Review
Reviewed Work(s): Ginuxsko-russkij slovar' by M. Š. Xalilov and I. A. Isakov
Review by: Maria Polinsky and Kirill Shklovsky
Source: *Anthropological Linguistics*, Vol. 49, No. 3/4 (Fall - Winter, 2007), pp. 445-449
Published by: The Trustees of Indiana University on behalf of Anthropological Linguistics
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/27667619
Accessed: 19-01-2017 20:10 UTC

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra
    2000   Classifiers: A Typology of Noun Categorization Devices. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Baruah, Nagendra Nath
    1992   A Trilingual Dimasha-English-Assamese Dictionary. Guwahati: Publication Board Assam.
Bhattacharya, Pramod Chandra
    1977   A Descriptive Analysis of the Boro Language. Gauhati: Department of Publication, Gauhati University.
Bradley, David
    2001   Counting the Family: Family Group Classifiers in Yi Branch Languages. Anthropological Linguistics 43:1–17.
Burling, Robbins
    1961   A Garo Grammar. Poona: Postgraduate and Research Institute, Deccan College.
    1963   Rengsanggri: Family and Kinship in a Garo Village. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
    1983   The Sal languages. Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area 7(2):14–42.
    2003   The Tibeto-Burman Languages of Northeastern India. In The Sino-Tibetan Languages, edited by Graham Thurgood and Randy J. LaPolla, 169–91. London: Routledge.
Joseph, U. V.
    2007   Rabha. Leiden: Brill.
Joseph, U. V., and Robbins Burling
    2001   Tone Correspondences among the Bodo Languages. Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area 24(2):41–55.
Pai (Karapurkar), Pushpa
    1976   Kokborok Grammar. Mysore: Central Institute of Indian Languages.

Ginuxsko-russkij slovar'. M. Š. XALILOV and I. A. ISAKOV. Maxačkala: Rossijskaja Akademija Nauk, Dagestanskij Naučnyj Centr, Institut Jazyka, Literatury i Iskusstva, 2005. [Hinukh-Russian Dictionary. Makhachkala: Russian Academy of Science, Daghestan Scientific Centre, Institute of Language, Literature and Arts, 2005.] Pp. 615. N.p. (hardcover).

Reviewed by Maria Polinsky, *Harvard University*, and Kirill Shklovsky, *MIT*

This book is an extensive Hinukh-Russian dictionary containing over seven thousand entries, supplemented by a useful grammatical sketch of the language. Though the main portion of the dictionary contains entries in the Hinukh language with corresponding translations and explications in Russian, the work also includes a concise Russian-Hinukh dictionary, thus facilitating two-way translation and reference. In addition, the dictionary includes a list of toponyms, as well as an inventory of personal names and nicknames.

    The Hinukh language belongs to the Tsezic group of the Nakh-Dagestanian (Northeast Caucasian) language family. It is spoken by some six hundred inhabitants of the village of Hinukh in the Tsunta district, plus a small number of expatriates living in other villages and towns in Dagestan, mainly in the lowlands, which have been steadily

attracting a growing number of highlanders over the last thirty years (van den Berg 1992). Other Tsezic languages include Hunzib, Bezhta, Hwarshi (Khvarshi), and Tsez (Dido). This language group has been relatively little studied compared to some other Dagestanian languages. Early work on Tsezic goes back to Dirr (1891), but the real groundbreaking descriptive work was done by Evgenij Bokarev (see especially Bokarev 1952, 1959). Another description of Hinukh appeared in 1963 (Lomtadze 1963), and since then Hinukh has been described mainly in short encyclopedia articles and in the dissertation work by Vakilov (1998). This book is therefore a welcome addition to the literature on Tsezic. One of its authors, Madjid Khalilov, is a well-known lexicographer, whose work also includes dictionaries of Bezhta (Khalilov 1995) and Tsez (Khalilov 1999). Isakov and Khalilov have also coauthored a dictionary of Hunzib (Isakov and Khalilov 2001).

Hinukh is not a written language, and the authors adopt the Cyrillic-based Avar orthography used for other languages of the group. Most Hinukh are fluent in Avar, the primary language of communication in the area, including the press and the radio. Russian is another important language shared by the inhabitants of the district. In addition to Avar and Russian, many Hinukh also speak Tsez and Bezhta. Although statistics on this issue are not known, men are often fluent in more languages than women, and as most men serve in the Russian army, they all have a good control of Russian. Classes in Hinukh schools are conducted in Avar initially, then, in higher grades, in Russian. Such a multilingual setting raises the question of whether or not Hinukh is endangered. The authors do not address this question directly, but their comments about language change and interference from Avar lead one to believe that the Hinukh linguistic situation may be precarious.

The bulk of the monograph is a detailed Hinukh-Russian dictionary. Each lexical entry is followed by several translations as well as examples. For nouns, the dictionary indicates the noun class (Hinukh has five noun classes in the singular) and several oblique forms (ergative, genitive, and the plural stem). Verb entries list the infinitive, masdar (verbal noun), present, past, and imperative. Many entries list idiomatic expressions, which makes this dictionary useful not only for linguists, but also for folklore specialists and cultural anthropologists. As is typical of many Dagestanian languages, many idioms include the word 'heart' (over three pages in the dictionary), 'head', 'wolf', 'feet', or 'Allah' (the area was Islamized in the eighteenth century).

