FINITE STRUCTURES IN FOREST ENETS SUBORDINATION
A CASE STUDY OF LANGUAGE CHANGE UNDER STRONG
RUSSIAN INFLUENCE[1]

OLESYA KHANINA
Max Plank Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig
ANDREY SHLUINSKY
Institute for Linguistics RAS, Moscow

1. *Introduction*

Enets is a moribund Northern Samoyedic language traditionally spoken on the right bank of the Lower Yenisei River (Taimyr Peninsula, Western Siberia). Now the use of Enets is basically restricted to two villages of the area, Potapovo in the south (Forest dialect) and Vorontsovo in the north (Tundra dialect). Enets is no longer used on an everyday basis, however, about 30–50 people, all over 45 and all native or near-native speakers of Russian, retain substantial production competence and rather full comprehension competence. Yet, field reports (cf., e.g., Helimski, Ms) show that the Enets spoken by these present-day speakers is structurally different in some respects from the language of their parents and grandparents reported in earlier sources, such as Castrén (1854), Prokofjev (1937), Tereschenko (1966, 1977, 1993), Sorokina (1975, 1981, 1985), Cheremisina et al. (1986), Sorokina & Bolina (2005), Urman-chieva (2006).

Enets subordination by means of non-finite forms was analyzed by Irina Sorokina in Cheremisina et al. (1986) and Sorokina (1981, 1985), with detailed attention both to forms used and their functions. Non-finite forms are understood in this paper as verbal forms that can never be a head of an independent clause. While these forms are indeed the most typical way to express a subordinated state of affairs in Uralic and in other languages of the region (Cheremisina et al. 1984, 1986; cf. also Anderson 2004), finite structures may also be used for this purpose, especially with verbs of speech

production. Finite structures are understood here as clauses governed by verbal forms that can be used as a head of an independent clause. The following examples illustrate both non-finite (1–2) and finite structures (3–4) of Enets used to express a semantically subordinate state of affairs.

(1) *b'i-ð*   *bar-xon*   *d'ir'i-**da**-xu-da*
     [water-GEN   bank-LOC   live-**PART**-DAT-3SG.OBL.SG]_{non-finite clause}
     bu   odu   m'e.
     s/he   boat   make.S:3SG
     "While he lived on the river bank (= to his living on the river bank),
     he made a boat". (Sorokina 1981: 143)

(2) *sojzan   mosra-**ba**-d*   *ek'i   d'er'i noda-ba*
     [well   work-**NMLZ**-2SG.OBL.SG]_{non-finite clause} this   day   hear-S:1PL
     "Today we have learnt that you worked well (= your working well)".
     (Cheremisina et. al. 1986: 127-128)

(3) *mora-**b'i-za***   *kora*
     [kill-**NARR-SO:3SGs.SGo**]_{finite clause} male.reindeer
     kas-ta-go   *osa-xu-da.*
     get.dry-CAUS-DUR.S:3SG   meat-DAT.SG-3SG.OBL.SG
     "He dries the killed (= that he killed) male reindeer for the meat"
     (Sorokina & Bolina 2005: 51)

(4) *myt'   e-b'*   *š'i*   *e-**n'i-š'***
     I   [mother-1SG   I.ACC   not.IRR-**SUBJ-PST**
     mydy-s   *takr'i-q.*
     see-CONN]_{finite clause} hide-R:1SG
     "I have hidden so my mother would not see me". (field notes, elicitation)

We are unaware of any studies of finite structures like those used in (3) and (4) for Enets. One of the reasons for possible absence of such studies is the former marginality of this morphosyntactic pattern, which became widespread only in last decades due to the mass Russian-Enets bilingualism of the Enets, and in particular, due to the ongoing language shift to Russian. Another possible reason for the lack of attention to this topic is the problematic theoretical status of the interclausal relations in cases like (3) and (4). Indeed, some factors, like linear order, point to the dependent syntactic status of the clauses like *morab'iza* "he killed" in (3) and *eb' S'i en'iS' mydys* "let my mother not see me" in (4), while other factors, like lack of any markers of the supposed clausal dependence, point to their independent syntactic status. If the latter factors are to be taken as decisive, one should speak rather of discourse-

level strategies of marking the interclausal relations, than of any morphosyntactic subordination; cf. Cristofaro (2003) for a consistent treatment of syntactic subordination vs. semantically subordinated state of affairs. And there is nothing unexpected that discourse-level phenomena are less studied than morphosyntactic phenomena.

