incomprehensible to the uninitiated among the Russians, this fashion soon died out in Moscow.

In the words of Epifaniy, Stefan's alphabet consisted of twenty-four letters, "in number corresponding to the Greek alphabet, but in sound to the Permian tongue".¹⁸ Owing to the large inventory of phonemes in the Komi language at the time, viz. thirty five, some graphemes were used to represent more than one phoneme. V. I. Lytkin posits that those palatalized consonants which do not appear to be differentiated from their velar counterparts, were probably marked as palatalized by a superscript diacritic since Stefan would have been acquainted with such devices in the Russian Slavonic orthography.¹⁹ It is curious, however, that Stefan was reluctant to distinguish, for instance, the central vowel represented in the modern Komi-Zyryan orthography as *ö* from the back vowel *o*, though they were, and remain, separate phonemes. It would seem that he did not wish to expand his alphabet beyond the quantitative limits of Greek and was willing to suffer certain interpretative anomalies as a result.

It deserves to be noted, *en passant*, that the Old Permian scribes adhered to the Old Church Slavonic orthographic convention of abbreviating, by means of a superscript diacritic, certain frequently-used lexemes. Thus, the initial three words of the Old Permian postscript to the *Nomokanon* of 1510 (which represents, in fact, the only dated specimen of Old Permian extant), abbreviate *mezose isus kristose* 'O Lord Jesus Christ' to *mze iss ske*.²⁰ In addition, not surprisingly, the letters of the Old Permian alphabet held the secondary function of denoting numerical values as in Greek.

It is clear from the above that the influence of Slavonic and Greek on the orthography devised by Stefan was fundamental but was, nevertheless, deliberately concealed for tactical reasons. Stefan's underlying loyalty to the traditional norms is evident in the restriction of his graphemes to twenty-four, in spite of the greater inventory of phonemes in the Lower Vychegda variety. This pattern of axiomatic, though covert, influence from Slavonic and Greek, while overtly appearing to eschew such is typical of Ste-

¹⁸ Quoted in V. I. Lytkin, *Istoricheskaya grammatika*, p. 39.

¹⁹ V. I. Lytkin, *Drevnepermskiy yazyk*, p. 27.

²⁰ *ibid.* pp. 33, 45.

fan's methodology as the studies on the lexicon and syntax of Old Permian which follow will also indicate.

V

It is in the lexical content of the Old Permian writings that Stefan's mastery of the Zyryan language and his remarkable ingenuity are best displayed. Obviously, many of the notions encountered in the Biblical and liturgical passages which he translated, were alien to the Komi way of life and, as such, had no ready designations. Guided by the principle of avoiding overt foreign influence, he set about extending the semantic field of certain native Zyryan words to embrace new concepts of a sacred nature and, where this proved impracticable, invented Zyryan morpheme-by-morpheme equivalents of, mainly Greek, terms, though, clearly, several of these already possessed Church Slavonic calques. I presume that Stefan would have compared the Slavonic versions with the originals as a pre-requisite to inventing Komi equivalents. A case might be made, on the basis of the sample texts which we possess, for suggesting that he actually surpassed the early Slavonic translators in the scope and quality of his calques, though doubtless this would be weakened owing to the lack of extant Old Permian material. However, it is instructive in terms of appreciating Stefan's skill, to consider the following examples of Permian lexical innovation, comparing them with the equivalent Church Slavonic forms. The lexeme *burvis'talöm* 'evangel' is a direct calque on New Testament Greek *euangelion*. It is a compound formed from the adjective *bur* 'good' and the deverbal substantive *vis'talöm* 'that which is told'. The form *vöytilan* 'baptism' is likewise modelled on New Testament Greek *baptisma*. The morphological constitution of this Old Permian neologism makes, in itself, an interesting study and demonstrates Stefan's understanding of the agglutinative character of the Komi language. The verbal root *vöy* signifies 'dip, drown' (compare the cognate form in Votyak *vyyny* 'to become submerged, to drown'). The *t* morpheme has a causative function thus making the verb transitive (compare the modern Komi-Zyryan verbs *bydmyny* 'to grow (intransitive)' and *bydtyny* 'to cause to grow'). The *l* morpheme reflects the temporary aspect while the suffix *-an* is the marker of the

active participle. Therefore, the literal meaning of the resultant lexeme is "the submerging of someone/something for a temporary period". This, of course, elegantly captures the sense of the original Greek form.

Among those Old Permian calques which have morpheme-identical counterparts in Slavonic are:

Old Permian	Russian
<i>byd kutys</i> 'Almighty'	<i>vsederzhitel'</i>
<i>vodzsiis</i> 'prophet'	<i>prorok</i>
<i>mortas'ny</i> 'to be made human'	<i>ochelovechit'sya</i>

The word *vidzko*, still used in Komi in the form *vichko*, and meaning 'church', is a compound which represents an instance of pure innovation, rather than adaptation, on Stefan's part. The constituents are *vidz* 'a fast' (compare Old Permian *vis* 'a sacrifice') and *ko* 'a dwelling'. Thus, *vidzko* denoted 'a house of prayer or sacrifice'.²¹

The great Komi-Zyryan poet, I. A. Kuratov, comparing the policy of Stefan to direct lexical borrowing with that prevalent in the mid-nineteenth century, commented: "The contemporary Zyryan expresses concepts concerned with the spheres of religion, jurisprudence, administration, science, art, craftsmanship and trade with words borrowed from other languages, most frequently Russian or through the medium of Russian. Thanks to St Stefan and his associates, who translated liturgical works into Zyryan, certain words dealing with religious ritual were sanctioned in the Zyryan language such as: *pyrts'öm* 'baptism', *vis'tas'öm* 'homily', *vichko* 'church', *burvis'talöm* 'gospel'."²²

A parallel can also be drawn between Stefan's accomplishment and the aspirations of the early twentieth-century Komi intellectuals who, in creating the literary language, desired to replace wholesale borrowings from Russian with native words which had either

²¹ For a fuller list of Old Permian calques the reader of Russian is referred to the glossary provided in V. I. Lytkin, *Drevnepermiskiy yazyk*, pp. 122 — 47, the Komi-Zyryan reader to V. I. Lytkin, *Istoricheskaya leksikologiya komi yazyka: Komi kylvlön istorichesköy leksikologiya*, Syktyvkar, 1979, p. 45.

²² I. A. Kuratov, 'Zyryanskiy yazyk', in *Vologodskiye gubernskiye vedomosti*, 1865 — 6 (reprinted as I. A. Kuratov: *Lingvisticheskiye raboty*, vol. II, Syktyvkar, 1939), p. 45.

fallen into disuse or were to be found only in isolated dialects. Their work, though successful to a degree, was impeded by official policy. Hence, the modern Komi-Zyryan literary language is all-pervaded by Russian lexical stock.²³ Károly Rédei asserts that in the sister Komi-Permyak language "the number of Russian loanwords is well over five thousand".²⁴ A similar parallel could be drawn between Stefan's creation of an original orthography and the adoption, after much debate, of a modified Cyrillic script for the Zyryan and Permyak literary languages.

The extent of Stefan's adaptation of the lexicon of fourteenth-century Lower Vychegda Zyryan becomes apparent with the realization that in the entire extant vocabulary of Old Permian, as given by V. I. Lytkin in *Drevnepermjskiy yazyk*, there are only sixteen items which are direct borrowings and half of those are proper nouns of Hebrew or Greek origin, for instance: *Avraam*, *Sarra*, *Kristos* and the Slavonicized form of Greek *Paulos*, *Pavel*. A further three are loans from Hebrew, via Slavonic, which express certain, specifically Biblical concepts: *amin* 'Amen', *serafim* 'seraphim', *kheruvim* 'cherubim'. The inclusion of the last two lexemes is curious given Stefan's penchant for invention, as they violate Zyryan phonology. Only in the present century, and then only in those varieties most exposed to Russian influence, does one encounter the phonemes *f* and *kh* in Komi speech. Their occurrence is further limited to Russian loanwords. Günter Stipa, in his discussion of Rédei's paper on Russian influence in Komi-Permyak syntax, states that *f* and *kh* are "new phonemes in Perm-yak".²⁵ Unfortunately, the manuscript containing these two words is not an original written Old Permian characters, but a later Cyrillic transliteration. Thus, it cannot be established that Stefan originally distinguished these phones.²⁶ The remaining Russian

²³ For a more detailed discussion of this question see John G. Coates, 'Aspects of Modern Komi-Zyryan Literature' (Ph. D. thesis, University of Cambridge, 1968), vol. II, p. 41.

²⁴ K. Rédei, 'Russische Einflüsse in der permjakischen Syntax', in Symposium über Syntax der uralischen Sprachen, ed. W. Schlachter, Göttingen, 1970, p. 154.

²⁵ *ibid.* p. 162.

²⁶ It is yet the more surprising that these foreign lexemes are included when, for the semantically similar notion of 'archangel', Stefan created the noun phrase *borda idög*, literally 'winged messenger'.

Church Slavonic borrowings are *grek* 'sin' (note the replacement of *kh* by the corresponding stop *k*), also found as *kreka* 'sinful' in a later manuscript; *ch'as* 'goblet' from *chasha*; finally, the co-ordinating conjunctions *a* 'and, but', *i* 'and', and *no* 'but'. These three items constitute an important sub-category of borrowings direct from Russian, in that they fulfil a uniquely syntactic function. While *a* and *no* occur only once respectively, *i* enjoys an almost ubiquitous distribution in the corpus. The reason for and significance of their usage lead directly to an analysis of the influence exerted by Slavonic upon Old Permian syntax. It is here that the pattern observed so far breaks down.

VI

It is a fact, oft-lamented in the literature, that the syntax of the Permian languages, viz. Votyak, Komi-Zyryan, and Komi-Permyak, has been inadequately researched.²⁷ Nowhere is this more applicable than in the case of Old Permian. Less than a page in V. I. Lytkin's *Drevnepermiskiy yazyk*²⁸, the sole monograph on the subject, is devoted to syntactic questions. However, the Old Permian syntactic system does provide especial interest in that it reflects Slavonic influence more clearly than other aspects of the language found in the writings. In the words of Lytkin: "In relation to syntax, the Old Permian texts, in many respects, represent a calque on the Church Slavonic language, therefore it behoves one to handle the syntactic data carefully. If one discards these calques, the structure of the sentence (both simple and complex) appears before us in the same approximate form as it is encountered in the modern dialects of Komi."²⁹

As mentioned above, our attention will be focused on the two parameters of conjoiner usage and modifier-head noun constructions. These have been selected because they represent areas where, in general, Finno-Ugrian languages are at variance with Indo-European and, in particular, where typically the Permian

²⁷ See, for instance, A. S. Krivoshechekova-Gantman, 'Poryadok slov komi-permyatskogo yazyka v sravnenii s udmurtskim', *Sovetskoye Finnougrovedeniye*, III, 4, 1967 (hereafter Krivoshechekova-Gantman, 'Poryadok'), p. 267.