Like other Tsezic languages, Hinukh features a large consonant inventory. Stops show a three-way contrast in laryngeal features (voiced vs. voiceless or aspirated vs. ejective), while the fricatives and affricates maintain a two-way contrast: voiced vs. voiceless in the fricatives, and ejective vs. voiceless (aspirated) in the affricates. In addition, the authors mention that Hinukh has labialization on some stops and fricatives, but they do not include labialized segments in the consonant inventory. Hinukh has long (doubled) consonants, e.g., *essu* 'brother' (cf. Tsez *esiw*). The authors state that these are not geminates, mainly because related languages lack gemination and show a vowel that is missing in the Hinukh cognate. In our opinion, this is not a sufficient argument that these consonants are not geminates; it would be useful to investigate this point further.

Hinukh shares most of its vowel inventory with other Tsezic languages: there is a front-back contrast and a three-way height distinction in addition to phonemic length. Like other Tsezic languages, Hinukh features pharyngealized vowels, though these lack phonemic status. Overall, the status of pharyngealization in Tsezic remains an open question—it may be a consonant in its own right, a suprasegmental feature, or a feature of vowels (Lomtadze 1963; Imnajšvili 1963; Ladefoged and Maddieson 1996 also references an unpublished paper by Catford, as well as Gaprindašvili 1966 on Dargi). Unlike other related languages, such as Hunzib and Bezhta, Hinukh lacks nasalized vowels, but has a rounded variant of both the short and the long high front vowel.

According to the authors, this vowel rounding is being lost, as it is now only present in the speech of the older generation.

The number of noun classes in Hinukh has been subject to some discussion, with Lomtadze (1963) and Imnajšvili (1963) arguing for four classes, and Bokarev (1959) adopting a five-class system. The authors of the book under review side with Bokarev in distinguishing five noun classes in Hinukh. The authors' evidence is persuasive and, in any case, the most judicious approach in compiling a dictionary is surely to adopt the more fine-grained noun classification. As in other Tsezic languages, classes I and II contain nouns for males and females, respectively. Although in some Tsezic languages class II also contains a number of inanimates (Comrie and Polinsky 1999; Polinsky and Jackson 1998), in Hinukh, the inanimates are confined solely to noun classes III through V.

Like most other Dagestanian languages, Hinukh is a case-marking language, with ergative-absolutive marking for main arguments and an articulated system of locative cases (see below). Only nouns show the ergative-absolutive distinction; pronouns use one invariant form for both cases. Also shared with other Dagestanian languages is the distinction between two genitive markers: one marks the possessor of an absolutive noun, while the other marks the possessor of a noun in any other case (including genitive). Besides the ergative, the absolutive, and the two genitive cases, Hinukh also has dative and instrumental cases, with one morphological exponent each.

The profusion of locatives is a striking feature of Tsezic languages. The locative system of Hinukh is similar to that of Tsez (Comrie and Polinsky 1998). Full locative case endings are formed from a combination of a locative case and a spatial orientation marker. Hinukh features five locative cases (essive, allative, ablative, directive, and translative), and seven orientation markers, yielding the paradigm in table 1.

Table 1. Paradigm of Hinukh Locative Cases

		ESSIVE	ALATIVE	ABLATIVE	DIRECTIVE	TRANSLATIVE
I	'among'	$-\lambda$	$-\lambda er$	$-\lambda so$	$-\lambda edo$:	$-\lambda bito$
II	'in'	$-a$:/-ø:	$-a$:/-ø:r	$-a$:s/-ø:s	$-a$:do/-ø:do	$-a$:bito/-ø:bito
III	'on (horizontal)'	$-tł'o$	$-tł'or$	$-tł'os$	$-tł'odo$:	$-tł'obito$
IV	'under'	$-dl$	$-dler$	$-dles$	$-dledo$:	$-dlbito$
V	'on (vertical)'	$-\chi o$	$-\chi or$	$-\chi os$	$-\chi odo$:	$-\chi obito$
VI	'near$_1$'	$-ho$	$-hor$	$-hos$	$-hodo$:	—
VII	'near$_2$'	$-de$	$-der$	$-des$	$-dedo$:	—

The authors are not specific about the difference between the series VI and VII markers, but if Hinukh is anything like Tsez, the salient distinction between the last two orientation markers is in the degree of contact (approaching vs. touching).

Hinukh has a hybrid vigesimal-decimal number system, a relatively common type (Comrie 2005) in which a base-twenty system is used for numbers 'one' through 'ninety-nine', and a decimal system for expressing numeric quantities of 'one hundred' and higher.