In this paper we will give an overview of all Forest Enets *finite structures* that may be used to encode *semantic* relations of complementation, adverbial and adnominal modification. Without aiming to provide a final answer, we will comment, for each case, on the morphosyntactic arguments for analyzing these structures as morphosyntactically dependent or independent clauses. Particular emphasis will be placed on comparison of the finite structures and their uses for semantic subordination in Enets as it is spoken today with structures used for the same purpose by Enets spoken in 1970–1990. For more on 'Modern Enets', cf. ex. (4); on 'Pre-Modern Enets', cf. ex. (1–3). Possible reasons for each case of the micro language change will be discussed.

Modern Enets data represent spontaneous Forest Enets narratives collected in 2005, a total of 523 sentences, and a set of ca. 300 elicited sentences. Both narratives and elicited data were collected during our short-term field trip to Potapovo in September 2005[2]. Pre-Modern data consist of ca. 3850 sentences from the text collection Sorokina & Bolina (2005). In both cases we limit ourselves to the Forest dialect of Enets, as our field data comes from this variety only, as well as most texts in Sorokina & Bolina (2005). The orthography was neither unified in Sorokina & Bolina (2005), nor was it in our field data: each word tends to be spelled as it was pronounced by an individual speaker; further study is necessary in order to work out a phonological transcription from which all possible individual pronunciations of Modern Enets could be derived. Pre-Modern Enets data was published in Cyrillic which we have transliterated for the purpose of this paper.

The rest of the paper will be organized as follows. Section 2 will discuss finite structures headed by a verb in indicative mood: its subsections will discuss unmarked structures (§2.1), as in (§3) above, structures marked by a conjunction (§2.2), and structures marked by a demonstrative (§2.3). Section 3 will discuss finite structures headed by a verb in subjunctive mood, as in ex. (4) above. Section 4 will draw some conclusions.

---

2.   *Finite structures with a verb in indicative mood*

A finite structure with a verb in indicative mood appeared in (3). The main criterion to identify this structure is the ability of its verb to be used as a head of an independent declarative clause. For example, *morab'iza* in (3) can be a head of an independent declarative sentence, meaning thus "He killed".

2.1 *Unmarked finite structures with a verb in indicative mood*

These structures do not have any further marker that could eventually point to their function as a semantically subordinated clause. In other words, not only can their verb be used as a head of an independent clause, the whole structure can function as an independent sentence. This was actually the case of *morab'iza* "He killed" in (3).

The functional load these structures may take is adnominal modification, as in Pre-Modern (3) and Modern (5), and complementation, as in Pre-Modern (6) and Modern (7).

(5) Modern Enets

   kaθa n'e-n'   *n'e-xun*   *dud'inka-xað*

   man   child-1SG.GEN.SG   child-LOC.SG   [Dudinka-ABL.SG

   *to-ða-**ða-š***   *ad'i-ð.*

   come-CAUS-**SO:3SGs.SGo-PST**]   sit-S:1SG

   "I am staying with my grandson (=my son's child) that (my son) brought from Dudinka" (field notes, elicitation)

(6) Pre-Modern Enets

   obu   *d'od'i-gon*   *onej*   *ne-r*   *modea-za:*

   what   time-LOC   Enets woman-DEF   see-SO:3SGs.SGo

   ***d'aza**,*   *čej*   *d'azulaa*   *m'eon*   *tar'i*   ***d'aza**.*

   [go.**S:3SG**   yesterday way   along   just   go.**S:3SG**]

   "Some time later, the Enets woman sees her going along the road she took yesterday". (Sorokina & Bolina 2005: 97)

(7) Modern Enets

   mana   *man':*   *aba*   *aj,*   *obuš*   *č'i*   ***n'i***

   say.S:3SG PTCL.DICT [sister INTERJ why   this not.REAL.**S:3SG**

   neri-r**,*   *čaj*   ***n'i   ***bat-or**?*

   get.up-FREQ.CONN tea   not.REAL.**S:3SG** pour-FREQ.CONN]

   "He said: Sister, why doesn't she get up (and) pour me some tea?" (field notes, spontaneous narrative)

In all these sentences the structure in question can function as an independent clause: *dud'inkaxað toðaðaš* from (5) would mean then "S/he

brought him/her from Dudinka"; *d'aza, čej d'azulaa m'eon tar'i d'aza* from (6) would mean "(S/he) goes, (s/he) goes along road she took yesterday (literally, along the yesterday way)"; *aba aj, obuš č'i n'i nerir, čaj n'i bator?* from (7) would mean "Sister, why doesn't she get up (and) pour me some tea?"

