

LANGUAGE CONTACT IN THE CIRCUMPOLAR WORLD II

25–27th October 2019

Institute of Linguistics RAS, Moscow, Russia

Moscow, Bolshoy Kislovskiy per., 1, building 1

**The conference is organized under the auspices of the project
“Dynamics of language contact in the circumpolar region”
supported by Russian Science Foundation (grant # 17-18-01649)**

ЯЗЫКОВЫЕ КОНТАКТЫ В ЦИРКУМПОЛЯРНОМ РЕГИОНЕ II

25–27 октября 2019 г.

Институт языкознания РАН

г. Москва, Большой Кисловский пер., д. 1, стр. 1

**Конференция проводится в рамках проекта РНФ 17-18-01649
«Динамика языковых контактов в циркумполярном регионе»**

Language Contact in the Circumpolar World II. 25–27th October, 2019. Institute of linguistics RAS, Moscow. Conference Abstracts / Ed. by Valentin Gusev, Olga Kazakevich, Olesya Khanina, Andrej A. Kibrik. — 58 p. — Moscow: Institute of linguistics RAS, 2019.

Языковые контакты в циркумполярном регионе II. 25–27 октября 2019 г. Институт языкознания РАН, Москва: Тезисы конференции / Под редакцией В. Ю. Гусева, О. А. Казакевич, А. А. Кибрика, О. В. Ханиной. — 58 с. — М.: Институт языкознания РАН, 2019.

ISBN 978-5-6041117-6-5



© Authors

© Institute of linguistics RAS, 2019

© Авторы

© Институт языкознания РАН, 2019

CONTENTS

Elena L. Berezovich	
RUSSIAN-GERMANIC LANGUAGE CONTACTS AT THE WHITE SEA: THE NEW FIELD DATA	5
Янне Саарикиви	
ЯЗЫКОВОЙ СУБСТРАТ И ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКАЯ ИСТОРИЯ АРКТИКИ	6
Hein van der Voort	
CONTEXTS OF LANGUAGE CONTACT: AMAZONIA AND THE ARCTIC COMPARED	8
Beáta Wagner-Nagy, Alexandre Arkhipov	
RUSSIAN BORROWINGS IN LANGUAGES OF CENTRAL SIBERIA: OBSERVATIONS FROM CORPORA	9
Maria Amelina	
LINGUISTIC IDEOLOGIES UNDER LANGUAGE CONTACT	
IN THE LOWER YENISEY AREA IN THE XX TH CENTURY	10
Mira Bergelson, Andrej Kibrik	
SOCIOLINGUISTIC TYPOLOGY OF ALASKAN RUSSIAN VARIETIES	13
Yulia Galyamina	
FROM KET-RUSSIAN DIGLOSSIA TO DOMINANCE OF RUSSIAN: ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL FACTORS	14
Evgeny Golovko	
THE CROSSROADS OF CONTINENTS, THE CROSSROADS OF CULTURES:	
BERING STRAIT AS A LINGUISTIC AREA	15
Ekaterina Gruzdeva	
MORPHOSYNTACTIC TRANSFORMATION OF NIVKH IN THE CONTEXT OF THE AMUR LINGUISTIC AREA	17
Valentin Gusev	
NORTH SAMOYED AND THE MYSTERIOUS <i>SPRACHBUND</i>	18
Csilla Horváth	
THE SOCIOLINGUISTIC ASPECT OF LANGUAGE CONTACTS IN KHANTY-MANSIYSK:	
ATTITUDES AND PRACTICE	19
Juha Janhunen	
MANCHURIA, SIBERIA AND THE BACKGROUND OF AMUR LINGUISTIC AREA	20
Olga Kazakevich	
WHY THE DIALECTS ARE SO DIFFERENT: ON EVENKI AND SELKUP DIALECTS AND THEIR CONTACTS	21
Olesya Khanina, Mira Bergelson, Valentin Gusev, Olga Kazakevich, Andrej A. Kibrik, Yuri Koryakov, Maria Pupynina	
LANGUAGE CONTACT IN THE NORTH: BUILDING A TYPOLOGY	22
Ludmila Khokhlova	
SOUTH ASIA AS SOCIOLINGUISTIC AREA	23
Irina Khomchenkova, Polina Pleshak, Natalia Stoyanova	
CONTACT-INFLUENCED RUSSIAN SPEECH OF RUSSIAN FAR EAST AND NORTHERN SIBERIA	26
Andrej A. Kibrik	
PURITY OF UPPER KUSKOKWIM AS A TYPOLOGICALLY RARE PHENOMENON	27
Elena Klyachko	
REFLECTION OF CONTACTS IN THE EVENKI GRAMMAR	29
Yury Koryakov	
MAPPING CIRCUMPOLAR LANGUAGES	30

Marina Lublinskaya	
COMMON IDIOMS IN SAMOYEDIC LANGUAGES.....	31
Alexandr Malyshev	
SPEECH REPRESENTATION OF THE SAMOYEDS	
IN THE FIRST RUSSIAN POPULAR SCIENTIFIC ARTICLE ABOUT THE SAMOYEDS (1732).....	32
Daria Mordashova, Maria Sidorova	
NOTES ON MULTILINGUALISM IN THE LOWER KOLYMA REGION	33
Maria Pupynina, Daria Mordashova, Maria Sidorova	
MULTILINGUALISM IN THE NORTHEASTERN YAKUTIA AND CHUKOTKA:	
COMPARING SOCIOLINGUISTIC, HISTORICAL-SOCIOLINGUISTIC, AND LINGUISTIC APPROACHES	35
Marina Raskladkina	
SOCIOLINGUISTIC SITUATION IN THE UPPER KUSKOKWIM, ALASKA:	
FEATURES, DYNAMICS, AGENTS OF INFLUENCE	37
Kirill Reshetnikov	
TOWARDS AREAL PHONETIC TYPOLOGY OF CENTRAL SIBERIA:	
A NON-TRIVIAL TYPE OF DIACHRONIC SOUND CHANGE IN SAMOYEDIC AND YENISEIAN	39
Fedor Rozhanskiy, Mikhail Zhivlov	
SOME OBSERVATIONS ON LEXICOSTATISTICS: A CASE STUDY OF FIVE FINNIC VARIETIES.....	41
Tapani Salminen	
EFFECTS OF LANGUAGE CONTACT ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE NENETS LANGUAGES.....	42
Anna Urmanchieva	
ON POSSIBLE HISTORICAL CONTACTS OF THE MANSI AND SELKUP LANGUAGES.....	43
Mikhail Zhivlov	
SOME THOUGHTS ON SAMOYED-YUKAGHIR CONTACTS.....	45
Т. Б. Агранат	
КОНТАКТЫ В ИНГЕРМАНЛАНДИИ В ПРЯМОМ НАБЛЮДЕНИИ.....	46
Г. С. Вртанесян	
О РЕЛИКТАХ ПАРНОГО СЧЕТА В ЯЗЫКАХ СЕВЕРНОЙ АЗИИ.	47
И. А. Зибер	
СОХРАНЕНИЕ И СДВИГ АРТИКУЛЯЦИОННОЙ БАЗЫ В УСЛОВИЯХ ЯЗЫКОВОГО КОНТАКТА	49
О. А. Теуш	
НАЗВАНИЯ ВРЕМЕННЫХ ЖИЛИЩ В ДИАЛЕКТАХ ЕВРОПЕЙСКОГО СЕВЕРА РОССИИ:	
РЕЗУЛЬТАТЫ ФИННО-УГОРСКО-РУССКОГО КОНТАКТИРОВАНИЯ	50

RUSSIAN-GERMANIC LANGUAGE CONTACTS AT THE WHITE SEA: THE NEW FIELD DATA¹

ELENA L. BEREZOVICH

Ural Federal University (Ekaterinburg)

The report presents dialectological, contactological, ethnolinguistic study, which recreates the image of the German world through the eyes of the White Sea coast inhabitants. This image was formed over the centuries due to the intensive Russian-German contacts in the White Sea area: military campaigns (language traces, for example, were left by the war with Sweden of the Peter's era and foreign intervention during the Civil war) and the closest trade and cultural relations, established between the Russian Pomors and Scandinavians since ancient times. To reconstruct this image the author analyses the North Russian dialect common words and proper names, derived from "German" ethnonyms and place names, as well as secondary ethnonyms (ethnic nicknames), denoting the representatives of the German peoples. The important source of material is unpublished data from the databases of the Toponymic Expedition of the Ural University and of the Arkhangelsk Region Dictionary. One can consider primarily the vocabulary of the three thematic groups: "Geographical space" (which characterizes the Pomors' perception of space as *Russian* in opposition to *German/Swedish/Norwegian*, gives examples of the Pomors' adoption of the German toponymy, etc.), "Man" (where the designations of the representatives of the German peoples are analyzed, which are used in the Pomors' speech, as well as semantic derivatives from ethnonyms *Swedish*, *Norwegian*, etc., characterizing a person), "Material culture" (it lists the names of everyday realities (clothes, tools, dwellings, etc., such as *Danish headscarf*, *Swedish axe*, *Norwegian spinning wheel*) being German or perceived as German).

The report also considers the facts of xeno-nomination, i.e. lexical units that implement generalized ideas about otherness of an object of reality. A comprehensive study of the block of vocabulary and phraseology, which has an indication of "Germanic" in the internal form or semantics, allows the author to propose and justify etymological solutions for a number of words: for example, *bishka* 'dry cookies,' *varezhki* 'mittens'. The author comes to support M. Vasmer's hypothesis, according to which the Russian *вапега*, *вапежка* originally meant 'Varangian gauntlet'. The opposition of "Russian" and "Norwegian" mittens is connected with the difference between them in the technique of knitting: for the manufacture of "Russian" mittens archaic and rather rough method of knitting with one needle was used, and "Norwegian" ones were knitted on the spokes, which allowed to give the mittens a more accurate shape and tie the elastic band on the wrist. Based on the totality of linguistic, historical and ethnographic information it is suggested that the word *вапега*, along with the denoted thing, entered the Russian language in about the 13th–14th centuries, as a result of Russian-Scandinavian trade contacts in Novgorod or in the largest Nordic trade centre of the time — on the island of Gotland.

The report contains the author's observations on the mechanisms of interaction between real history, oral stories and linguistic facts; it reveals common features in the images of the representative of the German world and other "strangers" in the linguistic consciousness of the inhabitants of the Russian North.

¹ This work is supported by the Russian Science Foundation (project 17-18-01351 "Contact and Genetic Ties of North-Russian Vocabulary and Onomastics").

ЯЗЫКОВОЙ СУБСТРАТ И ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКАЯ ИСТОРИЯ АРКТИКИ

ЯННЕ СААРИКИВИ

(Университет Хельсинки)

Помимо индоевропейских, тюркских, тунгусо-маньчжурских и других хорошо известных лингвистической науке языков, в финно-угорских языках можно найти влияние вымерших ныне не существующих субстратных языков. Особенно такие влияния можно идентифицировать в арктических языковых группах, т.е. в языках саамской, обско-угорской и самодийской групп.

Наличие палеоевропейского субстрата в саамских языках — старая идея, но критическое изучение этой гипотезы началось только в 2000-х годах в работах Анте Айкио (2004, 2012), а также автора настоящего доклада (Саарикиви 2004). Было выделено два пласта субстрата в саамских языках: южный слой субстрата («Palaeo-Lakelandic» по терминологии Айкио) в прасаамском, состоящий из слов, общих для всех саамских языков и замещающих исконные финно-угорские термины (**tuuli* → **pienkee* ‘ветер’, **puhi* → **muoree* ‘дерево’, **lumi* → **muotee* ‘снег’, **kivi* → **keadkø* ‘камень’), и арктический слой, характерный для современных саамских языков («Palaeo-Arctic») и включающий слова, связанные с природными реалиями арктических регионов (северносаамское *állat* ‘*Plectrophenax nivalis*’, *ráš’sa* ‘каменистый слон горы’, *ráktu* ‘плоский камень’, *čielkkis* ‘чистик (птица *Cerphus grylle*)’, *ákču* ‘нерпа’, *dápmot* ‘кумжа (*Salmo trutta*)’, и т.д.);.

С точки зрения сравнительного финно-угроведения интересно, что и в самодийских языках, скорее всего, есть два пласта субстрата из вымерших языков. Параллельно с саамскими языками и в прасамодийском произошел мощный процесс релексификации, и финно-угорские слова были замещены словами неизвестного происхождения (*kulma* → *nakur* ‘3’ **neljä* → **tättø* ‘4’, **käte* → **utå* ‘рука’, Helke 2019). Кроме того, в современных арктических языках самодийской группы также присутствует класс слов, связанных с арктическими явлениями природы и имеющих фонетическую форму, которую невозможно реконструировать для прасамодийского или прауральского (*l’idank* ‘бобр’, *lymbød* ‘болото’, *n’en’anj* ‘комар’, *hasr’o* ‘заросшее озеро’, *t’iwt’ei* ‘морж’). Что касается третьей группы арктических уральских языков, обско-угорских ханти и манси, в этих языках также имеется примерно 400 общих слов, главным образом, неизвестного происхождения (Sipos 2002).

В своем докладе я буду рассматривать семантические и фонологические характеристики слов, общих для данных субстратных слоев в саамском, самодийском и обско-угорском, и на этой основе, лингвистическую историю Евразийской Арктики, где в последние 2000 лет исчезло много языков и языковых групп в результате распространения финно-угорского языкового ареала (Helimski 2000).

Литература

Aikio, Ante 2004: An Essay on Substrate Studies and the Origin of Saami. – Irma Hyvärinen, Petri Kallio & Jarmo Korhonen (eds), *Etymologie, Entlehnungen und Entwicklungen: Festschrift für Jorma Koivulehto zum 70. Geburtstag*. Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique de Helsinki 63. Helsinki: Société Néophilologique. 5–34

Aikio, Ante 2012: An Essay on the Saami ethnolinguistic prehistory. Kallio & Grünthal: *A Linguistic Map of Prehistoric Northern Europe*. Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia = Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 266. Helsinki 2012. 63–117.

Helimski, Eugene 2000: Before the Uralians came: White spots on the historical language map of Northern Eurasia and the Uralic languages. – *Congressus Nonus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum*. Pars II. Tartu. 72–73.

Helke, Jaakko 2019: *Kantasamojedin kanoninen sanahahmo*. Pro gradu. Helsingin yliopisto.

Saarikivi, Janne 2004: Über das saamische Substratnamengut in Nordrussland und Finnland. – *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 58: 187–214

Sipos, Mária 2002: Az obi-ugor alapnyelv lexikális innovációi [Lexical innovations in Proto-Ob-Ugric]. *Nyelvtudományi közlemények* 99.7–56.

CONTEXTS OF LANGUAGE CONTACT: AMAZONIA AND THE ARCTIC COMPARED

HEIN VAN DER VOORT

Museu Paraense Emílio Goeldi

The Arctic and Amazonian regions represent strikingly different biomes. The Arctic is a polar region characterised by relatively low average temperatures and rather modest levels of biodiversity, whereas Amazonia is a tropical region that is famed for its high average temperatures and spectacular levels of biodiversity. Nevertheless, the Arctic and the Amazon also share certain characteristics, one of which is a concentration of indigenous linguistic diversity in specific subregions, involving various language families and isolates. The genealogical relationships between the languages in each region have been puzzling researchers from early on until today. One of the issues to be dealt with in the genealogical classification of languages is (possible) phenomena of language contact. In both the Arctic and the Amazon dedicated studies of language contact are rare, but fortunately on the rise and some important steps have been taken, which have given new insight into the different ways in which languages can be in contact, how they can influence one another, and how they can complement the genealogical picture of language in both these regions (where ethnolinguistic documentation goes back only few centuries). In my talk will sketch an overview of language contact situations and phenomena in Amazonia, which I will contrast with language contact phenomena and settings in the Arctic.