²⁸ V. I. Lytkin, *Drevnepermiskiy yazyk*, pp. 117 — 18.

²⁹ loc. cit.

languages are inherently opposed to Slavonic. It is most probable, however, that a more exhaustive study of Old Permian syntax than that given here would reveal an even greater amount of calquing.

Turning first to conjoiner usage, it is plain that co-ordinate conjunctions are fundamentally alien to the Permian languages. T. I. Teplyashina claims that: "Conjunctions came into being relatively late in the Permian languages as is shown by the fact that they do not share a common stock."³⁰

While discussing Komi-Permyak (though the same naturally applies to Votyak and Komi-Zyryan), V. I. Lytkin makes the same point more forcefully: "Right up to the Great October Socialist Revolution the Komi-Permyak language remained a non-literary, colloquial language. Complex speech constructions were not typical of it. Hence, there were few conjunctions in Komi-Permyak. After the victory of Great October... A literary language was formed. The Komi-Permyak language experienced robust development under the creative influence of the Russian language. A large number of words were borrowed from Russian, among them conjunctions... Short, basically simple, sentences were characteristic of colloquial speech... In spite of the absence of conjunctions,... there is a link between the sentences but this is not expressed by conjunctions but by the intonation, pauses and so on."³¹ R.M. Batalova, in her study on Komi-Permyak dialects, maintains the same position: "The number of conjunctions in Komi-Permyak dialects is not large since, in speech, there is a preponderance of simple sentences, and even complex sentences are usually conjunctionless."³²

The assertion that conjunctions in Komi speech are of fairly recent origin and are essentially artificial, is borne out by G. S. Lytkin, writing in 1889. He contends, in his diatribe directed against Zyryan translations produced by other scholars, that "as conjunctions are foreign to Zyryan they have taken them directly

³⁰ T. I. Teplyashina and V. I. Lytkin, 'Permskiye yazyki', in *Osnovy finno-ugorskogo yazykoznaniya: mariyskiy, permskiye i ugorskiye yazyki*, eds. V. I. Lytkin et al, Moscow, 1976, p. 200.

³¹ V. I. Lytkin, ed., *Komi-permyatskiy yazyk*, Kudymkar, 1962, pp. 312—13.

³² R. M. Batalova, *Komi-permyatskaya dialektologiya*, Moscow, 1975, p. 203.

from Russian, ignoring the fact that in the folk creations of the Zyryans a unique speech structure exists which does not require conjunctions. This inattention to the structure of Zyryan has led translators to create a peculiar Zyryan jargon which could be termed 'Educated Zyryan' or 'Seminary Jargon'.³³

True as this undoubtedly is, Lytkin's vociferous brand of Zyryan nationalism causes him to overlook the occurrence of Russian conjunctions in the Old Permian texts, presumably out of veneration for Stefan whom he lionized. Indeed, he claims that Russian conjunctions are "not found in St Stefan's Zyryan translations".³⁴ However, even a superficial inspection of the data reveals the frequent use of the Russian conjoiner *i*, though it appears less often in the Old Permian translations than in the parallel Slavonic versions. A word-count of the extant Biblical passages³⁵ shows that *i* appears forty-four times in the Slavonic text (where it corresponds almost exactly with the incidence of the Greek conjunction *kai*), while in Old Permian it is used twenty-seven times. For the remaining seventeen occurrences in Slavonic, Old Permian has either zero or the native Komi temporal adverb *ses* 'then'. Both would appear to represent syntactically more natural solutions with the former being the less 'marked'. The single Old Permian instance of the conjunction *a* (in John V, 29) corresponds precisely to its counterpart in the respective Slavonic passage. In the light of

³³ G. S. Lytkin, Introduction to Zyryanskiy kray, pp. VI — VIII.

³⁴ loc. cit.

³⁵ Genesis XVIII, 1 — 8; Acts of the Apostles II, 1 — 4; Matthew VI, 9 — 13; John V, 24 — 30; 1 Thessalonians IV, 13 — 17. I have used V. I. Lytkin's decipherment of the Old Permian texts (as found in his Drevnepermiskiy yazyk) for the data base as this appears the most reliable. The parallel Slavonic version for the first and second passages mentioned is, again, that employed by V. I. Lytkin: a fifteenth-century manuscript Bible which lies "closest to the Old Permian translation". For the remaining three passages the Slavonic parallel given by G. S. Lytkin in Zyryanskiy kray is used. Generally, it is only in orthographic detail that this version departs from the text given in N. Il'minskiy, Svyatoyevangeliye gospoda nashogo Iisusa Khrista: drevne-slavyanskiy tekst, Kazan', 1889. For the New Testament Greek comparison I have consulted Alexander Souter, Novum Testamentum Graece, second edition, Oxford, 1950. The oldest passages of Old Permian Biblical translation are those inscribed on the icons Troitsa (Genesis, XVIII, 1 — 8) and Soshestviye Svyatogo Dukha (Acts II, 1 — 4) and are believed to have been produced during Stefan's lifetime.

the above, one would think it an unassailable fact that, if conjunctions were regarded as artificial in Komi speech in the nineteenth century, they would have been non-existent in the Lower Vychegda variety of the fourteenth. Consequently, their employment by Stefan must have constituted a literary expedient unsupported by the vernacular language. This view, held by most scholars, is challenged by Krivoshchekova-Gantman. Basing her arguments solely on the syntactic constructions found in the *Troitsa* and *Soshestviye* inscriptions, and chiefly concentrating on the usage of subordinate conjunctions, she contends that "It would appear that the Old Permian syntax of the complex sentence reflected the true picture of the Lower Vychegda varieties' stage of development. Evidently, there existed already, at a reasonably advanced level, the analytical means for conjoining the constituents of complex sentences—conjunctions."³⁶

She supports this position by appealing to "the striking similarity between modern Komi and Old Permian in the syntax of the complex sentence" and by examining the deployment of four "subordinating conjunctions or conjunctive words": *kö* 'if'; *ködös* 'which'; *kudz* 'as' and *kytön* 'where'. All four are of Permian origin.

As for the similarity between Old Permian and modern Komi the answer must lie in the fundamental resemblance of subordinate clause syntax in Church Slavonic and Old Russian to that in the contemporary language. We have already seen how the Russian language has served as the constant and, practically, exclusive influence in the creation of Komi literary syntax. The basic syntax of Russian subordinate clauses has not altered dramatically in six hundred years (at least in comparison with, for instance, many Finno-Ugrian languages), and so any modification in Komi has been in but one direction. Stefan simply did, on the basis of the fourteenth-century Russian syntactic order, what the twentieth-century architects of the Zyryan and Permyak literary languages attempted with the contemporary one. The use of a single, diachronically-connected model on the same recipient should produce similar results.

³⁶ A. S. Krivoshchekova-Gantman, 'Razvitiye sintaksisa slozhnogo predlozheniya komi-permyatskogo yazyka', in *Voprosy lingvisticheskogo kraevedeniya Prikam'ya*, ed. A. S. Gantman, vypusk I, Perm', 1974, p. 8.

The four native subordinating conjunctions present a no more convincing argument. Two of them, *ködös* and *kytön*, are not strictly conjunctions. In modern Komi-Zyryan *ködös* is the accusative form of the relative pronoun *kod*. It functioned no differently in Old Permian as is evident from the passage (in the *Troitsa* inscription) quoted by Krivoschekova-Gantman: "i bos'tis vyy, ma, yöl, kuk, *ködös* das'tis i pugtis ny vodzyn."³⁷ In the Authorized Version (1611) of the English Bible the same passage (Genesis XVIII, 7) is translated: "And he took butter, and milk, and the calf *which* he had dressed, and set it before them." In Old Permian and in modern Komi *kytön* is an adverb of place meaning 'where'. Krivoschekova-Gantman cites its usage on the *Soshestviye* icon: "i tyrtis bödön kartaös, *kytön* loinys pukygön."³⁸ The Authorized Version renders this section of Acts II, 2: "And it filled all the house *where* they were sitting."

Yet all of this rather begs the question. The example just quoted is a word-for-word translation of the Slavonic text (itself a calque on the Greek): "i ispolni ves' dom, idezhe byakhu sedyashche." The Old Permian subordinate clause is made up of the following members:

<i>kytön</i> 'where'	(adverb of place)
<i>loinys</i> 'they were'	(3 pers. pl. of past tense of the verb <i>lony</i> 'to be')
<i>pukygön</i> 'sitting'	(verbal adverb formed from the verb stem <i>puk-</i> 'to sit')

This type of periphrastic construction, syntactically identical to its English gloss, would be considered artificial even in modern Komi. In Stefan's era it must have seemed absurd. In addition, it is improbable that subordinate clauses would have been used so liberally in fourteenth-century Zyryan for, according to Hajdú: "One of the common characteristics of Finno-Ugrian languages is their general preference for participial constructions instead of subordinate clauses... In Hungarian such constructions are *slowly* (emphasis mine) being replaced by subordinate clauses, but other

³⁷ *ibid.* p. 7.

³⁸ *loc. cit.*

Finno-Ugrian languages use them in profusion. In Nenets subordinate clauses are unknown, participial constructions being used in their place."³⁹ Thus, Krivoshchekova-Gantman's argument fails above all in that it takes no account of the rudiments of *Finno-Ugrian* syntax which would have provided the framework for Zyryan sentence structures in the fourteenth century. It is safer to assume that Old Permian subordinate constructions, of the type under discussion, constitute, in Uriel Weinreich's terminology, examples of 'the second type' of grammatical interference where "The replica of the relation of another language violates an existing relation pattern, producing nonsense or a statement which is understandable by implication."⁴⁰

It appears that Stefan and his associates felt constrained to copy the sentence pattern found in Slavonic on to their Zyryan translations without modifying it in any substantive way; though doubtless, even modest amendment such as sentence sub-division with concomitant conjunction deletion would have rendered their versions more authentic. The resultant structures must be considered atypical of the syntax of the recipient Zyryan variety and, as such, at variance with Stefan's normal methodology. Putative reasons for this departure will be suggested following an examination of another syntactic parameter: Modifier-Head Noun word order.