2.1.1 *Adnominal modification*. In this function, the unmarked indicative finite structures are attested both in Pre-Modern and Modern Enets. However, the *use* of these structures for adnominal modification seems to have increased from Pre-Modern to Modern Enets. Very few clear cases of the phenomena were attested in Pre-Modern Enets, while in Modern elicited data we have significantly more examples of these structures. However, this difference may actually derive from the difference in data type – elicited vs. natural – and not from the real structural change from Pre-Modern to Modern Enets.

From a morphosyntactic point of view, the unmarked finite indicative structures in adjectival function are rather to be analyzed as subordinate clauses per se. The syntactic dependence of these structures on the head noun phrase is evidenced by their linear order: they can easily be embedded into the main clause, as in (5).

2.1.2 *Complementation*. In complement function, unmarked finite indicative structures are regularly attested both in Pre-Modern and Modern Enets. The complement-taking verbs they usually go with are verbs of emotion, perception, cognition and speech production. Only some of these verbs are occasionally attested with complements encoded by other complementation strategies as well, while all other verbs always encode their propositional arguments with unmarked finite indicative structures.

The fact that these structures were extensively used for semantic complementation already in Pre-Modern Enets puts a question whether this was an original situation in Enets or whether the influence of Russian syntax, where finite complement clauses predominate, was that strong already in the 1970s to 1990s. One must study Enets texts of earlier periods – i.e., not later than the 1950s, when the state Russification program started[3] – to answer this question.

Judging from their semantics, sentences of the kind illustrated in (6–7) have a verb with a propositional valency, and one would expect a clause to fill this valence being thus semantically subordinate. However, from a morphosyntactic point of view, there is actually no strong evidence for the subordinate syntactic status of the structures in question in (6–7). The

---

[3] See Vakhtin (2001), Alpatov (1997), and also Grenoble (2004) for details regarding USSR language policy in the region.

embedding of the finite indicative structures into the clause with the complement-taking verb seems problematic. It was not attested in texts, and in elicitation it was strictly rejected in most cases, while it could also be occasionally allowed by some speakers.

It would be useful, thus, to check in future the unmarked finite indicative structures against some further syntactic tests for subordination (see, e.g., Haspelmath 1995, Culicover & Jackendoff 1997). This could be impeded by the moribund status of the language, as most speakers seem to allow unrealistically much if asked about grammaticality during elicitation sessions.

2.2 *Finite structures with a verb in indicative mood marked by a conjunction*

Another type of finite indicative structures are structures whose syntactically subordinate status is clearly marked by a conjunction. However, if the conjunction is eliminated, they can also function as independent clauses, similarly to unmarked finite indicative structures. These structures were attested in complement (8) and adverbial functions (9-10).

(8) Modern Enets
mut'   *b'ije-ep*   ***kun'*** *eθe-j*
I   remember-SO:1SGs.SGo   [**how** father-1SG.NOM.SG
te   *poðuro-**go-š***.
reindeer   harness-DUR.**S:3SG-PST**]
"I remember my father harnessing the reindeer". (field notes, elicitation)

(9) Pre-Modern Enets
toz *to-**jz***   *an'*   *kasa-da*   *k'ee-ed*
[**as**   come-**R:3SG**   EMPH   brother-3SG.GEN.SG   side-DAT.SG]
kasa-da   *ner-ta-gu-š'*   *pɛa-za.*
brother-3SG.ACC.SG   stand-CAUS-DUR-INF   begin-SO:3SGs.SGo
"As soon as he reached his brother's side, he began to stand his brother up" (Sorokina & Bolina 2005:191)

(10) Modern Enets
toðči k *ol'ga-eθ*   *kuji*   *to-**b'i***...   *mana [...]*
[**as** Olga-FATHER dead   come-**NARR.S:3SG**]   say.S:3SG
"As soon as Olga's late father came, he said […]"
(field notes, spontaneous narrative)

Complement clauses encoded with the help of these structures were occasionally attested both in Pre-Modern and Modern Enets by verbs of cognition and emotions; the conjunction used the most often here was *kun'* "how".

