

Language change in the Arctic
Workshop proposal for SLE 2023

Convenors: Lenore Grenoble (University of Chicago) & Olesya Khanina (University of Helsinki)

Key words: Arctic, language contact, language change, historical linguistics, sociolinguistics.

This workshop addresses the contributions of Arctic languages to our understanding of the processes of language change and linguistic contact. At the same time, it also aims to profile the role of linguistics in reconstructing human history and migrations. We examine the structural outcomes of language contact along with the social circumstances which produce them, as well as the implications of these linguistic histories for broader studies of changes and movements in speaker populations.

The circumpolar Arctic, understood here quite broadly, including also some Subarctic areas, is home to many indigenous languages. Historically and today, there is movement across the region, leading to contact among indigenous groups and in the last centuries also with speakers of colonial languages (primarily English, Russian, and the Nordic languages). The migrations could not help but leave their traces on the linguistic structures of the Indigenous languages. Besides, if the Arctic might not constitute a language area in terms of structural features, it definitely is a sociolinguistic area. One of its striking features is shared experience of certain kinds of contact ecologies, due to the specifics of Arctic life. Speakers of Arctic languages have traditionally had much in common: they have been (semi-)nomadic, they have lived in sparsely populated areas, they have had to adapt to the same harsh environmental conditions. To this day they engage in subsistence activities, hunting, herding and fishing, they share a cultural code of how interactions happen, etc. Linguistically, this is mirrored, for example, in language continua observed across most Arctic language families, stable for centuries and displaying numerous secondary convergences and spread of innovations regardless earlier splits (e.g. Unangan-Inuit-Yupit (Berge 2018), Athabaskan (Krauss & Golla 1981), Saamic (Aikio 2017), Samoyedic (Khanina 2022), Tungusic (Pakendorf & Aralova 2020)).

This workshop examines the differing kinds of language change in Arctic communities, focusing on the linguistic, social, and wider historical factors. It includes studies from across the Arctic, including Greenland, Scandinavia, Russia, and Alaska. Complex descriptions of particular Arctic language ecologies, their change through history, and their reflection in linguistic structures are still in minority in the ever-growing body of literature on language change. The contributions cluster into several thematic groups, although the boundaries between them are not absolute as the topics are interrelated.

The first group address questions of the reconstruction of historic population movements through a study of contact and change. The papers show how linguistic data can be used to complement analyses of human history based on archaeological information and DNA. They consider deep reconstructions of Uralic movements, going through the Neolithic, Bronze and Iron Ages (Vesakosi), of more recent northward movements of Tungusic over the last centuries (Janhunen), as well as of complex interplay between inheritance and internal contacts within the Chukotko-Kamchatkan language family (Dunn). A related question is the causal role of the geophysical environment in the geographic distribution of languages (Roose, Nylén, Vesakoski & Tolvanen). Mapping these movements and dialect mapping are tasks of their own: Koryakov aims

to move beyond traditional dialect mapping and to take into account contact effects and nomadic lifestyle of the Arctic speakers.

Second, the contributions study pre-colonial language contacts in the Arctic. They show that some northern communities, in particular that of the Lower Kolyma river and the Chukotka peninsula, were characterized by small-scale multilingualism with a general lack of hierarchical organization (Pupynina), and that the sociolinguistic settings are reflected in contact-induced changes in morphology and syntax of their languages (Matić & Nikolaeva). Whether such small-scale multilingualism existed in the Taimyr Region where Sakha speakers were in contact with Evenki, Nganasan and Tundra Russians, is a question for our categorization, but Dolgan differential object marking, resulting from the contact between Sakha and Evenki that led to the emergence of the Dolgan language itself, is quite definitely an example of structural transfer (Sheifer & Bolshakova). Extensive language contacts have also left their structural traces in the Selkup branch of Samoyedic languages: this is true for both their external (Kazakevich) and internal (Brykina & Budzisch) contacts. However, some other parts of the Arctic were also home to language communities with extreme hostility to contacts: the Athabaskan languages are well-known for their disinclination to borrowing, and Kibrik describes in details one particular Athabaskan community, Upper Kuskokwim, and their reasons for keeping their language as intact from external influences as possible.

The third group of papers focuses on contacts with colonizing languages, which involve social hierarchies that have often had an impact on the direction of change, and sometimes in the nature of change as well. A clear case is that of Aleut, for which a comparative study by Golovko shows the effects of Russian versus English on its two areal variants. The case of borrowing of debitive marking into Evenki mirrors in many ways the Dolgan differential object marking, although Klyachko argues that two sources may be involved, Russian and Sakha. Stoyanova uncovers an early influence of Russian onto an Evenki dialect based on texts collected in the 1900s-1910s. The power of colonizing languages can be seen not only in changes induced by them in the Indigenous languages, but also in the construction of the divergent orthographies of Kalaallisut (Greenlandic), which systematically reflect differences in the native language of the creator (Danish, English) of the system (Kristensen). We can also examine what happens when two colonizing languages are in contact in Alaska, with changes in social hierarchies as the territory shifts from the hands of one colonizing power (Russia) to another (the USA), as seen in the contribution by Bergelson, Kibrik & Raskladkina. Finally, contact effects are not confined to historical times but are taking place today. Urbanization, modern migrations, and nation-building language ideologies all play a role in ongoing linguistic change in Arctic languages, with Greenlandic cases being analyzed by Kantarovich and Kleemann-Andersen.