RUSSIAN BORROWINGS IN LANGUAGES OF CENTRAL SIBERIA: OBSERVATIONS FROM CORPORA¹

BEÁTA WAGNER-NAGY^a, ALEXANDRE ARKHIPOV^{a,b}

^aUniversity of Hamburg; ^bLomonosov Moscow State University

This talk presents a corpus-based overview of phenomena related to borrowings and, to a lesser extent, to code-switching, in several Central Siberian languages. The languages include Selkup, Kamas, Dolgan and Nganasan, for which corpora were developed at Hamburg University. The Nganasan Spoken Language Corpus (NSLC) and the Selkup Language Corpus (SLC) were supported by DFG. Three other corpora (Selkup, Kamas and Dolgan) have been developed within the ongoing INEL project.

The nature of data in the five corpora is quite diverse and not uniform across corpora. Selkup data in SLC originate from publications. The INEL Selkup corpus is based on the archive of Angelina Kuzmina collected in 1960s-1970s, which includes both written field notes and audio tapes. The INEL Dolgan corpus includes folklore publications (collected in 1930s-19XXs) and more recent audio (1970s-2010s). The Kamas corpus is centered around the audio recordings of K. Plotnikova (1960s-1970s). NSLC includes audio recordings from several sources (1960s-2010s).

The borrowings have been annotated in all the corpora; in most cases, both the source language and the borrowing type is noted. The borrowing types include the distinction between core and cultural vocabulary, as well as grammatical elements, discourse and modal words (as broad and to some extent arbitrary classes, subject to review). In some parts of the corpora, additional annotation is provided for morphological and phonetic adaptations of borrowings. Fragments of code-switching are annotated on a separate tier, distinguishing between sentence-external and sentence-internal scope.

It must be noted that we cannot often reliably distinguish between borrowings and code-switching. Single Russian words with no visible phonetic or morphological adaptations and no embedding-language inflection were generally treated as instances of code-switching. Words demonstrating some kind of adaptation or embedding-language morphological extension were classified as borrowings, and multi-word sequences as code switching.

We first compare the proportions of borrowings found in the corpora, depending on part of speech and the borrowing type. For Nganasan and Dolgan, we can also compare the texts of different periods; for Selkup, on the other hand, Northern, Central and Southern dialects can be compared. Although we focus specifically on Russian borrowings, other source languages will also be mentioned, such as the older Turkic borrowings in Kamas which are represented by a few very frequent lexemes.

We then proceed to review some phonetic, morphological and syntactic features of borrowings. In particular, nominal plural marking and strategies of verb adaptation will be discussed. We also pay attention to grammatical constructions formed with the help of borrowings, such as Russian *davaj*, *puskaj* and *nado*. As found in other languages of Russia, in such constructions we often find double marking, combining Russian and native markers.

¹ This publication has been produced in the context of the joint research funding of the German Federal Government and Federal States in the Academies' Programme, with funding from the Federal Ministry of Education and Research and the Free and Hanseatic City of Hamburg. The Academies' Programme is coordinated by the Union of the German Academies of Sciences and Humanities.

LINGUISTIC IDEOLOGIES UNDER LANGUAGE CONTACT IN THE LOWER YENISEY AREA IN THE XXTH CENTURY¹

MARIA AMELINA

Institute of Linguistics RAS (Moscow)

The issue of language ideology has gained prominence in recent years with the field of linguistic anthropology, but there has been little agreement over what exactly the concept of language ideologies should mean as a theoretically organizing unit of investigation and terms “language ideology”, “linguistic ideologies”, or “ideologies of language” have been used to describe the same conceptual notion (see discussions on the matter in [Woolard 1998; Kroskrity 2004]). Language, or linguistic ideology may be defined quite generally as “shared beliefs of commonsense notions about the nature of language in the world” [Rumsey 1990: 346], “sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use” [Silverstein 1979: 193] or “the cultural system of ideas about social and linguistic relationships, together with their loading of moral and political interests” [Irvine 1989: 255]. Linguistic ideologies reflect not only language issues, but also issues of social, ethnic and personal identity: “linguistic ideologies are never just about language, but rather also concern such fundamental social notions as community, nation, and humanity itself” [Woolard 2004: 58]. Language ideologies are not only manifested in linguistic practice itself, but they are also expressed in explicit talk about language, in metalinguistic or metapragmatic discourse [Lanza 2007: 51] (K. Woolard refers to as “implicit metapragmatics” [Woolard 1998: 9]). Under the circumstances of language contact linguistic ideologies can either support small-scale multilingualism (for example, this phenomenon takes place in Waruwi community, see [Singer, Harris 2016]) or “suppress” it causing language shift to the most dominant language (see about “big shift to Tundra Nenets” in the Lower Yenisey area in [Amelina 2019]).

The data for the research on linguistic ideologies in the Lower Enisey area in the XXth century (and at the beginning of the XXIst century) was collected in Tukhard tundra in the south-western part of Taimyrsky Dolgano-Nenetsky district (Karaul rural settlement) in 2017. Tukhard tundra (TN *Tu-ʔ χarəd°* ‘fire-GEN.SG’ + ‘settlement; house’) is the area on the left bank of the Yenisey river (in the basin of the river Bol’shaya Kheta). 28 detailed sociolinguistic interviews and language biographies of the Tukhard Tundra locals were collected during the expedition and became the data for the research (about the fieldwork methodology see [Khanina 2019]).

The local ethnic groups having language contacts in Tukhard tundra and nearby areas during the XXth century were:

1) Tundra Nenets, speaking the Yenisey (Taimyr) dialect of Tundra Nenets and calling themselves [jörákʰʔ] *jurak°ʔ* NOM.PL (they do not use the term *nyeney° nyenecy°h* [Salminen 1998: 493] lit. ‘true human’ about themselves, only about representatives of the other Tundra Nenets local groups);

2) Tundra Enets (TN *mantoʔ* NOM.PL)²;

3) Forest Enets (TN *pʼa wajʔ* NOM.PL);

4) Nganasans (TN *tawisʔ* NOM.PL)³;

5) Dolgans (TN *tungosʔ* NOM.PL)⁴ — Yarotskiy Nikolay’s descendants.

¹ The research is going on with the support of the Russian Science Foundation (RSF), RSF 17-18-01649 “Dynamics of language contacts in the Circumpolar region” (РНФ № 17-18-01649 «Динамика языковых контактов в циркулярном регионе»).

² In Tukhard tundra this Tundra Nenets word can be pronounced as [mándoʔ] / [mándoʔ] / [mántoʔ] / [mántoʔ].

³ In Tukhard tundra this Tundra Nenets word can be pronounced as [təwúsʔ] / [təwísʔ].

There can be highlighted some of the dominant language ideologies functioning in mixed families (Dolgan — Tundra Nenets, Tundra Enets — Dolgan, Tundra Enets — Tundra Nenets, etc.) in the Lower Enisey area in the XXth century.

1) It was necessary to understand and/or speak the language used by people, with whom one had common vitally important activity, determined by his/her gender: a woman should understand and/or speak the language used by other women (for example her husband's sisters) in a nomad reindeer camp while “housekeeping”; a man should understand and/or speak the language used by other men with whom he worked in a reindeer herd (a language for common activity for a female group / for a male group).

[Respondent SGK^h:] “And Yura (my husband who was Tundra Enets), when we were working in Levinsk (settlement Levinskies Peski) among these people — Dolgans, he heard (understood) what they were speaking about. If they were going to catch a reindeer, he knew which reindeer they had wanted to catch”.

2) A process of language learning was tightly linked with a process of “switching” to another material culture, language learning was considered to be an aspect of “cultural adaptation”: for example, learning of the Tundra Nenets language, as well as “switching” to sewing clothes of the Nenets type instead of the Dolgan one and “switching” to the Nenets type of reindeer harness and sledge instead of the Dolgan harness for riding on a reindeer, was perceived as one of the “cultural shift” components).

[Interviewer:] “Did Tatyana Nikolaevna (Dolgan) speak Tundra Nenets well?” [Respondent SGK^h:] “Well. And she sewed “sokui”⁵ — our (Tundra Nenets) clothes⁶. How could she even learn to do it?! (...) She (my mother-in-law Agraфena Nikolaevna who was Dolgan) knew Nenets. She sewed the Nenets “sokui””.

3) It was comfortable for parents to use a “non-dominant” language (for example, Tundra Enets or Dolgan) as “a secret language” (“adults’ language”), so that children speaking more widespread Tundra Nenets can not understand it (about the important role of parental beliefs and attitudes about language and language learning in early bilingual development and family multilingualism see [De Houwer 1999; Lanza 2007: 51—53]).

[Respondent YaRA]: “When it was necessary to say something secret from children, she (my mother, who was Tundra Nenets) could speak Dolgan. Her husband (my father) was Dolgan, Yarotskiy. That's why we knew nothing, they were speaking all secrets in another language (not in Tundra Nenets) — in Enets (Tundra Enets) and Dolgan. (...) And we never knew what bad things had been taking place (...). And our (elder) brothers — they always were good, because they did not tell us anything bad. If there was something bad, they could (speak) in another language only with adults — to discuss something this way”.

4) One's ethnic identity was considered to be inherited from his/her father (“by male line”) even if one's native language was a language of one's mother and he/she even did not know his/her father's language. Even in these cases one's “own language” was considered to mean ‘a language I inherited from my father with my ethnic identity (even if I do not know it at all)’: for example, *‘the “own” language of my children is Tundra Enets, because their father is Tundra Enets, nevertheless they do not know Tundra Enets and speak Tundra Nenets as a native language and I (their mother) am Tundra Nenets’* [respondent SGK^h]. But this linguistic ideology is not a law, it is a stable tendency.

Abbreviations

GEN — genitive case, lit. — literary, NOM — nominative case, PL — plural, SG — singular, TN — Tundra Nenets

⁴ In Tukhard tundra this Tundra Nenets word can be pronounced as [tɒŋgós?] / [tɒŋgús?].

⁵ Type of the Tundra Nenets clothing.

⁶ Respondent SGK^h highlights that Tatyana Nikolaevna spoke Tundra Nenets well enough, because she not only spoke Nenets, but also sewed “Nenets-like” (the Nenets type of clothes) very well.

Bibliography

- Amelina 2019 — *Amelina, Maria*. “The big shift to Tundra Nenets”: Reconstruction of the sociolinguistic situation in Tukhard tundra (Taimyrsky Dolgano-Nenetsky district) according to language biographies // *Tomsk journal of linguistics and anthropology*. 2019, 1 (23). Pp. 29–43.
- De Houwer 1999 — *De Houwer, Annick*. Environmental factors in early bilingual development: The role of parental beliefs and attitudes // *Bilingualism and Migration* / Eds. *Guus Extra, Ludo Verhoeven*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1999. Pp. 75–95.
- Irvine 1989 — *Irvine, J.* When talk isn’t cheap: Language and political economy // *American Ethnologist*. 1989, 16. Pp. 248–267.
- Khanina 2019 — *Khanina, Olesya*. Multilingual practices in the Lower Yenisei area: A sociolinguistic study of the past // *Tomsk journal of linguistics and anthropology*. 2019, 1 (23). Pp. 9–28.
- Kroskrity 2004 — *Kroskrity, Paul V.* Language ideologies // *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology* / Ed. *Alessandro Duranti*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2004. Pp. 496–517.
- Lanza 2007 — *Lanza, Elizabeth*. Multilingualism and the family // *Handbook of Multilingualism and Multilingual Communication* / Eds. *Peter Auer, Li Wei*. Berlin — New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2007. Pp. 45–67.
- Rumsey 1990 — *Rumsey, A.* Wording, meaning and linguistic ideology // *American Anthropologist*. 1990, 92. Pp. 346–361.
- Salminen 1998 — *Salminen T.* A Morphological Dictionary of Tundra Nenets. Helsinki, 1998.
- Silverstein 1979 — *Silverstein, Michael*. Language structure and linguistic ideology // *The Elements: A Parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels* / Eds. *Paul R. Clyne, William F. Hanks, Carol L. Hofbauer*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, 1979. Pp. 193–247.
- Singer, Harris 2016 — *Singer, Ruth and Harris, Salome*. What practices and ideologies support small-scale multilingualism? A case study of Waruwi Community, northern Australia // *IJSL*. 2016, 241. Small languages and small language communities, 81 / Ed. *Bernadette O’Rourke*. Pp. 163–208.
- Woolard 1998 — *Woolard, Kathryn*. Language ideology as a field of inquiry // *Language Ideologies. Practice and Theory* / Eds. *Bambi Schieffelin, Kathryn Woolard, Paul Kroskrity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998. Pp. 3–47.
- Woolard 2004 — *Woolard, Kathryn*. Is the past a foreign country? Time, language origins, and the nation in early modern Spain // *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*. 2004, 14 (1). Pp. 57–80.

SOCIOLINGUISTIC TYPOLOGY OF ALASKAN RUSSIAN VARIETIES¹

MIRA BERGELSON^a, ANDREJ KIBRIK^{b,c}

^aNational Research University Higher School of Economics (Moscow);

^bInstitute of Linguistics RAS (Moscow); ^cLomonosov Moscow State University

Alaskan Russian is a form of the Russian language that emerged in mid-18th century in the process of Russian colonial presence in Alaska. Alaskan Russian (AR) became a native language of the people of mixed Russian-Native American origin residing in various parts of Alaska. In the 19th century, the people born in such families were known as “Creoles”. AR was spoken throughout the Russian American period and long after, up to the present time.

In Russian colonial times, some contact forms of Russian were spoken in every part of Alaska where Russian presence was noticeable. For an approximate list of Russian posts location see map at <http://www.colonialvoyage.com/eng/america/alaska/russia.html>.

In this paper, we look at a number of locations where AR has been spoken. They include several villages on the Kenai peninsula, the Kodiak archipelago and the Pribilof islands. The AR variety of the Ninilchik village (NR) on the Kenai peninsula has survived till the present time and is to a certain degree described in a number of publications — Daly 1986, Krauss 1996, Bergelson, Kibrik 2010, 2014, 2017.

Our aim in this paper is to analyze new data on the distribution, functioning and degree of preservation of AR in its various historical locations in Alaska: Ninilchik and Nanwalek in the Kenai peninsula, Kodiak and Ouzinkie in the Kodiak archipelago, Saint Paul (the Pribilof islands). We present them in the form of a typology based on a number of features. Besides the obvious parameters such as number of speakers, official schooling, social prestige and the like, we would like to include other features, particular for the region and the period discussed. Those include:

- bilingualism or trilingualism in the family and community: Native American/AR/English;
- language repertoire of the priest in the community: SR/English/AR/Native American;
- specific locations and economic activities and processes: trapping/trading/mining/other labor;
- specific time frames: first half of the 19th century / second half of the 19th century / first half of the 20th century / second half of the 20th century;
- roles of individuals who served as agents of change.

Sociolinguistic typology of this kind contributes to the more general studies of postcolonial languages.

¹ Research underlying this paper was supported by Russian Science Foundation grant # 17-18-01649.

FROM KET-RUSSIAN DIGLOSSIA TO DOMINANCE OF RUSSIAN: ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL FACTORS¹

YULIA GALYAMINA

Lomonosov Moscow State University

According to [Vakhtin 2001] and Grigory Korsakov's field data [Galiyamina 2014] by the end of 1930s in the Ket community there was Ket-Russian diglossia. Almost all Ket people use Russian more or less. Our study that we conducted in 2018 in Ket villages Kellog and Sulomay demonstrates that men spoke Russian more often and better than women, but women were able to use Russian in relevant situations (usually communicating with Russians in official area).

Unfortunately nowadays there are only about 10-20 Kets who can speak their historical language and all Kets speak Russian. What social factors led to this status quo? Our research group asked Kets about history of their language in XX century and we identified the following factors:

- collectivization and settlement
- inter-ethnic marriages
- destruction of shamanism
- death of many men in the war
- education in boarding schools
- Russian language's monopoly in the official sphere of life
- the death of the deer herd in the end of 1980s
- alcoholism

In the deep interviews our respondents showed different degree of reflection on the problem of language death. Some of them feel it as a natural process but many Kets regret and try to find the answer to the question why this occurs.