As for adverbial relations, indicative finite structures with conjunctions were occasionally attested both in Pre-Modern and Modern Enets for two semantic types of relations: temporal relation (9–11) and locative relation (12–13). In Pre-Modern Enets we also encountered some cases of concessive relations (14)[4].

2.2.1 *Temporal relations.* In the case of temporal relations the finite indicative structure goes immediately before the semantically main clause. Most often the conjunction *toð* "as" is used, thus encoding immediate anteriority, as in (9); in Modern Enets it is usually attested in the form of *toðčik*[5], as in ex. (10).

In Pre-Modern data there were also attested three examples of the structures with the conjunction *kuna* "when". In this case a clause with *kuna* can be embedded into the semantically main clause, pronouncing thus an additional argument for the syntactically subordinate status of these structures.

(11) Pre-Modern Enets
 Nobgutun *k'iuz-noju* **kuna** *kaja-ku-za*
 once   morning-ADV [**when** sun-DIMIN-3SG.NOM.SG/PL
 soje *oz'i-go-š'*,   *bu nod-b'i*   *bunyk mozu […]*
 recently appear-DUR.**S:3SG-PST**] s/he hear-NARR.S:3SG dog barking
 "One morning when the sun was just rising he heard a dog barking […]"
 (Sorokina & Bolina 2005: 212)

2.2.2 *Locative relations.* Somewhat less often the finite indicative structures with conjunctions are used to encode locative relations. In this case the structure in question may go before, as in Pre-Modern (12), or after the semantically main clause, as in Modern (13). Structures with the conjunction *ku* "(to) where" encode direction, as in (12) while structures with the conjunction *kunyn/kunny* "where" encode location per se, as in (13).

(12) Pre-Modern Enets
 ku *d'azu-ma-d koma-z,* *tony d'aza-z.*
 [**where** go-NMLZ-DAT want-**S:1SG**] there go-S:1SG
 "I go where I want (to go)" (Sorokina & Bolina 2005: 140)

---

[4] In Pre-Modern Enets there were also attested isolated uses of finite indicative structures with conjunctions for other adverbial relations; we do not discuss them here because of the paucity of the data.
[5] Apparently from the collocation *toð čikoð* "and", see Sorokina & Bolina (2001: 140).

(13) Modern Enets
      myt' tony kan'i-ð   ***kunny** kaθa n'e-j*   ***d'ir'i.***
      I   there leave-S:1SG [**where** man   child-1SG.NOM.SG live.**S:3SG**]
      "I went (there), where my son lives" (field notes, elicitation)

2.2.3 *Concessive relations.* Data from Pre-Modern Enets also contain a few
examples of finite indicative structures with the conjunction *kun'r'i* "however"
encoding concession; in all these examples the semantically dependent clause
goes before the semantically main clause.

(14) ***kun'r'i***   *jet*   *pon'i-**b'i-za**,*   *boa   e-b'i.*
      [**however**   PTCL   do-**NARR-SO:3SGs.SGo**]   bad   be-NARR.S:3SG
      "However he did it, this was bad". (Sorokina & Bolina 2005:281)

    There are no Modern Enets examples of these structures rendering con-
cessive relations, but this may well be connected with a limited nature of our
Modern data. We would not expect this structure to disappear in Modern Enets.
Apart from this doubtful difference, there are no structural changes from Pre-
Modern to Modern Enets in the use of finite indicative structures with
conjunctions.

2.3 *Finite structures with a verb in the indicative mood, marked by a*
    demonstrative
    These structures are used only as adnominal modifiers. Demonstratives
function as relative pronouns, the rest of the structure being the same as in an
independent indicative clause. As in the case of finite indicative structures
marked by a conjunction, the syntactically subordinate status of finite
indicative structures with a demonstrative is clear, as the demonstrative
represents by itself a marker of syntactic subordination.