Hinukh verbs are morphologically marked for transitivity. The tense system distinguishes between past, present, aorist, and future. There is a developed system of nonfinite verb forms (several participles and gerunds, masdar, infinitive). Agreement with the absolutive argument in noun class is marked by prefixes on most vowel-initial verbs as well as some adjectives and adverbs (which may be of verbal nature as well). As with many other agglutinating languages, Hinukh features a morphological causative,

though an analytic causative construction (employing the verb 'to make, force') is also available. The examples of the latter construction are listed as single-word constructions, which might be meant to imply that the causativized verb is incorporated into the causation verb.

The authors recognize two present-tense verbal forms—present habitual and present progressive. It is interesting to note that the former is represented by a morphologically simpler form and employs affixal negation, while with the latter, negation is expressed as an independent form following the verb. With respect to the future in Hinukh, the facts are also quite interesting. The authors identify two future tenses, future I and future II, the former used only with first-person subjects (or agents with transitive verbs, though the authors are not explicit about this), and the latter with all other subjects. These forms might therefore constitute a reflex of some sort of nominative-accusative agreement system. There also appears to be some question as to how many different simplex past tenses should be identified in Hinukh.

Hinukh, like the other languages of the region, is verb-final, though not rigidly so. The authors mention that an "inverse" construction is available in which the object follows the verb. As a head-final language, Hinukh has postpositions rather than prepositions. It appears that the subject is clause-initial in most common word orders. As is common among languages of the Caucasus, Hinukh lacks passive voice. Hinukh features an overt copula, which is also used to express the nonexistence of something when combined with a negation suffix.

As would be expected for a minority language with massive multilingualism among its speakers, Hinukh features a large number of borrowings from other languages. Most of the borrowings are from Avar, Arabic, Georgian, Persian, Turkish, and Russian, with Avar and Russian borrowings being the most common. A number of adjectives borrowed from Avar feature the Avar inflectional endings -av/-ab. Avar verbs are borrowed in their infinitival form and adopted to Hinukh structure by combining them with the auxiliary 'do' (for transitives) or 'be' (for intransitives). Such a pattern, in which a borrowed word is verbalized using native means, is quite common cross-linguistically.

This dictionary is a welcome addition to the body of literature on the lesser-known languages of the Caucasus, and it showcases the first-rate lexicographic tradition of Dagestanian philology. We hope that other dictionaries of lesser-known languages of the Caucasus will follow.

References

Bokarev, Evgenij A.
    1952   Ginukhskij jazyk. Predvaritel'noe soobščenie. Trudy Instituta Jazykoz-
                nanija AN SSSR. Moscow.
    1959   Cezskie (didojskie) jazyki Dagestana. Moscow: Akademija Nauk SSSR.
Comrie, Bernard
    2005   Numeral Bases. In The World Atlas of Language Structures, edited by
                Martin Haspelmath, 530–33. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Comrie, Bernard, and Maria Polinsky
    1998   The Great Daghestanian Case Hoax. In Case, Typology, and Grammar,
                edited by Anna Siewierska and Jae Jung Song, 95–114. Amsterdam: John
                Benjamins.
    1999   Gender in a Historical Perspective: Radial Categories Meet Language
                Change. Journal of Indo-European Studies 30/31:566–89.
Dirr, Adolf
    1891   Materialy dlja izučenija jazykov i narečij ando-didojskoj grupy. Sbornik
                materialov po opisaniju mestnostej i plemen Kavkaza. Tbilisi.

Gaprindašvili, Shota G.
   1966   Fonetika darginskogo jazyka. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.
Imnajšvili, David
   1963   Didojskij jazyk v sravnenii s ginuxskim ixvaršijskim jazykami. Tbilisi:
             Akademija Nauk Gruzinskoj SSR.
Isakov, I. A., and Madjid Khalilov
   2001   Gunzibsko-russkij slovar'. Moscow: Nauka.
Khalilov, Madjid
   1995   Bežtinsko-russkij slovar'. Makhachkala: Dagestanskij Naučnyj Centr
             Rossijskoj Akademii Nauk.
   1999   Cezsko-russkij slovar'. Moscow: Akademija.
Ladefoged, Peter, and Ian Maddieson
   1996   The Sounds of the World's Languages. Oxford: Blackwell.
Lomtadze, Elizbar
   1963   Ginuxskij dialekt didojskogo jazyka. Tbilisi: Akademija Nauk Gruzinskoj
             SSR.
Polinsky, Maria, and Dan Jackson
   1998   Noun Classes: Language Change and Learning. *In* Cognition and Function
             in Language, edited by Barbara Fox, Dan Jurafsky, and Laura Michaelis,
             29–49. Stanford, Calif.: Center for the Study of Language and Information.
Vakilov, Kh. S.
   1998   Imja sučšestvitel'noe v ginuxskom jazyke (morfologičeskie kategorii i
             slovoobrazovanie). Ph.D. diss., Institut Istorii, Jazyka i Literatury imeni
             Gamzata Tsadasy, Makhachkala.
van den Berg, Helma
   1992   The Tsezic Peoples and the Policy of Resettlement (with Special Reference
             to the Hunzib). Annual of the Society for the Study of Caucasia 3–4:45–53.