

One assumed explanation for the use of different code-switching strategies can be found in the history of the two contact situations. While Russian–Surgut Khanty bilingualism started in the middle of the 20th century, Erzyas were reported to be bilingual already in the 19th century. This prolonged contact resulted in convergence between Russian and Erzya, making congruent lexicalization possible, even though the two languages are typologically different. These results are also in accordance with Auer’s (1999) continuum model describing different phases of language contact. While the first phase (code-switching) shows characteristics found both in Surgut Khanty and in the speech of Erzyas with more conscious language use and puristic ideas, typical patterns of phase two (language mixing) involving frequent switching and congruent lexicalization are attested only in Erzya.

References

- Auer, Peter. 1999. From codeswitching via language mixing to fused lects. Toward a dynamic typology of bilingual speech. *The International Journal of Bilingualism* 3(4): 309–332.
- Muysken, Pieter. 2000. *Bilingual Speech: A Typology of Code-mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 2006. *Multiple voices: An Introduction to Bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Izhma Komi in Western Siberia: At the crossroads of language contact²²

Egor Kashkin and Nikita Muraviev

(V. V. Vinogradov Russian Language Institute of RAS; Lomonosov Moscow State University)

Our talk deals with the sociolinguistic and structural aspects of contact-induced change in Izhma Komi in Western Siberia (Yamalo-Nenets district, partially Khanty-Mansi district). The beginning of their migration from the European part is usually dated to the early XIX century [Zherebtsov 1982; Povod 2006]. Whereas Komi in general has been involved in a centuries-long interaction with Russian, the Siberian Komi population has also fallen under the influence of the indigenous languages, namely Nenets and Khanty. That is why the contact situation between Russian and Siberian Komi cannot be adequately assessed without considering the role of Nenets and Khanty. There is some recent research on language contacts in Siberia, e.g. [Grenoble 2007, 2012; Siegl 2012, 2015], but Izhma Komi has remained beyond its scope so far.

Our data comes from fieldwork (2008 – present), as well as from some publications, e.g. [Sakharova, Sel’kov 1976; Subbota 2008], and archive materials (field data gathered in 1950-s by Komi dialectologists, some of the TV and radio recordings made in the last two decades by “Yamal-Region” broadcast company in Salekhard).

²² The research has been supported by Russian Foundation for the Humanities, grant № 14-04-00476.

The degree of contact-induced change varies within the region. The impact of Russian is comparable all around the area, but is less in those places where reindeer herding is in a more stable condition. The most substantial influence of the indigenous languages is being observed in the North-East (Samburg village with Nenets and Komi population), which is favoured by a lesser percentage of Komi, the maintenance of intermarriages and of mixed reindeer-herding communities.

The contact situation with Russian involves vast lexical borrowing (including words of closed classes, e.g. conjunctions *il'i* 'or', *što* 'that', *štoby* 'in order to', *potomu što* 'because'), lexical and grammatical calques, phonetic changes (e.g. final devoicing). The influence of the indigenous languages is less prominent and has been claimed as restricted to lexical borrowing (especially that of reindeer herding terms, see e.g. [Sakharova, Sel'kov 1976]). However, sometimes it is approaching the case of Russian (especially in Samburg). It includes calquing complicated polysemy patterns (e.g. the use of *pukoony* 'to sit' for cups, plates, benches copying the polysemy of Nenets *ngamtyosy*^o), copying some word-building patterns (e.g. the caritive Komi form *bážtem*, lit. 'tail-CAR', for a hare apart from the original noun *káč*', cf. Nenets *təwasyi* with the same meaning and caritive morphological structure), and phonotactic changes (insertion of consonants to avoid vowel sequences in Samburg Komi, which has not been observed in other local idioms of Izhma Komi, e.g. *vovis* 'he came' instead of *vois*, *lyjajen* 'with sand' instead of *lyaen*).

Sometimes Russian and Nenets borrowings even interact in Izhma Komi. Thus, a Russian loanword *star'ik* 'an elderly person' is extended to the meaning 'husband' (irrespective of an age) in the Northern local idioms, which is typical of Nenets and some other Siberian languages. A verb *karol'itny* (borrowed from Russian *karaul'it* 'to guard') means 'to herd reindeers' in Komi, but in Samburg it can also mean 'to keep' (e.g. 'to keep needles in a small bag'), similarly to Nenets *let^ompøsy^o* which combines both meanings.