There is a myth about 1930–1950s as the time of strong Kets and the Ket language among persons who are 45–70 years old. At this time Kets spoke their native language, lived in the taiga in chooms, led a traditional lifestyle, had deers, complied rites, looked for brides in other places, believed in spirits and shamans, children received traditional skills in the forest, leaders of the Ket community were the Kets, men were alive, strong and did not suffer from alcoholism.

Bibliography

Galiyamina Yulia. Grigory Korsakov i yego ketskaya tetrad' // *Tomsky zhurnal lingvisticheskikh i antropologicheskikh issledovanij*. 2014. № 1. P. 146–150.

Vakhtin N.V. *Yazyki narodov Severa v XX veke*. St-Petersburg, 2001.

¹ Research underlying this paper was supported by Russian Science Foundation grant # 17-18-01649.

THE CROSSROADS OF CONTINENTS, THE CROSSROADS OF CULTURES: BERING STRAIT AS A LINGUISTIC AREA

EVGENY GOLOVKO

Institute for Linguistic Studies RAS (St. Petersburg)

This paper results from several field trips to the Bering Strait area undertaken in the 1990s (funded by the U.S. National Park Service). Their aim was to document and analyze the extent of cultural and social exchange that has been achieved by Native people of the Bering Strait region. This area is historically heterogeneous. If one only counts broad ethnic and linguistic categories (formulated in the framework of Euro-American scientific tradition), Chukchi, Naukan Yupik, and Inupiaq (the latter two are also referred to as Eskimo) have to be considered. However, up to, at least, the 19th century, these ethnic categories were meaningless to the Native people themselves. Instead, smaller units – societies, consisting most often of one larger settlement and several smaller ones – were the basis of self-identification. In spite of the international Russia – U.S.A. border that cuts across the Bering Strait region, Native people on both sides of the strait have been in constant interaction across the narrow body of water.

Three major languages, Chukchi, Naukan Yupik, and Inupiaq, were spoken within the intercontinental network of the northern Bering Strait. Patterns of multilingualism reveal Chukchi as the dominant language on the Asiatic shore (Chukchi-Eskimo bilingualism was required only of the Eskimos, not of the Chukchi, cf. Bogoraz 1949: 29; Vdovin 1961: 55; Krupnik and Chlenov 1979: 26; Menovshchikov 1986: 63, 75), while the relationship between Naukan Yupik and Inupiaq speakers was more on an equal footing. English was the dominant European language until the early 1920s, since then replaced by Russian on the Asiatic side of the Bering Strait. Among the Native languages of the area, Chukchi on the one hand, and all Eskimo languages on the other hand, belong to different language families. Inupiaq and Naukan (as well as Chaplino Yupik language spoken in the southern part of Bering Strait) represent two different branches of Eskimo-Aleut language family. While speakers of the Yupik branch languages mentioned above, Naukan and Chaplino, are able to communicate with each other in their native languages quite successfully, Inupiaq on the one hand, and Yupik languages on the other hand, are considered mutually unintelligible. Based on interviews, the paper provides evidence of interaction patterns used by native people in the area. Not unexpectedly, people's perception of the languages in question ("folk linguistics") is far from the scientific evaluation of the degree of relatedness, as well as from "scientific" approach to "mutual understanding". In this connection, I turn back to the metaphoric concept of "diffused vs. focused" linguistic behaviour introduced by R. Le Page and A. Tabouret-Keller in their seminal work (1985).

The prior existence of unstable trade jargons and pidgins in the area seems most likely (de Reuse 1994). For a long time there existed a convention that there were no cases of pidginized Eskimo or Chukchi in the Chukotka area (Krupnik and Chlenov 1979:26). De Reuse (1988:492-506) was the first to provide linguistic and historic evidence that there were indeed several simplified trade languages in the area under discussion. I agree with de Reuse (1988:492) that these languages contributed to the spread of Chukchi influence on Naukanski and probably to the Inupiaq idioms spoken on the Diomed Islands.

The oral histories collected in the field provide indications to the existence of native trade jargons and pidgins, against the background of Pidgin English which was in use among whalers (de Reuse 1988:503), in the past.

References

- Bogoraz, Vladimir Germanovich. 1949. Materialy po yazyku aziatskikh eskimosov [Materials on the Asiatic Eskimo language]. Leningrad: Uchpedgiz.
- de Reuse, Willem J. 1988. Studies in Siberian Yupik Eskimo Morphology and Syntax. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas at Austin.
- de Reuse, Willem. 1994. Siberian Yupik Eskimo: The Language and its Contacts with Chukchi. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.
- Krupnik, Igor Il'ich and Mikhail Anatol'yevich Chlenov 1979. Dinamika etnolingvisticheskoy situatsii u aziatskikh eskimosov (konets XIX v. — 1970-e gody) [Dynamics of ethnolinguistic situation among the Asiatic Eskimo]. Sovetskaya Etnografiya. 2: 19-29.
- Le Page, Robert B. and Tabouret-Keller, Andree. Acts of Identity: Creole-based Approaches to Ethnicity and Language. Cambridge: CUP, 1985.
- Menovshchikov, Georgij A. 1986. Eskimosko-chukotskij belingvizm b interferentsiya perifrijnoj leksiki v eskimoskoj yazyk. P.Ya. Skorik (ed.), Paleoaziatskiye yazyki: Sbornik nauchnykh trudov. Leningrad: Nauka: 63-76.
- Vdovin, Innokentij S. 1961. Eskimoskije elementy v kul'ture chukchej i koriakov. Sibirskij etnograficheskij smornik III. Trudy Instituta etnografii im. N. N. Miklukho-Maklaya 64: 27-63.

MORPHOSYNTACTIC TRANSFORMATION OF NIVKH IN THE CONTEXT OF THE AMUR LINGUISTIC AREA

EKATERINA GRUZDEVA

University of Helsinki

Nivkh, which is traditionally classified as Paleosiberian, is synchronically spoken by a small, geographically marginal and culturally archaic population in the Lower Amur basin and on Sakhalin Island. Nivkh presumably forms the last remnant of a more significant language family, Amuric, whose homeland was once located further to the south in Central Manchuria. The neighboring Turkic, Mongolic, Tungusic, Koreanic and Japonic languages are conventionally classified as languages of the so-called Altaic type, while Nivkh is considered to represent a different typology. A closer look at the Nivkh data shows, however, that this language also has features reminiscent of the Altaic typology, especially as regards its morphosyntax. Moreover, there are reasons to assume that Nivkh has undergone a process of “Altaicization”, which has changed its original North Pacific Rim typology in the direction of the neighbouring Altaic languages.

The present paper analyzes in more depth the synchrony and diachrony of the syntax and morphosyntax of the verbal forms occurring in predicative position in the languages of the Amur basin that can be said to form the Amur Linguistic Area. In all languages of the area, verbal forms are typically divided into three types: (1) independent predicative forms, (2) dependent predicative forms or converbs, and (3) nominalized forms, occurring prototypically in the position of adnominal modifiers or participles (actor nouns), but also as independent nominal headwords or infinitives (action nouns). A tendency shared by all languages of the area is to replace the original independent predicative forms by nominalized forms, which, then, are also used in the function of finite predicates.

The paper will show that the “Altaicization” of Nivkh took place in several stages. Thus, forms synchronically used as finite predicates in Nivkh are historical nominalizations. At the same time the forms used as converbs may originally have been independent finite forms. Parallels for the latter development may be found in the neighbouring Tungusic languages, and it may be assumed that the Nivkh system of verbal predication was diachronically transformed in the context of the Amur Linguistic Area. The paper will also discuss the question concerning the relative and absolute dating of this transformation.

NORTH SAMOYED AND THE MYSTERIOUS *SPRACHBUND*¹

VALENTIN GUSEV

Institute of Linguistics RAS (Moscow) & University of Hamburg

North Samoyed languages (Nenets, Enets and Nganasan) possess a number of typologically rare features. Some of these features — such as consonant gradation or the system of so-called “conjugations” — are present in other Uralic languages and are, thus, inherited. Some other can be found in the neighbouring (Tungusic) languages and thus can be attributed to a relatively recent areal influence; such are, for instance, the destinative inflection or the use of negative forms to express affirmative meaning.

There are, however, some peculiarities of North Samoyed, which are not found either in genetically related or in geographically close languages. Such are, for instance, the auditive and the interrogative forms of the verb.

The auditive in Siberia, except North Samoyed and Northern Selkup (in the latter case evidently due to a contact influence), is only present in Yukaghir. The interrogative is not present anywhere else in Siberia.

There are also features, which North Samoyed shares with some of its eastern neighbours, notably Evenki and Even, but not with Southern Tungusic languages. Such are “tensed” nominal forms (it is not discussed here whether they are really parallel to the tense forms of the verbs in the present-day grammatical systems): the destinative and the anterior, first of which is used for the prospective possession (‘a sledge destined to me’), and second for disused or broken things (‘a broken sledge’). The same may be true for the intracitics with a discursive meaning such as ‘as concerns X’, ‘only X’ etc.

Of course, North Samoyed may have developed all these features independently. But one can hypothesise that such a whole cluster of typologically rare forms is due to an areal influence from some other language or language group, which is now extinct. Northern Tungusic languages have probably also been influenced by it, but naturally not in an exactly the same way.

Some of the features typical for the North Samoyed are attested in North America. The auditive is present in Penutian and Pomoan languages on the Pacific coast. The auditive and the tensed nominals are extensively used in Eskimo.

Another trait common for North Samoyed, on the one hand, and for languages of Alaska and Northern Canada (as well as Chukchi), on the another, is the use of the attribute ‘real’ or ‘genuine’ for self-designation.

It can be supposed that the ancestors of the present-day Nenets, Enets and Nganasans, having come to the Lower Yenisey area, found there a language that was a remnant of the older linguistic type close to some present-day languages of the North America. (Though, of course, not necessarily genetically connected to them.) They had this language as their substrate and borrowed some parts of its structure. The influence of the same linguistic type can be found in Northern Tungusic, Yukaghir, and Chukotko-Kamchatkan languages.

¹ Research underlying this paper was supported by Russian Science Foundation grant # 17-18-01649.

THE SOCIOLINGUISTIC ASPECT OF LANGUAGE CONTACTS IN KHANTY-MANSIYSK: ATTITUDES AND PRACTICE

CSILLA HORVÁTH

Research Institute for Linguistics, Hungarian Academy of Sciences (Budapest)

Khanty and Mansi, the Ob-Ugric languages are endangered Uralic languages, spoken in Western Siberia. Although the prestige of Khanty and Mansi languages and cultures is slightly rising, the number of speakers is decreasing. Ob-Ugric languages play limited role in their Russian-dominated, multi-ethnic and multilingual environment, their use is heavily affected by the loss of the traditional way of life and rapid urbanisation as well. While the Ob-Ugric peoples have been (and in some respect still are) regarded as followers of traditional, nomadic lifestyles, and are expected to live in rural conditions, the majority of Khanty and Mansi live in multi-ethnic urban environment, which — besides intensifying the efficiency of language shift — also creates new tools and domains helping language maintenance and language revitalization.

The aim of the paper is to analyse and to discuss the contradiction between the attitudes towards multilingualism and the practice of language use among Ob-Ugric peoples of Khanty-Mansiysk, with regards to the recent changes in the linguistic vitality, the attitudes towards heritage language acquisition, language use, and the new urban domains of language use. The presentation briefly introduces the Ob-Ugric community of Khanty-Mansiysk, the situation of Khanty and Mansi linguistic vitality, the speakers' groups and their attitudes and strategies on multilingualism.

The data used in the presentation were collected during fieldwork in the Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug (eight times between 2006 and 2019). The data on initiatives and institutions of heritage language education were collected during participant observation carried out at governmental and alternative schools in Khanty-Mansiysk. The data on language use and language attitudes were collected with the help of surveys and semi-structured interviews.

Bibliography:

- Bíró, B. — Sipőcz, K. 2009. Language shift among the Mansi. In: Stanford, J. N. — Preston, Dennis R. [szerk.]: *Variation in indigenous minority languages*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 321-346.
- Horváth, Csilla 2015: Old problems and new solutions: Teaching methods in the governmental and alternative Mansi educational institutions. *Finnisch-Ugrische Mitteilungen* 39. 37–48.
- Krauss, M. 1997. The indigenous languages of the North: A report on their present state. *Northern minority languages: Problems of survival*. *Senri Ethnological Studies* 44:1-34.
- Nagy, Zoltán 2015: Szibéria néprajza és a város. Akik kimaradtak az összefoglalókból. — *Érdekes Nyelvészet*: 1–16. Szeged: JATEPress. — <http://ling.bibl.u-szeged.hu/erdekes/05-NagyZ.pdf>
- Skribnik, Elena & Koshkaryova Natalya 2006: Khanty and Mansi: the contemporary linguistic situation. — Pentikäinen, Juha (ed.) *Shamanism and northern ecology*. The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter. 207–218.

MANCHURIA, SIBERIA AND THE BACKGROUND OF AMUR LINGUISTIC AREA

JUHA JANHUNEN

University of Helsinki

The Amur drainage area, which comprises the Upper, Middle and Lower Amur sections of the Amur main course with the adjoining southern tributaries Sungari and Ussuri, as well as the western source rivers Argun and Shilka, is located at the intersection of two macroscopic parts of Northeast Asia: Siberia and Manchuria. Taken together, and depending on the criteria of taxonomy and definition, these regions are the home for c. 50 to 60 indigenous languages, which are conventionally classified in terms of two major groups: “Ural-Altaic” and “Palaeo-Siberian”. The “Ural-Altaic” complex comprises six genetic language families — Uralic, Turkic, Mongolic, Tungusic, Koreanic, and Japonic — which are all united by a common typological orientation, though not a common genetic origin. The “Palaeo-Siberian” languages also comprise six language families — Yeniseic (Ket-Kott), Kolymic (Oduł-Wadul or Yukaghir), Kamchukotic (Chukchee-Kamchadal), Eskaleutic (Eskimo-Aleut), Amuric (Nivkh-Nighvng), and Kurilic (Ainu-Enchiw) — but these are neither genetically nor typologically connected with each other.

Historically, it seems that the “Palaeo-Siberian” languages basically represent relicts of a former linguistic diversity that once existed along the Eurasian part of the North Pacific Rim, which continues on the North American side. The “Ural-Altaic” languages, by contrast, represent a more coherent group of expansive languages which, moving mainly from east to west, but also from south to north, have covered much of the former diversity by spreading the “Ural-Altaic” typology to large parts of Northern and Central Eurasia, including also parts of Western Asia (Anatolia) and Eastern and Northern Europe (the Carpathian basin and the Baltic region). The expansions of the “Ural-Altaic” started with the spread and diversification of Uralic, probably already in Neolithic times, followed by the later (Iron Age) expansions of Turkic, Mongolic, and Tungusic. In parallel, there was an expansion of Japonic from the Korean Peninsula to the Japanese Islands, followed by the expansion of Koreanic on the Korean Peninsula itself.

This general picture offers many perspectives for studying the early linguistic contacts and typological interaction between the languages and language families of the region. An interesting case is offered by, for instance, Japonic. Originally, Japonic seems to have been an entity that spread from the coastal regions of continental East Asia, perhaps specifically from Shandong Peninsula, to Southwestern Korea. After this geographical translocation, Japonic underwent a process of “Altaicization”, meaning that its originally non-“Ural-Altaic” typology was transformed into an increasingly “Altaic” type. Later, under the impact of the relict languages of the Japanese Islands, which may be collectively identified as “Jomonic”, Japonic was further transformed into a non-“Altaic” direction. The only language remaining of the pre-Japonic diversity of the Japanese Islands is Ainu (Kurilic), which itself gives us direct insights into the “Jomonic” typology absorbed to some extent also into Japanese (Japonic).

Other cases of typological interaction and transformation are offered by the languages of the Amur basin, which linguistically may be understood as forming an “Amur Linguistic Area”. The Amur basin has historically functioned as the expansion route for both Amuric and Tungusic. The expansions took place in the form of a chain reaction, which initially led to the northward push of Tungusic under the impact of Koreanic (and, later, Chinese). This, in turn, started the northward expansion of Amuric towards its modern location in the Amur mouth region and on Sakhalin. In this process, Amuric (Nivkh-Nighvng) underwent transformations that changed the typological orientation of the language from non-“Uralic-Altaic” towards an “Altaic” type, but later again away from the “Altaic” type.

