

# Siberian Life: Language and Culture in the Great North

Book of Abstracts



Workshop, February 4<sup>th</sup> – 5<sup>th</sup> 2021

Institut für Finnougristik/Uralistik

Universität Hamburg

## Contents

Study on a poem by D.N. Kugultinov ( <i>Olga Bavaeva</i> ) .....	1
Conceptualization of Sikhirtya in Nenets culture ( <i>Nataliia Drozhashchikh, Elena Efimova, Marina Lublinskaya</i> ) .....	2
Yukaghir/Nganasan contacts: pro et contra ( <i>Valentin Gusev, Maria Pupynina</i> ) .....	3
Two nominal clause-types in Northern Mansi: an experimental study of language variation ( <i>Csilla Horváth, Nikolett Mus</i> ) .....	5
Northern Selkup folklore in space and time ( <i>Olga Kazakevich</i> ) .....	7
Spatial orientation by the Enets ( <i>Olesya Khanina</i> ) .....	8
Особенности коммуникативного поведения народов Сибири / Specific features in communicative behavior of Siberian peoples ( <i>Elizaveta G. Kotorova, Andrey Nefedov</i> ) .....	9
Introduction in folk and daily prose texts in Ket and Selkup: syntax and communicative structure ( <i>Elena Kryukova</i> ) .....	12
Interrogative pronouns in Kazym Khanty: expanding the scope of usage correspondingly to interrogatives in spoken Russian ( <i>Daria Motora</i> ) .....	13
Word order constraints in the Tundra Nenets wh-question ( <i>Nikolett Mus</i> ) .....	15
Dialectal variations of Chukotko-Kamchatkan languages in historical resources ( <i>Yukari Nagayama</i> ) .....	16
Prehistoric contacts of Eskimo–Aleut and Austronesian languages ( <i>Natalia Pimenova</i> ) .....	18
Tense in Nganasan narratives ( <i>Sándor Szeverényi</i> ) .....	21
<i>Küeldet</i> – богатырские песни селькупов/ <i>Küeldet</i> – heroic songs of the Selkup ( <i>Natalja Tuchkova</i> ) .....	23
Самоедоязычный антропонимический субстрат в историческом именнике хори-бурят/ Samoyedic anthroponymic substrate in the historical name-corpus of Khor-Buryat ( <i>Raisa Zhamsaranova</i> ) .....	25

# **Study on a poem by D.N. Kugultinov**

Olga Bavaeva (Peoples' Friendship University of Russia)

The Kalmyk language is spoken by the Kalmyk people in Kalmykia, situated in the south of the Russian Federation. The language is included in the number of “definitely endangered” languages by UNESCO. The study of Kalmyk literature is one of the ways to preserve and restore the language.

David N. Kugultinov (1922-2006) an outstanding Kalmyk poet of the 20-21 centuries, whose literary and cultural impact on the nation cannot be overestimated. His life and literary career are the reflection of the entire Kalmyk nation history and the Soviet people. Being born at the dawn of the Soviet Socialist country he was a child and a victim of the regime

The article studies the poem by this prominent Kalmyk poet. The aim of the paper is to show the beauty and variety of the Kalmyk language in general and the poetry by the writer in particular. Morphological, stylistic analyses used have revealed that the author uses traditional Kalmyk means of versification as well as those that are characteristic of Russian and European poetry. Thus, the poet employs traditional anaphoric rhyming along with the means of syllabic-accentual prosody. In the poem under consideration the author used trimetric iamb which sometimes alternates with a trochee. As for stylistic devices, the poem is rich in comparisons, metaphors, personifications along with phonetic stylistic means like onomatopoeia and repetition. Philosophical and psychological depth of the poem along with elaborate use of poetic literary means makes the harmonious unity of the poem.

# Conceptualization of Sikhirtya in Nenets culture

Nataliia Drozhashchikh (Tyumen State University)

Elena Efimova (independent researcher)

Marina Lublinskaya (Institute for Linguistic Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences Saint-Petersburg)

Is it possible to restore a particular culture based on folklore data? This report is devoted to the problem of legendary Sikhirtya people associated with the Nenets culture. The research was performed within the framework of cultural linguistics (Palmer 1996; Sharifian 2015). When Samoyeds (the Nenets) came to the Yamal coast, they encountered the culture of sea hunters who lived in dugouts in the hills. People they met were so different from the Nenets that these differences were reflected in Nenets legends. Can we really detect features that distinguish one culture from another? We show that the methods of cultural corpus analysis provide us with such possibility. In the corpus of Nenets folklore, we counted absolute/relative frequency of words and revealed the lexemes nominating basic actions, locatives, typical objects and artifacts, characteristic of Nenets folklore. Then we compiled a concordance and traced the collocations with the lexeme *sikhirtya*. Characteristic features of Sikhirtya include appearance, height, social organization, status, economy, crafts, language, beliefs, and magical actions. Sikhirtya go underground, live in underground dwellings, use mammoths and wild deer, have connections with God of the Underworld, being white-haired/white-eyed. These features distinguish Sikhirtya from the entire array of images and seem to be supported in historical sources. However, the features of white hair/white eyes are contradictory. Corpus analysis enabled us to reconstruct the fragment of the Nenets world view, in which Sikhirtya are presented as unique people, different from the Nenets, but connected with them in many cultural aspects.

## References:

Palmer G.B. (1996). *Toward a Theory of Cultural Linguistics*. Austin: University of Texas Press. 360 p.

Sharifian F. (2015). *Cultural Linguistics // The Routledge Handbook of Language and Culture*. Sharifian F. (Ed.). New York: Routledge. Pp. 473-492.

## Yukaghir/Nganasan contacts: pro et contra

Valentin Gusev (Institute of Linguistics, Moscow)

Maria Pupynina (Institute for linguistic studies, St. Petersburg/Institute of Linguistics, Moscow)

In this talk, we introduce an ongoing research on the comparison of a certain part of the cultural lexicon of Nganasan and Yukaghir. The study was inspired by an observation expressed by I. Gurvich after two continuous anthropological ('etnograficheskaya') expeditions to the Lower Kolyma area. Collecting material about a peculiar multinational Lower Kolyma community, he noted that Yukaghir culture was severely influenced by the local Even majority. However, the old people recalled that reindeer breeding was not that important before as it is now, with reindeer hunting having previously been the leading role in the economy. Gurvich also notes that the "ancient economy of Tundra Yukaghir resembles the one of Tawgi (Nganasan). The common features are not only the reindeer hunting complex, but some features of dwelling and clothes" (Gurvich 1959). Previous historical studies showed that in the 18<sup>th</sup> century Yukaghir and Nganasan camps were situated significantly closer than currently, see reconstruction map (Dolgikh 1952: 81) and comment (Dolgikh 1952: 77).