References

- Grenoble, Lenore. 2007. Perekl'uchenie kodov i izmenenija v jazykovej strukture [Code-switching and changes in linguistic structure]. In N. Vakhtin (ed.) *Jazykovye izmenenija v uslovijah jazykovogo sdviga* [Language changes under conditions of language shift]. St. Petersburg: Nestor, 116–138.
- Grenoble, Lenore. 2012. Areal typology and syntactic change. *TSPU Bulletin* 1 (116): 101–105.
- Povod, Nina A. 2006. *Komi Severnogo Zaural'ja (XIX – pervaja chetvert' XX v.)* [Komi of the Northwest Siberia (XIX – 1st quarter of XX century)]. Novosibirsk: Nauka.
- Sakharova, Marfa A., Sel'kov, Nikolaj N. 1976. *Izhemskij dialekt Komi jazyka* [Izhma dialect of Komi]. Syktyvkar: Komi knizhnoe izdatel'stvo.
- Siegl, Florian. 2012. More on possible Forest Enets – Ket contacts. *Journal of Estonian and Finno-Ugric Linguistics* 3-1: 327–341.
- Siegl, Florian. 2015. Three Nganasan-Evenki/Dolgan Morphosyntactic Parallels and Their Implications. *Linguistica Uralica* 51-4: 258–277.
- Subbota, Klavdija A. 2008. *Glagol v izhemsdom dialekte Komi jazyka: grammaticheskie kategorii i slovoobrazovanie (na materiale Kazym'skogo govora)* [Verb in Izhma Komi: grammatical categories and word formation (local idiom of Kazym)]. Candidate dissertation in philology. Syktyvkar: Syktyvkar State University.

Zherebtsov, Ljubomir N. 1982. *Istoriko-kul'turnye vzaimootnoshenija komi s sosednimi narodami* [Historical and cultural relationship of Komi with their neighbours]. Moscow: Nauka.

Selkup-Russian contacts and their sociolinguistic and linguistic consequences

Olga Kazakevich
(Lomonosov Moscow State University)*

Selkup-Russian contacts began well over four centuries ago, competence in Russian was rather common among the Southern Selkups (the Middle Ob basin) by the beginning of the 20th century, but it is only since the 1920s that it started spreading in the Northern Selkup communities intensely enough to make the majority of the Northern Selkups bilingual by the 1960s (Prokofieva 1966) and monolingual with Russian as their only language by the end of the second millennium (Kazakevich 2003). In the paper I'll focus on the Northern Selkup dialects still spoken by some 600 people in 14 communities. Today in all these communities the main means of communication both at home and in the community life, the *dominant language* (Sasse 1992) is Russian, so the process of language shift is developing in all the communities, but the level of its progress vastly varies from the communities where the language is still transmitted from parents to children in some families to those with just a handful of elderly Selkup speakers. Meanwhile all the local varieties of Northern Selkup undergo structural changes, and the objective of the paper is to consider some of these changes in the context of the linguistic situation in each community. The question is whether the progress of the changes correlates with the progress of language shift in a particular community.

Structural changes in two grammar categories were considered in details: the Number and the Conjugation Type. This was primarily a corpus study (Corpus 2008). As a starting point for the comparison, beside the existing Selkup grammar descriptions (Prokofiev 1935; Kuznetsova et al 1980; 2002), three text corpora recorded in the 1920s, 1940s and 1970s (about 60000 running words) were used. The corpus of contemporary Selkup (over 65000 running words) was formed with the texts recorded in the course of my fieldwork in Selkup communities in 1996-2015. Additional data was collected through elicitation using grammar questionnaires. The current data of each local dialect were compared with the earlier data of the same dialect, which allowed to receive a picture of local variation of linguistic changes.

The restructuring of the Number category can be traced in the majority of the Selkup local dialects, but the dialects demonstrate various points of the development of the process: the loss of the Dual has been fully completed in the Turukhan dialects, whereas it has just started in the dialects of the Upper and Lower Tolka; the situation in the Taz dialects is somewhere in between: the younger generation of the Taz Selkup communities stopped using Dual forms of the verbs, but the Dual forms of the nouns and pronouns are still preserved in their speech.