WHY THE DIALECTS ARE SO DIFFERENT: ON EVENKI AND SELKUP DIALECTS AND THEIR CONTACTS¹

OLGA KAZAKEVICH

Institute of Linguistics RAS & Lomonosov Moscow State University &
Russian State University for the Humanities

There are various reasons for dialects divergence (e.g. the break of contacts between groups speaking one and the same idiom). In the paper I'll focus on one of these reasons – contacts with other languages (actually dialects of other languages). Using the data of Selkup and Evenki dialects I'll try to show how different contacts induce (or probably partly induce, or just support inner trends in idioms changing) different ways of idioms' structure development.

Demographically the Evenki (37843) is practically 10 times stronger than the Selkup (3649), but both peoples are spread over vast areas and their languages exist as sets of local dialects, which are grouped according to some, mostly phonetic, criteria, but the variation of local idioms inside groups is also high. In the case of Selkup the dialects create a dialect chain. The number of speakers of all Evenki dialects is ab. 3000, the number of speakers of all Selkup dialects is five times less – ab. 600. The level of preservation of the dialects of both languages differs greatly: from the few dialects, which are still at least partly transmitted in families from parents to children, to the dialects with a handful of elderly speakers.

Though the earliest linguistic records from the beginning of the XVIIIth century prove that all the main distinctive traits of all Selkup dialect groups were already present at that time (see Helimski 1985), still some changes in grammar structure of dialect groups and of local dialects inside these groups took place since then, and they can be attributed to linguistic contacts: the fall of the dual, the restructuring of the conjugation type category and of the case system in some local dialects, the change of the proto-Uralic plural marker for a new one in some dialect groups. Similar observations can be referred to Evenki dialects (see Vasilevich 1948). The newest structural changes can be attributed there to the contacts with Russian: this is e.g. the development of quite a new category of the infinitive in the Upper-Lena dialect on the base of the Evenki imperative forms.

References

- Helimski 1985 – Хелимский Е.А. К исторической диалектологии селькупского языка // Лексика и грамматика языков Сибири. — Барнаул, 1985.
Vasilevich G.M. — Василевич Г.М. Очерки диалектов эвенкийского (тунгусского) языка. Л., 1948.

¹ Research underlying this paper was supported by Russian Science Foundation grant # 17-18-01649.

LANGUAGE CONTACT IN THE NORTH: BUILDING A TYPOLOGY¹

OLESYA KHANINA^a, MIRA BERGELSON^{a,b}, VALENTIN GUSEV^a, OLGA KAZAKEVICH^{a,c},
ANDREJ A. KIBRIK^{a,c}, YURI KORYAKOV^a, MARIA PUPYNINA^{a,d}

^aInstitute of Linguistics RAS (Moscow); ^bNational Research University Higher School of Economics (Moscow);

^cLomonosov Moscow State University; ^dInstitute for Linguistic Studies RAS (St. Petersburg)

This paper employs common methodology to describe several contact areas in the north, three in Siberia and two in Alaska. Through an analysis of parallels between respective sociolinguistic histories and contact phenomena for each of the areas, we are building a tentative typology of language contact in the Arctic. The main driving question of this study is whether Arctic language contact has any specifics atypical for other parts of the world.

The most evident feature of the north are large distances between members of any speech community, complemented by constant migrations of population. As a result, communication within a speech community can be not much more regular than outside the speech community, i.e. with speakers of another language migrating in an adjacent area. We have hypothesized that such sociocultural settings can lead to particular linguistic outcomes:

(a) if languages are related, there can be a continuum of related lects with no sharp boundaries,

(b) if languages are not related, there can be a continuum of converging lects, again with no sharp boundaries.

The selected case studies provide examples both for (a) and (b).

First, language contact between related languages was described for the Lower Yenisei area in central Siberia (Uralic, Northern Samoyedic) and for the Upper Kuskokwim area in central Alaska (Na-Dene, Athabaskan). Following our hypothesis, we have seen a continuum in each case, with (at least) receptive bilingualism and metalinguistic awareness by the speakers (phoneme recalculation for borrowings from related languages). The Northern Samoyedic case provides also evidence for the problematic status of a traditional tree-like genealogical structure: each pair of adjacent Northern Samoyedic languages shares some features, and it is often hard to say whether these are shared innovations or shared retentions. In the Athabaskan case, there is also a strong opposition towards contacts with unrelated groups/languages. In the both areas with related languages, we have discovered common cases of morphosyntactic convergence after an earlier split reflected in phonology.

Second, language contact between unrelated languages was described for the Lower Kolyma area in eastern Siberia (Even, Yukaghir, Chukchi, Yakut) and for the Middle Ob'-Taz-Yenisei area in central Siberia (Selkup, Evenki, Ket, Khanty). Contrary to our hypothesis, we do not see any erosion of linguistic boundaries, but we have discovered an erosion of ethnic boundaries in the both cases: numerous intermarriages lead to erosion of 'pure' ethnic identities. As for linguistic outcomes, multilingualism and subsequent language shifts have been documented. While in the Lower Kolyma local ideologies favored multilingual practices that could be supported for several generations, in the Middle Ob'-Taz-Yenisei area bilingualism was replaced by a shift in a more dynamic way. Both areas provide examples of shifts in all directions, whoever was more numerous in a given location; though The Lower Kolyma case features also the Chukchis that never switched to any languages (a parallel to the Athabaskans). Finally, in the both areas, we could spot contact-induced changes in target languages of the shift.

Besides, we have also studied the contact-induced changes in the colonial/dominant language, Russian. Comparing Alaskan Russian to Siberian Russian, we see that varying sociolinguistic settings, the end of presence of Russian in Alaska vs. the continuous presence of Russian in Siberia, lead to a contrast in the regularity of changes. While similar Russian features are particularly prone to changes, they are only incipient and rather chaotic in Siberia, but forming a new system in Alaska.

¹ Research underlying this study was supported by Russian Science Foundation grant #17-18-01649.

SOUTH ASIA AS SOCIOLINGUISTIC AREA

LUDMILA KHOKHLOVA

Lomonosov Moscow State University

There are many works describing contacts between languages of South Asia belonging to four different families: Indo-European, Dravidian, Austro-Asiatic and Tibeto-Burman. Very well known isoglosses of South Asian subcontinent include retroflex consonants, compound verbs, morphological causatives, dative subjects, SOV word order etc.

This paper concentrates on sociolinguistic features typical for South Asian area. These features are spread unevenly on the subcontinent, but taken together they make South Asia a unique example of linguistic area important both for diachronic and synchronic studies.

South Asia has always possessed a separate language for educated elite (Sanskrit, Persian, etc) and different local languages of the people who fulfill unskilled jobs. Cast divisions were reflected in different cast languages analyzed by different scholars. Medieval Europe also had separate languages for educated elite, but starting from the epoch of Renaissance in almost every European country the rising bourgeoisie first of all made efforts to standardize and promote its mother tongue, to convert it into the main means of communication at all levels and through this to facilitate functioning of their language as one of the most important tools of nation building.

In South Asia people continued living in diglossic situation when English has just replaced the languages that were previously used by educated elites.

Paradoxically, mother tongue has been always treated in South Asia as an important identity marker, but at the same time Indian society is not bothered about the tendency of minimizing the place of mother tongue in the speech repertoire of native speakers especially in the speech habits of the most educated and influential groups in society and in the speech habits of younger people who are supposed to represent the future of the country. Even recognized official languages are gradually losing their rich vocabulary and the ability to fulfill the intellectual demands of the society.

The speakers of South Asian languages have very rich speech repertoire which varies in accordance with speaker's age, social status, profession and other factors. The paper describes 1) *productive* vs. *receptive* bilingualism that can be divided into several subtypes, i.e. passive vs. active language skills in listening and reading comprehension, oral and written production; 2) *recessive* vs. *ascendant* bilingualism; 3) *sequential* vs *simultaneous* bilingualism; 4) *vertical bilingualism* (also known as *diglossia*); 5) *balanced* bilingualism; 6) *coordinate* and *compound* bilingualism; 7) *semilingualism*.

It will be shown in the paper that unlike Europe, languages in South Asia play in many cases a very significant role in religious rather than ethnic self-identification of population, first of all it happens in North India. The notion of script as religious symbol is also very important for various parts of South Asia.

References

- Ahmed, Feroze. The language question in Sind. In Akbar S. Zaidi (ed.), *Regional imbalances and the regional question in Pakistan*, Lahore, 1992, Vanguard Books: 139–155.
- Ayres, Alyssa. . The politics of language policy in Pakistan. In Michael Edward Brown & Sumit Ganguly (eds.), *Fighting words: language policy and ethnic relations in Asia*, Georgetown: Center for Peace and Security Studies, Georgetown University, 2003: 51–80.

- Baldrige, J. Linguistic and Social characteristics of Indian English. In M.S. Thirumalai & B. Mallikarjun (eds.), *Language in India: Strength for today and Bright Hope for tomorrow*. Vol. 2:4. June-July 2002. <http://www.languageinindia.com/junjul2002/baldrigeindianenglish.html>
- Bhatia, Tej K & Ritchie, W.C. *Bilingualism in South Asia // Handbook of Bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. 2008: 780–807.
- Brass, P.R. *Language, Religion and Politics in North India*, London-New York, Cambridge University press, 1974.
- Dua, H. The national language and the ex-colonial language as rivals: The case of India, *International Political Science Review*, 14, 1993: 293-308.
- Emeneau, Murray B. *Language and Linguistic Area*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, 1980: 197-249.
- Ferguson, C. A. Diglossia. *Word* 15, 1959: 325-340.
- Gardner-Chloros, P., & Charles, R. Subiko welcome (Welcomc to everyone): Hindi/English code switching in the British-Asian media. *Birkbeck Studies in Applied Linguistics* 2, 2007: 89-122.
- Gumperz, J. Speech variation and the study of Indian civilization, *American Anthropologist* 63, 1961: 976-988.
- Gumperz, J. *Language in Social Groups*. Stanford: Stanford University press, 1971:182.
- Gupta, R. English and Indian languages: Code mixing. In R. Gupta & K. Kapoor (eds.), *English in India: Issues and problems*. Delhi: Academic Foundation, 1991: 207-215.
- Hohenthal, A. English in India. Loyalty and Attitudes. In: *Language in India. Strength for Today and Bright Hope for Tomorrow*, M. S. Thirumalai (ed.), Vol. 3:5, May 2003. <http://www.languageinindia.com/may2003/annika.html>
- Islam, Nurul. *Making of a nation, Bangladesh: An economist's tale*. Dhaka: The University Press Ltd, 2003.
- Kachru, B. Code-mixing as a communicative strategy in India. In J. Alatis (ed.), *International dimensions of bilingual education*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1978: 107-124.
- Malhotra, S. Hindi-English code-switching and language choice in urban, upper-middle-class Indian families. In P. Hamel and R. Schafer (eds.), *Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics* 5, 1980: 39-46 (reprinted 1992).
- Malik, L. *Sociolinguistics: A study of code-switching*. New Delhi: Anmol Publications, 1994.
- Masica, Charles P. *Defining a Linguistic Area*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1976
- Mansoor, Sabiha. *Punjabi, Urdu, English in Pakistan: A sociolinguistic study*. Lahore: Vanguard, 1993.
- Pandit P.B. Perspectives on sociolinguistics in India. In W.C. McCormac and S.A. Wurm (eds.), *Language in Society*, The Hague, Mouton, 1979: 171-182.
- Rahman, Tariq. The Siraiiki language movement in Pakistan. *Language Planning and Language Problems* 19. 1, 1995.
- Rahman, Tariq. *Language and politics in Pakistan*. Karachi: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Rahman, Tariq. The Punjabi language movement in Pakistan. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 1996. http://www.apna.org.com/articles/rahman_2.html.
- Rahman, Tariq. *Language, education and culture*. Karachi: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Rahman, Tariq. *Language, ideology and power: Language-learning among the Muslims of Pakistan and North India*. Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Rahman, Tariq. Denizens of alien worlds: A survey of students and teachers at Pakistan's Urdu and English language-medium schools and madrassas. *Contemporary South Asia* 13(3). 2004:327-346, <http://www.uoit.ca/sas/Articles/DAW.pdf>
- Rahman, Tariq. Urdu as an islamic language. *Annual of Urdu Studies* 21.2006: 101-119.
- Rahman, Tariq. Language policy, multilingualism and language vitality in Pakistan. In Anju Saxena & Lars Borin (eds.), *Trends in linguistics: Lesser-known languages of South Asia — Status and policies, case studies and applications of information technology*, 2006: 73-104. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, http://www-01.sil.org/asia/ldc/parallel_papers/tariq_rahman.pdf, p. 8.
- Rahman, Tariq. The educational caste system: A survey of Schooling and polarization in Pakistan. In Zia Rukhsana (ed.), *Globalization, modernization and education in Muslim countries*. New York: Nova Science Publishers, 2006: 151-163.
- Rammah, Safir. Status of Punjabi in Pakistan. *Newslettter of American Institute of Pakistan Studies* V(1), New Series No. 9, 2002.
- Sahgal, A. Patterns of language use in a bilingual setting in India, in R. Agnihotri & A. Khanna (eds.), *Second language acquisition: Socio-cultural and linguistic aspects of English in India*. New Delhi, Sage, 1994: 299-306.
- Shackle, C. Pakistan. //Andrew Simpson (ed.), *Language of national identity in Asia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007: 100-115.

- Shapiro, M.C. & Schiffman, H. F. *Language and Society in South Asia*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1981.
- Sharma, G.N. *Social life in medieval Rajasthan, 1500-1800 A.D., with special reference to the impact of Mughal influence*. Agra: Lakshmi Narain Agarwal, 1968: 243-248.
- Schiffman, Harold. Diglossia as a sociolinguistic situation, in Florian Coulmas (ed.), *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*, Basil Blackwell Ltd., 1997: 205-216. <http://www.modlinguistics.com/Sociolinguistics>.
- Singh, R. *Linguistic theory, language contact and modern Hindustani: The three sides of a linguistic story*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers, 1998.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove. *Linguistic genocide in education, or worldwide diversity and human rights?* London: Routledge, 2000.
- Singh, Sukhdev. 2006. Understanding the socio-economic, socio-linguistic situation and social psychology behind learning a language in Punjab. *Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics* 32 (1, 2), 2006 : 133-166
- Simpson, A. *Language and national identity in Asia*. Oxford: Oxford university press, 2007.
- Tsui, A & Tollefson, W. (Eds.). *Language, Policy, Culture and identity in Asian Contexts*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2007.
- Weinreich, U. *Research Frontiers in Bilingualism Studies: Proceedings of the Eight International Congress of Linguists*, Oslo, 1958: 786 — 787.
- Zaidi, Abbas. 2010. A postcolonial sociolinguistics of Punjabi in Pakistan. *Journal of Postcolonial Cultures and Societies*
- JPCS* 1(3,4), 2010, <http://www.apnaorg.com/research-papers-pdf>

CONTACT-INFLUENCED RUSSIAN SPEECH OF RUSSIAN FAR EAST AND NORTHERN SIBERIA¹

IRINA KHOMCHENKOVA^{a,b,c}, POLINA PLESHAK^{a,d}, NATALIA STOYNOVA^{a,b}

^aInstitute of Linguistics RAS (Moscow); ^bRussian Language Institute RAS (Moscow);

^cLomonosov Moscow State University; ^dUniversity of Maryland

The paper deals with some peculiarities of the contact-influenced variety of Russian, spoken in Northern Siberia and the Russian Far East. Our investigation is based on the corpus of oral texts produced by bilingual speakers of Samoyedic and Tungusic languages, which were transcribed and manually annotated by our research group. One of the aims of the paper is to demonstrate how these data can be used in studies on language contact.