We are in the process of compiling a number of Nganasan and Tundra Yukaghir cultural lexicon comparison lists. Three lists reflect the cultural/economy domains mentioned by Gurvich: **hunting** (including fishing); **dwelling**; **clothes**. The items of the fourth list describe the **reindeer herding** as currently important economy type. The lists are compiled by manual search in the dictionaries (Kurilov 2001 and Helinski Ms.). The Yukaghir lists are complete; the pilot expert examination has not proved the existence of similar lexemes in the studied semantic groups, except for the probably common word for 'harness, reins' proposed by Piispanen 2015. If they are not found when the Nganasan lists will be completed, it will mean that this kind of linguistic examination does not prove the anthropological hypotheses of Yukaghir/Nganasan contacts, supposing that the search should be continued in other semantic/cultural domains.

We suppose that the hypothetical absence of similarities in the lists is not less informative than the presence of ones. We would have to subsequently suppose that, unexpectedly, the areal proximity and cultural similarities did not correlate to any kind of long trade, marital, or labour contacts which typically accompany lexicon exchange. An alternative explanation would be that the cultural similarities arose from an unknown substrate that was common for both Yukaghirs and Nganasans.

At the presentation, the controversial data of other disciplines such as archaeology and folklore studies would be provided, to contribute to the enigmatic Nganasan/Yukaghir contact problem.

**References:**

Dolgikh [Долгих Б. О.] 1952. Расселение народов Сибири в XVII веке. In: Советская этнография, 3, p. 76–84.

Gurvich [Гурвич И. С.]. 1959. Отчет о работе этнографического отряда юкагирской экспедиции 1959 г., p. 27–52. Архив ЯНЦ СО РАН, Фонд 5, опись 1, дело / ед. хр. 359. Yakutsk.

Helinski, Eugen. Nganasan dictionary (Ms.).

Kurilov [Курилов Г. Н.] 2001. Юкагирско-русский словарь. Novosibirsk.

Piispanen, Peter S. Extensive borrowing of reindeer terminology in north-eastern Siberia. In: Turkic languages, 19 (1/2).

## Two nominal clause-types in Northern Mansi: an experimental study of language variation

Csilla Horváth (Research Institute for Linguistics, Hungary)

Nikolett Mus (Research Institute for Linguistics, Hungary)

In this research, we investigate two clause-types with Nominal predicate (1) – (2) in Northern Mansi (Ob-Ugric, Uralic) whose distribution has either been considered alike or was ill-understood so far.

(1) *ti kol mań ol-əs.*  
this house small be-PST.3SG  
'This house was small.'  
[Construction 1]

(2) *ti kol mań-įγ ol-əs.*  
this house small-TRSL be-PST.3SG  
'This house was small.'  
[Construction 2]

For the analysis, we set up surveys by using standard techniques, such as, stimulus-driven and target-language-manipulation elicitation techniques. We applied an approach involving two stages. First, Mansi journalists (all being native speakers of Mansi, and bilingual in Mansi and Russian) working at the Mansi newspaper "Luima Seripos" filled out the first survey. Then, based on the results, we manipulated the data and got (some of) our informants to fill out the second/control survey.

This method allowed us to obtain a more complex and detailed picture of the constructions in question. Our results show that the two types exhibit differences in (i) agreement and in (ii) licensing of a copula: in Construction 1, there is obligatory agreement in number in the present tense and the copula is only used in the past (3), while the predicate Nominal takes the translative case and the agreement is marked on an obligatory copula in Construction 2 (4). At the same time, no systematic difference has been revealed between the semantics/pragmatics of the two constructions.

(3) *āmp-ət jāŋk-ət \*(ol-sət).*  
dog-PL white-PL be-PST-PST.3PL  
'The dogs were white.'

(4) *kol-įt janγ-įγ ol-sət.*  
house-PL big-TRSL be-PST.3PL  
'The houses were big.'

Finally, the results are varied across our informants: the two constructions above are examples of both inter-speaker and intra-speaker variations.



# Northern Selkup folklore in space and time

Olga Kazakevich (Institute of Linguistics RAS, Moscow)

In the paper I'll try to give an overview of the recordings of Selkup folklore done in the Northern Selkup communities (the Middle and Upper Taz and the Turukhan basins) between 1925 and 2015, whereby my main objectives will be

1) to reveal the way of existence and transmission of folklore tradition in the communities within this period basing on historical data both published (see e.g. Prokofiev 1928) and unpublished (archival documents), life-stories of the communities members and some results of a series of sociolinguistic surveys done in Northern Selkup communities during the last quarter of a century;

2) to show the distribution of folklore stories and motives over the Northern Selkup territory and to trace possible borrowings from contacting folklore traditions;

3) to analyze the use of tense, mood and evidential verb forms in folklore texts recorded in different communities and in different time periods and to see whether changes in the way of existence of folklore tradition lead to changes in the use of grammar forms.

The way of existence of the Northern Selkup folklore tradition radically changed in the 1980s when television came to far away Siberian villages and replaced fairy-tales. Folklore started moving from oral performance to books, and quite often Russian translation stands between an oral performance and a published Selkup text. It induces changes in the use of grammar forms (e.g. the past tense appears not only in dialogues, but also in the narrative, the use of evidential forms is reduced, as well as the use of all moods but the indicative and the imperative).

## References:

Prokofiev G.N. 1928. Ostiako-samoyedy Turukhanskogo kraya // Etnografiya. 1928. N 2. P. 96-103.