- Aikio, Ante. 2017. An essay on Saami ethnolinguistic prehistory, In Grünthal, Riho & Petri Kallio (eds.). *A Linguistic Map of Prehistoric Northern Europe*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 266. Helsinki, 63-118.
- Berge, Anna. 2018. Re-evaluating the Linguistic Reconstruction of Proto-Eskimo-Aleut, *Journal of Historical Linguistics* 8(2), 230-272.
- Khanina, Olesya. 2022. A history of Northern Samoyedic: adding details to the dialect continuum hypothesis. In Anikin, Aleksandr, Gusev, Valentin & Anna Urmanchieva (eds.). *Sibirica et Uralica: In Memoriam Eugene Helinski*. *Studia Uralo-Altaica* 56. 77-94. Szeged: University of Szeged, 77-94.
- Krauss, Michael E. & Golla, Victor. 1981. Northern Athapaskan languages. In Helm, J. (ed.), *Handbook of North American Indians*, vol. 6 'Subarctic', 67-85. Washinton D. C.: Smithsonian Institution.
- Pakendorf, Brigitte, and Natalia Aralova. 2020. Even and the Northern Tungusic languages, in Robbeets, Martine & Alexander Savelyev (eds.). *The Oxford Guide to the Transeurasian Languages*. Oxford: OUP.

Vertical and horizontal evolution of Uralic language family and its relation to genetic and cultural history

Outi Vesakoski (University of Turku)

The spread of Uralic languages has been associated with the dispersal of N-haplogroup, with various Comb Ceramic cultures, and even with the Bronze Age Seyma-Turbino trading network. However, empirical investigation of language-culture or gene-language coevolution is difficult because researchers have suggested contradictory truths for the timing and pattern of the Proto-Uralic disintegration. Besides, the evolution of language families is presumably a combination of vertical (genealogical) inheritance and horizontal transmission through language contacts, and there is no unified model taking this into account for the Uralic languages.

I will discuss the Uralic history in the light of vertical and horizontal evolution of the family. We used the updated UraLex 3.0 (basic vocabulary cognate corpus) to make a phylolinguistic model of the vertical evolution. The actual result from such model are the probability distributions of Uralic timings, which we used with genetic and archaeological timings in Bayesian chronological analyses to study the interrelation of linguistic, cultural and genetic events. Then, we used UraTyp (typological database of Uralic languages) complemented with data from Uralic neighbors in population genetic admixture model framework, and studied the typological contacts.

The phylogenetic model supports the timing proposed in the hypothesis of Grünthal et al. (2022), as it suggests series of disintegration of Proto-Uralic 4300, 4000 and 3800 years ago (with wide posterior probability distributions), giving 5 main branches. However, the admixture models indicate horizontal transfer of typological traits within linguistic areas. Furthermore a new multilevel phylogenetical model detects evidence of subtle simplification of Uralic typology, suggesting that language shifts have taken place alongside language diffusion through speaker population expansion and migration. I will discuss linguistic history in relation to chronology of genetic and cultural alterations through the Neolithic, Bronze Age and Iron Age.

Grünthal, R., Heyd, V., Holopainen, S., *et al.* 2022. Drastic demographica events triggered the Uralic spread. *Diachronica* 39:490-524.

How Siberia became Tungusic speaking

Juha Janhunen (University of Helsinki)

Since the 17th century, when ethnographic information started becoming available from North Asia, most parts of Siberia have been occupied by Tungusic speaking local groups (Dolgikh 1960). Most of these groups speak a variety of relatively uniform dialects of Ewenki, while in the northeast dialects of the closely related Ewen language are also spoken. The fact that Ewenki and Ewen, the two principal members of the Ewenic branch of Tungusic are mutually so close and internally so coherent is itself suggestive of a history of recent expansion, which has taken these languages from a compact homeland to all over Siberia.

The external history of Ewenic in Siberia can be studied on the basis of linguistic evidence, especially loanwords and onomastics, which confirm that Tungusic reached the more marginal areas of Siberia only some centuries ago, or even later. Along the margins of the Ewenic territories there arose language contacts with the neighbouring ethnic groups, including the Samoyeds in the northwest and the Yukaghir in the northeast. However, in most regions the earlier languages have been extinguished without clearly identifiable traces, suggesting that Tungusic spread under conditions of rapid and massive language shift.

The original expansion center of Ewenic can be placed in the Middle Amur basin and dated to the period corresponding to the consolidation of the historical Mongols in Mongolia and western Manchuria. The Middle Amur was probably the location where Ewenic underwent an initial differentiation into Ewen and Ewenki, of which the latter was further divided into a Siberian and a Manchurian subbranch. In this process, the language, which was originally spoken by semi-sedentary cattle breeders and small-scale agriculturalists was adopted by taiga-dwelling hunters, fishermen, and reindeer breeders. Ultimately, Ewenic varieties came also to be spoken in the actual Arctic zone, as defined by vegetational and climatic features.