(15) Modern Enets
      en'či,   ***čiki***   *br'igada-xan*   ***moθara**,*   *texe   d'aða.*
      person [**this.NOM** brigade-LOC.SG   work.**S:3SG**]   there   go.S:3SG
      "There goes a man that works in a herder-brigade".
      (field notes, elicitation)

    This strategy of relative clause formation has no restrictions on the
syntactic position of the relativized noun phrase: even an adjunct can be
relativized this way, see (16).

(16) Modern Enets
    ugulu-xon   *bočka-j*   ***či-kun***   *b'i*   *noob'ira-ð*   \`*mokači.*
    corner-LOC.SG butt-1SG.NOM.SG [**this-LOC** water keep-**S:1SG**] stand.S:3SG
    "In the corner there's a cask where I keep water". (field notes, elicitation)

A relative clause encoded by a finite indicative structure with a demonstrative usually follows its head noun and may, thus, be embedded into the main clause, as was the case both in (15) and (16).

This strategy of relative clause formation was not attested in Pre-Modern Enets, and in our Modern Enets data it came up in elicitation only. Therefore, this strategy may be seen as a direct outcome of Russian interference, as in Russian relative clauses are mostly finite clauses containing a relative pronoun[6].

3. *Finite structures with a verb in subjunctive mood*

A finite structure with a verb in subjunctive mood was illustrated in ex. (4) above. The main criterion to identify this structure is its ability to function as an independent non-declarative clause. For example, *eb' š'i en'iš' mydys* in (4) can be a head of an independent optative sentence, meaning thus "Let my mother not see me!". Thus, the only difference between indicative finite structures, discussed in the previous section, and subjunctive finite structures, discussed here, is the mood of the verb: zero-marked indicative with proper declarative semantics vs. *n'i-..-š'*-marked subjunctive with proper optative semantics.[7] Besides, all finite subjunctive structures do not manifest any other marker of dependency, i.e., no conjunction or demonstrative can go with them.

These structures were attested in our data only as different-subject adverbial modifiers of goal, as in (4), and as different-subject arguments of the verb *koma* "want", as in (17).

(17) Modern Enets
    bu   *koma*   *onej*   *baða*   *toxola-**n'i-r'i-č***.
    s/he   want.S:3SG   [Enets language learn-**SUBJ**-**SO:2DUs.SGo-PST**]
    "He wants you two to learn Enets". (field data, elicitation)

Functioning as an adverbial modifier, such a structure can be embedded into a semantically main clause, as in (4). Therefore, at least when used in this function, it is also a case of syntactic subordination. Unfortunately, the data on

---

[6] Note that it is, however, quite surprising to see demonstrative pronouns, and not interrogative pronouns used in Enets finite relative clause formation: in modern Russian, relative pronouns are the same as interrogative pronouns, and different from demonstrative pronouns.

[7] See Tereschenko (1966: 452) and Sorokina (1975, 1987) for more details on subjunctive ('konjunktiv') mood semantics in independent sentences.

different-subject wanting is insufficient to make any claims about the syntactic status of the finite subjunctive structures in this case.

Interestingly, these structures were attested only in Modern Enets and only in elicitation, while in Pre-Modern data different-subject goal relations were expressed by a postpositional strategy, as in (18), and different-subject wanting was surprisingly not attested at all in the whole corpus of about 3850 sentences in Sorokina & Bolina (2005).

(18) Pre-Modern Enets
      bus'i   pez'i-za   kamaza...   bazutu-da
      old_man   wood-3SG.ACC.PL   prepare.S:3SG [fire-3SG.NOM.SG
      *sojzaan lojdu-**ma   d'eon**.*
      well   burn-**NMLZ   for**]
      "The old man prepared some firewood, in order for his fire to burn well".
      (Sorokina & Bolina 2005: 64)

This mismatch between Pre-Modern and Modern structures might again be explained by the interference from Russian. The contexts of use of the subjunctive finite structures in Modern Enets are exactly the same contexts where the Russian subjunctive mood (conjunction *čtoby* + past tense) is used. Besides, in its independent uses, the Russian subjunctive mood also conveys optative-like non-declarative situations.

4. *Conclusion*

In this paper we have analyzed the possible *forms of finite structures* used in Forest Enets to encode semantic relations of complementation, adverbial modification and adnominal modification, and the particular *functional slots* these forms occupy in these semantic domains.