## Spatial orientation by the Enets

Olesya Khanina (Institute of Linguistics RAS, Moscow)

This paper analyzes clauses involving verbs of movement in a corpus of Enets (ca. 30 000 clauses / 150 000 words for Forest Enets (FE) and ca. 10 000 clauses / 50 000 words for Tundra Enets (TE)). We study the list of possible locative goals extracted from these data, as they uncover a worldview of the two Enets communities living at the banks of the Lower Yenisei river (Central Siberia). In Enets, the main spatial anchors are the Yenisei river, the village, and the foothills of the Putoran mountains. It is noteworthy that the habitats of the two Enets communities are crucially dissimilar: the FEs live at the forest line and to the south of it, and the TEs live in the treeless tundra, down by Yenisei. Given that their cultures are very close, this contrastive study illuminates the complex interplay between ecological and cultural factors. For example, cf. highly frequent FE *badu?*/*bɔdu?* and TE *kɔɔ*, referring to the space outside the modern village and away from the bank of Yenisei (translated as 'tundra' into local Russian). The literal meaning of *badu?*/*bɔdu?* is 'tree root' (in which it is also attested in TE), that of *kɔɔ* is 'hill' (in which it is also attested in FE). This example shows that the categorization of the environment is the same for the two communities, but its lexical coding diverges, reflecting the nature of this environment: the presence of trees in this spatial category for FEs and its hilly feature for TEs.

# Особенности коммуникативного поведения народов Сибири / Specific features in communicative behavior of Siberian peoples

Elizaveta G. Kotorova (University of Zielona Góra)

Andrey Nefedov (Universität Hamburg)

Besonderheiten des Kommunikationsverhaltens innerhalb einer nationalen Kultur werden zum einen durch geeignete Sprachmittel und zum anderen durch die Regeln für den Einsatz dieser Mittel bestimmt. In dem Beitrag wird bestrebt, Gemeinsamkeiten und Unterschiede in der Realisierung von Sprachhandlungsmustern durch die Sprecher der minoritären und majoritären Sprachen offenzulegen und zu beschreiben. Die Analyse wird auf dem Material der indigenen Völker des sibirischen Nordens durchgeführt, im Zentrum der Analyse steht die ketische Sprache.

Alle Sprachhandlungsmuster können ganz allgemein in drei Gruppen geteilt werden:

- 1) Etikettenhandlungen (z.B. Begrüßung, Abschied, Dankesbezeugung, Entschuldigung etc.);
- 2) Informationshandlungen (z.B. Zustimmung, Ablehnung, Versprechen, Wunsch etc.);
- 3) Aufforderungshandlungen (z.B. Bitte, Ratschlag, Warnung, Drohung etc.).

Im Laufe der Untersuchung müssen Besonderheiten in der Realisierung der Sprachhandlungsmuster jeder der genannten Gruppen in den indigenen Sprachen der Völker des sibirischen Nordens festgestellt werden. Vorläufige Beobachtungen lassen Folgendes vermuten:

- 1) Etikettenhandlungen sind in diesen Sprachen generell nicht üblich, in vielen Situationen werden Sie durch einfache Beschreibung der Sprechsituation oder durch nonverbale Handlungen ersetzt (Beispiel 1, 2).
- 2) Es werden sehr selten performative Konstruktionen gebraucht, entsprechende performative Verben werden oft aus anderen (vor allem majoritären) Sprachen entlehnt (Beispiel 3). Solche Ausdrucksformen der Sprachhandlungsmuster wie Gesprächspartikeln (z. B. *bitte*, *danke* u. ä. - vgl. Beispiel 4), sowie auch Funktionsverbgefüge, Kollokationen und idiomatische Wendungen werden auch kaum verwendet.

3) In den analysierten Sprachen spielen viele kommunikativ-pragmatische Faktoren (solche wie Alter, soziale Distanz u.a.), die in den majoritären Sprachen einen wesentlichen Einfluss auf die Realisierung der Sprachhandlungsmuster ausüben, kaum eine Rolle (Beispiel 5, 6).

**Beispiele:**

(1) Begrüßung:

*ēn<sup>i</sup> daŋtəy<sup>i</sup>n*

ēn [d<sup>8</sup>]-dəŋ<sup>6</sup>-t<sup>5</sup>-ok<sup>0</sup>-in<sup>-1</sup>

now 1S<sup>8</sup>-1PL.SS<sup>6</sup>-TH<sup>5</sup>-see<sup>0</sup>-S.PL<sup>-1</sup>

‘Jetzt sehen wir uns.’ (Now we see each other.)

(2) Dank:

*ū āt pəsəbatbəyɔl<sup>i</sup>bət, tətə ēn<sup>i</sup> āt uyas<sup>j</sup> l<sup>i</sup>ɔbet bil<sup>i</sup>betin*

ū ād [k<sup>8</sup>]-posobad<sup>7</sup>-bo<sup>6</sup>-k<sup>5</sup>-o<sup>4</sup>-l<sup>2</sup>-bed<sup>0</sup>

2SG 1SG 2S<sup>8</sup>-help.RUS<sup>7</sup>-1SG.O<sup>6</sup>-TH<sup>5</sup>-PST<sup>4</sup>-PST<sup>2</sup>-ITER<sup>0</sup>

tete ēn ād u-as lobed [d<sup>8</sup>]-b<sup>3</sup>-il<sup>2</sup>-bed<sup>0</sup>-in<sup>-1</sup>

well now 1SG 2SG-COM work.RUS 1S<sup>8</sup>-3N.O<sup>3</sup>-PST<sup>2</sup>-make<sup>0</sup>-S.PL<sup>-1</sup>

‘Du hast mir geholfen, jetzt mache ich die Arbeit mit dir.’ (You helped me, now I made the work with you.)

(3) Entschuldigung:

*āt ukuŋa sēl<sup>i</sup> tbil<sup>i</sup>bət, ū qān enkuns<sup>j</sup>ɔŋ, prəstitbəyɔl<sup>i</sup>ɛt*

ād u-kuŋa sēl d<sup>8</sup>-b<sup>3</sup>-il<sup>2</sup>-bed<sup>0</sup> ū qān en<sup>7</sup>-ku<sup>6</sup>-n<sup>2</sup>-soŋ<sup>0</sup>

1SG 2SG-2SG.DAT bad 1S<sup>8</sup>-3N.O<sup>3</sup>-PST<sup>2</sup>-make<sup>0</sup> 2SG OPT R<sup>7</sup>-2SG.S<sup>6</sup>-PST<sup>2</sup>-forget<sup>0</sup>

prostit<sup>7</sup>-bo<sup>6</sup>-k<sup>5</sup>-o<sup>4</sup>-l<sup>2</sup>-ked<sup>0</sup>

forgive.RUS<sup>7</sup>-1SG.O<sup>6</sup>-TH<sup>5</sup>-PST<sup>4</sup>-IMP<sup>2</sup>-ITER<sup>0</sup>

‘Ich habe dir Schlechtes getan, verzeih mir.’ (I did bad to you, may you forget, forgive me.)