Dolgikh, B. O. [Б. О. Долгих] 1960. *Родовой и племенной состав народов Сибири в XVII веке*. Москва: «Наука».

Inheritance and contact in Koryako-Chukotian

Michael Dunn (University of Uppsala)

The Chukotko-Kamchatkan language family consists of two distantly related branches. While the Kamchatkan languages comprise only one language that survived colonialism long enough to be documented, the other branch is relatively large. Apart from Chukchi, this branch also includes several so-named varieties of Koryak, as well as Alutor and Kerek. The names do not fit to historical linguistic classification, nor to indigenous ethnic identification. The Palana variety of Koryak, for instance, is a closer linguistic relative of Alutor than it is to any of the other so-called Koryak varieties. A basic subclassification of Koryako-Chukotian can be achieved through analysis of regular sound change, although no definitive classification can be made without the analytic decision to prioritise certain sound changes over others. For any classification there exist other regular phonological processes that are inconsistent with it, suggesting changes transmitted through waves of contact rather than through inheritance. A number of different tree-with-reticulation models of language relationship are consistent with the data.

Other evidence of long term and intensive contact can be found through analysis of the gender-indexical dialects of Chukchi. Men's and women's Chukchi differ in the realisation of ancestral phonemes in a way that superficially at least would place them on different positions in the family tree of the subgroup. This is likewise a contact phenomenon. I will revisit the evidence that this reflects a phonological process in which Chukchi speaking women have at some point in the past changed their Chukchi to a facsimile of an Alutor/Palana Koryak variety. One explanation of this would be immigration of speakers of such a variety to Chukchi communities. There exists some genetic (biological) evidence for such a historical process.

In this paper I will present a synthesis of the state of the art in Koryako-Chukotian historical linguistics, and indicate where further work should be focussed when conditions allow.

Habitat modeling of Uralic language speaker areas

Meeli Roose, Tua Nylén, Outi Vesakoski, Harri Tolvanen (University of Turku)

One hypothesis explaining language ranges, spread or linguistic diversity is that languages are limited by biogeographical boundaries. Languages themselves do not adapt to ecological environments, but the speaker populations do for subsistence strategies are cultural adaptations to ecological environments. This would imply an indirect connection between language boundaries and biogeographical variation mediated by culture. However, the connection between language ranges and ecological environments has not been empirically demonstrated. Thus we ask: do languages have habitats?

The study starts from the recent publication of the Geographical Database of Uralic Languages, which reflects the speaker areas 100 years ago. This data is combined with high resolution remote sensing data of North Eurasia (snow cover) and modeled historical environments (biomes in 1950s), which have been freely available only for a decade or so. We collected 26 environmental variables, including categorical (biomes), continuous (climate, soil suitable for agriculture) and distances (to ocean and lakes). We used the random forest algorithm to identify the habitat of Samoyedic, Saamic, Finnic and Permic languages as well as Khanty, Mansi, Mari and Mordvin language. We 1) tested if language speaker areas have distinct local compositions of environmental variables, and 2) used machine learning (random forest prediction analysis with spatial input) to predict if similar habitats could be found elsewhere in the study area.

The model did profile distinct habitats for each subfamily. For example, an ecological classification trained on the areas where Samoyedic languages were spoken 100 yrs ago identified areas primarily in the vicinity of the actual observations. We discuss the results in light of historical linguistics, e.g. that areas matching the habitat of Finnic languages occur also in Central Russia that indeed used to be Western-Uralic speaking. The results are encouraging for further research aiming at understanding how biogeographical boundaries limit languages.

Mapping languages of nomadic peoples in circumpolar areas of Eurasia

Yuri Koryakov (Institute of Linguistics RAS)

This talk will discuss the main difficulties that arise in the mapping of the nomadic peoples in the North of Eurasia and their languages, in comparison with the mapping of the sedentary peoples and languages. Among those difficulties are huge areas with no clear borders between them, very low population density, high personal, family and seasonal mobility, overlapping of winter pastures of one ethnic groups with summer pastures of another groups, transition of migration routes might through other group area, extensive multilingualism and lack of data. Quite surprisingly for an outside observer, the most part of Eurasian Circumpolar area were inhabited until recently by nomadic or semi-nomadic groups. Several types of life-styles could be defined: full (whole-family) nomadic pastoralism with herds of domestic reindeer, partial (male only) nomadic pastoralism with herds of domestic reindeer; (nomadic) hunting and gathering (sometimes together with occasional nomadic pastoralism). During Soviet period many of nomadic ethnic groups switched to mostly sedentary style of life. In the talk, the history of cartography of peoples and languages of Russian North in 19th –20th centuries will be discussed. Then the existing sources for modern maps will be reviewed. Finally, a several ways of visualisation are proposed that make it possible to adequately and at the same time visually display on maps not only nomadic and semi-nomadic ethnic groups but also their languages. Those ways are illustrated with maps.