In examining the word order of modifier-head noun constructions we are, in fact, concerned with the sequence of constituents within the noun phrase. This appears a promising avenue for research in Slavonic-Old Permian comparison as the basic order of the Slavonic noun phrase is actually the mirror-image of its Komi counterpart. Owing to the multiplicity of terms designating the syntactic status of the main members of the noun phrase found in the literature, such as *determinatum-determinant*, *adjunct-head* and so on, for the sake of consistency I have chosen to use the labels adopted by Bernard Comrie in his *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*, *operator-operand*.⁴¹ The table below (following Comrie⁴²) categorizes the various 'parts of speech' relevant to this

³⁹ Péter Hajdú, *Finno-Ugrian Languages and Peoples*, London, 1975, p. 80.

⁴⁰ Uriel Weinreich, *Languages in Contact*, The Hague, 1963, pp. 37 — 8.

⁴¹ Bernard Comrie, *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*, Oxford, 1981, p. 90.

⁴² *ibid.* p. 92.

discussion according to their syntactic function within the noun phrase.

<i>Operator</i>	<i>Operand</i>
Adjective	Noun
Genitive	Noun
Noun phrase	Adposition

According to Khaburgayev: "In all essential respects the Old Church Slavonic language preserved the features of the ancient Indo-European sentence... In the Old Church Slavonic sentence, in conformity with Indo-European syntactic tradition, the subject normally preceded the predicate, while those words which acted as attributes to the main members usually followed the determinant."⁴³ Due to the rich system of concord in Old Church Slavonic the word order within the noun phrase is not rigid. However, certain generalizations can be made: the adposition (preposition) precedes the noun to which it relates; the genitive constituent normally follows the substantive possessed by it; prepositive use of the attributive adjective is the less usual construction, generally functioning as a stylistic variant; the basic order is operand-operator. These generalizations are, of course, also true of Old Russian.

The sequence in Komi-Zyryan, Komi-Permyak and Votyak is summed up by V. I. Lytkin in the following rule: "The determinatum precedes the determinant."⁴⁴ The same is expressed in less absolute terms in another work: "The modifier in the sentence normally stands before its head word".⁴⁵ Thus, in the Permian languages the adposition (postposition) invariably directly follows its noun; in possessive constructions the possessor, often without any overt morphological marking, usually precedes the noun which it possesses; the attributive adjective stands before the noun though, exceptionally, for stylistic purposes it may follow; ⁴⁶ the basic order is operator-operand. There is, however, a tendency at work within these languages toward greater use of operand-opera-

⁴³ G. A. Khaburgayev, *Staroslavjanskiy yazyk*, Moscow, 1974, p. 366.

⁴⁴ V. I. Lytkin, ed., *Komi-permyatskiy yazyk*, Kudymkar, 1962, p. 10.

⁴⁵ N. N. Sel'kov, ed., *Sovremennyy komi yazyk*, vol. II (Sintaksis), Syktyvkar, 1967, p. 44.

⁴⁶ Krivoshchekova-Gantman, 'Poryadok', pp. 271 — 2.

tor order in possessive and attributive constructions — a phenomenon encountered in many western Finno-Ugrian languages and which Tauli considers can often be ascribed to Russian influence.⁴⁷ The possibly controversial inclusion of postposition in the category of operand is amply justified in terms of the Permian languages and of the Uralic family generally where a postpositional construction was originally an attributive syntagme of two nouns in which the determinant was the future postposition.⁴⁸

It follows that this operator-operand order within the noun phrase was a feature of the Permian proto-language and most commentators attribute the same to Proto-Uralic: "Another very important rule of word order can be generalized for the proto-language, according to which the rectum (modifier) preceded the regent (modified) of the construction. In conformity with this rule, the attribute was placed before the modified word..."⁴⁹

On the strength of the above, and with the knowledge that only slowly and, arguably, due to tremendous pressure from Russian, is this canonical word order being violated in the Permian languages, it can be assumed that in the Lower Vychegda Zyryan speech of six centuries ago the operator-operand sequence provided the universal pattern of noun phrase syntax.

I shall discuss the three pertinent categories of operator-operand order in turn with reference to their reflexes in the Old Permian texts, commencing with that of noun phrase-adposition. Plainly, what renders this type of construction least susceptible to change in the Permian languages is the fact that the postposition, though, generally speaking, originally the operand of a possessive construction, has forfeited its independent lexical role in favour of a purely syntactic one. Therefore, it becomes a pure nominal auxiliary whose function is to mark the relationship of its operator to the predicate. It is, then, a part not of the lexical, but of the syntactic, component of the phrase and, as such, differs from the remaining two kinds of operands found in the noun phrase. Of

⁴⁷ Valter Tauli, *Structural Tendencies in Uralic Languages*, Indiana University Publications Uralic and Altaic Series vol. XVII, The Hague, 1966, pp. 99 — 100.

⁴⁸ *ibid.* p. 44.

⁴⁹ Péter Hajdú, 'The Origins of Hungarian', in *The Hungarian Language*, eds. L. Benkő and S. Imre, The Hague, 1972, p. 45.

course, the same obtains for the prepositions of Slavonic which are equally non-mobile and non-deletable. In the Old Permian texts in question there are no instances where the postposition is moved from its place immediately to the right of its substantive. In fact, it directly follows the noun in the 'nominative' (zero-inflected) form with only the plural morpheme *-yös* permitted to intervene. The case marking is carried by the postposition. Thus, in the *Troitsa* inscription we find the following rendering of Genesis VIII, 7: *pyshyi avraam mösyös ordö* literally, 'Abraham ran to the cows'. In modern Komi-Zyryan the operator in postpositional constructions is normally in the nominative. Clearly, Stefan recognized the vital grammatical role played by postpositions in the language and did not attempt in any way to modify their function, position, or form. Obvious though this may seem, actually Stefan was more perceptive as to the basic structure of the language than some of his successors. Flyorov, for instance, in his Zyryan grammar attempts to totally conform Zyryan to the model of Russian grammar, claiming that it possesses prepositions and six cases!⁵⁰ Stefan's strict adherence to the facts of the language can, in this case, probably find explanation in two factors. Firstly, there could have been no occasions when, for example, inversion of the postposition could occur, in contrast to possessive and attributive constructions where, feasibly, the language would have permitted slight word order variation for emphasis, thus providing an exploitable precedent. This supposition finds support in the modern Permian varieties where, in terms of postpositional operand order alone, variation is not encountered. Secondly, Slavonic possessed equally rigid, though plainly not identical, rules governing the position of prepositions in the sentence.

A very different picture emerges in the genitive-noun relationship. In Old Permian the canonical sequence is so disrupted that it is difficult to speak of a *basic* order. It is also impossible for us to determine whether atypical constructions are attributable to Slavonic or to Greek influence for in this case often the sequence in the one language is identical to that in the other. Nevertheless, on the evidence which has already been considered in the discussion of Slavonic influence on conjoiner usage, there is some basis for

⁵⁰ A. Flyorov, *Zyryanskaya grammatika*, St Petersburg, 1813.

thinking that it was Slavonic which provided the principal inspiration for non-Uralic operand-operator order in Stefan's translations. In the possessive construction of the type under review, it is a feature of the Permian languages that overt case marking is often not required on the operator, its function being denoted by its position in the noun phrase as the following quotation from Old Permian illustrates: *mezös kylön* 'by the word of the Lord'. Here *mezös* takes no case suffix yet is the 'genitive' constituent of the construction. Examples of the uninflected genitive are not common in Old Permian except where the short personal pronoun forms are used to indicate the possessor. The more frequent pattern involves suffixing the genitive marker *-lön* to the operator. V. I. Lytkin considers the widespread occurrence of this usage of the genitive marker *-lön* in the Old Permian texts idiosyncratic, though he admits that the situation in Votyak is analogous.⁵¹ The deployment of a morphological expedient to mark possessive relationships had the effect of relaxing the strict word order which, in turn, facilitated the postposing of the genitive operator at the whim of the translator without impairing the semantic or grammatical content of the phrase. The samples given below are representative.

ödös vodzyn ch'ömlön sylön 'Before the door of his tent' (door in front of tent of him). The modern literary Zyryan version would read *sy ch'om ödös vodzyn* with *sy* 'his' standing to the left of its operand and without case marking, likewise *ch'om* 'tent' which bears the twin roles of operand (in the construction with *sy*) and operator as the possessor of *ödös* 'door'. However, the Old Permian translation is a syntactic replica of the Slavonic *pred dver'mi khramu yego*. A combination of typical Uralic with basic Slavonic order is seen in the phrase from John V, 25: *kulömayas kylasnys gorasö yen pilön* literally 'The dead shall hear the voice of God's son'. Here the primary operator constituent *yen pi* is postposed to the right of the operand (in this instance the direct object of the sentence) and consequently *pi* is marked with the suffix *-lön*;⁵²

⁵¹ V. I. Lytkin, *Drevnepermskiy yazyk*, p. 118.

⁵² Another idiosyncrasy which Lytkin points out in Old Permian, and which is related to possessive *-lön* suffixing, is the use of the genitive suffix on the operator in possessive constructions when the operand is the direct object of the sentence. In modern Komi-Zyryan the ablative in *-lys'*, not the genitive, is

yen, retaining its anteposition with respect to *pi*, requires no case ending, the secondary possessive relationship denoted by word order alone.

In Old Permian reverse order in possessive constructions commonly occurs when the operator role is filled by a personal pronoun which then, invariably, takes the appropriate genitive marker: *podös tiyan* 'your feet' (compare Slavonic *nogi vasha'*); *aye miyan* 'O our Father' (compare Slavonic *otche nash*); *yord'yalömö menam vim ves'* 'my judgment is just' (compare Slavonic *sud'' moy praveden'' yest'*). The last example raises a further point. The Permian languages mark personal possession by means of possessive suffixes on the noun possessed and so obviate the need for a possessive pronoun. However, in the construction *yord'yalömö menam* 'my judgment' both the synthetic device of the first person singular possessive suffix *-ö* and the analytical first person singular personal pronoun in the genitive case are employed. What is not clear is whether this represents a method of emphasising the possessor or is simply a case of redundancy due to the desire of the translator to follow the Slavonic model in using a separate lexeme, yet feeling uncomfortable about discarding the native suffix. There is no question, however, that this type of twin expression of personal possession is more widely found in the Old Permian writings than in modern Zyryan speech.