(4) Bitte:

*qomtəŋ ār<sup>i</sup> us<sup>j</sup>taq, bil<sup>i</sup>da kəmnatij*

qomtəŋ ād us<sup>7</sup>-d<sup>1</sup>-aq<sup>0</sup> bil<sup>i</sup>da k<sup>5</sup>-o<sup>4</sup>-b<sup>3</sup>-n<sup>2</sup>-a<sup>1</sup>-tij<sup>0</sup>

money 1SG R<sup>7</sup>-1SG.O<sup>1</sup>-give<sup>0</sup> all TH<sup>5</sup>-PST<sup>4</sup>-3N.S<sup>3</sup>-PST<sup>2</sup>-TH<sup>1</sup>-end<sup>0</sup>

‘Gib mir Geld, es ist alle.’ (Give me money, all is over.)

(5) Bitte:

*balna bar<sup>a</sup> rə bise:pdaŋa: bo:ɣene batn*

balna bada da = biseb-daŋa

bok<sup>7</sup>-a<sup>4</sup>-n<sup>2</sup>-a<sup>0</sup> batn

B. 3M.say M.POSS = sibling-M.DAT

fire<sup>7</sup>-NPST<sup>4</sup>-IMP<sup>2</sup>-MOM<sup>0</sup> 1SG.for

‘Balna sagte seinem Bruder: “Mache Feuer für mich.” (Balna told to his brother: “Make a fire for me.”) (Krjukova, Glazunov 2011: 187)

(6) Bitte:

*uska dʒmaŋdein Balna ra qibatdaŋa barʼa: “bajyin qɔ:lʼqine!”*

uska	d <sup>8</sup> -o <sup>4</sup> -n <sup>2</sup> -aŋ <sup>1</sup> -den <sup>0</sup>	balna	da = qibba:d-daŋa	bada
back	3S <sup>8</sup> -PST <sup>4</sup> -PST <sup>2</sup> -3PL.SS <sup>1</sup> -go <sup>0</sup> B.	3SG.M.POSS = father.in.law -		3M.say
b = ajkin		qol <sup>7</sup> -q <sup>5</sup> -n <sup>2</sup> -a <sup>0</sup>		
1SG.POSS = wound		heal <sup>7</sup> -CAUS <sup>5</sup> -IMP <sup>2</sup> -MOM.TR <sup>0</sup>		

‘Als sie nach Hause kamen, sagte Balna seinem Schwiegervater: „Heile meine Wunde!“ (When they came home, Balna said to his father-in-law: “Heal my wound!”) (Krjukova, Glazunov 2011: 197)

### References:

Krjukova E., Glazunov P. Ket texts. In: Annotated folk and daily prose texts in the Languages of Ob-Yenisei linguistic area. Tomsk: «Veter», 2010, 185-210.

# Introduction in folk and daily prose texts in Ket and Selkup: syntax and communicative structure

Elena Kryukova (Tomsk State Pedagogical University)

First clauses in the texts are of special interest for study of sentence information structure. In folkloric and literary compositions, they are defined by a term “introduction”.<sup>1</sup>

In the Ket and Selkup languages the most significant elements, for example, participants of situation may have zero marking in the initial text position; otherwise they can be marked by possessive markers or numerals.

According to the results of random sampling from the Ket texts Corpus, the participants of situation in the focus position (in the first clause of narration) lean toward the far right or far left position and in seven cases they are marked by a zero marker, in 11 cases by possessive affixes and numerals (equally on average). Moreover, for the numerals, this can be not only a prototypic for focus marking *qoʔk* ‘one’, apart from it, in the small sampling there were numerals *in* ‘two’, *doʔŋ* ‘three’ and *qāk* ‘five’. It is noteworthy that, the participants of situation in the initial position in the introduction have zero marking, and the participants of situation in the far right position in the clause as a rule are marked with possessive markers or they appear accompanied with numerals and possessive pronoun.

Only two examples were found in the random sampling from 12 Selkup texts, where the participants of situation in the focus position were positioned closer to the far-right position in the clause. In other 10 examples, the participants of situation were in the far-left position in the clause. In three of these examples, the participants of situation were marked: in one case by a pronoun, in two other cases by possessive affixes.

It has been planned to consider syntax structure of introductions in the report, also their communicative organization based on the Ket and Selkup Corpus of folk and daily prose texts.

---

<sup>1</sup> In Russian – *зачин*, in German – *Textanfang*.

# Interrogative pronouns in Kazym Khanty: expanding the scope of usage correspondingly to interrogatives in spoken Russian

Daria Motora (Lomonosov Moscow State University)

In Kazym Khanty (Ob-Ugric < Uralic), there is one basic series of indefinite pronouns on the semantic map. It is derived mainly from interrogative pronouns, and these indefinites are used for most functions [Haspelmath 1997: 3]: specific known, specific unknown, irrealis non-specific, question, conditional. For direct negation are used negative pronouns, for free choice – basic indefinite series with prepositional *kũš* and constructions with universal quantifier *kašəŋ*. For comparative most of asked speakers use constructions with universal quantifier *kašəŋ*.

Interrogative pronouns in original Kazym Khanty are normally never used as indefinite ones – e. g. in conditional clauses, as in spoken Russian:

- (1) *Если кто будет меня искать, скажи, что я приду в субботу.*  
"If somebody would look for me, say I'll come on Saturday".
- (2) *Приходил ли кто?*  
"Did anyone come?"

In spoken Khanty there may be cases when a speaker translates such sentences literally, calquing the Russian stimulus:

- (3) *ki χɯj juχt-əλ <... >*  
if who go-NPST[3SG]  
'If anybody comes', <... >

However, speakers prohibit usage of interrogative pronouns when asked, whether it is possible to say in Khanty “*ki χɯj juχt-əλ*” in such cases. So, as far as generally there is a typological possibility of using interrogatives to represent indefiniteness [Bhat 2000], for Kazym Khanty such usage seems to be introduced from spoken Russian.