Small-scale Multilingualism in Northeastern Siberia

Maria Pupylnina (Institute for linguistic studies, RAS & University of Münster)

Vast cold lands Northeastern Siberia were historically inhabited by small-scale communities, tribes of nomads, fishers and hunters. This region used to be the gates for Americas' settlement, and peoples and languages repeatedly replaced each other moving towards and backwards by Bering Strait/land bridge and adjacent seas. In this talk, I will examine how contacts between some communities inhabiting the area during the last several centuries gave rise to the emergence of small-scale multilingualism in this region.

I will concentrate on the contrast between two Siberian regions where I worked. One is the lowland of Kolyma river where five languages belonging to five different linguistic stocks are spoken: Tundra Yukaghir, Even, Chukchi, Yakut, and Russian. For the local communities having a command of five languages was the norm during the big part of 20th century. The second region is Chukchi Peninsula, a tiny easternmost end of Eurasia, where during the last century Chukchi, Chaplinski, Sirenik, Naukan, Inupiaq, English Hawaii pidgin, and Russian languages were spoken. Multilingualism here was a more distant and less widespread practice, which was continuously reducing during the 20th century

Multilingualism and its dynamics will be discussed on the community level. The issues I plan to discuss are listed below:

- What kinds of localities are examined? (e.g. nomadic groups vs. settlements)
- Are/were there any differences (e.g. ideology, culture, identity) between communities in contact, except languages/language repertoires?
- What types of contacts between the communities can be listed?
- How multilingualism (its popularity, language repertoires etc.) changed through time, and how this dynamics can be explained?

The generalizations that will be made can be probably extended to the more distant past, which can allow us to hypothesize what forces could have influenced language drift across the Bering Strait/land bridge.

Morphosyntactic convergence and types of multilingualism in the Lower Kolyma tundra

Dejan Matic & Irina Nikolaeva (University of Münster)

The paper will describe the convergence phenomena in the grammar of the languages of the Lower Kolyma tundra and interpret them against their historical and sociolinguistic settings. The Lower Kolyma tundra in north-eastern Siberia is inhabited by the speakers of Tundra Yukaghir (TY; Yukaghiric), Lower Kolyma Even (LKE; Tungusic), Yakut (Turkic) and Chukchi (Chukotko-Kamchatkan). Our investigation of morphosyntactic convergence in this region will focus on the comparison between two contact situations, the TY-LKE contact on the one hand, and TY-Yakut on the other. These two contact situations are of interest due to different types of multilingualism they instantiate. While the TY-LKE relationship has been of a reciprocal symmetrical type for centuries, the more recent relationship between Yakut and TY is asymmetric, with a clear dominance of Yakut.

The degree of lexical (and to a certain extent, phonological) convergence between TY and LKE is very high, but the morphosyntactic features that can be attributed to mutual contact are rather few. The direction of influence appears to be primarily from TY to LKE (e.g. pretensive and hypocoristic forms), not the other way round. In contrast, TY morphosyntax was influenced by Yakut in the course of the 20th century. The phenomena which appear to be the result of the recent copying of respective Yakut patterns into TY comprise at least: (a) the structure of the necessitative paradigm based on the future participle with or without proprietive marking, (b) the grammaticalisation of the generic verb of saying as a multi-purpose grammatical item, (c) the emergence of the future imperative, and (d) contrastive markers deriving from the converbal forms of the copula verb.

We will collate these and other linguistic features with the sociolinguistic data and the type of multilingual situation, and discuss the ramifications of our findings for the theory of language contact.

Contact-induced patterns in direct object marking in Dolgan

Karina Sheifer (Institute of Linguistics RAS & Institute of System Programming RAS & Dartmouth College) & Kseniia Bolshakova

The study investigates direct object marking in Dolgan, comparing it with the case distribution in Evenki and Yakut. The Dolgan data were obtained through elicitation with the lower Dolgans living in the villages of Popigay, Syndassko and Khatanga, as the most vital Dolgan language community to date.

Däbritz stresses that the exact patterns of DOM in Dolgan are not fully understood yet [Däbritz 2022: 353]. Possible competing cases include nominative, accusative and partitive in a non-possessive and possessive declension (1).

Among three main morphological interferences of the Evenki language on Yakut, Ubryatova singles out a partitive in Yakut [Ubrjatova 2011: 27]. Seržant points out that the partitive case of Yakut and Tofa (both contacted with Evenki) is only used with imperatives, while in Dolgan with future events as well [Seržant 2021: 147]. Likewise, Kazama states that the partitive-like indefinite accusative of Evenki clearly shows a preference for future tense and imperative [Kazama 2012: 144–145]. Nevertheless, the conducted elicitation in Dolgan allows expanding this list with the desiderative, capacitive, necessitative and conditional (1) modalities for Dolgan. The choice of competing cases depends on the definiteness of the direct object.