It is in the syntax of possessive constructions that Stefan most freely conformed Old Permian noun phrase word order to the Indo-European model immediately represented by Slavonic (though, undoubtedly, Greek too provided a stimulus). In doing so he, in fact, anticipated a trend which is manifest in Komi today. Nevertheless, in terms of degree, the extent of genitive case marking on the operator and the concomitant violation of rigid order in Old Permian remains more advanced than is generally true of the contemporary Komi-Zyryan language. Some idea of this may

used. Though space does not permit a detailed examination of this question, it is of interest that in the modern Lower Vychegda variety possessive constructions identical to the allegedly aberrant Old Permian type are found. Thus, in V. A. Sorvacheva, *Nizhnevychegodskiy dialekt komi yazyka*, Moscow, 1977, p. 204, one reads *taye nyvlön plat't'esö mysköma* 'someone has washed this dress of my daughter'. In the literary language the correct form would be *nyvlys'*.

be gleaned simply by looking at possessive constructions in the modern Lower Vychegda Zyryan dialect as shown in the collection of texts given by Sorvacheva in her monograph devoted to this variety.⁵³

The third word order category is that consisting of attribute and noun. The attribute class includes, in addition to adjectives used attributively, numerals and demonstrative pronouns. In the modern Permian languages it is uncommon for the substantive to precede its attribute and when this does occur, it is for stylistic reasons. In contradistinction to the case of possessive constructions, pressure from Russian in this direction has not been great as Russian itself prefers, in this instance, the operator-operand sequence, the attribute standing in anteposition. Unlike Russian, Komi has no case or number concord between the two constituents when the canonical order is observed. In our corpus of Biblical texts only one phrase exists where the sequence is reversed and this, again, occurs in the *Troitsa* passage: *kutis ch'öl öshös, burös* 'He chose a tender calf, a good one'. The postposed attributive adjective takes the *-ös* 'accusative' suffix signalling concord with its noun.⁵⁴ Though it is justifiable to assume that this represents unnatural order, nonetheless, it is not a direct calque on Slavonic where both adjectives follow the noun. Where numerals appear in the text they precede the noun and, as is generally found in the Uralic languages, the substantive is in the singular number.

To summarise our findings on Slavonic influence in noun phrase syntax, it would appear that where some precedent already existed for reversing the basic order to a version closer to that of Slavonic, this was exploited by Stefan. In those constructions where the operator role was filled by a noun phrase and the role of operand by an adposition, Old Permian faithfully reflects the true

⁵³ V. A. Sorvacheva, *Nizhnevychegodskiy dialekt komi yazyka*, Moscow, 1977, pp. 203 — 25.

⁵⁴ Rajja Bartens considers that *bur* is, in fact, substantivized and stands in apposition to the preceding noun phrase as my English gloss suggests. If this is the case, and there is reason to believe it to be so, then in the Old Permian passages under consideration, there are no instances of the attribute following the noun. Nevertheless, on the strength of a single example it is impossible to be precise particularly as the notion of apposition itself is problematical when different word categories are involved (see David Crystal, *A First Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*, London, 1980, p. 29).

picture in the recipient language as the Lower Vychegda variety of that time would have admitted no exceptions. Coupled with this, the translators evidently sensed the unquestionable importance of maintaining the canonical order for the grammatical structure of the sentence. In the case of possessive constructions, on the other hand, an exploitable precedent already existed not only in possible stylistic variation, but, I would suggest, in the form of the *habeo* construction. In Votyak and the Komi languages the notion of 'to have' is expressed by the genitive case suffix *-lön* on the noun possessor while the entity possessed stands in the 'nominative' (zero-inflected) form. The relationship between them is conveyed by the use of the 'to be' copula, which can separate the two constituents of the construction. The following example is taken from modern literary Komi-Zyryan: *Byd mortlön em aslas shog*. 'Every man has his own sorrow'. While bearing a superficial resemblance to the Russian 'have' construction using the preposition *u*, actually the construction in question was already established in Proto-Permian. The breakdown of the possessor-possessioned sequence through the intervention of the copula and the marking of the possessor with *-lön* provided a precedent sufficient for further adaptation of possessive word order in terms of the noun phrase. The attribute was not subjected to this treatment to the same degree because, firstly, the motivation provided by Russian was not so intense and, secondly, disruption of canonical order in fourteenth-century Zyryan would have been minimal.

VII

We have seen how Stefan and his associates, for tactical reasons, sought to minimize the appearance of Slavonic influence in their Old Permian translations. In the areas of orthography and lexicon ingenious adaptations of the Komi pasyas and of native lexical roots were produced which disguised the actual Greek and Slavonic source of the alphabet and neologisms. In the field of syntax, however, the influence of an Indo-European linguistic model, particularly that of Russian, is at once apparent. Many of the syntactic constructions found in the Biblical passages of Old Permian are manifestly atypical of the Komi-Zyryan language. There seems to be a methodological contradiction in Stefan's

work which scholars have pointed out but not explained. From the one side, he painstakingly worked the translations so as to conceal Slavonic influence while, from the other, he was not averse to the importation of non-Uralic syntactic structures on a wide scale. We have noted already how Stefan must have found the work of the first Slavonic translators a source of spiritual and practical inspiration. I submit the hypothesis that it was their example which actually shaped Stefan's attitude to his work and, thus, provides the reason for the apparent methodological inconsistency in his Old Permian creations. Stefan appears always to have sought a precedent for his work; the Slavonic translators provided one. They were a spiritual inspiration in that they stood by the principle of producing liturgical works in hitherto unwritten languages as an aid for extending Christendom. They offered theoretical inspiration in creating an orthography and creating a lexicon capable of expressing religious concepts in a language other than the sacred tongues of Hebrew, Greek and Latin. On a practical plane their methods gave Stefan insight in the art of translation.

Discussing the work of these early Slavonic translators, Kurz, in the article already cited, admits that the syntactic component of Slavonic underwent greater adaptation in their translations than any other aspect of the language. Syntax "more than other parts of grammar is subject to foreign influence".⁵⁵ Although they were gifted linguists, their sense of veneration for the religious texts which they were translating made them cautious about drastically altering the syntax away from the original Greek model, and, consequently, certain complex constructions, though comprehensible as Slavonic, actually owe more to Greek than to the Slavonic vernacular of the area around Salonica. According to Kurz, nowhere is this caution more manifest than in the translation of the Bible. "In translating the Books of Scripture they endeavoured to keep exactly to the original (they were governed by an awe for the sacred texts)."⁵⁶

In many respects the analogy with Stefan's activities is apparent. It seems that, while recognizing the limitations in the work of

⁵⁵ Kurz, 'Problematika', p. 6.

⁵⁶ *ibid.* p. 9.

his forbears, he felt unable to go beyond the bounds which they set. Although skilfully adapting the Zyryan variety with which he was acquainted, he evidently felt unwilling to modify or expand upon the theoretical model established for Old Church Slavonic, even at the expense of linguistic authenticity. Of course, it is true that syntactic copying, though appearing foreign to the basically monoglot speakers of the recipient variety, indicates its origins less obviously than do lexical borrowing or the transfer of an alphabet. It may also be the case that a certain proportion of alien syntax gives an air of holy mystique which is permissible, even possibly desirable, providing the basic sense is conveyed. These two lesser factors may have contributed to Stefan's willingness to allow direct Slavonicisms into his Old Permian syntax. Without doubt, however, his predecessors were more successful in terms of syntactic rendering in Old Church Slavonic than he was in Komi-Zyryan. This is probably due to the fact that the divide between Lower Vychegda Zyryan and Slavonic in the field of syntax, particularly six hundred years ago, was very substantially wider than that which existed between Macedonian-Bulgarian Slavonic and Greek. Nonetheless, it is to Stefan's credit as a linguist that he, in fact, anticipated developments in the Permian languages which came about thanks to increasing Russian influence.

Thus, in conclusion, though one can see Slavonic influence at every level in the Old Permian texts (covertly in orthography and lexicon, more openly in syntax), its primary role was less directly linguistic in that it provided a theoretical model possessing ecclesiastical approbation, which acted as a guiding precedent for translations into the language of the pagan Vychegda Zyryans.

ROBIN W. BAKER

- bis auf *a*, *â*
ɬɔχĩ 'Stelle' (117, 849b) aber *ɬɔχĩ* (ebd.), *ɬɔχĩ* (976b),
 vgl. *-âĩ* (OL 61)
- e* ɔ:*e*
eməl'ɬā 'saugen, säugen' (115) 50 b nicht zu finden,
 aber *em-* 8mal
tēləy 'offen' (115) 907b nicht zu finden, aber mit *e*
 6mal
ue'r'si'm 'ich machte es' (115, 235a) s. aber *uēr-* (ebd.
 9mal) zu den übrigen angedeuteten 8 *e*-Belegen s. das
 System
- e* ɔ:*e*
lēr 'Strich' (115, 497a) s. aber *lēr'* (1086b 4mal)
ē ɔ:*e*
lēmāχtātā 'giessen' (115, 484b) das ganze ins Palatale
 verbessern s. "(kop.) *lēmāχtātā*' (ebd.)
- u* ɔ:*u*
k'ul' 'Fisch', (118, 699a) aber *k'u'l'* (380a, OL 136)
nu'r 'Riemen' (118) nicht zu finden, *nu'r'* (626b —
 628a, 12mal)
- ü* ɔ:*ü*
u s. im Südostjakischen als /ü/
k'üt'k'ütāχ 'macht es' (119, 456a), aber *k'üt'k'ä* (ebd.)

EDITH VÉRTES

Zwei Monographien über den Dialekt von Sysola

N.A. KOLEGOVA — G.G. BARAKSANOV, Srednesysol'skij dialekt komi jazyka (Der mittelsysolische Dialekt des Syrjänischen). Moskva 1980. 226 S.

Der hier in Frage stehende Dialekt wird an der mittleren Sysola gesprochen, also südlich des der Schriftsprache zugrundeliegenden Dialekts von Syktyvkar bzw. der mittleren Vyčegda. Der Dialekt des Dorfes Lozym ist eine Mischung aus diesen beiden Typen. Im Süden grenzt das Areal des Mittelsysolischen an das Obersysolische an.