We will discuss possible reasons and conditions of this extension in Kazym Khanty and try to answer the question – are phrases like (3) caused mostly by priming effect or has implicative map for Kazym Khanty changed indeed, compared to data of [Solovar 2014].

*The work is supported by the RFBR grant No19-012-00627 "Syntax and Semantics of Uralic and Altaic languages: converging functional typological and formal perspectives".*

**References:**

Bhat 2000 – Bhat D. N. S. 2000. The indefinite-interrogative puzzle. *Linguistic Typology* 4:365-400.

Haspelmath 1997 – Haspelmath M. 1997. *Indefinite Pronouns*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Solovar 2014 — V. N. Solovar. *Khanty-Russian dictionary (Kazym dialect)*. Khanty-Mansiysk: Ob-Ugric Institute of applied research and development, 2014.



## Word order constraints in the Tundra Nenets wh-question

Nikolett Mus (Research Institute for Linguistics, Hungary)

In Tundra Nenets (Northern Samoyedic, Uralic) genuine content questions, the basic order of the constituents is usually SOV, and the wh-phrase remains in situ (1) – (2).

- (1) *Xib'a jewej-m?      ŋǎwor-ca?*  
who soup-acc eat-inter.3sg  
'Who ate the soup?'
- (2) *Igoŕ ŋǎmge-m?      ŋǎwor-ca?*  
Igor what-acc eat-inter.3sg  
'What did Igor eat?'

Other configurations are also observed without changing the meaning of the clause (3)-(4). Thus, the order of the constituents is said to be free in questions, and the only syntactic constraint is the verb-finality of the question (Nikolaeva, 2014).

- (3) *Jewej-m?      xib'a ŋǎwor-ca?*  
soup-acc who eat-inter.3sg  
'Who ate the soup?'
- (4) *ŋǎmge-m?      Igoŕ ŋǎwor-ca?*  
what-acc Igor eat-inter.3sg  
'What did Igor eat?'

However, there are examples in which the wh-phrase appears together with certain kind of expressions and the order of the constituents is not free. For instance, in (5) the focused element marked by *-fi/-lí-* 'only' suffix cannot precede the wh-phrase.

- (5) *\*Masha-fi ŋǎmge-m?      ŋǎwor-ca?*  
Masha-lim what-acc eat-inter.3sg  
intended meaning: 'What did ONLY Masha eat?'

Based on these data the following rule can be constructed: expressions that have scope cannot precede the wh-phrase in genuine content questions (\*[op...wh]). This rule leads us to the observation that the position of the wh-phrase is not free in the question.

In this talk, I will argue that data of experiments and elicitations can help us to get a fuller picture of (syntactic) constructions.

### References:

Nikolaeva, Irina 2014. *A grammar of Tundra Nenets*. De Gruyter

# Dialectal variations of Chukotko-Kamchatkan languages in historical resources

Yukari Nagayama (Kushiro Public University of Economics)

Koryak and Alutor of the Chukotko-Kamchatkan language family are endangered languages spoken in Kamchatka and Magadan regions. Scientific research on these languages had begun in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century by Russian researchers. In addition to language resources by modern researchers, there are some word lists collected by Russian explorers or other researchers in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries:

- i. Krashaninnikov (1755/1949): 70 Koryak vocabularies in four different dialects including 3 vanished dialects.
- ii. Pallas (1786/1977): 285 Koryak vocabularies in four dialects including 3 vanished dialects.
- iii. Dybowski (Radliński 1894): 2393 Koryak vocabularies (possibly in different dialects).

In this presentation I compare vocabularies of Northern Koryak dialects in above mentioned works with modern Koryak, Alutor, and Chukchi vocabularies, and show that those dialects had some intermediate features between Koryak, Alutor and Chukchi. And I also show that those works are useful for comparative research in lexicons of Chukotko-Kamchatkan languages, although the phonetic transcription in those earlier works contains many problems.

Table 1 *Examples of Lexical variations in Koryak, Alutor, Chukchi*

	Krasheninnikov (Northern Koryak)	Pallas (Koryak)	Pallas (Kolyma)	Dybowski (Radliński 1894)	Alutor (Nagayama et al. 2017, 2019)	Chukchi (Inenlikei 1982)	Koryak (Zhukova 1967)
star	<i>ʔelʔapičan</i>	<i>jejer (sg)</i>	<i>ʔelʔapičan (sg)</i>	<i>engeri-wgi (pl)</i>	<i>aŋar (sg.) aŋari-wwi</i>	<i>eŋer ~aŋar- ləŋən</i>	<i>ʔəlʔapəčʔən (sg)</i>
rein	<i>kumuxatu</i>	<i>muxemuks</i>	<i>kumuxatu</i>	<i>ergin</i>	<i>arŋin</i>	<i>iliil</i>	<i>muqe-muq</i>
river	<i>uejem</i>	<i>vejem, uejem</i>	<i>wajm, gojem</i>	<i>vejem</i>	<i>wajam</i>	<i>weem</i>	<i>wejem</i>
sand	<i>gejčaam</i>	<i>čigej</i>	<i>gejčam</i>	<i>šgej</i>	<i>səŋaj-jə</i>	<i>čəŋaŋ-ləŋən</i>	<i>čəŋej</i>

## References

- Inenlikej, P.I. 1982. *Slovar Chukotsko-Russkii i Russko-Chukotskii* [Chukchi-Russian and Russian-Chukchi Dictionary.] Leningrad: Prosveschenie.
- Krashennnikov, S. P. (1755/1949). *Opisanie zemli Kamchatki: S prilozheniem raportov, donesinii i drugikh ne opublikovannykh materialov*. Glavsevmorputi. Moscow/Leningrad.
- Nagayama, Y., V. M. Nutayulgin, L. I. Chechulina (2017, 2019) *Nymylan-Russian Dictionary: Alutor dialect. Part1, 2*. The working group of the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C) "Compiling a Dictionary and Creating a Database for the Revitalization of Endangered Paleosiberian Languages": Sapporo.
- Okružnoi Institut Uoverschenstvovaniia Uchitelei (1996) *Dialektnoi slovar koriakskogo iazyka* [Koryak Dialectal Dictionary]. Palana. (unpublished)
- Pallas, P.S. (1786/1977). *Linguarum totius orbis vocabularia comparativa Band 1, 2*. [Comparative dictionaries of all languages and dialects] St. Petersburg. rep. 1977. Hamburg: Buske.
- Radliński, Ignacy. (1894). *Słownik narzecza Koryaków wschodnich*. Ze zbiorów Prof. B. Dybowskiego (Słowniki narzeczy ludów Kamczackich, 5) Nakładem Akademii Umiejętność.
- Zhukova, A. N. (1967) *Russko-koryakskiy slovar*. Moscow: Soviet Encyclopedia.