(1) et-te	[et-i	/ et-pin	/ *et	/ *et-im
meat-PART	[meat-ACC	/ meat-ACC.1SG	/ *meat.[NOM]	/ *meat-NOM.1SG
/ *et-pine]	hi̇e-tek-pine	bi̇ar-im	i̇ald' -i̇a	
/ *meat-PART.1SG]	eat-TEMP-1SG	stomach-1SG	be.sick-FUT.[3SG]	

If I eat [the] meat, I will have a stomach ache.

The elicited contexts include those with (in-)definite, (non-)partitive, (non-)specific objects as well as measurements, as of time, space or quantity. The hypothesis put forward is that, taking into account the origin of Dolgans and their further close interaction with Evenki, Dolgan shares more common features in direct object marking with Evenki and demonstrates wider use of partitive than Yakut does.

Däbritz, Ch. L. A Grammar of Dolgan. Grammars and Sketches of the World's Languages, Volume: 18. Brill, 2022. 573 p.

Kazama, Sh. Designative case in Tungusic languages. – Andrej L. Malchukov & Lindsay J. Whaley (eds.), Recent advances in Tungusic linguistics. Turcologica 89. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2012. P. 123–152.

Seržant, I. Diachronic Typology of Partitives / Partitive Determiners, Partitive Pronouns and Partitive Case. Ed. by Sleeman, Petra and Giusti, Giuliana. Partitive Determiners, Partitive Pronouns and Partitive Case, Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, 2021. P. 111-167.

Ubryatova, E.I. Interaction of languages based on the relationship between the Yakut and Evenk languages {Vzaimodeistvie yazykov na materiale vzaimootnosheniy yakutskogo i evenkiiskogo yazykov} // Selected Works. Studies in Turkic languages. Novosibirsk: Publishing house RIC NGU, 2011. 281 p.

Language change over the Arctic Circle and under it: the case of Northern and Southern Selkup

Olga Kazakevich (Institute of Linguistics RAS)

The objective of the paper is to analyze linguistic situation and traceable structural changes in the dialects of Northern and Southern Selkup and to compare the results in order to see whether the “Arctic position” contributes anything to the language wellbeing and influences the quantity, quality and speed of structural changes.

The results of the archaeological excavations compared with the results of the ethnographic studies of the Selkup traditional culture allow to state that the Selkups have been occupying the Southern part of their present day territory (the middle flow of the Ob' and its tributaries) for at least two thousand years. The ancestors of the Northern Selkups moved to the Taz and Turukhan basins in the second part of the 17th century, after the Russians had come to Western Siberia, so well over three centuries the Northern and Southern Selkup dialects developed separately.

Interestingly, language contacts of the Northern group remain almost the same as of the Southern one (Ket, Evenki, Eastern Khan ty, finally Russian), the only difference was that Turkic languages in the South have changed for Forest and Tundra Nenets in the Arctic.

First, it should be stated that the Arctic helped most of the Northern Selkup dialects to survive while most of the Southern Selkup dialects disappeared by now, their speakers shifting to Russian. Still, as most of them were documented to some degree, we can trace changes in their structure basing on their documentation done in different periods.

Second, the categories and directions of the grammar changes coincide with those of the Northern Selkup dialects (number, conjugation type and mood). In some dialects the changes started over hundred years ago.

Finally, there remains a question, whether there is some input of language contacts into the changes in grammar structure both in the South and in the North.

Dialectal variation in Selkup: challenges of a corpus study

Maria Brykina & Josefina Budzisch (University of Hamburg)

This study is an overview of dialectal variation among the Selkup speakers in the 1960-1970-s. Selkup is a Samoyedic (< Uralic) language spoken in the Western Siberia; traditionally its speakers were semi-nomadic hunter-gatherers, though in many areas permanent Selkup settlements appeared by the end of the 19th cent., in particular, in the southern areas. Selkup is notorious for both numerous dialects and subdialects, and lack of sharp boundaries between them (cf. Kazakevich 2022, Klump & Budzisch, Forthc.). So this language represents another case of a dialect continuum of the Arctic, and the present paper aims to contribute to better understanding of patterns organizing such continua. Our study is based on the data from the archive materials of Angelina Ivanovna Kuzmina and on the published texts.

On the basis of twenty phonetic, morphological and lexical features we have compared speech samples of about eighty Selkup speakers from different dialects and have reviewed the isoglosses known from previous research, and also added new ones, in order to better understand the Selkup dialectal distribution. We have also matched structural isoglosses to current (as of 1960-1970-s) or previous locations of the speakers. A more detailed microstudy of ten speakers of the Novosondorovo and Ivankino subdialects, geographically situated about 40 km from each other along the Ob river, showed that at least in this region a dialectal continuum definitely existed.

So, in our talk we will present descriptive results of the study and address a methodological question of how such kind of linguistic data may contribute to understanding of Arctic sociolinguistic processes.

Upper Kuskokwim Athabaskan: A case of resistance to language contact

Andrej A. Kibrik (Institute of Linguistics RAS and Lomonosov MSU)

Upper Kuskokwim (UK) is an Athabaskan (Dene) 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.