Unmarked indicative structures are used for expression of adnominal modification and for expression of semantic arguments of verbs of emotion, perception, cognition and speech production. Indicative structures with conjunctions are used for expression of adverbial modification by location in time or in space, and for expression of semantic arguments of verbs of cognition and emotions. Indicative structures with demonstratives are used occasionally in Modern Enets for expression of adnominal modification. Finally, subjunctive structures were shown to be used in Modern Enets for expression of adverbial modification by different-subject goal, and for expression of different-subject arguments of the verb *koma* "want".

In most cases the structures described above were attested both in Pre-Modern and Modern Enets, however the increase in frequency of their usage is evident; in some cases, though, new structures arose really recently. The main

responsibility for this ever-growing usage of finite structures in the encoding of subordinate state of affairs is to be found in interference from Russian morphosyntax. Today many Enets speakers are more proficient in Russian than in Enets, and the others have fairly equal competence in both languages.

Therefore, one could claim that the system of subordination in Enets is undergoing a process of rather fast restructuring where a number of crucial roles are transferred from the non-finite structures to the finite ones. The intermediate syntactic status of many finite structures – manifesting either no syntactic dependence, or weak evidence for syntactic dependence – seems to support this thesis. Indeed, a young means of expressing a certain semantic function is generally not expected to possess a clear syntactic profile differentiating it from other means that could equally be used in this function. However, the frequent association of a language structure with a particular function often leads to its grammaticalization, i.e., to its adherence to specific syntactic restrictions, properties, etc. On the latter process, for example, cf. Bybee (1998), Bybee & Hopper (2001) and Haspelmath (to appear). Therefore, it could be suggested that if Enets survives as a living language, some time later the structures analyzed in this paper may well develop a particular syntactic profile of syntactically subordinate structures (e.g., they could start using an obligatory subordinating conjunction, thus following the Russian pattern of finite subordinate clause formation).

Abbreviations

1, 2, 3 – 1, 2, 3 person, ABL – ablative, ACC – accusative, ADV – adver-bial marker, CAUS – causative, SUBJ – subjunctive, CONN – connegative (verb form used with negation marker), DAT – dative, DEF – definite, DIMIN – diminutive, DU – dual, DUs – dual subject in subject-object conjugation type, DUR – durative, EMPH – emphatic, FATHER – suffix marking someone's father (used with proper names), FREQ – frequentative, GEN – genitive, INF – infinitive, INTERJ – interjection, IRR – irrealis, LOC – locative, NARR – narrative, NMLZ – nominalization, NOM – nominative, OBL – oblique case, PART – participle, PL – plural, PST – past, PTCL – particle, PTCL_DICT – speech particle, R – reflexive conjugation type, REAL – realis, S – subject conjugation type, SG – singular, SGo – singular object in subject-object conjugation type, SGs – singular subject in subject-object conjugation type, SO – subject-object conjugation type.

REFERENCES

Alpatov, Vladimir A. 1997. *150 jazykov i politika: 1917–1997 [150 languages and politics: 1917–1997]*. Moscow: Institut Vostokovedenija RAN.

Anderson, Gregory D. S. 2004. "The Languages of Central Siberia: Introduction and overview". *Languages and Prehistory of Central Siberia* ed. by Edward J. Vajda, 1-119. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Bybee, Joan. 1998. "A functionalist approach to grammar and its evolution". *Evolution of Communication* 2.249-278.

Bybee, Joan & Paul Hopper, eds. 2001. *Frequency and the Emergence of Linguistic Structure.* Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Castrén, Matthias A. 1854. *Grammatik der samojedischen Sprachen*. St. Petersburg: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Cheremisina, Maya I. et al. 1984. *Predikativnoe sklonenie prichastij v altajskikh jazykakh [Predicative declension of participles in Altaic languages].* Novosibirsk: Izd. "Nauka.

Cheremisina, Maya I. et al. 1986. *Strukturnye tipy sinteticheskikh polipredikativnykh konstruktsij v jazykakh raznykh sistem [Structural types of synthetic polypredicative constructions in languages of different typologies].* Novosibirsk: Izd. "Nauka".

Cristofaro, Sonia. 2003. *Subordination.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Culicover, Peter W. & Ray Jackendoff. 1997. "Semantic subordination despite syntactic coordination". *Linguistic inquiry* 28:2.195-218.