# Prehistoric contacts of Eskimo–Aleut and Austronesian languages

Natalia Pimenova (Higher School of Economics, Moscow)

The Eskimo–Aleut languages are believed to represent a separate prehistoric migration of people from Asia. The more credible proposals on the external relations and prehistoric contacts of Eskimo–Aleut concern one or more of the language families of northern Eurasia. The two serious genetic hypotheses are (1) 'Altaic' (Mudrak 2008)/ 'Uralo-Siberian' (Fortescue 1998) or more inclusively (2) 'Nostratic' ('Eurasianic').

With using a comparative analysis method, this paper provides data for connections between Eskimo-Aleut and Austronesian languages. The comparative word-list consists of comparisons of Proto-Eskimo (PE) or Proto-Eskimo-Aleut (PEA) and Proto-Austronesian (PAN) or Proto-Malayo-Polynesian (PMP) words put together by the author:

- a) canonical comparisons: those with one-to-one sound correspondences (only in words with the uncontroversial PAN stops and sonants \*p, \*t, \*k, \*q, \*m, \*n + \*l) or with some regular sound correspondences (PAN \*S – PE \*c, PAN \*s – PE \*c, PAN CeC > Yup CeC, Inup CiC) and identical or close semantics.
- b) near comparisons: those with sound and meaning correspondences as in a) and with one other final sound.

The material includes lexical entries (several dozen) that the author believes to be strong evidence for the Austronesian influence on Eskimo and Aleut languages. We can explain the lexical similarities as a result of a prehistoric substratum or convergence of proto-languages (contacts with peripheral prehistoric Austronesian subgroups, before PAN \*S > PMP \*h).

Examples:

PEA (Proto-Eskimo-Aleut) \**tanə* 'earth', Aleut *tanax* 'earth, land', Yupik *tanem* 'how on earth!' – PMP \**taneq* 'earth, soil, land'

PE \**pana* 'spear, knife; to spear', PEA \**panə* (Al \**anu* 'throw at') – PAN \**panaq* 'throw something at a target, shoot bow and arrow'

PE \**qulə* 'top area, above, upper part, upper part of human body' – PAN \**quluh* 'head', *qulu* 'head-end, upper part'

PE \**kapə-* 'stick, to stab' – PAN \**kapit* 'fasten together by sewing or tying'

PE \**aku* 'root of a plant' – PMP \**akaR* 'root'

PE \**takit*- 'come, to arrive' – PMP \**teka* 'come, arrive, reach'

PE \**katə-γ*- 'knock' – PMP \**katuk* 'knock'

With PAN \*S – PE \*c, PAN \*s – PE \*c:

PE \**cikə*- 'bend down' – PAN \**sekel* 'bend, bow'

PE \**cukar* 'post, pole' – PAN \**sukud* 'walking stick, cane, staff'

PE \**cavət* 'grope' – PAN \**SapSap*, \**SapuSap* 'feel, grope'

With specific root polysemy:

PE \**ilu* (Yupik *ilutak* 'valley; dip; bay', *il'unaaq* 'deep crevice in sand dunes' Nun, Inup *ilunaaq* 'ditch') – PAN \**iluR*<sub>2</sub> 'river channel'; PEA \**ilu* 'inside, interior, emotions' – POC \**ilo*<sub>1</sub> 'inside, interior, emotions'.

### Abbreviations:

ACD - Austronesian Comparative Dictionary.

### References:

- Bengtson, John D. & Blažek, Václav. 2009. Ainu and Austric: Evidence of Genetic Relationship. In *Journal of Language Relationship/Вопросы языкового родства*. — Santa Fe Institute & Brno, Masaryk University.
- Berge, Anna. 2010. Origins of Linguistic Diversity in the Aleutian Islands. In *Human Biology*, 84(4), 557-581.
- Bergsland, Knut. 1994. *Aleut Dictionary. Unangam Tunudgusii*. Alaska Native Language Center, University of Alaska Fairbanks.
- Bergsland, Knut. 1997. *Aleut Grammar: Unangam Tunuganaan Achixaasiĭ*. Alaska Native Language Center: University of Alaska Fairbanks.
- Blust, Robert. 2013. *The Austronesian languages*. Canberra.
- Fortescue, Michael. 1998. *Language Relations Across Bering Strait: Reappraising the Archaeological and Linguistic Evidence*. London: Bookcraft Ltd.
- Fortescue, Michael & Jacobson, Steven & Kaplan, Lawrence. 1994. *Comparative Eskimo Dictionary with Aleut Cognates*. Alaska Native Language Center: University of Alaska, Fairbanks.

Jacobson, Steven A. 2012. *Yup'ik Eskimo Dictionary*. Alaska Native Language Center. University of Alaska Fairbanks.

Mudrak, Oleg A. Kamchukchee and Eskimo Glottochronology and Some Altaic Etymologies Found in the Swadesh List. 2008. In *Aspects of Comparative Linguistics*, 3. Moscow, 297-336

Mudrak, Oleg A. 2011. *Eskimo Etymological Dictionary*. [*Eskimosskij Etimologikon*]. Moscow.

Seiler, Wolf A. 2012. *Iñupiatun Eskimo Dictionary*. SIL International.

Vovin, Alexander. 2015. Eskimo Loanwords in Northern Tungusic. *Iran and the Caucasus*, 19 (2015), 87-95. Leiden: Brill.

## Tense in Nganasan narratives

Sándor Szeverényi (University of Szeged)

The aim of the presentation is to classify the use of some typical TAME-suffixes (tense-aspect-mood-evidentiality) in Nganasan narratives. The approach is text-level, used some basic notion of narratology and perspectivization. The main findings will be demonstrated with examples taken from the Nganasan Spoken Language Corpus (Brykina et al.).

The main research question is how the unique Nganasan TAME system „works” on the text-level in monopersonal narratives, first of all: is there any correlation between the use of deictic tenses (past and future) and the use of aspectual-based aorist (perfective and imperfective). Second, what types of evidentials (inferential, reportative, sensitive) are used in narratives? The third, what kind of patterns or strategies of tense, aspect and evidential use can be established in the speech of the narrator and speech of the quoted speakers.