Four kinds of potential external influence may be expected in UK: neighboring Athabaskan languages, Yup'ik Eskimo, Russian (in the 19th century) and English (in the 20th century). All of them will be considered in turn in the paper.

- Potential borrowings from the adjacent related languages (Dena'ina, Lower Tanana, Koyukon, Holikachuk and Deg Xinag) are difficult to recognize as Athabaskans traditionally had a knowledge of inter-language sound correspondences and recalculated borrowings into the local phonetic system, making them indistinguishable from original forms.
- The only other indigenous contacting group were Yup'iks of middle and lower Kuskokwim. 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.
- Contact with Russians started in mid-19th century but was never intense. 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. UK has about 80 lexical borrowings from Russian, all being nouns denoting European artefacts or religious concepts.
- 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 and a single grammatical borrowing. Massive language shift ensued in the 1960s, and at later times English elements in UK discourse qualify more as code mixing than as entrenched borrowings per se.

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.

Aleut as a “split language”: contact-induced language changes in two Aleut communities

Evgeniy Golovko (Institute for Linguistic Studies RAS, European University St Petersburg)

In the circumpolar area, the Aleut people represent not a rare case of “divided nation”. Starting 1867, when Alaska and the Aleutian Islands were purchased by the U.S.A., the Aleut language got under the influence of two socially dominant languages, Russian (on the Commander Islands) and English (on the Aleutian Islands and in Alaska). The two Aleut groups found themselves in two different countries and lived in complete isolation from each other for over a century and a half. After the meltdown of the ice curtain in the early 1990s, the contacts resumed. Already the first direct contact, a thirty-minute telephone talk in 1990 (tape-recorded), between the two persons, one from Bering Island, the U.S.S.R., and the other from Atka Island, the U.S.A., demonstrated that the two speakers, indeed, used the same language, but encountered serious difficulties understanding each other due to contact-induced changes in both language varieties. These changes are found not only in the lexicon (which could be easily predicted), but also in syntax and even in phonology.

In the proposed talk, I will demonstrate what particular changes occurred in the two language varieties during the last two centuries. I will also speculate on the sources of these changes - which of them are the effect of Russian and English influence correspondingly, and which changes should be treated as the result of independent language development. In my talk I will mainly use Bergsland’s materials on Atkan Aleut and my own field notes on Bering Aleut.

Debitive constructions in Evenki as a consequence of language contact

Elena Klyachko (NRU Higher School of Economics, Moscow)

Evenki, a Tungusic language spoken in Russia and China, has had contacts with Turkic, Mongolic, and Uralic languages as well as Russian and Chinese ([Grenoble 2000; Helimski 2003; Khabtagaeva 2010; Pakendorf and Aralova 2020: 290]). I will use dialect corpora to demonstrate the effect of contacts on Evenki debitive constructions.

Necessity is expressed with $-ŋA^1:t$ or $-mAtʃin$ converbs ([Bulatova and Grenoble 1999: 37]). However, other strategies are possible:

- (1) *skoro nado kərəmi:-dʹə-kol skoro*
soon.R **it.is.necessary.R** squirrel.VBLZ-IPFV-IMPER.2SG soon.R
‘It is necessary to hunt squirrels soon’ (Angara and Upper Lena ← Russian, Mongolian)
- (2) *utə-l-bi nado uli-ri:-du:*
child-PL-ACC.RFL **it.is.necessary.R** feed-PTCP-DAT
‘It is necessary to feed one’s children’ (Ayan-Maya ← Sakha, Negidal)

In (1), “nado” (a Russian borrowing) is used with the imperative $-kol$ form, which has lost its vowel harmony and become an infinitive form in the Upper Lena dialects ((3)), cf. ([Khromov 2015; Shchapova 2016]).

- (3) *lu:tʃa-di-t gun-dʹə-kol mulli-dʹa-ra-n*
Russian-ADJ-ADVZ say-IPFV-IMPER.2SG cannot-IPFV-NFUT-3SG
‘He cannot speak Russian’

Vasilevich mentions the Russian-Evenki trade “jargon” in the Upper Lena region ([Vasilevich 1948: 103]). The transformation of the imperative may be the effect of this “trade language”.

In (2), “nado” is accompanied with a $-ri:$ participle, which is not used in this way in other dialects. Moreover, dative non-finite forms are not typical for Evenki but normal for Sakha, e. g. in purpose ([Stapert 2013: 297, 299]) or debitive constructions. Sakha has also borrowed “nado”, and there is a Sakha purposive $-A:ri$ converb. I suppose that the “nado”+ $X-ri:-DAT$ construction is borrowed from Sakha, with the $-A:ri$ converb influencing the $-ri:$ participle. A similar $-wri:$ form in the sister Negidal language ([Khasanova and Pevnov 2003: 270]) may also be due to contact.

I will show other examples of debitive constructions and discuss why they are borrowed so often.

Bulatova, Nadezhda, and Lenore Grenoble. Evenki. 1999. München/Newcastle: Lincom Europa.
Grenoble, Lenore. Morphosyntactic change: The impact of Russian on Evenki. Languages in contact. Brill, 2000. 105-120.