Wie lange das Gebiet an der Sysola besiedelt ist, konnte bisher nicht mit Sicherheit festgestellt werden, da es weder archäologische Funde noch ältere historische Quellen gibt. Man nimmt jedoch an, dass die Bevölkerung auf geradem Weg aus dem alten Kulturzentrum des Kamatals hierhergezogen ist. Dies lässt sich jedenfalls aus späteren nachweislich engen Beziehungen zwischen Sysola und Kama schliessen. In einem Schenkungsbrief von Zar Iwan III. an die Einwohner des vyčegdischen Perm aus dem Jahre 1485 werden allerdings nur zwei Klöster auf mittelsysolischem

Gebiet erwähnt (von diesen wird die Gründung des Klosters Votča mit 1384 angegeben — das wäre nur fünf Jahre nach dem Beginn der Missionsarbeit unter den Syrjänen, die Stephan der Heilige, Bischof von Perm, von Ust'-Vym aus in Angriff genommen hatte), doch braucht das Alter der Besiedlung deswegen nicht herabgesetzt zu werden: In den Grundbüchern von 1585—86 werden schon alle bedeutenderen gegenwärtigen Siedlungszentren aufgezählt. Die Bevölkerung scheint durch natürliche Vermehrung ständig gewachsen zu sein; jedenfalls sind keine Anzeichen von Wanderungsbewegungen da. Die Volkszählung von 1970 ergab, dass auf mittelsysolischem Gebiet 22 000 Syrjänen ansässig waren. — Der einleitende Abschnitt der Monographie wird durch eine Karte des Gebiets ergänzt (S.6).

Die Behandlung des Dialekts erfolgt in den Abschnitten Lautlehre (S.7—28), Formenlehre (S.29—61), Wortschatz (S.62—211) und Textmaterial (Vorzeichen, Rätsel, Sprichwörter, Sagwörter, S.212—223).

Das Phonemsystem des Dialekts umfasst die gleichen 33 Phoneme (7 Vokal- und 26 Konsonantenphoneme), die auch die meisten anderen syrjänischen Dialekte sowie die Schriftsprache aufweisen. Unterschiede liegen jedoch bezüglich der Phonotaktik vor. Im Mittelsysolischen können in den nichtersten Silben ausser *ɛ* und *j* auch *e* und *i* erscheinen. Im allgemeinen liegt hier eine allophonische Variante vor: In der Stellung nach palatalisiertem Konsonanten erscheinen *e* und *i*, sonst *ɛ* und *j*. In Lehnwörtern treten *e* und *i* jedoch auch unabhängig von der Lautumgebung auf (S.12—13), *i* auch im — syrjänisch seltenen — zweisilbigen auf Vokal auslautenden Wort (*turi*, *čeri*, *šondi*). *o* ist in den nichtersten Silben häufiger als in der Schriftsprache; hier scheint eine innermorphemische Assimilation vorzuliegen: *o* ist Allophon für *ɛ* nach labialem Vokal in der ersten Silbe (S.10). *a* hat assimilierende Wirkung auf *ɛ* und *j* in der nachfolgenden Silbe, auch über die Morphemgranze hinaus: Ill.Sg. *lavkaa* 'in den Kaufladen' (schriftspr. *lavkaɛ*); *bečkaan* 'im Fass' (schriftspr. *bečkajɛ*). Von den Vokalen kann der letzte wegfallen, besonders als Bestandteil des Morphems *ɛs*: *olemaš* 'sie haben gelebt' (schriftspr. *olemaɛs*) (S.8). Eine typische Erscheinung des Konsonantismus ist, dass *l* in allen Stellungen auftreten kann; es handelt sich also um einen sog. *l*-Dialekt. Das Auftreten von *l* ist in den syrjänischen Dialekten ja insofern an das Auftreten von *v* gebunden, als in allen Dialekten, in denen *l* ohne Einschränkungen erscheint, das *v* im zentralen Wortschatz nur in der Anfangsstellung vorkommt. Im peripheren Wortschatz, in Deskriptiv- und Lehnwörtern, gibt es diese Beschränkung für *v* nicht. Gerade dass der Laut im Deskriptivwortschatz erscheint, weist auf seine Ausnahmestellung hin (*uvginj* 'rauschen'; *ovginj* 'quengeln'). In Lehnwörtern kann andererseits das *v* des entlehn-

ten Wortes durch *l* ersetzt werden: *altobus* < *автобус*; *laskol*, *laskola* < *ласковый*, *ласково*; *sloboda* < *свобода* (S.14—). Eine Besonderheit des Mittelsysolischen, besonders seiner südlichen Varianten, und des Obersysolischen ist der Ausfall des *l* am Stammende vor auf *i* anlautenden Morphemen, den Präteritumendungen und der Gerundiumendung *ig*: *vištai* 'ich erzählte' (schriftspr. *vištali*); *juktaig* 'beim Tränken' (schriftspr. *juktalig*) (S.16). Die für den untervyčegdischen Dialekt so charakteristische Aussprache *t'*-, *d'*- vor Vordervokalen pro *k*-, *g*- erscheint in vielen mittelsysolischen Varianten (*t'erka* pro *kerka* 'Haus'; *d'id* pro *gid* 'Stall') (S.17—). Konsonantenverbindungen am Morphemende lässt der Dialekt weniger zu als die meisten anderen Dialekte und z.B. die Schriftsprache: Ein *t* nach stimmlosem Sibilanten fällt aus (wie übrigens auch im Obersysolischen, in den nördlichen Dialekten des Syrjänischen und auch in den nordrussischen Dialekten). Konsonantenverbindungen am Morphemanfang, überall im Syrjänischen Kennzeichen von Deskriptiv- und Lehnwörtern, sind im Mittelsysolischen dagegen geradezu übertrieben beliebt (*struba*, russ. *truba*; *stabun*, russ. *tabun*; *spolnevej*, russ. *polnyj*) (S.27). Die teilweise mit der Morphemstruktur zusammenhängenden Allomorphvarianten (vor einem grammatischen Morphem auf Vokal erscheint ein auf *j*, *k*, *m* oder *t* auslautendes Allomorph) sind auch im Mittelsysolischen bekannt (S.19—; *t* scheint auch hier nach Sibilant oder stimmlosem Verschlusslaut zu stehen; die Form *ultjn* 'unter' — S.21 — ist kein Beispiel für dieses Phänomen, wie die im Wortschatz aufgeführte Flexionsform *ultlañ* 'hinunter' zeigt, deren Suffixmorphem ja nicht mit Vokal anlautet). Die Assimilation hat, wie im Syrjänischen im allgemeinen, regressive Richtung, ausgenommen die Verbindung palatalisierter Konsonant + *j*, in der die Assimilation umgekehrt verläuft. *j* wird dem vorausgehenden palatalisierten Konsonanten auch über die Morphemgrenze hinaus angeglichen: *pel'las* 'die Ohren' (pro *pel'jas*) (S.23—).

Die Behandlung der Formenlehre beginnt mit den Substantiven (S.29—). Besonderheiten weist deren possessive Deklination auf. In Pluralformen mit dem Personalsuffix der 2. oder 3. Sg. verliert das Pluralkennzeichen (*jas*) seinen auslautenden Konsonanten: *mužikjajd* 'jene Männer'; *t'erkajajs* 'jene Häuser' (S.30; dieselbe Besonderheit tritt auch im Obersysolischen auf). Das auch in anderen Dialekten gebräuchliche Pluralkennzeichen *jan* kommt im Mittelsysolischen bei zwei Substantiven vor: *pi* 'Junge', Pl. *pijan*; *bobę* 'Liebling', Pl. *bobegan*. (Mit dem Substantiv *pi* als zweiter Komponente werden auch die Bezeichnungen für Tierjunge und junge Bäume gebildet. Wenn auf S.30 gesagt wird, dass es sich hier um Nadelbäume handelt, so steht das jedoch im Widerspruch zu den auf S.35 aufgeführten Beispielen.)

Im Mittelsysolischen gibt es einen Kasus mehr als in den mei-

sten anderen Dialekten und in der Schriftsprache. Hier kennt man den Präklusiv mit der Endung *ša*, den Kasus der südlichen Dialekte und des Permjakischen für komparative Konstruktionen (S.30). Der Gebrauch der Fälle wird erläutert, soweit Besonderheiten vorliegen. Für das interessante Phänomen des Subjekts im Genitiv gibt es auch solche Beispiele, in denen die Genitivform die Rolle des Agentivs übernimmt: *Jul'alen vojbid kutas otčot večnj* 'Jul'a wird die ganze Nacht am Bücherabschluss arbeiten' (S.31). Der in den syrjänischen Dialekten hier und da auftretende Gebrauch von zwei Kasusendungen hintereinander (z.B. Egressiv + Terminativ) ist auch im Mittelsysolischen anzutreffen, und zwar als Typ Konsekutiv + Elativ: *me voji jel-la-šjd* 'ich ging Milch holen' (S.34). Was die Possessivsuffixe anbetrifft, so fällt die Sonderstellung der Verwandtschaftsbezeichnungen auf, eine auch in vielen verwandten Sprachen bekannte Erscheinung. Wenn sich einer solchen das Possessivsuffix der 1.Sg. anschliesst, so erscheint letzteres in einer ursprünglicheren Gestalt — ohne das angeblich diminutivierende *j*-Element: *bat'e* ~ *bat'e!* 'Vater!'. Am Paradigma der possessiven Flexion fällt die Unvollständigkeit des Paradigmas der Formen der 1. Sg. ins Auge (S.32—33): hier fehlen bis auf den Approximativ und den Egressiv die Lokalkasus sowie der Instrumental, also genau die Kasus, bei denen die Suffixe in der Reihenfolge Kasus-suffix-Possessivsuffix zu stehen kommen. Die substantivischen Wortbildungssuffixe (S.35—) werden in zwei Typen eingeteilt, einen davon bilden die emphatischen (diminutiv-kosenden) Suffixe. Bei der Behandlung der Ableitungselemente vermisst man jedoch Angaben über das Stammwort oder korrelative Ableitungen.