To fit the study in a broader context of contact phenomena in bilinguals' Russian, we have chosen several striking non-standard grammatical features: gender disagreement, non-standard word order in the noun phrase and non-standard use of the “reflexive” *-sja*. They are frequent both in Tungusic and in Samoyedic sub-corpora and they are reported to be typical also for other contact-influenced varieties of Russian (cf., e.g., Daniel & Dobrushina 2010; 2013 and Daniel et al. 2010 on Daghestanian Russian).

For each of these grammatical features, we will present the frequency distribution between the standard and non-standard variants attested in the corpus, propose possible sources of the deviation from monolinguals' Russian and show to which extent the contact-influenced Russian varieties in question form a separate consistent grammatical system, different from the standard one.

One of the most frequently attested features is gender disagreement (*бабка номер* ‘old woman die.pst.masc’, *моя нанка* ‘my.fem father’). We show that bilingual speakers are less likely to follow the standard agreement pattern for adjectives and more likely to choose the standard form of verbs (*делал* ‘made.masc’ ~ *делала* ‘made.fem’) and especially of anaphoric elements (*он* ‘he’ ~ *она* ‘she’).

Another feature observed in the texts collected from speakers of Tungusic and Samoyedic is that the frequency of prepositive genitives (*матери брат* ‘mother.gen brother’, *дома крыша* ‘house.gen roof’) is significantly higher, compared to the data of oral informal speech of Russian monolinguals (taken from Russian National Corpus). This can be due to the fact that the genitive in the indigenous languages is strictly prepositional.

Finally, we show that the overuses and omissions of *-sja* (*pereplylsja* ‘crossed’, *ostavalsja* ‘stayed’) have to be explained not only by the influence of indigenous languages but also by difficulties of acquisition of non-trivial semantic patterns.

Despite the fact that the tendencies are strong and the frequency of the non-standard uses is significantly higher than in the Russian speech of monolinguals, these peculiarities seem not to form strict grammatical systems.

References

- Daniel, Michael & Nina Dobrushina. 2010. Novye russkie [New Russians]. *Voprosy russkogo jazykoznanija* 13. 141–158.
- Daniel, Michael, Nina Dobrushina & Sergey Knyazev. 2010. Highlander's Russian: Case Study in Bilingualism and Language Interference in Central Daghestan. *Instrumentarium of Linguistics: Sociolinguistic Approach to Non-Standard Russian*. *Slavica Helsingiensia* 40. 65–93.
- Daniel, Michael & Nina Dobrushina. 2013. Russkij jazyk v Dagestane: problemy jazykovoj interferencii [Russian in Daghestan: problems of language interference]. *Computational Linguistics and Intellectual Technologies. Papers from the Annual International Conference “Dialogue” (2013)*. Issue 12. Moscow: RGGU. 186–199.

¹ The paper was prepared with support of RSF grant No. 17-18-01649.

PURITY OF UPPER KUSKOKWIM AS A TYPOLOGICALLY RARE PHENOMENON¹

ANDREJ A. KIBRIK

Institute of Linguistics RAS (Moscow) & Lomonosov Moscow State University

Upper Kuskokwim (UK) is an Athabaskan language of interior Alaska. Ancestors of the modern UK people have been residing in the area for some millennia, without languages of other language families spoken there during the reasonable time frame. Potential external influences upon UK include: other Athabaskan languages, Central Yup'ik (Eskimo), Russian, and English. UK demonstrates an unusually low level of external linguistic influence. The goal of this paper is to describe and explain this phenomenon.

1. The UK ethnic territory borders other Athabaskan languages: Dena'ina in the South, Lower Tanana and Koyukon in the East, Koyukon in the North, Holikachuk and Ingalik in the West. Athabaskan borrowings are difficult or impossible to identify because Athabaskans traditionally had a knowledge of inter-language sound correspondences and recalculated borrowings into the local phonetic system, making them indistinguishable from original forms. Generally during the early contacts with Athabaskan neighbors each Athabaskan speaker would speak his own language and understand (to an extent) another Athabaskan's talk. At the same time, before the European (Russian) contact and throughout the 19th century ethnic boundaries between UK and its Athabaskan neighbors were permeable: there was a substantial influx of migrants from the neighboring groups (possibly with the exception of Dena'ina on the other side of the Alaska range). It appears that those individuals from other groups who joined the UK community switched to the UK language.

2. Apart from the neighboring Athabaskans, the only other contacting group in the pre-Russian time were Yup'iks of middle and lower Kuskokwim. There were some Ingalik Athabaskans in between, but their population was sparse and some Yup'ik contacts must have been possible. These contacts became stronger during the Russian and post-Russian period as Yup'iks were cultural and religious intermediaries between the Russians and the UK Athabaskans. In the early 20th century some Yup'iks penetrated the Upper Kuskokwim area, marrying into the UK community. In such case they acquired UK and their children did not learn Yup'ik. There is no evidence of any UK people learning Yup'ik. Accordingly, only a couple of lexical borrowings from Yup'ik have been identified in UK. (But see below on Russian borrowings via Yup'ik.)

3. Contact with Russians started in mid-19th century but was never intense. There is no historical information of the UK people learning Russian. However, this contact had vast impact on the UK culture. Eventually the Russian Orthodox religion has become the most visible element of the UK ethnic culture. In fact, the UK people became consolidated as a distinct group (about the end of the 19th century) largely as a result of their strong affiliation with the Russian Orthodox religion. UK has about 80 lexical borrowings from Russian, all being nouns denoting European artefacts or religious concepts. Many of these borrowing bear traces of arriving via the mediation of a neighboring Athabaskan language (mostly Dena'ina or Koyukon) and/or Central Yup'ik. As for those borrowings that appear to have been taken directly from Russian, it is more likely that they arrived to UK due not to bilingualism but rather due to some kind of ostensive acquaintance with and nomination of particular referents.

4. Contact with English speaking migrants to the UK area started around the turn of the 20th century and became more intense in the 1930s and particularly 1940s. The period of partial English bilingualism was relatively short and limited and resulted in several lexical borrowings. There is an instance of English grammatical borrowing: the negative particle *no*. Massive language shift ensued

¹ Research underlying this paper was supported by Russian Science Foundation grant # 17-18-01649.

in the 1960s, and at later times English elements in UK discourse qualify more as code mixing than as entrenched borrowings per se.

5. Converging causes behind the linguistic purity of UK include:

- Long residence in the area, without any unrelated languages in the vicinity
- Native comparative knowledge of Alaskan Athabaskans
- General disinclination of the Athabaskan languages to borrowing (Sapir 1921, Brown 1994)
- Scarcity of contact with Yup'ik and of bilingualism in Yup'ik
- Geographical isolation
- Lack of bilingualism in Russian
- Brief period of partial bilingualism in English.

REFLECTION OF CONTACTS IN THE EVENKI GRAMMAR¹

ELENA KLYACHKO

Institute of Linguistics RAS (Moscow)

The Evenki language is one of the most widely-spread Siberian languages, having thus a long history of language contacts. Most works on contacts of Evenki and surrounding languages consider phonetic interference and lexical borrowings, e. g. Yakut in [1], Buryat in [2], or historical contacts with Yakut and other Turkic languages [3].

However, there are also extensive works dealing with grammatical influence, such as paradigm copying [4], relative clause structure [5], word order and preferring subordinate/coordinate clauses over participial/converbial clauses ([6], [7]). Whereas paradigm copying is quite easy to detect, other possible results of contacts such as word order changes or converbial to subordinate clause shift can be subtler. In these cases, the proof of whether the situation is a product of contacts is hindered by the lack of dialectal or historical data.

The aim of this work is to fill up the lacunae and provide a historical dialectal corpus of the Evenki language. Such data, together with extralinguistic contact data (such as bilingualism or inter-marriage rates), can help to trace the influence. The corpus is based on the relatively modern (1996–2018) fieldwork data as well as the texts collected by G. M. Vasilevich [8] (the first half of the 20th century), and field materials by L. M. Brodskaja and T. Z. Pukshanskaya. With the aid of the corpus, I intend to demonstrate the direct influence of contacts for two cases:

- various non-imperative uses of the imperative form
- word order

References

1. Романова А. В. Взаимовлияние эвенкийского и якутского языков. — Наука, 1975.
2. Чимитдоржиева Г. Н. и др. Исторические связи бурятского и эвенкийского языков (на примере лексики). Улан-Удэ, 2012.
3. Бурыкин А. А. Институт лингвистических исследований РАН, Санкт-Петербург Некоторые замечания к проблеме тюркских заимствований в тунгусо-маньчжурских языках и их значении для сравнительно-исторической тюркологии и алтаистики //Актуальные вопросы исторической лексикографии и лексикологии. 2005. С. 272.
4. Pakendorf B. Paradigm copying in Tungusic //Paradigm Change: In the Transeurasian languages and beyond. — 2014. Т. 161. С. 287.
5. Malchukov A. L. Yakut interference in North-Tungusic languages // Turkic languages in contact. 2006. Т. 61. С. 122.
6. Malchukov, A. L. Russian interference in Tungusic languages in an areal typological perspective. In Per Sture Ureland (ed.), Convergence and divergence of European languages, 235–249. Berlin: Logos, 2003.
7. Рудницкая Е. Л. Порядок слов (глагол и прямой объект) в устных рассказах на эвенкийском языке // Сибирский филологический журнал. 2018. №. 1.
8. Василевич Г. М. Исторический фольклор эвенков // Сказания и предания. М.; Л.: Наука. 1966.

¹ This research has been supported by the Russian Science Foundation, Grant 17-18-01649 “Dynamics of language contact in the circumpolar region”.

MAPPING CIRCUMPOLAR LANGUAGES¹

YURY KORYAKOV

Institute of Linguistics RAS (Moscow)

Quite surprisingly for an outside observer, the most part of (Eurasian) Circumpolar area were inhabited until recently by nomadic or semi-nomadic groups. In fact, it is easier to list non-nomadic (sedentary) groups for this region, namely: Karelians, most Komi, Mansi, larger part of Khanty, South Selkups, Eskimos and Coastal Chukchi, Itelmens, Coastal Koryaks, Aleuts and Europeans.

Their nomadic ways of life are quite different, so one can define several types of such life-styles:

1. Full (whole-family) Nomadic Pastoralism with herds of domestic reindeer: traditionally Sámi, Evenk, Nenets, Chukchi, Evens, Koryaks, Dolgans, Enets, Komi, Nganasan,
2. Partial (male only) Nomadic Pastoralism with herds of domestic reindeer: all mentioned groups in later Soviet times except eastern groups of Nenets.
3. (Nomadic) Hunting and gathering (sometimes together with occasional Nomadic Pastoralism): Neshans, Northern Selkup, Kets, Negidal, Yukagir.

During Soviet period many of these ethnic groups switched to mostly sedentary style of life. But since we create maps for earlier periods too, we have to face fully the difficulties of mapping the nomadic ethnic groups and their languages.

And they are following.

1. Huge areas with no clear borders between them.
2. Very low population density and very small absolute numbers of population in general: normally we say about dozens people per group.
3. High personal and family mobility: one or few families could easily change place of their pastures, and it could have serious impact on distribution area for whole ethnic groups (due to low absolute number of population).
4. Seasonal mobility — different grounds for summer and winter pastures and migration in autumn and spring between them.
5. High group mobility — borders between groups also changed time to time (and much more often than between sedentary peoples).
6. Winter pastures of one ethnic group might coincide with/to summer pastures of another group (Dolgans/Nganasans) or migration routes might pass through other group area (Yenisey Dolgans).
7. Multilingualism and unclear ethnic identifications for many groups — notwithstanding low density and due to high mobility the groups had contacts with other groups, could speak several languages and often had no clear ethnic identification (earlier Dolgans, Eveno-Yukaghirs).
8. But the most serious problem is to obtain sufficient data on all pasture areas and migration routes. Unfortunately census data give not all necessary information.

In my talk I'll show how nomadic peoples were mapped on earlier maps, especially in 1920s-1930s, and how above-mentioned difficulties were solved or at least approached. Then I'll show what other ways to map such complex patterns are possible.

¹ This research has been supported by the Russian Science Foundation, Grant 17-18-01649 “Dynamics of language contact in the circumpolar region”.

COMMON IDIOMS IN SAMOYEDIC LANGUAGES

MARINA LUBLINSKAYA

Institute of Linguistic Studies RAS (St-Petersburg)

Idioms are currently indivisible phrases, meaning of idiom isn't a simple sum of the meanings of the contained words. There are phraseologisms (phraseologic utterance, popular expressions). These phrases are stable and their meanings are figurative [Sovremennaya encyclopedia]. According to the same Sovremennaya Encyclopedia adages are aphoristically concise, figurative, grammatically and logically complete sayings with instructive meaning, usually in a rhythmically organized form. Riddles, short stories, parables also may be considered figurative utterances. Furthermore the description of the fact in any language may differ the description of the same fact in our one and so it is figurative. E. g. *m̄t̄ ̄mt̄* 'the house is (somewhere)' literary translation is 'the house is sitting'. The idiom meanings are cultural and informative (direct and allegorical content plan). The list of these figurative utterances is specific for any language. Their typology, classification by different parameters is being developed (for more details see, for example, [Kuznetsova 2000]). The community of idioms confirms the existence of linguistic and extralinguistic communities in the culture of ethnic groups. The study of the question may be a component of the contrasting method of studying of cultures.

The stable figurative utterances in the Nenets language were published in the literature, mainly in the school books. O. Kazakevich carried an analysis of Selkup idioms [Kazakevich 1999]. Scientific analysis of idioms in the other Samoyedic languages has not been yet. In related Samoyed languages, the same idioms are used.

In the Nenets and Enets languages:

хобада " *һадаць* (nen.) ~ *кобада нызучь* (en.) 'with all his might (lit. tearing the skin)'

һая тар ~ *ая тодяй* 'one with hairy skin, wood goblin, monkey'

едб пиресь ~ *дизи* 'food (lit. boiler) cook'

сейда хая ~ *сейза кань* 'frightened (lit. heart gone)'

Coincide with Nganasan:

мяд' тер " ~ *мяз тер* ~ *мазъ черә* " 'family (lit. the contents of the plague)'

хасава/не һацекеы ~ *каса/нэ касай* ~ *куодюму/ны нюо* 'boy/girl (lit. man /woman child)'

In Nenets and in Selkup:

һув' һяра (nen) ~ *һун һер* (selk.) 'firmament (lit. pergola of the sky)'

һумда таһома ~ *һор таһутһуһа* 'summer has come (lit. weather/sky became summer)'

һеля' сәв ~ *peläl' sajil'* 'one-eyed (lit. half-eyed)'

Nenets, Nganasan fairy tales and fairy tales of the Madu (Tundra) Enets, unlike the fairy tales of the Bay (Forest) Enets, are completed with the expressions: This is the end / Terer everything / Now lead the end.

References

Sovremennaya Encyclopedia (in Russian) — <https://dic.academic.ru/>

Kazakevich 1999 — O. A. Kazakevich. *O kulture naroda, otrazhennoj vo frazeologii* // *Frazeologia v kontekste kultury*. M.: Jazyki Russkoj kul'tury. 1999, pp. 311–317.

Kuznetsova 2000 — *Idiomaticheskie edinicy s zoo-komponentom v uralskikh jazykah: poiski novyh putej analiza*. — <http://www.dialog-21.ru/en/digest/2000/articles/kuznetsova/>

SPEECH REPRESENTATION OF THE SAMOYEDS IN THE FIRST RUSSIAN POPULAR SCIENTIFIC ARTICLE ABOUT THE SAMOYEDS (1732)¹

ALEXANDR MALYSHEV

St. Petersburg State University

The report is considered to the stylistic peculiarities of presenting information about one of the Northern people in the first printed article about them, published in 1732 in the popular scientific academic magazine “Notes to the Saint-Petersburg Sheets” (republishing [Malyshev 2014]) and intended to the audience acquaintance (mostly in St. Petersburg and Moscow) with the way of Samoyed’s life.