¹ A stands for the harmonizing vowel

Helimski, Eugene. Areal groupings (Sprachbünde) within and across the borders of the Uralic language family: A survey. *Nyelvtudományi közlemények* 100 (2003): 156-167.

Khabtagaeva, Bayarma. Mongolic elements in Barguzin Evenki. *Acta Orientalia* 63.1 (2010): 9-25.

Khasanova, Marina, and Alexander Pevnov. *Mify i skazki negidal'tsev* [Myths and Tales of the Negidal]. Publications on Tungus Languages and Cultures 21 (2003).

Khromov, Vladimir. *Evedy tureruk. Dialektnyy slovar yevenkov Verkhnelenya* [Evenki dictionary. A dialect dictionary of the Upper Lena Evenki]. Khanty-Mansiysk, 2015.

Pakendorf, Brigitte, and Natalia Aralova. Even and the Northern Tungusic languages. In Robbeets, Martine, and Alexander Savelyev, eds. *The Oxford guide to the Transeurasian languages*. Oxford University Press, 2020.

Shchapova, Diana. *Yevenkiysko-russkiy slovar : verkhnelenskiy (kachugskiy) govor* [Evenki-Russian dictionary: the Upper Lena (Kachug) dialect]. Krasnoyarsk, 2016

Stapert E. L. Contact-induced change in Dolgan: An investigation into the role of linguistic data for the reconstruction of a people's (pre) history. – Leiden University, 2013.

Vasilevich, Glafira M. *Ocherk dialektov jevenkijskogo (tungusskogo) jazyka* [Essays on the grammar of the Evenki (Tungus) language]. Leningrad: Uchpedgiz, 1948.

Reconstructing a pre-Soviet contact with Russian: The case of Barhahan Evenki

Natalya Stoyanova (University of Hamburg)

While language contact with Russian observed in the territory of Siberia in the Soviet and post-Soviet time is quite well-studied (cf., e.g., Grenoble 2000; 2010; Rudnitskaya 2019 on the Evenki-Russian contact), earlier contacts still need investigation. In the paper, I will reconstruct the contact situation attested in the early XX century among speakers of one of the yet identified Evenki dialects, based on archival data. Both linguistic and extralinguistic data give evidence for a pre-Soviet intense contact with Russian.

The data come from the archive of Konstantin Rychkov. It consists of manuscript texts in several Evenki dialects collected in the 1900s-1910s (cf. Arkhipov & Däbritz 2021: 48-50). I will analyze one part of the archive, i.e. texts in Barhahan Evenki (531 pages). The name “Barhahan” is mentioned nowhere except for Rychkov's materials. According to its phonetic and morphosyntactic features, this dialect belongs to the Southern group. According to Rychkov's notes and toponyms mentioned in the texts, it was spoken in the territory from Yeniseysk to Krasnoyarsk along both banks of Yenisey.

The texts are mostly life-stories and personal narratives: they contain a lot of information on contact between the Barhahan Evenki and their neighbors, including the Selkups (“Ostyaks”), Siberian Tatars, and especially Russians. I will consider this extralinguistic information and map it to the linguistic evidence of language contact coming from the same texts.

Barhahan Evenki appears to have been highly influenced by Russian already in the 1910s, i.e. before the Soviet “russification”, affecting all the indigenous peoples of Siberia. The texts contain many Russian loanwords, including those in core vocabulary, as well as a number of multi-word code-switches. Some morphosyntactic features, such as non-standard word-order, valency, and clause-linkage patterns can also be explained by the Russian influence. The data of Barhahan Evenki will be compared to those of three other Evenki dialects documented by Rychkov in the same period.

Arkhipov, A.V., and C.L. Däbritz. 2021. Reconstructing phonetics behind the graphic system of Evenki texts from the Rychkov archive // *Rhema*, 2. 2021. P. 46–64.

Grenoble, L. 2000. The impact of Russian on Evenki // Gilbers D., Nerbonne J., Schaeken J. (eds.). *Languages in contact*. Amsterdam; Atlanta, GA: Rodopi. P. 104-120.

Grenoble, L. 2010. Switch or shift: code-mixing, contact-induced change and attrition in Russian-Evenki contacts // *Slavica Helsingiensia*, 40. P. 147-161.

Rudnitskaya, E.L. 2019. Morphosyntax of the spoken Evenki of the early XXI century. Sankt-Petersburg: Nestor-Istorija. [In Russian]

Orthographies in Greenland from 1700 until today

Tikaajaat Kristensen (Ilisimatusarfik, The University of Greenland)

From the beginning of colonization of Greenland in 1700 until now, various Kalaallisut orthographies have been put to use in Greenland. The best known to Kalaallit, the people of Greenland, are Kleinschmidt's orthography from mid-1800 and the new orthography from 1973, but there are older orthographies from the start of the colonization used by the missionaries. The different orthographies are from different periods of time, the first developed by Danish missionary Otto Fabricius from 1791, the second developed by German missionary Samuel Kleinschmidt from 1851 and the last developed by a committee appointed by Landsrådet (National council) from 1973.