Der Abschnitt über die Adjektive (S.38—) vermittelt nützliches Wissen über die Adjektivsuffixe; in der Darstellung wird so wie bei den Substantiven verfahren. Bei den Pronomen werden zuerst die Personalpronomen behandelt. Die 1. und 2. Pl. haben ausser der einsilbigen Form (*mi*, *ti*) auch eine längere Variante mit dem Pronominalsuffix *-je*: *mije*, *tije*, was für das Südsyrjänische und das Komipermjakische typisch ist. (Das Pronomen der 3.Pl. geht fast immer auf *a* aus: *nja*, *nija*, *nija*, *naja*; in zwei Dörfern *naje* — S.41.) In der 3.Pl. stehen auch hier zwei Typen nebeneinander, die auf *ni*-/*ni*- und die auf *na*-; von möglichen Unterschieden in der Verwendung wird jedoch nichts berichtet. (In einigen Dialekten besteht hier eine Opposition bezüglich der Entfernung bzw. der Intimität.) Die Gründlichkeit der Paradigmentafeln ist anerkennenswert und macht die Dominanz der Genitivform im Paradigma anschaulich: Sie kann als Flexionsstamm auch den singularischen Pronomina zugrundeliegen (nur Dativ, Ablativ und Akkusativ bleiben ausserhalb ihres Einflussbereichs).

Die Verbalflexion des Mittelsysolischen (S.48—) hat nicht wenige interessante Einzelzüge. Eine Besonderheit bezüglich der Plu-

ral-Personalendungen ist die völlige Gleichheit von Indikativ- und Optativendung in der 1.Pl.: *munam*, *muname*, *munamej* — der letztere Typ ist anderswo ja nur Optativ. In der 2.Pl. erscheint — eigentlich erwartungsgemäss — der *d*-Typ (*munad*). Dieser vertritt ja die südliche, beiden permjakischen Dialekten gemeinsame Endung für die 2.Pl. und erscheint auch im Obersysolischen sowie in den Dialekten von Luza und Letka. Im Norden ist die Endung bis zum Mittelyčegdagebiet verbreitet, ausserdem in einem umschlossenen Gebiet an der oberen Vyčegda. Die bei Stephan auftretende Form *adnjd* zeigt, dass der *d*-Typ an der unteren Vyčegda in den 600 Jahren seit Stephan an Boden verloren hat. Im Mittelsysolischen ist auch der nördliche Endungstyp *annjd* in Gebrauch sowie auch ein Allomorph *annj*, *anj*, dessen Schluss man mit der Endung der 3.Pl. vergleichen kann. Die 2.Sg. des Imperativs hat phonotaktisch geregelte Allomorphe: *juiš* ~ *juištj* 'trinke ein wenig!' (S.52). Von den infiniten Verbformen ist die Infinitivendung *-ne*, die in der Region von Votča auftritt, erwähnenswert (S.48). Der Infinitiv kann mit einem nominativischen oder akkusativischen Possessivsuffix, nämlich dem der 2. und 3.Sg., verbunden werden (*-jd*, *-tę* und *-js*, *-se*; gibt es Unterschiede in der Verwendung von Nominativ- und Akkusativendung?) (S.48). Das Mittelsysolische kennt die gemeinsyrjänischen Partizipien und Gerundien, auch die auf *-a* auslautenden Partizipien (*-ana*, *-ęma*) (S.55—). Dem Abschnitt über die Verben ist auch ein Verzeichnis der Verbsuffixe (S.52—) sowie der — typisch syrjänischen — Deskriptivverbbildung (S.54—) beigelegt. Bei den Adverbien fällt die *ę*-Endung (statt *a*) der Adverbien der Art und Weise auf: *mičaę* 'schön, in schöner Weise'. (Beide, die illativische *ę*- und die adverbiale *a*-Endung werden ja historisch als *k*-Lative interpretiert.) Was die Partikeln angeht, so vermittelt die Durchsicht der Partikelgruppen (S.58—) ein anschauliches Bild vom Einfluss der herrschenden Landessprache. So sind den finnisch-ugrischen Sprachen z.B. nebenordnende Konjunktionen ursprünglich fremd. Interessant nun zu sehen, wie alle 10 nebenordnenden Konjunktionen des Syrjänischen dem Russischen entstammen.

Beide Kapitel, sowohl Laut- als auch Formenlehre, haben am Schluss ein Verzeichnis der typischen Besonderheiten des Dialekts (S.28 bzw. S.60—). Allerdings hätte der Leser auch gerne etwas darüber erfahren, wie sich diese Erscheinungen areal auf dem gesamten syrjänischen Sprachgebiet verteilen.

Der Abschnitt über den Wortschatz muss für seine Materialfülle gelobt werden. Bei den Textproben hätte man sich neben den vorhandenen oft recht lapidaren Ausdrücken auch laufenden Text gewünscht.

T.I. ŽILINA, Verchnesysol'skij dialekt komi jazyka (Der obersysolische Dialekt des Syrjänischen). Moskva 1975. 268 S.

Das Obersysolische hat nur eine kleine Anzahl von Sprechern, nach Schätzung Zilinas etwa 6000. Von diesen leben die meisten am Oberlauf der Sysola, einige jedoch auch ganz im Süden der Autonomen Sowjetrepublik der Komi, beiderseits des zum Einzugsgebietes der Vjatka gehörenden Flusses Kobra.

Die Region um die obere Sysola ist archäologisch noch nicht hinreichend erforscht, doch hält es L.N. Žerebcov, der Verfasser des ersten Kapitels, in dem die Siedlungsgeschichte dieses Gebiets behandelt wird, für begründet anzunehmen, dass dieses Gebiet zu den ersten gehört, auf denen sich die nach Norden abwandernden Syrjänen ansiedelten. Auf einen alten Zusammenhang zwischen oberer Sysola und oberer Kama lässt auch der folgende Umstand schliessen: Dem ältesten historischen Beleg (1485) zufolge bildeten die Gebiete um den Oberlauf von Sysola und Kama, einschliesslich u.a. des Gebietes, auf dem die sog. Zjuzdinsker Permjakten lebten und leben, eine gemeinsame Verwaltungseinheit, nämlich den Bezirk Užga. 1586 wurde der Oberlauf der Kama diesem Bezirk ausgeschlossen und kam zu Gross-Perm (Perm Velikaja). In den Grundbüchern von 1585—86 sind für den Bezirk Užga 66 Häuser verzeichnet, davon allerdings 21 verlassene. In den nächsten anderthalb Jahrhunderten ist die Bevölkerung kaum gewachsen. Im 18. Jh. wurde der Bezirk etwas vergrössert und der Oberlauf der Kobra besiedelt; 1485 war das Kobragebiet noch als den Permiern von Luza gehörig aufgeführt worden ("v sostav Lyzskoj permcy"). Hier haben sich offensichtlich von alters her die Obersysolier mit den Einwohnern von Luza berührt. Im 17. Jh. verödete die Luza-Permische Gegend arg, und die Bevölkerung zog von Luza u.a. in den Bezirk Užga. Aber auch in nordsüdlicher Richtung, vom Mündungsgebiet der Sysola aus, hat nachweislich eine Einwanderung in Užga stattgefunden. Die Bevölkerung war eben in verschiedenen Richtungen in Bewegung, denn vor der oberen Sysola wanderte sie wiederum an den Oberlauf von Vyčegda und Pečora ab. Auch in Richtung obere Kama wurde gezogen, intensiver gerade in die Zjuzdinsker Gegend. Letztlich hat die obersysolische Bevölkerung auch an der Besiedlung Sibiriens aktiv teilgenommen. — Zusammenfassend stellt Žerebcov fest, dass die Besiedlung dieser Region offensichtlich sehr früh erfolgt ist und dass ihr eine gewisse Isolierung von den übrigen komi-syrjänischen Gebieten nebst gleichzeitiger engerer Beziehung zum Oberkamagebiet eigentümlich ist.

T.I. Žilina, die Verfasserin der Abschnitte über den Dialekt, ist die Leiterin des Forschungsprojekts zur Erfassung des obersysolischen Dialekts, das von der Abteilung für Syrjänisch der Akade-

mie der Wissenschaften der UdSSR in den 50er Jahren ins Leben gerufen worden war. In diesem Zusammenhang war eine Forschungsgruppe acht Monate in der Region unterwegs, weswegen man bei der Lektüre der Monographie auch sehr schnell davon überzeugt ist, dass das Material wirklich repräsentativ ist.

Eine Besonderheit des Obersysolischen ist das Nebeneinanderstehen zweier *o*-Phoneme, eines offenen und eines geschlossenen. Dies ist eine Reminiszenz aus dem Vokalsystem des Gemeinpermischen, das nach dem Öffnungsgrad der Vokale in vier Phonemreihen eingeteilt war (wie Erkki Itkonen und V.I. Lytkin angenommen haben). Mit der Behandlung dieses zentralen Phänomens wird die Lautlehre (S.14—58) eingeleitet. Žilina gibt u.a. ein Verzeichnis derjenigen obersysolischen Worte, in denen das offene *o* der Vokal der ersten Silbe ist (S.21—25). Žilina hat an anderer Stelle auch ein Verzeichnis der Wörter mit geschlossenem *o* vorgelegt (Komi filologija. Syktyvkar 1972) und begnügt sich hier mit einem Hinweis darauf. Es wäre jedoch wünschenswert gewesen, wenn dieses Verzeichnis auch hier mit aufgenommen worden wäre. Žilina weist auch auf die Fälle hin, in denen das obersysolische *q* einem *vo*- oder *ve*- der anderen syrjänischen Dialekte entspricht (S.25—). Das obersysolische Gebiet schliesst sich auch in dieser Hinsicht den permjakischen Dialekten an, insofern nämlich, als die entsprechenden Wörter in den permjakischen Dialekten vokalisches anlauten. In bezug auf die *l* ~ *v*-Frage (S.36—) bringt Žilina erhellende Beispiele dafür, wie auch in diesem *l*-Dialekt das *v* expandiert (auch hier *lqv* 'Seele') bzw. *l* und *v* zusammenhängen (das *v* russischer Wörter kann durch *l* ersetzt werden: *solhoz* < *sovhoz*; aber auch umgekehrt *l* durch *v*: *ževna* < *želna*, *kovkoz* < *kolchos*; in Deskriptivwörtern erscheinen am Silbenschluss sowohl *v* als auch *l*: *zilgini*, *ževgini*). Neben *t'* und *d'* am Silbenschluss gibt es manchmal auch *jd* (S.50). Die Verbindungen *st*, *št*, *št* gibt es am Silbenschluss nicht (*bošni* 'nehmen', *boš!* 'nimm!' ~ *bošta* 'ich nehme', S.48). Im Hinblick auf die vier Stammergeänzungskonsonanten bietet der Dialekt ein buntes Bild, ein und derselbe Informant kann u.U. zwei Paradigmen nebeneinander verwenden (*nal'ken* ~ *nal'kjen*, S. 44—).