The materials take four releases (16 pages, parts XXVIII–XXXI). In the article, the speech representation of Samoyeds is done doubly: “from the outside” and “from within”. First, the article is built according to the general scheme realizing typical steps of the ethnographic informing communicative scenario: 1) Contribution of the key nomination and etymological information about it; 2) Contribution of the nationality origin and structure; 3) Story about relationship with colonists of the Russian North; 4) Description of religion and its status in Samoyed’s life. Secondly, in the end of the article the reader can see a part of language which Samoyeds speak: some examples of keywords in Archangelic Samoyed dialect (71 words and 16 short everyday phrases) are given, the translations of “Pater Noster” prayer into three dialects of the Samoyed language (Archangelic, Turukhanic and Taffian) and the counting from one to ten on the same dialects are shown.

The article “About the Samoyeds” not only told Russian readers about the “foreign” people, but also acquainted these people and the territory they lived on with other people and lands as a part of the Russian state. The statement tonality formed the positive perception of Samoyeds as common people which are living subsistence economy, kept streaks of primitive culture, but at the same time goodhearted, partly naive and friendly.

Literature

Malyshev A. A. The first domestic popular scientific article about Samoyeds (1732) // *Voprosy uralistiki* 2014. SPb., 2014. Pp. 702–722.

¹ The article is supported by the grant of Russian Foundation for Basic Research № 18-312-00164 “Historical stylistics of the Russian popular scientific periodical press of the first half of the 18th century”.

NOTES ON MULTILINGUALISM IN THE LOWER KOLYMA REGION¹

DARIA MORDASHOVA, MARIA SIDOROVA

Lomonosov Moscow State University & Institute of Linguistics RAS (Moscow)

This paper focuses on multilingualism situation and contact-induced phenomena in the lexis of languages within the Lower Kolyma region. Lower Kolyma (LK) is a region in the Sakha Republic (Yakutia), Russia, which has a long-term history of intensive contacts between Yakut, Tundra Yukaghir (TY), Even, Chukchi and Russian (see [Jokhelson 1926/2005]).

The data were collected during several field trips to Yakutsk (2018–2019). Our methodology combines interviewing language consultants (originating from the LK area, but based in Yakutsk) and analyzing the archival data. The latter includes studying the reports on ethnographic and sociolinguistic field trips to the LK during the 20th century and lexical questionnaires concerning the dialects of Yakut (see also [Korkina 1992]) as well as other languages of the region. Such questionnaires enable us not only to find out the peculiarities of the LK language varieties which could have been the result of language contact, but also to trace diachronic changes. For example, [Kurilov 2001: 162; 582] notes that there are several words meaning ‘wolf’ in TY, and *kōriel* (көрүөл) is an obsolete one. Our consultants mentioned only *ewrejrukun* (эврэйрукун) lit. ‘the walking creature’, whereas in the archival lexical questionnaires [Kondakov 1932–1936] there is only one variant, spelled as *korjəl/kodjəl*². Thus, the archival data help us to reveal changes in the use of different lexemes. Another example is a TY word for ‘bear’. There are two lexemes in [Kurilov 2001: 502, 544]: *čameruun* (чамэруун) and *qajčietege* (хайчуэмэгэ). The last one (*qajciətəgə*) is also present in the archival lexical questionnaires and mentioned by our consultants as well. But there are lexemes *məməcen*, *qəqə*, *əljočurcənçe kajciək*, which are already not present in the dictionary of modern TY (see [Kurilov 2001]).

The reports on ethnographic field trips conducted under the guidance of I. Gurvich (see [Gurvich 1966]) are an important tool for reconstruction of linguistic situation of the LK region during the 1st half of the 20th century. According to Gurvich’s consultants from the older generation (around 50 years and older), multilingualism developed within the LK region “50–60 years ago”, thus, in the end of the 19th century. One of the consultants, a 96-year-old T. Trifonov, recalled his youth with the Yukaghir people clinging together and speaking only Yukaghir, except for a couple of members of local administration who managed to speak the neighbours’ languages. Similar stories were told by Even and Chukchi consultants.

Sociolinguistic data collected by I. Gurvich in the 1950s shows that monolingualism was atypical for the LK area at that time (with 23% speakers of Chukchi, Russian or Yakut); 50% of 306 respondents spoke at least two languages, and the rest 27% — 3 to 5 languages. These data are supported by our own questionnaires, where interviewees recalled their older relatives speaking almost all the languages of the LK area. However, today’s situation is characterized by “drifting” to prestigious languages, namely Russian and Yakut. In the talk, we will provide and compare the data from different available sources in a more detailed way.

References

Gurvich I. S. Etnicheskaya istoriya Severo-Vostoka Sibiri {Ethnic history of the North-East of Siberia}. Moscow, 1966.

¹ This research has been supported by the Russian Science Foundation grant № 17-18-01649.

² Here and in the examples below the transcription of the source [Kondakov 1932–1936] is preserved.

- Jokhelson V. I. Yukagiry i yukagirizovannyje tungusy {The Yukaghir and the Yukaghirized Tungus}. Novosibirsk: Nauka, 2005.
- Korkina E. I. Severo-vostochnaya dialektnaya zona yakutskogo yazyka {North-Eastern dialectal zone of Yakut}. Novosibirsk: Nauka, 1992.
- Kondakov A. Yukaghir, Tungus and Chukchi dictionaries. Fieldwork report. IHRISN RAS (Siberian Branch), 5/1/145. 1932–1936.
- Kurilov G. N. Yukagirsko-russkij slovar' {Yukaghir-Russian dictionary}. Novosibirsk: Nauka, 2001.

MULTILINGUALISM IN THE NORTHEASTERN YAKUTIA AND CHUKOTKA: COMPARING SOCIOLINGUISTIC, HISTORICAL-SOCIOLINGUISTIC, AND LINGUISTIC APPROACHES¹

MARIA PUPYNINA^{a,b}, DARIA MORDASHOVA^{b,c}, MARIA SIDOROVA^{b,c}

^aInstitute for Linguistic Studies RAS (St. Petersburg);

^bInstitute of Linguistics RAS (Moscow); ^cLomonosov Moscow State University

In this talk, we will present the results of three-year research on multilingualism in the downstream tundra of Kolyma and Alazeya rivers. Over this period, we conducted a series of expeditions to Yakutia and Chukotka, and a vast literature research on different anthropological issues of all ethnic groups inhabiting the region.

Working in the field, we concentrated on collecting sociolinguistic, historical-sociolinguistic and linguistic types of data.

The starting point of our research was the evidence that, in the downstream tundra of Kolyma and Alazeya, several individuals could speak four languages apart from Russian: Chukchi, Even, Yukaghir and Yakut. A lot of others could speak three and four, and they claimed, that the generation of their parents was even more multilingual.

The first step was to check this information through the series of open-ended interviews collected from the people who originated from two villages downstream Kolyma (Cherskii and Kolymskoye) and Alazeya (Andryushkino). We asked questions about people's origin (if they were born and raised in the nomadic brigade or in the village), the languages they could speak, the domains in which the languages were used, which was a sociolinguistic part. The same questions were asked about people's parents, and about the general linguistic context of their childhood, which was a historical-sociolinguistic part. Several interviewees could speak only two languages, however, often they could share valuable historical-sociolinguistic data. People, who could remember linguistic repertoires and other biographical information about their grandparents, were encouraged to do so. If a person claimed to speak some language apart from Russian, we asked him/her to say several words in this language, or to tell a story. We even collected several parallel texts in the languages of the region. This part of the study showed that multilinguals' competence in the studied languages was usually very different.

During the next expedition year, we collected quantitative data on the same topic. We created a questionnaire with a closed set of questions (the full version of the questionnaire will be distributed during the talk). The data could be collected orally (registered by the researcher during the short 20–30 minutes interview), or in the written form by the consultants themselves. The results were striking: out of 76 subjects, 50 claimed to be trilingual, quadrilingual, or quintolingual.

The analysis of texts collected by our group and other researchers showed that the biggest linguistic reciprocal influence existed between Yukaghir and Even languages, and Yakut language influenced both of them. The historical and anthropological literature gave the good ground for this kind of linguistic outcomes of the contact.

The analysis of questionnaires, open-ended interviews and literature data showed that another similar contact zone could be Northwestern Chukotka. The difference, according to our hypothesis, was the lack of Yakut influence in Even and presumably extinct Yukaghir speakers. The next field trip research, partly conducted in this region, proved both assumptions. During the same trip, we

¹ This research has been supported by the Russian Science Foundation grant № 17-18-01649.

undertook a pilot linguistic research aimed to describe the level of language competence of multilingual consultants.

For this kind of multilingualism studies, the interdisciplinary approach seems to be the most effective. Multilingualism is a dynamic (both in space and time) phenomenon with deep sociocultural roots, and only the overview of historical, historical-sociolinguistic and cultural context together with linguistic and sociolinguistic analysis could help to reveal its inner patterns.

SOCIOLINGUISTIC SITUATION IN THE UPPER KUSKOKWIM, ALASKA: FEATURES, DYNAMICS, AGENTS OF INFLUENCE¹

MARINA RASKLADKINA

Institute of Linguistics RAS (Moscow)

The paper describes the sociolinguistic situation in the Upper Kuskokwim area for the period from the middle of the 19th century till the present time. In the early historical times this area extended from the Alaska range to the Kuskokwim mountains and from the Swift River to the watershed between the drainages of the Kuskokwim and Kantishna rivers. Representatives of the ethnic group under investigation, Athabaskan Indians, live in the upstream of the Kuskokwim river. Hence the name of the area, the group and, accordingly, the language.

This paper reveals the factors and agents of social influence that determined the language situation in this area at different times. The picture included, in the first place, the native language of the area, Upper Kuskokwim Athabaskan in its local variants, as well as the languages of the neighboring territories, including, to various extent, Athabaskan (Koyukon, Deg Hitan, Tanana, Denaina) and Central Yupik Eskimo. Undoubtedly a special place is occupied by English as the language of the dominant culture. Since the inhabitants of Upper Kuskokwim are Orthodox Christians, of course, the Church Slavonic language was used throughout the twentieth century; and traces of the Russian language are noted in at least 80 loanwords in the Upper Kuskokwim language.

Among the most important agents of influence are the following:

- 1) **explorers and fur traders** who can be considered a single kind of agent since exploration was inseparable from the activity of the Russian American Company (later replaced by Alaska Commercial Company and some independent traders); they organized meeting points with locals to collect fur and to sell various goods.
- 2) **Russian Orthodox Missionaries**, whose activities were originally directly related to the RAC territory development and continued many years after the transfer of Alaska to the US. The Upper Kuskokwim people adopted Orthodoxy as their own ethnic and religious tradition, which helped them to preserve their cultural and linguistic identity longer than others. This process contrasts with the development of religious beliefs in other indigenous peoples who have been influenced by other faiths - the American Episcopal, Catholic churches, etc. (Such places are: the Eskimo settlement of Holy Cross, the Athabaskan Deg Hitan settlement of Anvik, located in the downstream of the Yukon river, as well as the settlements of the Middle and Lower Kuskokwim).
- 3) **mining and gold mining** came to the upper Kuskokwim later (from the beginning of the 20th century and later) and at a different scale than in other territories (Yukon, Kenai Peninsula); this brought a flood of Europeans and "lower 48 Americans" to the remote Alaskan territories.
- 4) **Government services in the field of health, education, and economic development** which became available to the Upper Kuskokwim people in the 20th century. First of all, it was a school that was organized in Nikolai in 1948 and radically changed the everyday life, patterns of communication and attitude to the native language.

The activities of these agents led to the intensification of contacts with the neighboring ethnic groups and with "white" Americans, resulting, among other things, in inter-ethnic marriages.

Currently, English is the main language of the Upper Kuskokwim people. The native language is considered to be dying, it is practically not used in everyday life and there are no more than 10-15

¹ This research has been supported by the Russian Science Foundation grant № 17-18-01649.

speakers of various degrees of competence. According to studies (R. Collins, E. Hosley, A. Kibrik), the number of native speakers never exceeded 250-300 people.

At present the UKA people are concentrated in the Nikolai village (about 100 persons), in the regional center of McGrath and in Anchorage, the largest city of Alaska; they also partially dispersed across Alaska and change their place of residence quite often due to various reasons. According to our study, the number of living persons of UKA origin is about 380.

TOWARDS AREAL PHONETIC TYPOLOGY OF CENTRAL SIBERIA: A NON-TRIVIAL TYPE OF DIACHRONIC SOUND CHANGE IN SAMOYEDIC AND YENISEIAN

KIRILL RESHETNIKOV

Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration (Moscow)

The paper is focused on some peculiar consonant change processes that seem to be relevant for describing the central Siberian region as a linguistic area. The observations below are (mostly) based on data obtained by linguistic reconstruction, but we only consider commonly recognized language groups as well as reliable etymological parallels and unambiguously established sound correspondences.

In Mator, one of the extinct Samoyedic languages, Proto-Samoyedic word-initial **s-* > velar **k-* before front vowels: Mator *keje* ‘heart’ < Proto-Samoyedic **sejə* (> Tundra Nenets *šej*) ~ Finnish *sydän*, Hungarian *szív*; Mator *künžü* ‘breast’ < Proto-Samoyedic **sünsə* (> Tundra Nenets *šunz*) ~ Hungarian *szügy*.

Similarly, in the Ket dialect of Selkup, the same development is regular for Proto-Selkup word-initial **č-* < Proto-Samoyedic **j-*, i. e. **č-* > *k-* before front vowels: Ket Selkup *kū* ‘belt’ < Proto-Selkup **cū* < Proto-Samoyedic **jiə*, Ket Selkup *kindi* ‘bowstring’ < Proto-Selkup **cinti* < Proto-Samoyedic **jänti*.

It is important to add that according to a recent suggestion, the Proto-Samoyedic consonant traditionally reconstructed as **s* would have been in fact a palatalized affricate rather than a sibilant, which would be indicated by phonotactic features it had in the proto-language as well as by its reflexation (see [Zhivlov 2018] and [Kümmel 2019]). Let’s note that the development of **s* attested in Mator is actually also a fact speaking in favor of reinterpreting this Proto-Samoyedic phoneme as **č*: the change *č-* > *k-*, although looking quite unusual, is still observed at least in Selkup (see above), while *k* as a reflex of *s* would be absolutely unique and rather implausible. Reconstructing **č* instead of **s* for Proto-Samoyedic implies that it had no sibilants at all, which is still not unparalleled (cf. Proto-Eskimo, a language that also would have had a phonological inventory without any sibilants, see [Fortescue et al. 2010]).

At last, several Yeniseian languages known from records of the XVIII and XIX centuries have word-initial velar *k-*, *h-*, and *x-* presumably going back to Proto-Yeniseian **c-*, **č-*, and **ʒ-*: Kott *heŋai*, Arin *kegan*, Pumpokol *xiŋa* ‘hair’ < Proto-Yeniseian **cəŋe* (> Ket *təŋə*), Arin *kes*, Pumpokol *kit* ‘stone’ < Proto-Yeniseian **čičs* (> Ket *tičš*, Kott *šičš*); Arin *bi-k’al* ‘(my) son’, *bi-k’ala* ‘(my) daughter’, Pumpokol *pi-kola* ‘(my) daughter’ < Proto-Yeniseian **ʒal* ‘child’ (> Ket *dāl*, Kott *d’al*). Detailed arguments in favor of reconstructing Proto-Yeniseian affricates and not velars in cases like these are given in [Starostin 1982] along with some hypotheses regarding the respective system of reflexation (in particular, the change **č-* > velar is supposed to have taken place only in forms where **č-* first yielded *c-*).

It is safe to say that the phonetic phenomenon under consideration, i. e. the development of affricates into velars, is very rare and typologically remarkable. So there hardly can be any doubt that its presence in several languages within the same areal continuum is, at least partly, a result of some contact processes, even if their source and direction are at present difficult to establish. It is interesting to note that in all of these cases, an affricate becomes a velar only word-initially. In the paper, we try to clear up some geographical aspects of a possible interaction between the Samoyedic and Yeniseian idioms in question. We also consider the sound changes mentioned above in the context of other uncommon phonetic developments attested in the area (*s* > *t* in Mansi, Samoyedic and Pumpokol etc.).