I analyze three subcorpora of the NSLC (Brykina et al. 2018):

- ”Life” stories – they represent personal narratives, typically stories of the speaker or his/her relatives (14 texts, 4379 types, 10081 token)
- Dyayku’s stories – representing a folklore genre about the Nganasan trickster (7 texts, 2266 types, 5088 token)
- conversations – there are some quasi-spontaneous dialogues about ordinary topics that can serve as a base for contrastive studies (7 texts, 1797 types, 4422 token)

The main criteria of the selection were that personal vs. folklore characteristics in contrast with non-narrative and more interactive texts. Individual language use and sociolinguistic aspects do not play a role in this study, but we will return to these later in the research. So far, the oral, prosodic, suprasegmental features were not examined (emphasis, pause, intonation etc.) either.

The main findings are as follows:

- there are some „basic” TAM strategies that are characteristic of the genres,
- the structure of the personal narratives often shows parallel features with the folkloric ones, but interestingly, they seem to be more coherent,
- deictic tenses are more typical in folklore-type texts,
- epistemic modals are less typical in tales, in spite of the high rate of the direct quotes,
- only direct reported speech exists in Nganasan,
- ”Ou” marks the turning point in narrative discourse, often without.

## References

Brykina, Maria - Valentin Gusev - Sándor Szeverényi - Beáta Wagner-Nagy 2018: “Nganasan Spoken Language Corpus (NSLC).” Archived in Hamburger Zentrum für Sprachkorpora. Version 0.2. Publication date 2018-06-12. <http://hdl.handle.net/11022/0000-0007-C6F2-8>.



## ***Küeldet* – богатырские песни селькупов/**

## ***Küeldet* – heroic songs of the Selkup**

Natalja Tuchkova (Tomsk State Pedagogical University)

Сказания о битвах богатырей были в прошлом широко распространены у всех групп селькупов. В XIX в., вероятно, это был один из самых популярных жанров селькупского фольклора. В тот период активного их исполнения эти сказания бытовали в виде песен, поэтому А. Кастрен и обозначил этот жанр как «богатырские песни». Он писал: «Богатырские песни называются в Томской губернии *Küeldet* или *Küeldshut* (букв. Древность), ... ..» [Кастрен, 1860. С. 298].

Сам Кастрен записал четыре богатырских песни у Томских Самоедов в 1846 г., они были опубликованы издателем А. Шифнером в 1855 г. [Castrén, 1855].

Обычно богатырские сюжеты селькупов начинаются с того, что один воин отбирает у другого жену или перехватывает во время сватовства невесту и увозит (пытается её увести) к себе на родину. Другие богатыри (часто «низовские») стремятся преградить путь удачливому богатырю-сопернику, завязывается битва. Если невеста на стороне умыкнувшего её богатыря, то впоследствии, когда соперники через какое-то время предпринимают попытку её выкрасть, она предупреждает мужа об опасности, и ему удается её отстоять, и в целом – победить в битве. Если же невеста насильно увезена богатырем от отца или от первого мужа, то она не предупреждает нового мужа об опасности, и ему приходится сражаться в окружении, при численном превосходстве противника, и погибнуть в неравном бою.

Эпизод (мотив) о «коварной жене», не предупредившей мужа-богатыря о приближающемся вторжении воинов и даже зашившей нитками (саргой) его кольчугу, чтобы он не смог её быстро надеть, отмечен несколько раз как самостоятельный сюжет в разных локальных ареалах селькупов.

К богатырским сказаниям некоторые исследователи относили и сюжеты с героем Итя /Итте, однако классификация этих сюжетов показала, что богатырскими сказаниями они не являются; только небольшая группа сюжетов может быть оценена как богатырские тексты.

### **Литература:**

Кастрен, А. Путешествие Александра Кастрена по Лапландии, Северной России и Сибири (1838–1844 и 1845–1849) / А. Кстрен // Магазин землеведения и путешествий.

Собрание старых и новых путешествий. Географический сборник Николая Фролова. Т. VI. Ч. 2. – Москва, 1860. – 495 с.

Костров, Н. А. Образцы народной литературы самоедов / Н. А. Костров. – Томск, 1882. – 36 с.

Купер, Ш. Ц. Образец фольклора кетских селькупов / Ш. Ц. Купер, Н. П. Максимова // Языки народов Сибири. Томск, 1995. – С. 154–168 [1 фольклорный текст].

Пелих, Г. И. Происхождение селькупов / Г. И. Пелих. – Томск : Изд-во Том. гос. ун-та, 1972. – 423 с.

ТЭВ, 1891 – Тяпса Мергы (сказка) // Томские епархиальные ведомости. – 1891. № 21. – С. 17.

Castrén, M. A. Wörterverzeichnisse aus den samojedischen Sprachen. Bearbeitet von A. Schiefner / M. A. Castrén. – St. Petersburg, 1855. – XXIV. – 404 s.

# Самоедоязычный антропонимический субстрат в историческом именнике хори-бурят/ Samoyedic anthroponymic substrate in the historical name-corpus of Khor-Buryat

Raisa Zhamsaranova (Transbaikal State University, Russia)

Статья посвящена исследованию самоедоязычного субстрата в исторической антропонимии хори-бурят<sup>2</sup>. Личные имена извлечены из архивных документов Государственного Архива Забайкальского края, ревизских описей инородческого населения 1830-1831 гг. Известно, что подавляющее число бурятской антропонимии, особенно восточной группы – хоринских бурят, имеют тибет-монгольское языковое происхождение. Однако в процессе сложения бурятского этноса участвовали и какие-то самоедоязычные племена.

Подтверждением данного тезиса служат как топонимические данные, так и этнонимические, когда главный этноним Монгол имеет объяснение из койбальского как одного из вымерших самодийских языков как «волк». Предлагаемая этимология этнонима Монгол согласуется с преданиями о происхождении монголов от союза легендарного Борте-чино (волка) и Гоа-Марал.