Der Regionaldialekt an der Kobra hat seine eigenen Besonderheiten, so z.B. *o* statt *ę* am Wortende (S.54). Dieser Lautwandel hat einschneidende Wirkung — er betrifft z.B. die 3.Sg.Präs. und den Illativ — und gibt dem Kobradialekt ein eigenes Gepräge. Labialvokale in den nichtersten Silben sind dem Syrjänischen ja an sich fremd. Der Kobradialekt hat sich über russische Lehnwörter auch die Phoneme *f* und *χ* angeeignet (die syrjänischen Dialekte substituieren diese ansonsten bekanntlich durch *p* und *k*; da die Stimmhaftigkeitskorrelation ein wesentliches Element des syrjänischen Lautsystems ist, erscheint sie auch hier im Zusammenhang

mit der Substitution: $l \rightarrow v, p - f$).

Auch im Bereich des Akzents treten die Gemeinsamkeiten des Obersysolischen und Komipermjakischen zutage. Für das Obersysolische kann eine morphologisch bedingte Betonung konstatiert werden: bestimmte Morpheme, besonders Ableitungssuffixe, werden betont (S.56—). Žilina äussert die vorsichtige Vermutung, dass dies dann geschieht, wenn das Wort im Nominativ oder Infinitiv steht, während ansonsten die in der Gemeinsprache übliche Anfangsbetonung herrscht (S.58; ist die Betonung verschieden, je nachdem ob die Wörter einzeln oder im Satzzusammenhang ausgesprochen werden?).

Was die Lautlehre anbelangt, so hält sich Žilina mit dem Vergleichen der verschiedenen Dialekte ziemlich zurück. Dies ändert sich in der Formenlehre (S.59—154), wo Žilina neben einer Fülle sorgfältigster Deskription auch areale Gesichtspunkte beachtet; wiederholt kommt sie auf die Zusammenhänge des Dialekts mit dem gesamten Sprachgebiet zurück.

An der substantivischen Kasusflexion (S.60—) fällt auf, dass der Akkusativ in der Paradigmentabelle als endungslos angegeben wird. Im Zusammenhang mit der possessiven Flexion wird festgestellt, dass nur die 2. und 3.Sg. ein volles Paradigma haben. In den Plural-Personalformen gibt es überhaupt keine possessive Flexion; in der 1.Sg. gibt es angeblich nur eine Akkusativform, die mit der Endung *es* (S.61—). (In den Postpositionalkonstruktionen hat sich das Possessivsuffix sowohl der pluralischen Personen als auch der 1.Sg. erhalten: *as kežanjim* 'unter uns, wir beide'; *me dirjam* 'in meiner Anwesenheit'.) Der auf *es* auslautende Akkusativ der possessiven Flexion wird angeblich sowohl possessiv (*mamges veten ažžili* 'ich sah die Mutter im Traum') als auch determinativ (*višišes vidlinj* 'den Kranken besuchen') gebraucht (S.62). Weil im Syrjänischen der Akkusativ der absoluten Deklination und der Akkusativ der 1.Sg. der possessiven Flexion im allgemeinen formgleich sind, so könnte man auch zu der Auffassung neigen, dass die akkusativische *es*-Endung im Obersysolischen nicht die possessive Flexionsform der 1.Sg. darstellt, sondern eben die Endung der absoluten Deklination. (Nichts an den Beispielen, die Žilina zum Gebrauch der Endung anführt, S.62 u. 67, widerlegt diese Annahme.) Soweit die Besonderheiten des obersysolischen Kasussystems vom Gemeinsyrjänischen abweichen, handelt es sich um gemeinsame Züge der südlichen Dialekte (der Präklusiv ist typisch für das Mittel- und Obersysolische, die Dialekte von Luza und Letka und das Komipermjakische; die Dativendung *le* ist eine gemeinsame Variante des Obersysolischen, der Dialekte von Luza und Letka und des Komipermjakischen). Žilina macht auch Angaben zum Gebrauch der Kasus (S.66—). Ihre Darstellung enthält viele interessante Details wie z.B. eine besondere Konstruktion mit Elativ-

objekt (S.69): In dieser steht immer das Fragepronomen *mej*, die Intonation ist nach Žilina fragend [?]: *kiltem-qmtemšis mej vijan* 'warum haust du denn die Kreatur'; *mej pižšis dolkjėdlanid* 'warum schaukelt ihr denn das Boot'. Anstelle der gemeinsprachlichen Postpositionalkonstruktion wird in gewissen Fällen ein Kasus verwendet: *sakar, sukar vaji pizanę* 'Zucker, Zwiebäcke setzte ich auf den Tisch' (S.70). Die in der Sowjetunion verbreitete Auffassung, bei den Elementen *ti* und *ėd* handle es sich nur um einen einzigen Kasus, wird auch von Žilina vertreten (S.60). Die besseren Argumente sprechen jedoch für die Ansicht, es handle sich um zwei verschiedene Kasus, den Transitiv (-*ti*) und den Prosektiv (-*ėd*), die z.B. Uotila, Lakó, Rédei vertreten. Die Formen sind von ihrer Funktion her ja nicht kongruent (nur Prosektiv möglich: *kirjmedis kuti* 'hielt ihn bei der Hand', S.71). Der Präklusiv kann auch alleine eine ganze Komparativkonstruktion bilden: *kujim oša* 'mehr als drei Jahre'; *polverstaša* 'mehr als ein halber Kilometer' (S.72).

Die Ableitung der Substantive (S.72—) wird gründlich und genau dargestellt, ebenso die Ableitung in den anderen Abschnitten der Morphologie. Žilina berücksichtigt die Frage der Produktivität. Die Ableitungssuffixe werden in produktive, schwach produktive und nicht mehr produktive eingeteilt; als eigene Gruppe werden die emphatischen Ableitungen behandelt. Neben dem Derivatium wird immer auch das Grundwort oder das Korrelat angeführt. Žilinas repräsentatives Material enthält auch in diesem Zusammenhang höchst interessante Einzelheiten. Greifen wir z.B. den deverbalen Ableitungstyp auf *anka* heraus: Dieser wird modal gebraucht, und so entsteht die Frage, ob die Form als verbal anzusehen ist, also als infinite Form des Verbs: *užanka nin* 'man muss schon schlafen gehen'; *taja ned'elajs po užalanka* 'an diesem Sonntag muss er angeblich arbeiten'.

Auch eine andere Wortbildungsart, die Zusammensetzung, wird kurz berührt (S.85—). [In bezug auf die determinativen Komposita erhellt übrigens auch aus Žilinas Material nicht, weshalb die orthographischen Normen in Syrjänischen eine Opposition Kompositum ~ Konnexion schaffen. Üben bei der Abgrenzung die entsprechenden russischen Bezeichnungen und deren Motiviertheit bzw. Unmotiviertheit einen Einfluss aus? Vgl. *šinkim* 'brov'; *jurši* 'volosy'; *čerineń* 'rybnik' (S.86) ~ *pu gr* 'derevjannoje koryto'; *ňur va* 'bolotnaja voda'; *dozmer šid* 'sup iz glucharja' (S.66).]

Die Adjektive (S.86—) werden in qualitative und relative eingeteilt. Die Komparation, Kennzeichen der qualitativen Adjektive, wird genau abgehandelt (S.91), und mit der gleichen Gründlichkeit werden, zur Freude des Lesers, auch die adjektivischen Ableitungssuffixe behandelt (S.88—, S.94—).

Die sorgfältige Darstellung der verschiedenen Gruppen der Pronomen (S.100—115) hätte der Kritiker nur insofern etwas anders gewünscht, als die Kategorie der Possessivpronomen, die von der russischen Grammatik abgeleitet ist und nicht charakteristisch für das Syrjänische ist, eigentlich nicht hierhergehört (S.111). Bei den Personalpronomen fallen die Angaben über den Gebrauch der Genitivformen auf. Als Agens des Gerundiums hat das Pronomen der 1. und 2.Sg. Genitivform: *menam loktigen* 'bei meinem Kommen'; *tejad vojigen* 'bei deinem Kommen' (S.105). Auch in Postpositionalkonstruktionen können diese Pronomen ausser im Nominativ auch im Genitiv stehen — wie in den südlichen Dialekten von Luza und Letka (S.106). Ein gemeinsamer Zug des Sysolschen, sowohl des Mittel- als auch des Obersysolschen, und des Komipermjakischen sind die Pronomen der 1. und 1.Pl. vom Typ *mije*, *tije* (S.105). Eine Besonderheit des Obersysolschen ist das Pronomen der 3.Sg. *jeve*, eine Entlehnung aus dem Russischen (S.104).

Was die Flexion des Verbs (S.115—) betrifft, so ist für das Obersysolsche, wie auch für die anderen südlichen Dialekte, typisch, dass die 3.Sg. des Präteritums nur eine Form hat: Es gibt nur den *munis*-Typ (S.120). (Im Mittelsysolschen werden dagegen nach Art der übrigen Dialekte und der Schriftsprache beide Typen gebraucht, *munis* und *muni*.) Entsprechend geht die Endung der 3.Pl. im Präteritum, sowie auch im Präsens und Futur, immer auf *s* aus (S.121). Im Perfekt hat die 3.Pl. nur den *-emaś*-Typ, der eigentlich nördlichen Gepräges ist; das *-emni* des Mittelsysolschen und der Dialekte von Luza und Letka ist im Obersysolschen nicht vertreten (S.121). In der 1.Pl. des Optativs erscheint nach der Personalendung das dem Russischen entlehnte *-t'e*, *-t'e*: *munamt'e*, *munamt'e* 'lasst uns gehen' (S.122).

Die Darstellung der Ableitungsmittel stützt sich auch bei den Verben wieder auf ein breites Material (S.123—). Doch haben die abgeleiteten Verben im Syrjänischen so viel Problematisches an sich, dass selbst die sorgfältige Analyse Žilinas nicht immer restlos Klarheit verschafft. Gleich zu Beginn wird das Suffix *l* vorgenommen, dessen Funktion so bestimmt wird: 1) Ausdruck der Momentanität, 2) Ausdruck der Frequentativität, 3) Ausdruck für Geschehnisse, die in der Vergangenheit liegen (S.123). Hier geht es anscheinend um etwas anderes als temporale Verhältnisse. Vielleicht hat sich Žilina bei der Bestimmung der Funktionen bisweilen zu sehr von der Bedeutung des Grundwortes leiten lassen (auf diese Weise werden z.B. dem Suffix *al* unwesentliche Funktionen zugeordnet, S.126). Die Hauptsache bleibt jedoch unangetastet: dass dem Leser auch in puncto Verbbildung ausführliches Material zugänglich gemacht wird. Mögen die Schwierigkeiten der Beschreibung zu künftigen von neuen Theorien ausgehenden Ar-

beiten über die verbalen Ableitungen des Syrjänischen anregen!