Literature

Janhunen, Juha. Samojedischer Wortschatz. Gemeinsamojedische etymologien. Helsinki, 1977.

Fortescue et al. 2010 — Fortescue, Michael & Jacobson, Steven & Kaplan, Lawrence. Comparative Eskimo Dictionary, with Aleut cognates. Fairbanks, 2010.

Kümmel 2019 — Kümmel, Martin Joachim. Early Indo-Iranic loans in Uralic: Sounds and strata // Contacts. Archaeology, genetics, languages. Joining forces to shed light on early contacts (4000 BC — 1000 AD) between Indo-European and Uralic speakers. Suomenlinna / Sveaborg 9. 5. 2019.

Starostin 1982 — Старостин С. А. Праенисейская реконструкция и внешние связи енисейских языков // Кетский сборник, Л., 1982.

Zhivlov 2018 — Живлов М. А. Прасамодийский $*s$ — фонология и фонетика // Семинар по сравнительно-исторической фонетике самодийских языков. Москва, 25–26.5.2018

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON LEXICOSTATISTICS: A CASE STUDY OF FIVE FINNIC VARIETIES

FEDOR ROZHANSKIY^a, MIKHAIL ZHIVLOV^b

^aInstitute for Linguistic Studies RAS (St. Petersburg); University of Tartu,

^bRussian State University for the Humanities; National Research University Higher School of Economics (Moscow)

Any generalizations about linguistic areas are tightly connected with the global problem of comparability of linguistic data and, in particular, the comparability of grammar descriptions, see, for example, the discussion in (Miestamo 2018, Haspelmath 2016). For most studies, a typologist uses the secondary rather than the primary linguistic data: grammars, dictionaries, etc. These data are always subjective: they depend dramatically on a particular linguistic tradition or theory, on the preferences or interpretations of a concrete researcher, and other factors. Any of these factors can significantly influence the final results of the research.

The current paper discusses the experience of a particular research based on the lexicostatistical method, which is one of the most well-known methods for language comparison. A lexicostatistical analysis using the 110 word Swadesh list was applied to five Finnic idioms: Standard Estonian, Standard Finnish, Votic (Luuditsa variety of the Western dialect) and two Ingrian dialects: Lower Luga and Soikkola. The main aim of the research was creating appropriate word lists for these varieties. In the current paper, we offer some observations on methodology of this approach.

The core problem of using the word lists is synonymy: a language often has two or more words corresponding to a particular word in the original wordlist. In order to achieve the appropriate level of comparability, we compiled the word lists following the method described by Kassian et al. (2010). This method is based on contexts that contain token words, but not exclusively on the translation equivalents of lexical items. The word lists were compiled in cooperation with native speakers of the analysed varieties.

Among others, the following conclusions were made:

1. The lexicostatistical difference between varieties does not correlate with their genetic affiliation, if we analyse closely related varieties spoken in contact zones. In particular, bigger languages (Estonian and Finnish) demonstrate a lot of diversity, while the minor Votic and Ingrian varieties are more homogeneous, even though they belong to the different branches of Finnic languages.

2. A thoroughly compiled word list that does not apply any techniques to reduce the synonymy has the error of around 5%. The methodology applied in our paper reduces the error rate, but cannot exclude it completely.

3. The diversity in the core lexicon of different varieties appears due to various factors. For the analysed languages, these are primarily the synonyms that existed in the protolanguage and the semantic shifts. Secondarily, the new derivatives and the recent borrowings play a role.

References

- Haspelmath M. 2016. The challenge of making language description and comparison mutually beneficial. *Linguistic Typology* 20 (2), 299–303.
- Kassian A., Starostin G., Dybo A., Chernov V. 2010. The Swadesh wordlist. An attempt at semantic specification. *Journal of Language Relationship* 4, 46–89.
- Miestamo M. 2018. On the relationship between typology and the description of Uralic languages. *Journal of Estonian and Finno-Ugric Linguistics* 9 (1), 31–53.

EFFECTS OF LANGUAGE CONTACT ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE NENETS LANGUAGES

TAPANI SALMINEN

University of Helsinki & Kone Foundation

The focus of my paper is to investigate a number of features of Forest Nenets and Tundra Nenets, two languages constituting the Nenets subgroup of the Samoyed branch of the Uralic family, that can be attributed to language contact. Both lexical and grammatical aspects of contact-induced change are taken into concern.

The common predecessor of the modern Nenets languages, Proto-Nenets, poses an interesting challenge to the study of language contact, because the relatively small number of loanwords that are shared by and confined to Forest Nenets and Tundra Nenets are open to competing interpretations. With the exception of certain words that potentially derive from a substrate language, the origin of non-native lexicon found in both Nenets languages is unquestionably either Khanty or Evenki. It is, however, possible, and in most cases even likely, that these loanwords are later than the Proto-Nenets stage and would therefore represent parallel borrowings from the same or similar source. All Komi and Russian loanwords are clearly recent and largely restricted to Tundra Nenets.

While the case for early Khanty loanwords in Nenets remains dubious, both the eastern dialects of Tundra Nenets and the entire Forest Nenets language possess an extensive number of words of Khanty origin. That they represent separate layers of borrowings becomes manifestly obvious when it is noticed that there is little overlap in the actual sets of Khanty loanwords between the Nenets languages, and, what is more, those found in Tundra Nenets dialects derive from Northern Khanty while the Forest Nenets words were borrowed from Eastern Khanty.

Indeed, the influx of Khanty loanwords has been a major contributor to the lexical differences between the Nenets languages at large, as well as, even more notably, among the dialects of Tundra Nenets. As a rule, the concepts expressed by Northern Khanty borrowings in the eastern, i.e., Siberian, dialects of Tundra Nenets turn out to be rendered through words of Russian or Komi origin to the west of the Urals. As for Forest Nenets, virtually its entire non-native lexicon consists of Eastern Khanty loanwords, barring a handful of words borrowed from Tundra Nenets. There appear to be slightly more words of Khanty origin in the western dialects of Forest Nenets, with retentions or neologisms as their semantic counterparts in the east of the language area.

The role of language contact in phonology and morphology constitutes an interesting yet complicated topic. Since loanword studies alone reveal that Forest Nenets has been the recipient of major Eastern Khanty influences, it is perhaps not controversial to suggest that not only the Forest Nenets vowel system in general has been restructured according to an Eastern Khanty model, but a number of features of the consonant systems of Forest Nenets dialects also reflect contact with Eastern Khanty. The idea that the differences among the consonant systems of Tundra Nenets dialects could be based on language contact, by contrast, remains hypothetical. The claims in question would involve Komi model for denasalization in western Tundra Nenets, which had lead to an enriched consonant inventory in comparison with less peripheral dialects, and potential substrate influences in the far-eastern dialects whose consonant system may be characterized as impoverished.

Finally, it is tempting, but problematic, to assert that the virtual merger of grammatical cases in western Forest Nenets should be considered an adaptation to the Khanty system, which lacks grammatical case marking in nominal inflection entirely.

ON POSSIBLE HISTORICAL CONTACTS OF THE MANSI AND SELKUP LANGUAGES¹

ANNA URMANCHIEVA

Tomsk State University & Institute for Linguistic Studies RAS (St-Petersburg)

Despite the fact that the Mansi and Selkups are not immediate neighbours on the modern ethnic map of Western Siberia, some linguistic data indicate the possibility of historical contacts between these two ethnic groups. The first to notice this was Gennady N. Prokofiev. He noted: “In the vocabulary, the Selkup word *qum*, *qup* ‘man’ attracts attention. This word is not found in any of the known Samoyed languages {...}. The word *qum*, *qup* ‘man’ we find in Mansi *hum* ‘man’” (Прокоев 1935: 12).

Without giving a complete list, I can indicate a number of Selkup words that have correspondences in Mansi, but not in Khanty (Mansi data from Munkácsi, Kalman 1986):

1. Selkup *piči* ‘ax’ [Alatalo 2004 514]. A cognate word [UEW 416] is represented by Mansi T *pøist* ~ *pøst* ~ *pāst* ~ *päist*.

2. Selkup *šāḱ* ‘salt’ [Alatalo 2004: 2579] < ir. The same word for ‘salt’ is represented by Mansi LM *šāḱ* ~ *šex* ~ *šāḱ*, LU *šāḱ*, P *šāḱ*, K *šāḱ* (*šāk*-), T *čix* ~ *čix* ~ *čux* ~ *čōḱ*.

3. Selkup *ñarə* ‘swamp’ (Alatalo 2004: 1690). Alatalo compares it with Ewenki *няру*, but equally possible is the comparison with the Mansi word N *ñar* [= *ñar*], LM *ñar* ~ *ñar*, LU *ñar*, P *ñar*, K *ñar*, T *ñar* ~ *ñar* ~ *ñēr* ‘swamp (with shallow clear water, with trees and flowers’.

4. Selkup *panəj-* ‘to cone down, to come into the water’ (Alatalo 2004: 476). In other sources (Быконя и др. 2005: 177, Казакевич, Будянская 2010: 96) the stem is registered with *-ń-*, in this case is possible the comparison with Mansi LU *pañitāti*: *nal-* **pañitāti* ‘to push on the water’.

5. Selkup *pōsə* (Alatalo 2004: 604), a particle with the superlative meaning. Jarmo Alatalo compares it with Yenisseic word denoting ‘still, one more’: ~ jen. (C-JOK) I hasa S fas. But probably a Mansi word can be taken into account: N *pusən* [pusn], LM *pušn*, P *puššən*, K *posən*, T *pišən* ~ *pišən* ‘all, completely, entirely, healthy’.

6. Selkup *колык/у* ‘seldom’ (Казакевич, Будянская 2010: 41). Cf. Mansi N *χaliñis* ‘seldom’ // LM **khwāšā* *khaləl* ‘seldom’.

7. Selkup *tjətəj* ‘cedar’ [Alatalo 2004: 1075, SW 160]. Deserves attention Konda and Tavda Mansi word for ‘cedar’: K *tōt-jiw*, T *tāt*.

8. Selkup *pār* ‘time’ 619, ср. манс. N P *por*₂, LM *por* ~ *poår*, LU *por* ~ *pår* ~ *pār*, K *por* (~ *porè*), T *pār* ~ *pår* ~ *poru* ‘time’.

I will consider in more detail these correspondences (whether they are borrowings from Mansi into Selkup or vice versa, or common retentions of Uralic words). I also will provide an additional list of such separate Selkup-Mansi isoglosses. I will discuss the possibility of reconstructing this historical contact situation - in particular, taking into account modern views on the ethnogenesis of the Selkups, cf. Тучкова 2018.

References

- Быконя и др. 2005 — В. В. Быконя, Н. Г. Кузнецова, Н. П. Максимова. Селькупско-русский диалектный словарь. Томск: Издательство ТГПИУ, 2005.
Казакевич, Будянская 2010 — О. А. Казакевич, Е. М. Будянская. Диалектологический словарь селькупского языка (северное наречие). Екатеринбург: Баско, 2010.

¹ The research underlying this talk has been supported by the RFBR grant № 18-012-00833.

- Прокофьев 1935 — Г. Н. Прокофьев. Селькупская (остяко-самоедская) грамматика. Ленинград : Издательство Института народов Севера ЦИК СССР, 1935.
- Тучкова 2018 — Н. А. Тучкова. Этногенез селькупов с лингвистических и этноисторических позиций // Вестник Томского государственного университета. История. 2018. № 53, С. 153–156.
- Alatalo 2004 — Jarmo Alatalo. Sölkupisches Wörterbuch aus Aufzeichnungen von Kai Donner, U.T. Sirelius und Jarmo Alatalo. Helsinki, 2004.
- Munkácsi, Kálman 1986 — Wogulisches Wörterbuch. Gesammelt von Bernát Munkácsi, geordnet, bearbeitet und herausgegeben von Béla Kálmán. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, 1986.
- SW — J. Janhunen. Samojedischer Wortschatz. Gemeinsamojedische Etymologien // Castrenianumin toimitteita. Helsinki, 1977.
- UEW — Rédei K. Uralisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. Budapest, 1986–1991.

SOME THOUGHTS ON SAMOYED-YUKAGHIR CONTACTS

MIKHAIL ZHIVLOV

Russian State University for the Humanities & National Research University Higher School of Economics (Moscow)

Ante Aikio (2014) has conclusively demonstrated that the most striking lexical correspondences between Yukaghir and Samoyed languages result from contacts between Proto-Yukaghir and Proto-Samoyed. However, many aspects of these contacts remain poorly understood. Thus, it is not clear why most lexical parallels between Yukaghir and Samoyed belong to the realm of basic vocabulary. The direction of borrowing, clear for those cases where the Samoyed word has a Uralic etymology, remains uncertain for many other comparisons.

The present talk has several aims: 1) to present some new Yukaghir-Samoyed lexical comparisons, 2) to determine the direction of borrowing in the case of already known comparisons, 3) to discuss the distribution of Yukaghir-Samoyed etymologies within the basic vocabulary of both families.

References

- Aikio 2014 — Luobbal Sámmol Sámmol Ánte (Ante Aikio). 2014. The Uralic-Yukaghir lexical correspondences: genetic inheritance, language contact or chance resemblance? // *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 62: 7-76.
- Janhunen 1977 — Janhunen, Juha. 1977. *Samojedischer Wortschatz. Gemeinsamojedische Etymologien* (Castrenianumin toimitteita 17). Helsinki.
- Nikolaeva 2016 — Nikolaeva, Irina. 2006. *A Historical Dictionary of Yukaghir*. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

КОНТАКТЫ В ИНГЕРМАНЛАНДИИ В ПРЯМОМ НАБЛЮДЕНИИ

Т. Б. АГРАНАТ

Институт языкознания РАН (Москва)

В Ингерманландии с XII в. водский, ижорский и русский языки находятся в контакте. По имеющимся источникам, общение води и ижоры происходило по-ижорски, долгое время ижорский язык был лингва франка (подробнее см. [Агранат 2007], [Агранат 2016]. В западной Ингерманландии на водском субстрате сформировался нижнелужский ижорский диалект. При этом в нижнем течении р. Луги сохранялся и водский язык; водь и ижора часто жили в одной деревне, ежедневно контактировали. По свидетельству уроженца водского села Краколье Д. Цветкова, учившегося в Тартуском университете, в начале XX в., если в водскую семью приходила молодая жена ижорка, вся семья, включая старшее поколение, начинала говорить по-ижорски (см. [Tsvetkov 1925]).

В 2003 г. автору была передана для расшифровки аудиозапись беседы, сделанная в 1982 г. (Текст опубликован в [Агранат 2012]). В беседе принимают участие несколько человек, все они 1910-х г.р. Среди них одна носительница нижнелужского ижорского диалекта, говорит по-ижорски; остальные — носители водского языка, говорят по-водски. Основные собеседники: А. (водь) и Ф. (ижорка). Объем текста — 282 предложения. Одна из тем беседы — языки, на которых они говорят, реплики принадлежат А.:

Kuza pajatõ-tta¹ kuza läe-tä²

где говорить-PRS.IPS где говорить-PRS.IPS

‘Где разговаривают (по-водски), где разговаривают (по-ижорски)’.

Näd õmma naapuri-d siä läkä-d a miä pajata-n

вот быть-PRS-1PL сосед-NOM.PL ты говорить-PRS-2SG а я говорить-PRS-1SG

‘Вот мы соседи, я говорю на водском языке, а ты — на ижорском’.

Участница разговора Ф. никогда не переключает код на водский, иногда переключает на русский в ответ на реплику других собеседников, если они переключали код на русский. А. никогда не переключает код на ижорский в ответ на реплики, сказанные по-водски другими собеседниками, на русский переключает при тех же условиях, что и Ф. При ответе на реплики Ф. она начинает переключать код с 86 предложения. Все переключения внутрифразовые. Иногда употребляются ижорские формы в лексемах, совпадающих в этих языках, поэтому невозможно разграничить переключение и смешение кода. Иногда употребляются ижорские лексемы, иногда, если лексемы в двух языках различаются фонетически, употребляется ижорский вариант.