Добавим, что такие этнонимы как самоед и хамниган (каму-ни-хань), функционирующий в качестве экзонима в этнической среде агинской группы хори-бурят, представляют на деле один и тот же этноним. Это свидетельствует, прежде всего, о наличии немонгольского компонента в происхождении бурят. Помимо кетоязычных, тюркоязычных, тунгусо-маньчжуроязычных (эвенов) племен в становлении бурят важную роль сыграли и самоедоязычные. Первыми о возможности поисков монгольско-самодийских контактов писали Г.Н. Румянцев и Ц.Б. Цыдендамбаев.

Выявлено наличие бурятско-селькупских лексико-семантических параллелей как в терминологии родства, так и апеллятивной лексике. Началом изучения самоедоязычного субстрата в ономастической системе Восточного Забайкалья послужили топонимические исследования. Выявлен и описан в ряде научных статей и монографий плотный самоедоязычный субстрат. В монографии «Топонимическая лексика Восточного Забайкалья: сопоставительный анализ» описаны лексико-

---

<sup>2</sup> При финансовой поддержке гранта РФФИ № 20-012-00335 А «Словарь исторической антропонимии хори-бурят».

семантические параллели в корпусе местной географической монголоязычной терминологии, которая имеет типологически схожие и лексические, и семантические сходства с таковой самодийских языков. Любопытно, что сходство апеллятивной лексики в виде местной географической терминологии обусловлено через посредство старописьменно-монгольского языка, что может служить доказательством временного периода самодийско-монгольских языковых контактов.

Представим обзор лексико-семантических параллелей личных имен бурят цаганского рода 1831 г. с таковыми сойотскими.

Историческое личное имя	Апеллятив сойотского языка	Апеллятив бурятского языка	Значение имени
Тугулдур / Түгүлдэр (имя главного тайши <sup>3</sup> Агинской Степной думы), Тугултур Якшиев (л.335 об.), Тугултур Бысыев (л.342), Тугут Тугултуров (л.348 об.), Рашан Тугултуров (л.348 об.), Тугултур Кулыров (л.349 об.), Тугултур Ибанов (л.352), Тугултур Мункуев (л.357),	атрибутива тыгъһыгыры (прил.) 'добычливый, удачливый, счастливый на добычу' (см.: Рассадин – 2003, с.68)	атрибутивное түгэлдэр, означающее дословно «выражает полноту качества того, чем выражено определяемое, также употребляется постпозиционно с предшествующим существительным в неофициальном или в орудном падеже; түгэлдэр ухаантай – 'редкостного ума'; түгэлдэр бэлигтэй 'исключительного	исторического чередования гласных алтайских языков, к примеру сойотское –ыг в бурятском передается как –э или -у.

<sup>3</sup> <http://encycl.chita.ru/encycl/person/?id=3261> © Энциклопедия Забайкалья. Дата обращения 01.02.2020

		<p>таланта’;  түгэлдэр хүсэн  ‘мощь,  могущество’ и  т.д. (БРС-1973, с.  442)</p>	
<p>Тобоевь (л.), Тубу  Боохоевь (л.343), Вашир  Тобоев, Зодбо Тобоев  (л.356),</p>	<p>ду-бо или то-ба  / туфа –  туьһа~туьфа  ’сагаантан  уйгар, урянхай  (бур.) / уйгур-  оленовод,  урянхаец, тофа  (рус.)’ [см.: 20,  с.108]</p>	-	
<p>Бысыевъ, Босоєва, равно  как и имена Божа  Галцанов [6, л.336 об.],  Бохой Такиров, Босон  Тахиров[там же, л.336  об.], Тугулдур Бысыевъ  (л.342), сынъ Быцый  (л.349), Божиги  Бодогоевъ, Хара  Божигиевь, Бакши  Божигиевь, Бальжи  Божигиевь [там же,  л.354], Базай  Борхожиевь[там же,  л.354 об.], Хориган  Бажигиевь, Сымун  Бажигиевь [там же,  л.354]</p>	<p>сойотского  апеллятива  бузаа [бузаасы]  ‘новорожденный  теленок  (крупных  домашних и  диких копытных  животных)’ [см.:  20, с. 34]</p>	-	
<p>Азар Шараевъ (л.334  об.),</p>	<p>Мужское имя  Азырча (Гемуев,  с.130)</p>		

<p>Маюр Салуевъ (л. 335 об.), Маюр Морходов (с.337 об.), Маюр Болгадаевъ (л.351), Боржан Маюров (л.351), Доржи Маюров (л.351), Маюръ Боинов (л.353),</p>	<p>Мужское имя Маюр (Гемуев, с.134)</p>		
--	---	--	--

Поэтому чрезвычайно перспективным является обсуждение о наличии самоедоязычного компонента в этногенезе хори-бурят как восточной группе бурят – одного из монголоязычных народов алтайской языковой семьи.

### **Список литературы:**

1. Жамсаранова Р.Г., Дыжитова Е.Ч. Топонимическая лексика Восточного Забайкалья: сопоставительный анализ: монография / Р.Г. Жамсаранова, Е.Ч. Дыжитова: Забайкал.гос.ун-т. – Чита: ЗабГУ, 2019. – 244 с.
2. Гемуев И.Н. К истории семьи и семейной обрядности селькупов // Этнография Северной Азии. – С. 80-138.
3. Малиновская С.М. Традиционный селькупский именник и его историческая модификация // Вопросы финно-угорской ономастики. – Ижевск, 1989. – С. 155-161.
4. Жамсаранова Р.Г. Типологический анализ бурятско-селькупской терминологии родства // Вестник Томского государственного университета: Вестник ТГУ № 324 (июль). – Томск: ТГУ, 2009. - С.22- 25.
5. Zhamsaranova Raisa. Onomacoept as a verbal sign of nomadic Middle-Age conceptual sphere // NAME AND NAMING. Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Onomastics “Name and Naming” Sacred and Profane in Onomastics. Cluj-Napoca: Editura Mega, Editura Argonaut, 2017, ISSN: 2501-0727.- pp.1127-1140.  
<http://onomasticafelecan.ro/iconn4/docs/rezumat-ICONN4.pdf>.
6. Zhamsaranova Raisa. ETHNONYM MONGOL AND ITS MEANING: ETIMOLOGICAL AND CONCEPTUAL // Материалы XXI международной научно-практической конференции. 2019. С. 147-150. [https://elibrary.ru/download/elibrary\\_41817763\\_61029794.pdf](https://elibrary.ru/download/elibrary_41817763_61029794.pdf)