Der Abschnitt über die Verben schliesst mit einer Beschreibung der Partizipien und Gerundien (S.134—), nachdem er mit dem Infinitiv begonnen hatte (S.115—). Natürlich hätte geschienen, die gesamte Verbflexion, also den finiten und den infiniten Bereich, vor der Behandlung der Ableitungen durchzunehmen. (Bezüglich des Gebrauchs des *an*-Partizips wird der sonderbare Gedanke geäußert, dieses Partizip eigne sich zur Charakterisierung der Geschehenszeit, S.134; die Sache ist jedoch höchst einfach die, dass das *an*-Partizip auch als Attribut der Substantive *kad*, *djŕ* 'Zeit' stehen kann.) Der im Mittelsyrjischen häufig verwendete *anka*-Typ ist an der Kobra bekannt (S.135); Žilina rechnet ihn also zu den Partizipien.

Die Beschreibung der Adverbien (S.136—), der Postpositionen (S.140—), der verschiedenen Partikeltypen (S.147—) und der Konjunktionen (S.105—) ist straff und enthält nützliche Information. Zum Abschluss der Morphologie bringt Žilina eine Zusammenfassung, in der sie die Besonderheiten des Dialekts, geordnet nach 36 Punkten, noch einmal zusammenstellt (S.151—).

Der Abschnitt über den Wortschatz (S.155—254) beweist mit seiner Ausführlichkeit wiederum, wie reichlich das Material ist, das der Monographie zugrundeliegt. Und dabei ist nur solcher Wortschatz aufgenommen worden, der nicht im syrjänischen Dialektwörterbuch (*Sravnitel'nyj slovar' komi-zyrjanskich dialektov*) enthalten ist! Ein 10 Seiten umfassender Abschnitt mit Textproben beschliesst das Werk.

Diese solide Dialektmonographie ist mit ihrem überzeugenden Belegmaterial ein starkes Glied in der Kette der Monographien über syrjänische Dialekte. Wenn einmal — auf Veranlassung der Abteilung für Syrjänisch der Akademie der Wissenschaften der UdSSR — auch über Luza und Letka, Udora und Vym entsprechende Arbeiten vorliegen werden, so wird damit eine der bedeutenden Unternehmungen im Bereich der Finnougristik abgeschlossen sein. Die Forscher auf dem Gebiet der permischen Sprachen verbleiben in Dank und Erwartung.

RAIJA BARTENS

Phonostatistical study of Komi Zyryan vowels and consonants

Phonostatistical investigations deal with more and more Finno-Ugric languages. Komi Zyryan is one of the major Finno-Ugric languages, and that is why it too must be studied by phonostatistical methods.

The stories, plays and novels of famous Komi Zyryan writers were analysed statistically by computer. The list of authors included Ivan Toporov (Regyd das Kvajt. Syktyvkar 1975, 323 pages), Gennadij F'odorov (Novels. Syktyvkar 1979, 444 pages), F. V. Šerbakov, A. S. Tarabukin, Z. I. Rogova, I. I. Tarabukin, N. E. Nikulin (Tolyś Vylo. Stories and Plays, Syktyvkar 1979, 108 pages).

The material was transcribed by E. A. Igušev (the author expresses his gratitude for help received to the Dean of the Philological Department of Syktyvkar University, docent E. A. Igušev). The transcription was made according to the accepted Komi Zyryan system of phonemes established by V. I. Lytkin (Lytkin, 1955, 1966). The statistical analysis was made at the Computing Centre of Novosibirsk University (Computer EC-1033). The total volume of the sample was 80 168 vowel and consonant phonemes. This size of sample allowed us to produce statistically valid results (Tambovcev, 1980).

According to V. I. Lytkin's system, the following phonemes are to be found in Komi Zyryan:

1. Vowels *i, j, u, e, ɛ, o, a*
2. Consonants *p, t, t', k, b, d, d', g, f, s, š, ś, x, z, ž, c, č, ć, ǰ, ǯ, m, n, ñ, v, l, l', r, j*

Thus there are 36 phonemes: 7 vowels and 29 consonants.

After computing the sample the following ordered series of

Komi Zyryan phonemes was obtained (Table 1). This series was divided into three subseries which were called high, middle and low. Then the absolute mean probability was calculated, which in this case was found to be equal to 0,00278 or 2,78 %. The middle subseries comprised the phonemes whose frequency of occurrence was close to the value of the absolute mean probability: *e* (3,10 %) and *u* (2,76 %). The high subseries comprised the phonemes whose frequency of occurrence was greater than 2,88 % — *a*, *ɛ*, *ɨ*, *s*, *i*, *n*, *k*, *o*, *r*, *t*, *l*, *m*, *d*, *v*, *j*. These phonemes can be regarded as more characteristic of Komi Zyryan. The phonemes whose values were less than 2,56 % were found to be in the low subseries, thus — *ś*, *p*, *č*, *š*, *g*, *b*, *ń*, *z*, *l'*, *ž*, *d'*, *t'*, *ž*, *č*, *z*, *f*, *c*, *x*.

The analysis of Table 1 showed the following regularities in the Komi Zyryan language:

1. The ratio of vowels and consonants is 2:3 (vowels 41,33 %, consonants 58,67 %)

2. The ratio of vowels of middle, high and low height was 8:7:5

3. The ratio of vowels of middle, front and back zone was 18:6:5 or 3,6:1,2:1

4. The ratio of prelingual, mediolingual, labial and postlingual consonants was 6:2:2:1

5. The ratio of the sonants, occlusives and fricatives was 1,6:1,1:1)

6. Komi Zyryan speech is melodical since about 70 % (i.e. 66,84 %) of it is vowels and sonants.

It should be mentioned that Komi Zyryan and Mansi (Tambovcev 1977, 1979, 1980, 1981) have some features in common: they have the same ratio of vowels and consonants (2:3); the order of the sonants, occlusives and fricatives is the same and the ratio of them is very similar also; both languages are very melodical and have a similar frequency of occurrence of vowels and sonants (Mansi 70 % and Komi Zyryan 66,84 %). The most frequent vowel in both languages is /a/. If one takes into account the fact that in Hungarian (Jékel, Papp, 1974), in Nenets (Popova, 1978) and in Selkup (Morev, 1973) the most frequent vowel is also /a/, while in languages of the Slavonic and Germanic families the most frequent vowel is not /a/, but /e/ or /i/ — in Russian (Jolkina, Judina, 1964) it is /i/, while in Czech (Ludvíková, Kōniková, 1967) it is /e/ as well as in Polish (Segal, 1972), German (Kučera,

Monroe, 1968) and Swedish (Fant, 1954) — then perhaps the coincidence of one and the same phoneme /a/ as the most frequent in Komi Zyryan, Mansi, Hungarian, Nenets and Selkup may not be by chance, and some similarity of vowel distribution can be seen in Finno-Ugric and Samoyed languages.

JURI A. TAMBOVCEV

Table 1

Absolute frequency of occurrence of Komi Zyryan vowels and consonants, %

I		II		III	
1. <i>a</i>	9,71	16. <i>e</i>	3,10	18. <i>ś</i>	2,73
2. <i>ę</i>	8,93	17. <i>u</i>	2,76	19. <i>p</i>	1,78
3. <i>j</i>	7,18			20. <i>ć</i>	1,60
4. <i>s</i>	6,82			21. <i>š</i>	1,19
5. <i>i</i>	5,26			22. <i>g</i>	1,15
6. <i>n</i>	5,18			23. <i>b</i>	1,08
7. <i>k</i>	4,83			24. <i>ń</i>	1,05
8. <i>o</i>	4,39			25. <i>z</i>	0,98
9. <i>r</i>	4,02			26. <i>ł</i>	0,75
10. <i>t</i>	4,00			27. <i>ź</i>	0,73
11. <i>l</i>	3,79			28. <i>ż</i>	0,60
12. <i>m</i>	3,72			29. <i>d'</i>	0,52
13. <i>d</i>	3,70			30. <i>t'</i>	0,43
14. <i>v</i>	3,65			31. <i>ǰ</i>	0,42
15. <i>j</i>	3,35			32. <i>č</i>	0,30
				33. <i>ž</i>	0,21
				34. <i>f</i>	0,04
				35. <i>c</i>	0,03
				36. <i>x</i>	0,02

Σ -80 168 -100 %

REFERENCES

- Елкина В. Н., Юдина Л. С., Статистика слогов русской речи. Вычислительные системы 10, Новосибирск 1964, с. 61.
- Fant G., *Relativa förekomsten av ord och talljud i svenska språket*. Radiovetenskaplig konferens. Stockholm 1954.
- Jékel P., Papp F., *Ady Endre összes költői műveinek fonémastatisztikája*. Budapest 1974.
- Kučera H., Monroe G. K., *A comparative Quantitative Phonology of Russian, Czech and German*. New York 1968.
- Ludvíková M., Königová M., *Quantitative Research of Graphemes and Phonemes in Czech*. The Prague Bulletin of Mathematical Linguistics, 1967, No 7, pp. 15 — 29.
- Лыткин В. И., Коми-зырянский язык. Языки народов СССР, Том 3, Финно-угорские и самодийские языки. Москва 1966, с. 283 — 284.
- Морев Ю. А., Звуковой строй среднеобского (ласкинского) говора селькупского языка. Томск 1973, с. 4 — 12.
- Попова Я. Н., Фонетические особенности лесного наречия ненецкого языка. Москва 1978, с. 128 — 147.
- Сегал Д. М., Основы фонологической статистики. Москва 1972, с. 137 — 138.
- Тамбовцев Ю. А., Некоторые характеристики распределения фонем мансийского языка. СФУ XIII, 1977.
- Тамбовцев Ю. А., Распределение гласных фонем в мансийской поэзии. СФУ XV, 1979, с. 164 — 167.
- Тамбовцев Ю. А., Частотные характеристики первого слога мансийского языка. Звуковой строй сибирских языков. Новосибирск 1980, с. 72 — 75.
- Тамбовцев Ю. А., Закономерности частотного функционирования долгих и кратких гласных в ударных и неударных слогах мансийского слова. СФУ XVII, 1981, с. 105 — 109.