Во всех случаях переключение происходит на язык, находящийся в более высокой иерархии.

В докладе будут подробно продемонстрированы случаи кодового переключения, и будет дана их классификация.

Л и т е р а т у р а

Агранат Т.Б. (2007) Западный диалект водского языка. MSUA 26. Москва-Гронинген. 2007.

Агранат Т.Б. (2012) Водские тексты с поморфемной нотацией. М.: Тезаурус, 2012.

Агранат Т.Б. (2016) Сравнительный анализ грамматических систем прибалтийско-финских языков: принципы интрагенетической типологии. М.: Языки народов мира, 2016.

Tsvetkov D. (1925) Vadjalased // Eesti keel. IV. 1925. P. 39–44.

¹ ‘говорят’ (водск.)

² ‘говорят’ (ижорск.)

О РЕЛИКТАХ ПАРНОГО СЧЕТА В ЯЗЫКАХ СЕВЕРНОЙ АЗИИ.

Г. С. ВРТАНЕСЯН

Российский государственный гуманитарный университет (Москва)

В работах по счету в языках Циркумарктики, интересны по меньшей мере два факта. Это практическое отсутствие работ с описанием архаичных процедур счета (всего 2 работы), и исследований влияния парности на облик числительных первого десятка. По признаку парности можно разделить языки региона (достаточно условно) на две группы. Первая (эскимосо-алеутские, чукотско-камчатские, также кетский) без явных рефлексов парности (для чисел 1-9). Вторая включает в себя некоторые уральские и алтайские языки (и м.б. нивхский), сохранивших реликты парности. Доминанту парности в архаичных счетных процедурах, корректно соотносится с первичным использованием в качестве эталонной системы меры и счета рук, по схеме «один — два — много». То есть «двойка» была первым пределом счета. По мере развития счета, ожидаем рост величины предела счета. Однако автору неизвестны случаи рассмотрения «пятерки» в качестве «предела счета». Поэтому нет видимых оснований, полагать, что пятиричный счет, и был единственной эталонной системой счета, с опорой на которую шло развитие счета на ранних стадиях. Проблема восприятия частей тела как эталонной системы счета («проточисла») интересна, особенно в связи с существованием разных вариантов счета (обычный и календарный) по частям тела. Наиболее древним рефлексом парности, по-видимому, является аддитивная схема формирования тройки, по схеме 2+1. В уральских языках она была выявлена для праюкагирского и прауральского состояний. При этом предполагалось развитие счета по схеме парности 2+2. Дальнейшее наращивание счета шло с вовлечением в счет пятерки (пальцы рук), развитие счета по типу «один, два, пять, двадцать» (Напольских). Это не единственная схема развития парного счета, реликты которого существовали в виде дейктиков местоименного происхождения для пар 1-2, 3-4, 5-6 (Серебренников) ещё в прафиноугорском состоянии. На существование парного счета косвенно указывает также этимология «четверки» в угорских языках, как «парности пар» (Поппе), а также в виде «две четверки» в самодийских языках. Увеличение величины базовой счетной единицы (тройка вместо двух), позволило представить «шестерку» как «две тройки», сохраняя алгоритм парности (юкагирский, др.-монгольский, др. японский). В ряде других языков разные варианты аддитивно-парной схемы внутри первой пятерки не исключение, а скорее правилом (Австралия, Н. Гвинея, Северная Америка). При этом базовым счетным циклом является «пара», а нечетные числа формируются по схеме «пар(а/ы)» плюс/минус «половина пары». На это указывает доминирование порядка сложения, когда вначале указывается «пара» (два), и лишь затем только «единица», в форме «один из пары». Выделение парности при счете имеет место и в случаях, в которых ее формально нет, например, фонетикой (кнгинг, касхг — 1,2; чокг, чаак — 3, 4, ительм.). Другой способ выражения парности, использование единственного числа при обозначении парной части тела (полглаза и т.д.). При исчислении парных предметов, кеты обозначали «единицу» термином *kolen* — половина (эквивалент единицы) (Дульзон). Из сказанного вытекает, по меньшей мере одно, важное следствие, десятичный (на основе пятерки) счет, стадийно, скорее всего, не мог следовать сразу за двоично — парным, указание на это счет по частям тела, когда, исчерпав возможности пальцев руки, развитие счета шло уже по суставам руки, и пройдя верхнюю точку (обычно выступающая часть головы (нос), счет продолжал «спуск» по другой руке. По странному стечению обстоятельств, счетные циклы в этих случаях чаще всего находились в пределах 27–29, что близко к значениям лунных циклов. С опорой на версию «десятичной революции»

в Евразии IV тыс. до н.э. (Хелимский), можно было бы ожидать быстрого вытеснения реликтовых парных счетных схем. Этого, однако, не произошло, анализ частотности чисел в евразийских эпических текстах (данные автора), показал, что пятерка не входит даже в первую тройку чисел, с наиболее высокой частотностью. Это можно полагать указанием на продолжительное сохранение алгоритмов парности, в самых различных формах.

СОХРАНЕНИЕ И СДВИГ АРТИКУЛЯЦИОННОЙ БАЗЫ В УСЛОВИЯХ ЯЗЫКОВОГО КОНТАКТА

И. А. ЗИБЕР

Национальный исследовательский университет Высшая школа экономики (Москва)

Артикуляционной базой языка обыкновенно называют «некоторые общие установки произношения, которые придают [языку] специфическую окраску» [Кодзасов, Кривнова 2001: 313]. Несмотря на то, что этот термин широко употребляется, систематически артикуляционные базы языков не описаны или почти не описаны, перечень признаков, который за ними стоит, не установлен, а обсуждение артикуляционной базы языка обыкновенно имеет импрессионистический характер [там же]. При этом существует традиция описания артикуляционной базы идиома с опорой на конкретные артикуляционные (в широком смысле) признаки, предположительно связанные друг с другом: апикальный или ламинальный характер язычных артикуляций; акустические параметры, стоящие за фонологическим противопоставлением по глухости/звонкости; позиционная реализация глухости-звонкости и твёрдости мягкости, склонность к прогрессивным или регрессивным ассимиляциям и так далее [Князев 1991].

Подобный подход, предполагающий связь одних признаков с другими в рамках устойчивых интегральных установок (то есть собственно артикуляционной базы), позволяет анализировать и объяснять интуитивно воспринимаемые на слух и хорошо заметные различия, сходства или изменения в фонетических системах языков, обусловленные контактами. В докладе речь пойдёт о двух случаях сдвига артикуляционной базы в условиях контактного влияния доминирующего языка: о чукотском языке в русскоязычном окружении (Чукотский АО) и о саамском языке в окружении русского и коми языков (Мурманская область).

«Сдвиг» или даже мена артикуляционной базы возможна и в интерферированной речи на неродном языке, и даже у носителей языка с сохранённой артикуляционной базой в условиях переключения кодов: регулярна ситуация, в которой небольшой речевой отрезок (например, слово или короткое сочетание) на одном языке, попадая в окружение слов на другом языке, меняет артикуляцию и подстраивается под доминирующую произносительную установку. В разных языках и разных условиях такая ассимиляция артикуляционной базы может восприниматься как норма, допустимое произнесение, ошибка или языковая игра.

В докладе пойдёт речь о том, как именно происходит сдвиг артикуляционной базы чукотского и саамского языков в условиях контакта, какие признаки и каким образом изменяются в первую очередь, а какие демонстрируют устойчивость. Будет обсуждаться вопрос о том, можно ли оценить скорость сдвига артикуляционной базы и сравнить эту скорость у разных языков, а также предположительные причины того, почему сдвиг артикуляционной базы происходит в разных языках по-разному.

Л и т е р а т у р а

- Князев С. В. О связи особенностей артикуляционной базы говора с характером противопоставления глухих/звонких и твёрдых/мягких согласных // *Современные русские говоры*. М., 1991.
Кодзасов С. В., Кривнова О. Ф. *Общая фонетика*. М., 2001.

НАЗВАНИЯ ВРЕМЕННЫХ ЖИЛИЩ В ДИАЛЕКТАХ ЕВРОПЕЙСКОГО СЕВЕРА РОССИИ: РЕЗУЛЬТАТЫ ФИННО-УГОРСКО-РУССКОГО КОНТАКТИРОВАНИЯ

О. А. ТЕУШ

Уральский федеральный университет (Екатеринбург)

На Европейском севере России хозяйственные и промысловые интересы населения требовали перемещения в географическом пространстве на далекие расстояния. В силу этого достаточно распространенным было устройство временных жилищ. Названия таких жилищ преимущественно заимствованы из языков местных народов.

Карел. *pugri* ‘место для сна на воздухе’, *pukra*, *bugra*, *pukri*, *pugri*, *bugri* ‘шалаш’, ‘хижина’ [KKS 4, 492] послужило источником русск. диал. *бугра* ‘временное жилище рыбаков, охотников – землянка, шалаш’ (Арх.: Прим.) [КСГРС], (Арх.) [Даль 1, 135], (Печор.) [СРГНП 1, 46], *бугор* ‘временное жилище – шалаш из сосновых веток’ (Печор.) [СРГНП 1, 46]. Этимология предложена Я. Калима [Kalima 1919, 81].

П. А. Дилакторским была записана лексема *кóуз*, *кóус* ‘шалаш, сделанный пастухом из хвойных прутьев для защиты от непогоды’ (Влг.: Кадн.) [Дилакторский, 212]. В современных диалектах слово отмечено в многочисленных вариантах: *кóуз* (Влг.: Сямж., У.-Куб., Хар.), *кавúз*, *кавúзик*, *каúз*, *каúзик* (Влг.: Хар.), *коúз* (Влг.: Сямж., У.-Куб., Хар.), *коúза* (Влг.: Хар.), *кóузик* (Влг.: Сямж.), *коúзик* (Влг.: Сямж., Хар.), *коúзок* (Влг.: Хар.), *коúсик* (Влг.: Хар.) ‘шалаш, крытый ветками (обычно на покосе, в поле)’ [КСГРС]. Лексема имеет прибалтийско-финское происхождение, ср. фин. *kuosto* ‘обрамление из высушенных сосен, стоящих в вертикальном положении на месте используемой стоянки’ (< саам., ср. швед. *kåste* ‘прогорклый’, вефс. *Gýostie* ‘старый’, ‘прокисший’, ‘немного изношенный’, норв. *goas'te* ‘прогорклый’, ‘прокисший’, ‘невкусный’) [SKES 2, 242; SSA 1, 443]. Слово должно было приобрести форму среднего рода, однако по аналогии к *шалáш* было освоено как лексема мужского рода. Приб.-фин. *-st-* на русской почве в конце слова > *c/z*.

Может быть предложена и альтернативная версия: лексема восходит к приб.-фин., ср. фин. *koju*, *koiju* ‘шалаш, хижина из лапника’, *kojureki* ‘крытые сани’, карел. *koju* ‘будка’, ливв. *koju* ‘сторожка, будка’ [SKES 2, 206; SSA 1, 386], см. [Востриков 1981, 29]. В прибалтийско-финские языки слово вошло из германских языков [SKES 2, 206; SSA 1, 386]. При этом сопоставлении, однако, неясен исход русского слова: объяснение конечного *-с* как нового суффикса в русских говорах Европейской части СССР, вычленившегося из большого количества финно-угорских заимствований на *-с* [Востриков 1981, 29] выглядит натянутым. Более правдоподобно то, что *-s(-z)* могло появиться в языке-субстрате [Востриков 1981, 29].

М. Фасмер [Фасмер 4, 464] считает темным словом *шóга*, *шогá* ‘шалаш, устроенный в поле или в лесу охотниками на птицу с чучелами’ (Олон.: Карг.) [Куликовский, 138]. При учете возможности упрощения аффрикаты *tš* > *š* источником заимствования могло являться саам. нот. *čok'ká*, ин. *čokke*, кольск. *tšok'k̄k̄^E*, кильд. *tš'~ok'k̄* ‘вершина, верхушка’, ‘холм’ [SKES 4, 1062]. Охотничий шалаш имеет простую форму: наклонно устанавливаются тонкие стволы деревьев, которые образуют острый угол. Поверхность конуса маскируется пластами дёрна таким образом, чтобы шалаш не выделялся из окружающего ландшафта и выглядел как естественный пригорок, холм. Подобно по внутренней форме *накиá* ‘шалаш из еловых веток’ (Арх.: Плес.) [КСГРС], *на́киа* ‘избушка, шалаш, низкий, некрасивый дом’ (Карел.: Медв.) [СРГК 4, 375]: < саам., ср. патс. *pā'kkvž*, нот. *pā'knš* ‘вершина, верхушка’, ‘холм’ [KKLS 1, 334].

Источники и литература

- Востриков 1981 – *Востриков О. В.* Финно-угорские лексические элементы в русских говорах Волго-Двинского междуречья // *Этимологические исследования*. Вып. 2. Свердловск, 1981. С. 3–45.
- Даль — *Даль В. И.* Толковый словарь живого великорусского языка. Т. 1–4. М., 1994.
- Дилакторский — *Дилакторский П. А.* Словарь областного вологодского наречия в его бытовом и этнографическом применении. Вологда, 1902. 677 с.
- КСГРС — Картотека «Словаря говоров Русского Севера» (хранится на кафедре русского языка и общего языкознания УрФУ).
- Куликовский — *Куликовский Г.* Словарь областного олонецкого наречия в его бытовом и этнографическом применении. СПб., 1898. 151 с.
- СРГК — Словарь русских говоров Карелии и сопредельных областей. Вып. 1–6. / Гл. ред. *А. С. Герд*. СПб., 1994–2005.
- СРГНП — Словарь русских говоров Низовой Печоры / Под ред. *Л. А. Ивашко*. Т. 1–2. СПб., 2003, 2005. 553 с.,
- Фасмер — *Фасмер М.* *Этимологический словарь русского языка*. Т. 1–4. М., 1964–1973.
- Kalima 1919 – *Kalima J.* Die ostseefinnischen Lehnwörter im Russischen // MSFOu, XLIV. Helsinki, 1919. 265 с.
- KKS – Karjalan kielen sanakirja. I–V. LSFU. XVI. Helsinki, 1968–1997. 1899 s.
- KKLS – *Itkonen T. I.* Koltan- ja Kuolanlapin sanakirja. I–II. LSFU, XV. Helsinki, 1958. 1236 s.
- SKES – Suomen kielen etymologinen sanakirja. LSFU, XII. O. 1–7. Helsinki, 1958–1981. 2293 s.
- SSA – Suomen sanojen alkuperä. Etymologinen sanakirja. O. 1–3. Helsinki, 1992–2000. 486 s., 470 s., 503 s.

Сокращения

1. В географических названиях

Арх.	— Архангельская область (губерния), г. Архангельск
Влг.	— Вологодская область (губерния)
Кадн.	— Кадниковский уезд Вологодской губернии
Карг.	— Каргопольский район Архангельской области
Карел.	— Республика Карелия
Медв.	— Медвежьегорский район Карелии
Олон.	— Олонецкая губерния
Печор.	— басс. р. Печора
Плес.	— Плещеевский район Архангельской области
Прим.	— Приморский район Архангельской области
Сямж.	— Сямженский район Вологодской области
У.-Куб.	— Усть-Кубинский район Вологодской области
Хар.	— Харовский район Вологодской области

2. В названиях языков и диалектов

вефс.	— вефсфальский диалект саамского языка
ин.	— диалект Инари саамского языка
карел.	— карельский язык
кильд.	— кильдинский диалект саамского языка
кольск.	— кольский диалект саамского языка
ливв.	— ливвиковский диалект карельского языка
норв.	— норвежский диалект саамского языка
нот.	— нотозерский диалект саамского языка
патс.	— диалект Патсойоки саамского языка
приб.-фин.	— прибалтийско-финские языки
русск.	— русский язык
саам.	— саамский язык
фин.	— финский (суоми) язык
швед.	— шведский диалект саамского языка

Языковые контакты в циркумполярном регионе

Под редакцией В. Ю. Гусева, О. А. Казакевич, А. А. Кибрика, О. В. Ханиной