With the exception of the latest orthography developed by Kalaallit themselves, the orthographic systems were developed by outsiders who spoke different European languages. These different languages influenced the development of Kalaallisut orthography and the language itself. This presentation examines three of these writing systems and shows linguistic developments that have been through history of Kalaallisut and what influence the various European languages that laid the foundation for the orthography had on Kalaallisut. Particular attention is given to the methodologies used in developing the orthographies and whether those differences represent phonetic differences: do they show differences in pronunciation of word at different times? Do the differences in orthographies represent language change, or do they rather reflect differences in the languages of the developers?

The different grammars from these different orthography developers and the guidance to the new orthography from the National council are examined, with examples of usage of the orthographies from the national newspaper in Greenland *Atuagagdliutit*.

On parameters of language shift: The case of the Kodiak town variety of Alaskan Russian

Mira Bergelson (NRU Higher School of Economics, Moscow), Andrej A. Kibrik (Institute of Linguistics RAS & Lomonosov Moscow State University), Marina Raskladkina

The Kodiak town on the Kodiak island was a 'metropolitan city' of Alaskan Russian for a long time. Under the name of Pavlovskaya Gavan', it was the first capital of Russian America at the end of the 18th century and it retained its importance as a hub for the RAC economic activities even long after that. After 1867 and through the first decades of the 20th century when other-than-Russian-speaking population started settling in the town of Kodiak, the majority of the population of the Kodiak town was speaking Russian as their first language. In most cases these people, the Creoles, were bilingual, or even trilingual in Alaskan Russian, Alutiiq, and eventually, English, and could write in these languages. This lasted till 1970-s and is in contrast with the situation in Ninilchik, the best studied location of Alaskan Russian, where no knowledge of Alutiiq was observed.

In the summer of 2019, we traveled to Kodiak looking for traces of the Alaskan Russian language and culture. We managed to meet the very last speakers/rememberers of Alaskan Russian there whose words and phrases recorded during 8 hours of interviews led us to conclude that there existed a special Kodiak town variety of Alaskan Russian. It has some peculiar features in phonetics, grammar and vocabulary, different from Ninilchik Russian, the best preserved and the most documented variety of Alaskan Russian.

These differences correspond well to what is known historically about the Russian Creole community in the Kodiak town, and the ways this place developed since 1792 when Russians established it. This variety of Alaskan Russian has features of more profound creolization. At the same time, it had a relatively long history of use in the urban setting, where Alaskan Russian was spoken in a broader set of functional domains compared to the Ninilchik village. Our data allows for better understanding of the linguistic processes that took place in this area in the last two centuries and thus, for working out a more fine-tuned typology of the language shift in Alaska that has involved Russian.

Urbanization and incipient morphosyntactic change in Kalaallisut (West Greenlandic)

Jessica Kantarovich (University of Chicago)

Kalaallisut (West Greenlandic) is an Inuit language widely spoken as a first language throughout the country of Greenland. Although it is presently robustly spoken, Kalaallisut has been under pressure from Danish since colonization began in the 1700s, and was considered under threat before Greenlanders attained home rule of their country in 1979. The current population is highly diverse in terms of speakers' degree of multilingualism, with variable proficiency in different Greenlandic dialects. The situation has also been changing in light of pressure from globalization and urbanization—Nuuk, the country's capital, attracts immigrants from all over the world. Although Danish remains a noticeable presence throughout the capital, English is also increasingly used as a lingua franca in public spaces, especially during service encounters. This study investigates the impressionistic claims of urban dwellers in Greenland who report that the grammatical structure of their language has been changing for at least a decade. As a polysynthetic language, Kalaallisut differs significantly from the two languages with which it is in contact, Danish and English, which have far more analytic morphosyntax. Thus, this contact scenario affords us an opportunity to investigate different mechanisms of contact-induced change in an urbanizing society. In particular, we investigate basic clause structure with monovalent and polyvalent verbs. Our study was carried out with young adult speakers of different educational and linguistic backgrounds who hail from different parts of Greenland but currently reside in Nuuk. We find that there is morphosyntactic variation among speakers in the domains of case marking, word order, and noun incorporation, and evaluate different explanations for this variation. We ask to what extent changes to the degree of synthesis in a language are a direct result of contact pressures from specific (less synthetic) languages, or whether they can be explained by changes in social structure.

Decoloniality and dilemmas of standardization ideologies in Greenland

Camilla Kleemann-Andersen (Ilisimatusarfik, The University of Greenland)

Standard ideologies are some enduring parts of a language society. In sociolinguistics, standard ideologies seem reviled by linguists but are very common among language users. In the Greenlandic context, they are used to oppose Danish as the colonial language. Despite arguments about protecting Kalaallisut through standardization, it has consequences for other dialects that are not standardized. But because standard ideologies are so strong, people sometimes express willingness to sacrifice different dialects. In a postcolonial context, how can the problem be addressed without neglecting the enormous symbolic value that West Greenlandic has in the language community?