Grenoble, Lenore A. 2003. *Language Policy in the Soviet Union.* Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Haspelmath, Martin. 1995. "The Converb as a Cross-Linguistically Valid Category". *Converbs in Cross-Linguistic Perspective* ed. by Martin Haspelmath & Ekkehard König, 1-55. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Haspelmath, Martin. To appear. "Creating Economical Morphosyntactic Patterns in Language Change". *Language Universals and Language Change* ed. by Jeff Good. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Helimski, Eugen. Ms. *Fonetika i morfonologija ènetskogo jazyka v uslovijakh jazykovogo sdviga [Enets phonetics and morphophonology under language shift].* Unpublished manuscript.

Prokofjev, Georgij N. 1937. "Ènetskij (enisejsko-samojedskij dialekt) [Enets (Yenisei-Samoyedic dialect)]". *Jazyki i pis'mennost' narodov Severa [Languages and writing systems of the peoples of the North]* ed. by G. N. Prokofjev, 75-90. Moscow & Leningrad: Uchpedgiz.

Sorokina, Irina P. 1975. *Morfologija glagola ènetskogo jazyka [Verbal morphology in Enets].* Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. Leningrad.

Sorokina, Irina P. 1981. "Zavisimye predikaty s padezhnymi formantami v ènetskom jazyke [Dependent predicates with case affixes in Enets]". *Padezhi i ikh èkvivalenty v stroe slozhnogo predlozhenija v jazykakh narodov* Sibiri *[Cases and their equivalents in the structure of complex sentence in the*

languages of the peoples of Siberia] ed. by Maya I. Cheremisina et al. 138-148. Novosibirsk: IIFF SO AN SSSR.

Sorokina, Irina P. 1985. "Polipredikativnye konstruktsii s poslelogami v ènetskom jazyke [Polypredicative constructions with postpositions in Enets]". *Polipredikativnye konstruktsii v jazykakh raznykh sistem [Poly-predicative constructions in the languages of different typologies]* ed. by Maya I. Cheremisina et al. 139-148. Novosibirsk: IIFF SO AN SSSR.

Sorokina, Irina P. 1987. "Kategorija vremeni-naklonenija v ènetskom jazyke". [Tense and mood in Enets]. *Problemy fonetiki i morfologii jazykov narodov Severa [Problems of phonetics and morphology in the languages of the peoples of the North]* ed. Ju. A. Sem, 58-68. Leningrad: Leningradskij Gos. Pedinstitut im. Gertsena.

Sorokina, Irina P. & Darja S. Bolina. 2001. *Ènetsko-russkij i russko-ènetskij slovar' [Enets-Russian and Russian-Enets dictionary].* St. Petersburg: Prosveshchenie.

Sorokina, Irina P. & Darja S. Bolina. 2005. *Ènetskie teksty [Enets texts].* St. Petersburg: Izd. "Nauka".

Tereschenko, Natalja M. 1966. "Ènetskij jazyk [Enets]". *Jazyki narodov SSSR [Languages of the peoples of the USSR],* vol. 3. *Finno-ugorskie i samodijskie jazyki [Finno-ugric and Samoyedic languages]* ed. by Vasilij I. Lytkin & Klara E. Majtinskaja. 438–457. Moscow: Izd. "Nauka".

Tereschenko, Natalja M. 1977. *Sintaksis samodijskikh jazykov: prostoe pred-lozhenie [The syntax of Samoyedic languages: simple clause].* Leningrad: Izd. "Nauka".

Tereschenko, Natalja M. 1993. "Enetskij jazyk [Enets]". *Jazyki mira: ural'skie jazyki [Languages of the world: Uralic languages]* ed. by K. E. Majtinskaja, 343-348. Moscow: Izd. "Nauka".

Urmanchieva, Anna Ju. 2006. "Vremja, vid ili modal'nost': glagol'naja sistema ènetskogo jazyka". [Tense, aspect or modality: the Enets verbal system]. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 4.88-100.

Vakhtin, Nikolaj B. 2001. *Jazyki narodov severa v XX veke: ocherki jazykovogo sdviga [Languages of the people of the North in the 20th century: essays on language shift].* St Petersburg: Bulanin.